Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Scandinavian Journal of History

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/shis20

A Theory of the Enlightenment in Late Eighteenth-Century Sweden: Nils von Rosenstein and Scotland's Science of Man and Politics

Max Skjönsberg

To cite this article: Max Skjönsberg (2023): A Theory of the Enlightenment in Late Eighteenth-Century Sweden: Nils von Rosenstein and Scotland's Science of Man and Politics, Scandinavian Journal of History, DOI: 10.1080/03468755.2023.2187879

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/03468755.2023.2187879

Published online: 19 Mar 2023.

SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL OF HISTORY
https://doi.org/10.1080/03468755.2023.2187879

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

A Theory of the Enlightenment in Late Eighteenth-Century Sweden: Nils von Rosenstein and Scotland's Science of Man and Politics

Max Skjönsberg

Faculty of History, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

ABSTRACT

Nils von Rosenstein's *Försök til en afhandling om uplysningen, til dess beskaffenhet, nytta och nödvändighet för samhället* (*An Attempt at a Dissertation on the Enlightenment, its Character, Usefulness and Necessity for Society*), published in 1793, presents an unusually comprehensive theory of 'the Enlightenment' (*Upplysningen*) from a contemporary of the period. This article explores the impact of Enlightenment ideas in late eighteenth-century Sweden through the case study of Rosenstein and his remarkable text. While deepening our understanding of the Enlightenment in Sweden, it also expands our knowledge of the impact of the Scottish Enlightenment abroad, the scholarship on which has been mainly focused on Germany. Sweden is further shown to be a fruitful case study for considering the politicization of the late Enlightenment independently of the French Revolution. The French Revolution formed a key part of the political backdrop to the publication of the *Dissertation*, but its intellectual content was more indebted to the Scottish Enlightenment. Rosenstein's pragmatic and contextual approach to politics is often explained away by the precarious climate after Gustav III's assassination. Instead, this article shows that it is better understood as a style of thought which Rosenstein had in common with the leading thinkers of eighteenth-century Scotland.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 07 Oct 2022
Revised 16 Jan 2023
Accepted 02 Mar 2023

KEYWORDS
The Enlightenment; Nils von Rosenstein; Sweden; Scotland; Political Science; The French Revolution; Gustav III

Introduction

Humanity has in all ages been guided by ways of thinking (*tankesätt*), wrote the Swedish man of letters and civil servant Nils von Rosenstein (1752–1824) towards the end of the eighteenth century.[1] Obedience or disobedience to law, the spirit of freedom or thraldom, idolatry, superstition, fanaticism, honour, virtue and vice have all depended on thought and opinion. After the fall of feudalism and especially since the Reformation, light had begun to spread in Europe, as political freedom followed religious freedom. By the seventeenth century, light had entered the scientific realm as well. Such developments had paved the way for a transformed Europe and demonstrated the usefulness of a

CONTACT Max Skjönsberg mss64@cam.ac.uk

general and public enlightenment, which, though incomplete, could alone correct mistakes in politics and make people happy. These were some of the key arguments in Rosenstein's *Försök til en afhandling om uplysningen, til dess beskaffenhet, nytta och nödvändighet för samhället* (*An Attempt at a Dissertation on the Enlightenment, Its Character, Usefulness and Necessity for Society*), published in 1793.

Rosenstein's emphasis on ways of thinking and the pursuit of happiness resonates clearly with crucial ideas of the European Enlightenment, and in particular with Scottish eighteenth-century thinkers such as David Hume, Adam Ferguson and Adam Smith, all of whom he had studied.[2] This article sheds light on how fundamental Scotland's science of man and politics was for Rosenstein and his theory of the Enlightenment. Besides deepening our understanding of *the* key text of the Enlightenment in Sweden, the article contributes to the growing literature on the impact of the Scottish Enlightenment abroad, which has been mainly focused on Germany.[3] The little discussion we have of the influence of the Scottish Enlightenment in eighteenth-century Sweden has so far been concentrated under the headings of moral sense philosophy and to an extent political economy.[4]

The distinguished Swedish intellectual historian Tore Frängsmyr (1938–2017) made a notorious case for the limited impact of the Enlightenment in Sweden.[5] Frängsmyr's *Sökandet efter upplysningen (Searching for the Enlightenment*), published in 1993 with an extended edition in 2006, was translated into French but stimulated relatively little discussion outside Sweden.[6] However, the same author's contribution to *The Enlightenment in National Context* (1981), in which his argument was first formulated, has for decades been the starting point for non-Swedish historians and students alike.[7] Frängsmyr's understanding of the Enlightenment was explicitly francocentric, and heavily indebted to Peter Gay.[8] By focusing on religious and philosophical criticism, he concluded that the Enlightenment 'never formed a truly coherent current of ideas or became a unified movement' in Sweden.[9] His broader argument has been challenged by many Swedish historians, who have pointed to the wider impact of the Enlightenment, inspired by Robert Darnton and Jürgen Habermas's *Öffentlichkeit*.[10] One has even gone as far as seeking to detect it among Swedish farmers.[11] Patrik Lundell has helpfully suggested that the best way forward between the extreme positions is to acknowledge that the Enlightenment had a presence in Sweden, but evidently not everywhere.[12]

For Frängsmyr, Rosenstein's *Dissertation* illustrated the late arrival of Enlightenment ideas in Sweden and their limited impact. It must, however, also be read as an unusually clear and comprehensive theory of 'the Enlightenment' from the period itself. The Enlightenment (*Upplysningen*) is used by Rosenstein already in the title of the work, and he uses the term in the definite and indefinite forms, in upper case as well as lower case, and as an adjective (*upplyst/upplysd*) throughout the text. This article follows his usage. Crucially, he argued for an '*allmän*' enlightenment, which denotes *public* as well as *general* enlightenment. As a remarkably elaborate theory of the Enlightenment, Rosenstein's text deserves the attention of eighteenth-century historians. In a similar vein to recent research on the Enlightenment, this case study clearly shows that studying the peripheries can illuminate our understanding of the movement as a whole.[13] Even though most of Rosenstein's Enlightenment programme was borrowed from foreign thinkers, especially Scottish ones, there is no equally elaborate reification of the Enlightenment in English from the time, and hardly one in French – at least not before Condorcet's *Esquisse d'un*

tableau historique des progrès de l'esprit humain (1794).[14] The German debate about *Aufklärung* does not appear to have influenced Rosenstein much, at least if we are to believe his citations, but there was unsurprisingly some basic overlap, and he would certainly have agreed with Kant that *sapere aude* (dare to know) was a suitable motto for the Enlightenment.[15]

Rosenstein's neglect of German philosophy is noteworthy since it was so central in eighteenth-century Sweden, and especially at Uppsala where he was educated, though it should be noted that his student days in the 1760s and early 1770s took place after John Locke had begun to displace Christian Wolff as the dominant philosophical force, and before Kantianism was introduced in the late 1780s.[16] The main attention the *Dissertation* received outside of Sweden was in Germany when the reviewer in Jena-based *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* complained about the lack of Kantian ideas in the text.[17] Indeed, Rosenstein had little time for what became known in Sweden as the new critical philosophy of Kant and Fichte, and he applauded his friend Carl Gustaf af Leopold's 1797 critique of Kant's *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten* (1785).[18] For Rosenstein, Kant's synthesis between rationalism and empiricism strayed too far away from the latter, to which Rosenstein was strictly committed.

The Gustavian era in eighteenth-century Sweden is often and rightly described as strongly influenced by France, Sweden's ally and the cultural hub of Europe.[19] By contrast, this article focuses on the impact of the Scottish Enlightenment on what is generally considered to be Sweden's clearest formulation of Enlightenment philosophy. The purpose is not to substitute Frängsmyr's French model of the Enlightenment with a Scottish one, but rather to consider the Scottish contribution, and its adoption by Rosenstein in the Swedish context, as a distinctive part of a multi-faceted yet recognizable movement focused on broad intellectual commitments including the study of human nature, evidence-based argument, freedom of enquiry and critical thinking, practical improvement and the pursuit of happiness in this life, as well as interaction with a wider range of readers in the public sphere.[20] Rosenstein's engagement with the thought of important Swedish contemporary philosophers such as Leopold and Daniel Boëthius falls outside the scope of this article,[21] but his relationship with the poet Johan Henric Kellgren is treated below, and his immediate reception among the Swedish literati is briefly discussed in the concluding section. Sten Lindroth called Locke and Montesquieu Rosenstein's 'gods', and Helvetius and Condillac are frequently held out as key influences.[22] Rosenstein was, however, not uncritical of Montesquieu, and although the book starts with, and to a large extent is based on, Locke's empirical philosophy, we shall see that it is even more engaged with Scottish sources and in responding critically to Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who was the main target in the *Dissertation*. Of course, the Scottish Enlightenment's science of man was indebted to Locke's empiricism, as Hume pointed out in the introduction to *A Treatise of Human Nature* (1739–40).[23]

Among the Scots, Rosenstein had read and engaged especially with Hume, Adam Ferguson, Lord Kames, and Adam Smith. In one instance, Rosenstein speaks of the 'Scottish philosophers' who had in his view best treated themes such as the centrality of sentiments and the passions, the slowness and coldness of the understanding, and the natural desire for esteem.[24] Only a few of the Scottish literati's works had been translated into Swedish at this time. Rosenstein would himself later write a short preface to the Swedish translation of William Robertson's *History of Charles V* (1769), published in four

volumes between 1800 and 1804, in which he opined that Robertson surpassed Greek and Roman historians thanks to his philosophical bent.[25] The fact that Rosenstein referred to several book titles in English in the *Dissertation's* footnotes – including Ferguson's *Essay on the History of Civil Society* (1767), Kames's *Sketches on the History of Man* (1774), and Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1776) – indicates that he is likely to have read most of the Scottish philosophers in English rather than in French or Swedish translations. Indeed, Rosenstein had an early and strong interest in English literature and was known as an 'anglophile'.[26] His knowledge of British history seems to be on par with that of French history as his *Dissertation* is full of rather obscure references (from a Swedish perspective), including to the High Tory preacher Henry Sacheverell, who caused a stir in the reign of Queen Anne at the start of the eighteenth century.[27]

The fact that Rosenstein points out that the *Wealth of Nations* was written by a 'metaphysician' indicates that he did not only know Smith as a political economist but also as a moral philosopher. His reference to Hume (admittedly along with Descartes, Newton, Leibniz, Locke, Montesquieu, Helvetius, and Franklin) as a model human being hints that he may have been familiar with Hume's 'My Own Life' and Smith's accompanying *Letter to Strahan*.[28] Ferguson's *Essay* appears to have been the most important source and inspiration for the *Dissertation*, especially as he is the most cited authority in the text. Ferguson's book was translated into Swedish in 1790, the year after Rosenstein's text had been delivered as a speech but four years before it was actually published as a revised and extended work.[29] A review of the Swedish translation of Ferguson's *Essay* in *Stockholms-Posten*, most likely written by Rosenstein, stated that Scotland had produced more eminent philosophers than any other country in modern times.[30] Only two editions of Hume's essays on political economy had been published by this time.[31] Excerpts from Smith's *Wealth of Nations* were published in the periodical press, whereas Kames remained untranslated.

Rosenstein's *Dissertation* can further be seen as part of the politicization of the late Enlightenment, which, as Vincenzo Ferrone has recently argued, is best considered independently of the French Revolution.[32] As mentioned above, the text originated from a speech given on 26 August 1789 to the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences and was revised and published four years later in as a book of more than two-hundred pages. Rosenstein and his friends had discussed the early stages of the French Revolution when the speech was first given, and his decision to finally publish it in 1793 must be understood as an attempt to salvage the Enlightenment as he understood it after the Revolution had taken a violent turn and the Swedish king had been assassinated by rebellious nobles. Its content, however, does not appear to have been inspired by either revolutionary or counter-revolutionary ideas, but by an older Enlightenment discourse. Before we turn to the *Dissertation* itself, we will contextualize it in the next two sections by discussing the reign of Gustav III, often regarded as an enlightened monarch, and Rosenstein's life and career.

Gustav III and the Enlightenment in Sweden

Rosenstein's reason for outlining a clear Enlightenment programme was indeed that such ideas had made limited progress in Sweden. The period between Karl XII's death in 1718 and Gustav III's royal coup in 1772 is called the Age of Liberty (*Frihetstiden*). This term

refers primarily to the political system that limited royal authority, and which many foreign commentators viewed as aristocratic despotism, even though some were more positive.[33] Frängsmyr's main arguments against a Swedish Enlightenment were that religious criticism in Sweden was reserved for foreign Catholicism rather than the domestic Lutheran Church and that the debate about freedom in the 1750s and 1760s focused on political economy and freedom to trade rather than freedom to 'philosophize'.[34] The fact that political economy is now a much more important aspect of Enlightenment historiography, to a great degree thanks to research on the Scottish Enlightenment, is a clear example of why Frängsmyr's case is in need of revision.[35] He was certainly right, however, to highlight that one of the most celebrated achievements of the Age of Liberty, the Freedom of the Press Act of 1766, excluded theology and religion from criticism. In some ways, the religious climate became harsher and more conformist during the Age of Liberty, and the few acts of liberalization were strongly related to economic utilitarianism, as when Jewish merchants were given certain rights in 1741.[36]

The royal coup of the twenty-six-year-old Gustav III on 19 August 1772 was applauded by many Enlightenment thinkers, especially in France, led by Voltaire, who wrote a poem for the Swedish king: 'Qu'on Roi ferme et prudent prenne entre ses mains les rênes | Le peuple avec plaisir reçoit ses douces chaînes'.[37] Did the event usher in Enlightenment? Gustav had been steeped in a mixture of Lockean principles and François Fénelon's *Les Aventures de Télémaque* (1699). His education had been predominantly French, which continued to be his preferred language.[38] With a strong interest in history, literature, and the theatre, Gustav was well-read in the most famous French works of his day. As a child, he began an essay on Montesquieu, in which he criticized the Frenchman's climatic theory and emphasized the influence of education. Gustav was particularly impressed by Le Mercier de la Rivère's *L'Ordre naturel et essentiel des sociétés politiques* (1767), which made a case for legal absolutism. His preference for strong monarchy is clear from a constitutional draft he prepared in 1766, and his distaste for the Age of Liberty's circumscribed monarchy was one he shared with his mother Lovisa Ulrika, Frederick the Great's sister.

When his father died in 1772, Gustav was in France, where he mingled with men of letters such as Helvetius, Marmontel, Grimm, Morellet, Quesnay, Chastellux, d'Alembert, and the elder Mirabeau, and even visited Rousseau.[39] But he confessed to his mother that the *philosophes* were more pleasant to read than to meet, and he also appears to have clashed with some of them politically. He wrote to Madame de Boufflers in 1771 that the Swedish *Riksdag* (Diet) of the Estates was 'no pleasant spectacle for any but cosmopolitan philosophers'.[40] His interests in French culture remained, however. When he visited France again in 1784, he attended Beaumarchais's scandalous *The Marriage of Figaro* (1784), and though he was present at the meeting of the French academy that condemned the play and its author, the Swedish king was instrumental in bringing it to his own theatre, the Drottningholm Palace Theatre, in 1785.[41]

Gustav's coup in 1772, described as the 'Swedish Revolution' at the time, strengthened the monarchy without introducing autocracy. His intention was to re-establish the constitution of Gustav II Adolf rather than the absolutism of Karl XI. After the *Riksdag* had been dissolved, Gustav embarked on a programme of reforms that included the liberalization of the grain trade, the establishment of the Order of Vasa to encourage commerce, agriculture and the arts, the abolition of torture and the creation of a more humane system of penal laws, inspired by Cesare Beccaria.[42] In 1781 toleration was extended to

non-Lutheran Christians, including Catholics, and in 1782 Jews were allowed to settle in certain cities. However, Frängsmyr dismissed any suggestion that Gustav's reign ought to be seen as a breakthrough for the Enlightenment in Sweden, since these reforms mainly formalized existing practices.[43] Gustav reintroduced censorship in 1774, and especially restricted criticism of the crown. As a result, book production fell drastically, from 944 new titles in 1770 to less than 300 per year for most of the period between 1772 and 1789.[44] Moreover, natural science continued to lose much of its former status, a process which had already begun at the end of the Age of Liberty.[45] Most of the prominent practitioners of Carl von Linné's generation had died by the 1780s, including Rosenstein's father, Nils Rosén von Rosenstein. French culture and aesthetics gained status, especially the theatre and opera, which were actively supported by the king, who tried his hand at playwrighting as well as virtually every other role in relation to the stage.[46] As we shall see in the following section, this change favoured Rosenstein personally, but his *Dissertation* can still be seen as a reaction against this development. It is significant that his original speech was delivered to the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, to which he belonged, when the institution celebrated its 50th anniversary. As the son of the foremost physician of the Age of Liberty, his commitment to science was deep-seated.

From 1779, the king continued to curb the freedom of the press and in 1789 he colluded with the lower Estates to increase royal power in exchange for the abolition of several noble privileges. The Union and Security Act gave the king the sole power to declare war, previously shared with the *Riksdag* and the council of the realm (*riksrådet*), and divested from the *Riksdag* the right to initiate legislation. By this time, Gustav had become increasingly disillusioned with the French *philosophes* and the 'system of innovation', which he blamed for unrest in France in the prelude to the French Revolution. A decade earlier, in 1778, he had remarked regarding the American Revolution that 'I cannot admit that it is right to support rebels against their king. The example will find only too many imitators in an age when it is the fashion to overthrow every bulwark of authority'.[47] After the outbreak of the French Revolution, Gustav emerged as a self-appointed leader of the royal counter-revolution until he was assassinated by discontented nobles in 1792.[48] His assassins justified their deed as a tyrannicide in the name of Enlightenment principles.[49] In any case, Gustav III unquestionably made lasting contributions to Sweden's cultural politics, to the benefit of Rosenstein, as we shall see in the next section.

Rosenstein's enlightenment

Nils von Rosenstein was the son of the ennobled Nils Rosén von Rosenstein (1706–73), the royal physician and famous professor of medicine at Uppsala University.[50] His extended family included prominent bishops and academics on both of his parents' sides, and thanks to his father's connection with the royal family he became a courtier already in his youth. At Uppsala, he studied Latin and political science (*statskunskap*) under the internationally renowned comparative philologist Johan Ihre, and Greek under Johan Floderus. Ihre, a cousin of Rosenstein's mother and a friend to his father, is a significant figure, since many dissertations defended during his presidium were influenced by especially Locke but also Hume, usually read in French translation.[51] Rosenstein's admiration for Ihre was profound.[52] After his studies, Rosenstein rose through the ranks in the Swedish civil service. Because of his family's proximity to the court, he may have welcomed the royal

coup in 1772, but we should remember that he was never as critical of the Age of Liberty as the king was.[53]

In 1778, Rosenstein's friend Johan Henric Kellgren began to propagate Enlightenment ideas in *Stockholms-Posten* by championing Voltaire's legacy. Three years later, Kellgren defined enlightenment philosophy (*upplysningsfilosofi*) as ability 'to rise above all prejudices . . . in order to only follow the light of reason and in life have the love of humanity as the basis of all virtues'.[54] Despite his ambivalent relationship with the *philosophes*, Gustav III made Kellgren his librarian and later his private secretary. Kellgren and Rosenstein would subsequently in the 1780s establish the fictional society *Pro Sensu Communi*, with only themselves as members, to oppose Freemasonry, Swedenborgians, mysticism and 'occultism', which were increasingly popular in late eighteenth-century Sweden, including at the court.[55] In 1784, Gustav III had instructed Johan Gustaf Halldin to establish *Aftonbladet* to instil patriotism and submission, but the paper increasingly became an organ for the propagation of the controversial ideas of Emanuel Swedenborg (1688–1772), the internationally famous Swedish philosopher who had notoriously transitioned from science to spirituality. In 1786 the Exegetic and Philanthropic Society was founded by Carl Bernhard Wadström and Carl Fredrik Nordenskiöld to promote Swedenborgianism, which at this point had come to include elements of alchemy. The king's brother, the future Karl XIII, and his circle became members in 1787. In the late 1780s, moreover, ideas of animal magnetism, or mesmerism, that is to say, the belief in an invisible natural force that could heal diseases, arrived in Stockholm with the establishment of the Harmonious Society.[56] Such ideas were combined with Swedenborgianism, and Kellgren and Rosenstein actively combatted them in *Stockholms-Posten*. In a well-known poem in 1787, 'Man äger ej snille för det man är galen' ('You Own Not Genius For That You are Mad'), Kellgren argued that Swedenborg was a fool in comparison to Isaac Newton.[57] Even though most of the mystic societies were a spent force by 1790, they certainly formed part of the backdrop to Rosenstein's original speech in defence of Enlightenment in 1789.

Unlike Kellgren, Rosenstein had the chance to go to Paris to experience the 'French Enlightenment' first-hand, albeit after its peak. For two years from December 1782, he served as secretary to the Swedish ambassador, first the poet Count Gustaf Philip Creutz, and then Erik Magnus Staël von Holstein. The latter was married to Jacques Necker's brilliant daughter Germaine de Staël, with whom Rosenstein would maintain a long-standing correspondence. She once called him *l'Aristote de la Suède*.[58] In Paris, Rosenstein became acquainted with Marmontel, d'Alembert and Benjamin Franklin. In a letter to Kellgren, however, he wrote that the French *philosophes* had lost their previous reputation, and this applied also to Kellgren's beloved Voltaire (Kellgren had asked Rosenstein to look into the cost of a bust of his recently demised hero):

> the so-called philosophes have undergone a kind of transformation. They have found themselves without support from the government and have lost even in the public's mind a degree of the esteem which they previously had. This they blame on some among them who had gone too far, and among them they include in certain respects Voltaire. They have become more moderate after his death, and kept to a Deism associated with the exercise of a precise morality, from which they seem generally to say that Voltaire had diverged . . . Neither do they want to hear about the names philosophers, *Encyclopédistes* etc. and certainly not of the formation of any sect.[59]

In a letter later in 1783, Rosenstein wrote to Kellgren about Marquis de Bièvre's new successful comedy, *Le Seducteur*, which criticized the '*Encyclopédistes*'. The play would please the public, he believed, since they were unpopular at that moment.[60] But Rosenstein also emphasized that everything changed from day to day in fashionable Paris.

In November 1784, Rosenstein was recalled from Paris as he was appointed by Gustav III as the preceptor to Crown Prince Gustav Adolf, a position he held until 1795. His mirror-for-princes, *Samtal emellan döde personer* (*Conversation among Dead People*), published posthumously in his collected works, sheds light on the prince's education, and includes among other things the maxim that 'If a king wrongs his entire people, if he breaks his promises or if he acts unconstitutionally, the people have an indisputable right to oppose him, and even depose him'.[61] Gustav was warned about entrusting the education of his son to someone who thought highly of America's independence, but the king is believed to have responded that when his son became king, he would probably become a royalist, as well.[62]

Rosenstein was from this point on showered with titles, pensions, memberships of learned societies and appointments, including the Chancellorship of Uppsala University. In 1786, the king set up the Swedish Academy, dedicated to the cultivation of the Swedish language, after the model of the French Academy. The original members of the academy comprised many independent minds such as Anders Johan von Höpken, Carl Fredrik Scheffer, Axel von Fersen the Elder and Matthias von Hermansson. It also included members who were chosen for their loyalty to the king, and Rosenstein belonged to this group along with Kellgren.[63] Rosenstein became the Academy's first permanent secretary and served in this capacity for thirty-eight years until his death in 1824, which remains the record.

Although Kellgren was at least at one stage favourable towards the French Revolution, and he went into the opposition to the king after the 1789 Act of Union and Security, neither he nor Rosenstein belonged to the group of discontented nobles who conspired against the king and assassinated him.[64] Rosenstein, unlike Kellgren and almost his entire family, stayed loyal to the monarch officially, even if he expressed criticism of both the Finnish war and the 1789 constitutional changes in private letters to the king.[65] After the assassination in 1792, it is often said that Enlightenment principles became anathema in a deeply shocked nation, though this article will revisit this point in the conclusion. Rosenstein's decision to finally publish his *Dissertation on the Enlightenment* in 1793 must be understood as an attempt to salvage the reputation of the Enlightenment as he understood it.

When Rosenstein was working on his speech in August 1789, Kellgren wrote him a series of letters from Gothenburg. On 7 August, Kellgren expressed his worries that developments in France risked leading to a conflation of insurgents and philosophers, and arsonists and geniuses.[66] Rebellion was in general a sign of 'barbarity' rather than 'enlightenment', and the goal of enlightened politics was to prevent rebellions, which only happened in response to oppression, real or imagined. To prevent the latter, transparency was needed. The key question, however, was whether it was ever possible for the masses to attain enlightenment.[67] Probably as a joke, Kellgren sketched a project for popular Enlightenment by having priests read the fables of Aesop on every third or fourth Sunday instead of the gospels. Kellgren conceded that the Swedish public was not ready for Rosenstein's speech, but he also stressed that this should not discourage him since most philosophers wrote for posterity. A few days later, Kellgren had

become convinced that order had emerged from the chaos in Paris, and that the French Revolution was *not* the riot of a mob but the rising of a people. This boded well for Rosenstein's speech, which could now be performed with less anxiety, according to Kellgren.[68]

The immediate domestic context behind the publication of the *Dissertation* in 1793 was the harsh intellectual climate of Gustaf Adolf Reuterholm's *de facto* regency following Gustav III's assassination in March 1792. The king's murder was preceded by a crackdown on press freedom: Swedish newspapers had been forbidden to report about events in France in 1791, and in 1792 foreign books that discussed the French Revolution were prohibited. As Reuterholm first abolished censorship but reintroduced it at the end of 1792, Kellgren published his final major poem, 'Ljusets fiender' ('The Enemies of Light'), on 21 December in *Stockholms-Posten*. Kellgren might have been mainly preoccupied with the French Revolution when working on the poem, but the return to censorship in Sweden certainly gave it more urgency.[69] Rosenstein's *Dissertation*, which presented a forceful defence of the importance of freedom of thought and writing, took on a new significance during the Reuterholm era, known as the beginning of an 'iron age' in Swedish history. This certainly motivated Rosenstein to prepare his work for publication. Reuterholm regarded Rosenstein as his enemy and wanted to prosecute him for the publication, but this was prevented by the crown prince, Rosenstein's pupil. At the start of 1795, however, Reuterholm managed to suspend the Swedish Academy; it resumed its work after the crown prince reached maturity the following year and sent Reuterholm into exile. But despite Rosenstein's lessons, the 'iron age' continued under Gustav IV Adolf, and censorship was expanded during his reign.[70]

We must remember, meanwhile, that Rosenstein's original speech had been delivered in 1789 and it was thus part of a more longstanding debate about Enlightenment. In a letter to Gustav III, Rosenstein described his intention of the 1789 speech as refuting Rousseau's thesis that Enlightenment is harmful for society.[71] This was above all a reference to Rousseau's *Discourse on the Arts and Science* (1750), known as the *First Discourse*, which had outraged the king back in 1760. Some of Rosenstein's teachers at Uppsala, John Ihre and Carl Fredrik Georgii, had also written against Rousseau in the 1760s, and they certainly influenced Rosenstein's positions.[72] In 1788, his friend Germaine de Staël had celebrated and discussed Rousseau in her first published work, *Lettres sur les écrits et le caractère de J. J. Rousseau*, which she sent to him in 1789.[73] Interest in Rousseau also experienced a revival in Sweden in the last decades of the eighteenth century on the back of pre-Romanticism and Gustavian Gothicism, a form of Romantic nationalism centred on the glorification of an idyllic and simpler past.[74] Rosenstein had laid the foundation for his refutation of Rousseau's *First Discourse* in his *Anmärkningar om vitterhet och smak* (*Observations on Learning and Taste*), a speech given at the Swedish Academy in 1787. All historical examples showed that learning and culture improved states rather than corrupted them, he had then argued.[75] Indeed, learning and taste had reached new heights in modern France and Britain, the two most powerful countries in Europe. Since Rousseau's main concern was with morals rather than learning and taste, Rosenstein may not have been the most careful interpreter of Rousseau, but his reading was certainly not uncommon at the time, and indeed was similar to de Staël's in this regard, even if she was more positive.[76] Though the central argument in the *Dissertation* had been foreshadowed in the *Observations*, the later text, to which we now turn, was more ambitious.

The Science of Man

The first, shorter part of the *Dissertation* is the most Lockean, and it was particularly the Locke of the *Essay concerning Human Understanding* on whom Rosenstein drew. Although Rosenstein was dismissive of Cartesian system-building and the mathematical method, he paid lip service to Descartes as a trailblazer in a way similar to D'Alembert's preliminary discourse in the *Encyclopédie*.[77] He wrote that 'true Light' in science had only been kindled in Europe a little more than a hundred years earlier, by Descartes, Newton, and 'he, who of all has had the greatest influence', i.e. Locke.[78] Rosenstein opened the *Dissertation* with the Lockean statement that all knowledge begins from our external senses and is based on experience. We acquire knowledge through sensation and reflection about similarities between objects which give rise to abstract ideas and concepts.[79] According to Rosenstein, Locke's contribution was fundamental since he taught human beings to know themselves and gave them a vocabulary to conceptualize this understanding. In this way, Locke had revealed the only way that could lead to 'light' in moral philosophy, as well as in the art of legislation, the reason of state and all the other aspects of government.[80]

Rosenstein's contention that 'Man is not born only to know and investigate. He is born to act'[81] shows the influence of the Scottish Enlightenment's science of man, and is particularly reminiscent of Ferguson, with whom he engaged more than any other thinker in the text, and whom he called 'the master'.[82] Ferguson had written: 'We speak of art as distinguished from nature; but art itself is natural to man. He is in some measure the artificer of his own frame, as well as his fortune, and is destined, from the first age of his being, to invent and contrive'.[83] 'Activity' and 'art' were vital for Rosenstein's story about human development, in which practice preceded theory. Human beings had tilled the soil, treated diseases, sailed, traded, ruled societies, made laws, waged war, built fortresses, spoken to communions, depicted nature and described the passions before agriculture, medicine, navigation, commerce, the art of government, eloquence, and poetry had any theory, and before there had even been names for these arts.[84]

A short introduction on how knowledge is acquired set the stage for Rosenstein's main intention in the first part of the text, which was to distinguish between knowledge, learning and enlightenment. One who knows a set of facts is knowledgeable and one who knows several sets is learned.[85] Knowledge and learning are necessary but not sufficient to produce enlightenment, which Rosenstein defined as knowledge that was 'true', 'sufficient' and 'applicable'.[86] As he wrote: 'He is alone enlightened, who has read that which is true, who has thought that which is correct, and who has through reading and thinking become released from the reign of prejudices and acquired true concepts about that which is the most important to know for human beings'.[87] For this reason, Rosenstein argued that truth and usefulness were the same at the societal level.[88] It was needs (*behov*) that had for the most part of history driven human beings to search for knowledge. If we had followed their directions, there would have been fewer errors as we would have been led by experience. But since human nature is inventive and creative, guesses, hypotheses, and systems have been made and developed, and become theorized and separated from experience.[89]

The foundation of enlightenment was the free and true exercise of reason, which is why Rosenstein (along with many other Enlightenment thinkers) put so much emphasis

on freedom of thought and writing.[90] For the proper use of reason, however, humanity needed to know its abilities and limitations, and understand that experience was the foundation of theory, which itself could enlighten practice. This is the way in which Lockean empiricism was essential for enlightenment as defined in the *Dissertation*. Rosenstein was committed to the idea that systems of government influenced peoples. If governments did not allow their people to exercise their reason, neither the possession of wealth nor books could save their countries from being as 'barbaric' as the ones of ignorant ages.[91]

Besides the natural desire to investigate and understand, human beings instinctively searched for happiness, a pursuit Rosenstein wanted to see universally promoted.[92] Though not cited by Rosenstein, it is worth noting that Francis Hutcheson (1694–1746), sometimes known as the 'father of the Scottish Enlightenment', and who had taught and influenced Rosenstein's favourite writers (Hume, Ferguson and Smith), had been the first to say at least in English that 'that Action is best, which procures the greatest Happiness for the greatest Numbers', which later became the cornerstone of Benthamite utilitarianism.[93] The pursuit of happiness and its relationship to action are also central themes in Hume's *Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals* (1751) and his essay 'Of Refinement in the Arts' in the *Political Discourses* (1752), the latter of which had been translated into Swedish as early as 1767.[94] The value of sciences for Rosenstein depended on their ability to promote happiness.[95] Politics was therefore the most important science, since the happiness of human beings depended on the civil societies (*borgerliga samhällen*) to which they belonged. Enlightenment concerned all human beings since they all needed to be just and happy through wisdom and virtue, and they all must know their rights and duties, and be free from the prejudices that could prevent or disrupt their happiness.[96] In civil societies, enlightenment therefore concerned all citizens (*medborgare*), whatever their rank, Rosenstein argued persistently.

Specialist knowledge could be reserved for specific professions: only doctors needed to know the medical arts, but knowledgeable and learned doctors could be unenlightened if they were ignorant about the rights and duties of man, and general moral and political truths. Whatever skill and sense of justice a judge may possess, he could not be called enlightened if he believed in dreams, prophecies, and mysticism.[97] What was true for individuals was also true for nations and epochs. The Greeks and the Romans possessed scientific knowledge, but not enlightenment since they also believed in superstition and oracles, and owned slaves. The mediaeval scholastics were knowledgeable and learned, but not enlightened since they only followed authorities, chiefly Aristotle, who could not be said to be enlightened, as we shall see.[98]

Rosenstein believed that enlightenment trickled down from the top to the public (*allmänheten*).[99] In this way, enlightenment did not require erudition on the part of the masses. They could rely on the conclusions of the educated, and learn, for example, that the earth revolves around the sun rather than the other way around without ever having heard of Galileo. The person who saved their house with a lightning rod was acting in an enlightened manner, even though they may not understand the nature of electricity. 'General and public enlightenment' (*allmän upplysning*) thus did not mean that the full range and depth of the sciences needed to be known by the public. Indeed, Rosenstein conceded that most people were too busy to have time to cultivate their minds.[100] However, an enlightened people must know the most essential and necessary *practical*

truths to avoid errors. This required that the sciences, especially the practical ones, reach a certain level of sophistication, and their conclusions be made available to the general public.[101]

Happiness and inequality

Rosenstein began the second, longer part of the work by writing that the primary purpose of civil societies is to ensure the happiness of their inhabitants.[102] The second purpose of civil societies must be their preservation, and since humankind is necessarily divided into separate societies, national defence is one of the main duties of the state. For this reason, power politics cannot be neglected, as societies need to be strong to defend themselves.[103] This requires knowledge in reason of state (*stats-klokhet*) and the art of war (*krigskonst*). Since wealth had become a great part of a state's power, trade and monetary policy should also come within the state's remit under the headings of economy (*hushållning*) and finance.[104] All these functions of the state require experience, theory, skill, and above all, enlightenment.[105]

In addressing the question for the second part of the work – whether enlightenment was harmful or profitable for societies and the public – Rosenstein's chief target was Rousseau, as he clarified in his letter to Gustav III.[106] Throughout the *Dissertation*, Rosenstein sought to refute Rousseau's idea that enlightenment and development more generally led to unhappiness. Rousseau believed that strong states were supported by patriotism, virtue and respect for laws and customs, and Rosenstein interpreted the Genevan as saying that these qualities were more reliably found among simple and rude peoples than among refined ones. National defence depended on zeal, strength, and bravery rather than knowledge, according to this line of argument, and all these characteristics were weakened by luxury.[107] Rosenstein believed that Rousseau's argument could be answered by investigating the nature of happiness. His examination involved some concessions to Rousseau, as he argued in a way similar to Smith in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759) that wealth and luxury did not produce happiness on their own.[108] The Greenlanders could be as happy in their scarcity as the Englishmen in their abundance. Similarly to Ferguson, Rosenstein highlighted that exertion did not lead to unhappiness but rather the opposite.[109] Ferguson had devoted several sections to 'happiness' and 'national felicity' in his *Essay on the History of Civil Society* (1767), and called it the 'least understood' term, since it was often confounded with enjoyment and repose.[110] Rosenstein fully agreed with Ferguson that happiness ultimately depended on the active exertions of the individual, physical or intellectual.

Though happiness would then seem to depend chiefly on the individual rather than the state, Rosenstein stressed that it would be a mistake to think that the average Turk could be as happy as an Englishman. Such an argument could be used to argue against all changes and in defence of oppression, he warned. What did good and evil then consist of? The foremost good was personal freedom, and the highest evil coercion and thraldom.[111] Even if the Spartan might be happy without comfort, Rosenstein pointed out that their slaves were certainly unhappy. The second good was security, which was indispensable for happiness. The protection of the laws meant that Spartans could be happy even without material possessions. In a footnote, Rosenstein said that he often used the example of Sparta in the text since he had seen 'many authors, and among them

FERGUSON, fall in love with the Spartan constitution'.[112] Rousseau's admiration for Sparta was arguably stronger than Ferguson's, but this is yet another example of Rosenstein's reliance on Scottish sources as he understood them.

In this part of the text, Rosenstein used a natural law argument with a religious dimension, as was common among Enlightenment reformers. Human beings could not have been created to be unhappy. Since personal freedom and security were essential for happiness, they also became rights (*rättigheter*) that can never be taken away without injustice (*orättvisa*).[113] Rosenstein wrote: 'We have by nature been given abilities, the use of which leads to all pleasure; we acquire through them the means to increase our happiness; for this increase we demand freedom, and for the possession of what we have acquired, security'.[114] These rights could be enjoyed in monarchies as well as in republics, Rosenstein emphasized, in accordance with Alexander Pope's dictum in *An Essay on Man*: 'For *Forms* of *Government* let Fools contest; whate'er is best administered, is best.'[115] In one of Rosenstein's letters to Kellgren from Paris, he mentioned Pope's *Essay* in relation to a new French translation, and he also cited Pope elsewhere in the *Dissertation*.[116] Only governments that violated 'human rights' (*mänskliga rättigheter*), abused their power and had forgotten that their purpose was to protect the happiness of the people, would find enlightenment harmful and darkness (*mörker*) preferable. In this context, Rosenstein referred to 'Asiatic and Turkish Despots' in a manner typical of Montesquieu and many others in the eighteenth century.[117]

As already indicated, in addition to personal freedom and security, happiness consisted in active exertion. What made human beings different from other animals was their capacity to develop their natural abilities, increase their needs, change and, at least according to their own judgement, improve their condition. This capacity was responsible for all changes in human history, according to Rosenstein. His argument is reminiscent of *perfectibilité* in Rousseau's *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality* (1754–5), but Rosenstein instead drew attention to Ferguson, 'the master', who had described these changes in his *Essay*.[118] Rosenstein refers directly to Ferguson's *Essay* in two footnotes, and in the first one he mistakenly calls it *History of Moral Society* – the kind of imprecision which was of course very common in the eighteenth century. Drawing on Ferguson, Rosenstein believed that he had demonstrated the necessity of enlightenment to human happiness.

Another aspect of the Rousseauian challenge Rosenstein had to tackle was the issue of inequality, and he did this by questioning the desirability, and even more so the feasibility of equality. As noted above, Rosenstein was close to Gustav III, who is often discussed in the context of 'enlightened despotism'.[119] Rosenstein was clear, however, that it was anathema for legislators and rulers to treat their people like children and lead them towards happiness by force. Rulers of this bent usually promoted equality (*jemnlikhet*) and sought to limit the number of human needs, supported by writers such as Rousseau.[120] But Rosenstein pointed out that poverty had usually been linked with slavery throughout history, whereas the spirit of liberty and well-being had flourished together in modern countries such as England and the Netherlands.[121]

Rosenstein's key argument was that equality was neither founded in nature nor necessary for human happiness.[122] Development and the proliferation of needs made inequality inevitable. Savages illustrated the naturalness of distinctions, since among them the strong and wise were given advantages, which, as long as they were not used to oppress others, could never be called unjust. Private property was the chief source of

differences in wealth as well as comfort, abundance, and luxury. Rosenstein stressed that the Spartan way of life required constant practice in war and a small society in which there were far more slaves (*trälar*) than citizens.[123] He added that the fall of Sparta, which was said to have persisted for five-hundred years, may have happened far earlier than generally believed, since the knowledge of Sparta was based on so few certain facts and many contradictory ones. Ancient Rome did not abolish private property but sought to maintain its warlike and simple way of life and customs through the strict regulation of morality and the office of the censor. Rosenstein believed the Roman struggle against luxury and pleasure was largely 'fruitless' as it amounted to a struggle against the human inclination to create and fulfil new needs. In short, he argued that it was as 'vain' (*fåfängt*) as it was ineffectual to seek to erect laws that would oppose the stronger dominion of nature.[124]

Legislation, human nature and history

Rosenstein was confident that enlightenment had a positive impact on legislation. Like Hume, Helvetius, or indeed Gustav III, he disputed Montesquieu's climatic theory, which still enjoyed popularity in late eighteenth-century Sweden among the travel writer Carl August Ehrensvärd, the Uppsala professor Jacob Fredrik Neikter, and especially 'Romantic nationalists' such as Johan Fischerström, who were flattered by Montesquieu's notion that the harsh climate made Nordic people physically strong and enterprising.[125] In opposition to climatic theories, Rosenstein argued that human beings were 'on the whole similar anywhere on the planet or in different epochs'.[126] This was reminiscent of Hume's statement that 'there is a great uniformity among the actions of men, in all nations and ages, and that human nature remains still the same, in its principles and operations'.[127] While legislators had to take local circumstances into account, they ought to be guided by general principles. The key lesson for legislators was that they must follow human nature.[128] In true Scottish Enlightenment fashion – see, for example Ferguson – Rosenstein argued that most advancements in the art of legislation, as in most other branches of knowledge, were originally the products of unintended consequences.[129] After they had taken place, however, experience of such advancements could lay the foundation for useful theory that would inform future practice.

Legislators of past ages had not known human nature well enough. The ancients had misunderstood freedom, Rosenstein said echoing Hume's verdict, by confusing it with 'independence' (*sjelfständighet*) and 'participation in rule' (*deltagande i styrelsen*).[130] Personal freedom and security concerned them very little. Even if slavery was put to the side, laws in Rome such as *Lex Licinia* created 'an unnatural difference between the high and the low' in terms of property rights. Drawing on Roman historians such as Livy, Rosenstein concluded in a footnote that 'The entire Roman History is a chain of the oppression of the weak by the powerful, of injustice and violence'.[131] It was thus a mistake to hold up the early history of Rome as a model of virtue, as Rousseau had done, when the positive instances had been so few and far between, and were individual cases rather than part of a pattern.[132] The Swedes had as little reason to admire their ancestors, the violent Vikings.[133]

Rosenstein was convinced that the extent to which our knowledge of human nature had been transformed was evident if the works of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and Tacitus were placed alongside those of Montesquieu, Helvetius, Rousseau, Ferguson, Smith, and

Necker. The contrast between the ancients and the moderns and the improvement in philosophy were apparent from the fact that Aristotle, hailed as the father of political science (*den politiske vetenskapen*), believed that some people were by nature slaves.[134] Thanks to recent advancements, Rosenstein believed that one theorem of Newton, or one chapter of Locke or Montesquieu, contains more 'true enlightenment' than all the works of Cardano, Agrippa, Duns Scotus, or Machiavelli. Probably alluding to Rousseau,[135] he added in a footnote that some people had lately sought to prove that Machiavelli's *The Prince* was a satire, but that even if this was the case Machiavelli was justifiably blamed since his book had led readers astray.[136] Furthermore, utopias from Plato's *Republic* to Francis Bacon's *Nova Atlantis* had failed largely because of insufficient knowledge of human nature.[137]

Experience learned from history was fundamental for political science, and like Hume, Rosenstein suggested that we may need more history before political science could reach its full potential.[138] But it would be a mistake to be *led* exclusively by historical examples in the way Rosenstein believed had been the case for Machiavelli, Jean Bodin, Lipsius, and the lesser known Giovanni Vincenzo Gravina (1664–1718).[139] Before 'a true philosophical knowledge of man in general' was well understood, history had been of limited use and the wrong lessons learned. History could lead to as much error as enlightenment if people believed that everything that had happened needed to have happened. The art of making human beings happy through laws was the achievement of 'the immortal MONTESQUIEU'. Rosenstein was, however, not uncritical of the Frenchman. He held that Montesquieu had been too trusting of history, and in all his wide-ranging investigations into laws, customs and forms of government, he had not always distinguished the true from the false.[140]

Be that as it may, most improvements in European governments and constitutions had their origin in Enlightenment thought.[141] Although experience was fundamental, one person's experience could never be sufficient for the art of legislation and government. Legislators thus needed to utilize the experience of other ages and places, as well as general ideas and concepts. This did not mean that the world should be ruled by philosophers: 'When we speak of politics, it is not only FENELON, MONTESQUIEU, SMITH, who have enlightened the world, but also all the great and virtuous Rulers and Ministers, who have intended to make people happy'.[142] Theory and practice worked best when they supported each other.

Passion, prejudice and political economy

Rosenstein argued that humanity had in all ages been guided by ways of thinking (*tankesätt*).[143] It was thought that had supported obedience or hatred of kings, as well as the relationship between peoples. The Greeks divided humanity into two parts, Greeks and Barbarians, and gave different morals to these two 'classes'. In the Middle Ages, the system of chivalry had guided behaviour. Ways of thinking could be straightforwardly divided into two parts: correct, or enlightened, and incorrect, or prejudiced.[144] Prejudice could either be the result of ignorance or stem from the passions, which impeded understanding. The passions were a much greater hindrance than ignorance, since the latter could be more easily cured. Importantly, however, Rosenstein was not an enemy of the passions as such, only the false judgements they could produce.[145] Indeed, Rosenstein

held that the difference in people's passions and the struggle between interests they generated opened up a new way for truth, as truth was often a result of the clash between different prejudices and interests, in morality as in politics.[146] This agonistic approach to enlightenment and progress was once again in line with Ferguson's *Essay*.[147]

Rosenstein underlined that human needs and passions were in themselves neither virtues nor vices. Instead, it was only their expressions and impact which determined their value. Patriotism, for instance, was a feeling (*känsla*) that needed direction.[148] Being ambitious was not a crime in itself as one could be ambitious in the manner of Cicero or Marius.[149] It was natural for kings to love power, but many had an unfortunate tendency to take this too far; James I of England, for example, believed that his power was God-given and unlimited.[150] Rosenstein argued that enlightenment should act as a moderating force against such excesses. But rather than seeking to combat feelings, enlightenment should guide them towards the good. This is why laws and constitutions mattered: 'In a state, where the right concepts about society's purpose [and] about human and citizens' rights and happiness prevail, the ambitious person, when he is seeking to become great, must also seek to be useful and good.'[151]

It would be vain to believe that human nature could be altered, and that passions and affections could be obliterated. The highest level of enlightenment could not stop people from being pleasure-seeking, self-interested, and ambitious.[152] Romantic love and the desire for private property had always been part of what it meant to be human, even though these sentiments had taken different manifestations. The greatest honour used to be the life and death of a warrior such as Styrbjörn the Strong from late Norse sagas, whereas in the eighteenth century it was the life of the philosopher and statesman Benjamin Franklin.[153] Envy, hatred, division, and revenge would never disappear, but the way we resolve arguments and disagreements could be improved. Our natural sociability made rules of behaviour and politeness necessary, but what the precise rules were varied across both time and space. Differences in customs did not undermine the general principle that human nature had always been fundamentally the same everywhere.[154] For this reason, customs and manners could also be better or worse. Rosenstein believed that a book on customs would be very useful, adding in a footnote that the subject had been partially treated in Ferguson's *Essay* and Kames's *Sketches on the History of Man*.

The wish to gain and improve one's condition was the most common of all passions, according to Rosenstein. This was clearly very similar to Smith, who called 'the desire of bettering our condition' a wish that 'comes with us from the womb'.[155] Laws that made this difficult would therefore always be despised, and restrictions on trade and industry would only encourage cheating. Rosenstein wanted trade to be 'as free as is possible'.[156] The study of economy and finance was initiated by Sully, Pierre Le Pesant, sieur de Boisguilbert, and Vauban in France – long before Quesnay and the Physiocrats, Rosenstein pointed out – and William Petty and Charles Davenant in England.[157] Rosenstein contended in a footnote that the best work on finance was Smith's *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*.[158] The leading Swedish economic historian Lars Magnusson is thus incorrect when saying that the only Swede who directly referred to Smith around this time was David von Schulzenheim in his *Bref of rikets penninge-werk och allmänna hushållning* (2 vols., 1794–96).[159] Like Smith, Rosenstein criticized the 'bullionist' policies of the Spanish and instead favoured domestic industry

and manufacturing, alongside agriculture. In this context, he could have but did not cite the Swedish-Finnish political economist Anders Chydenius (1729–1803), with whom he corresponded and indeed to whom he sent the *Dissertation*, and who is often said to have anticipated many of the theories in Smith's *Wealth of Nations*.[160]

Nowhere was abundance and luxury as widespread as in Britain, and few countries were as secure and reliable.[161] In this context, Rosenstein argued that laws needed to be obeyed by everyone, by the powerful and the weak, as well as by the governors. He argued that despotic countries were insecure, since no countries had as many rebellions and depositions of monarchs as despotic ones.[162] Good laws were those that were useful and protected people's lives and property, and the purpose of punishment was prevention and deterrence rather than retribution. Industry and trade increased the love for riches, comfort and luxuries, whereas warlike systems produced manliness, abstinence, and strength of mind. But it remained common knowledge that the state that flourished from industry and economic growth (*tillväxt*) was more natural, safer, and happier than the one that engaged in war and conquest.[163] Like Hume, Rosenstein was an enemy of public debt, and he emphasized that the size of Britain's debt was largely a result of 'the false politics of olden days', in other words, warfare and conquest, rather than commercial modernity.[164]

In one of his few explicit departures from the Scots, Rosenstein sided with unidentified French thinkers over Hume and Ferguson on the necessity of war.[165] This did not apply to all French authors, however. In his 1750 address delivered at the Sorbonne and in his notes for an essay on world history, Turgot – mentioned several times by Rosenstein in the *Dissertation* though mainly as a politician – had argued that wars and revolutions assisted humanity's march towards perfection. Perhaps Rosenstein had in mind Voltaire, in whose *Candide* (1759) war is used to falsify the doctrine of *Tout est bien*, and who attacked wars and apologists for it in his *Dictionnaire philosophique* (1764) and the *A B C* (1768).[166]

Party, duty and revolution

The *Dissertation* is in some ways a rather optimistic text. Rosenstein was convinced that rulers of the same ilk as Nero, Christian II of Denmark (known in Sweden as Christian the Tyrant), and Henry VIII were inconceivable in late eighteenth century Europe because of the progress of enlightenment. If Philip II rose from his grave, he would not have dared to revive the Inquisition. No ruler would now burn people on the stake for witchcraft.[167] However, as he must have been aware, Sweden had sentenced people for witchcraft as recently as the 1750s, even though the last execution took place in 1704. The point of these optimistic arguments was to defend the importance of a widespread enlightenment, and point to a rather recent historical shift in the manner of thinking (*tankesätt*).

Notwithstanding this cautious optimism, Rosenstein was certainly no utopian. His approach to political parties exemplifies his rather sober and realistic attitude towards politics. Differences in opinion and interests, as well as competition for power, meant that political parties were unavoidable in free states, according to Rosenstein. He had earlier defended the Swedish party system during the Age of Liberty,[168] but in the *Dissertation* he turned to the English case study and the writing of Henry St John, 1st Viscount Bolingbroke. Bolingbroke had argued that the English parties had turned into self-interested and power-hungry factions (*factioner*) which no longer represented 'major subjects'

(*stora ämnen*) such as the power of the monarch, the rights of parliament and the succession to the throne.[169] For Rosenstein, however, Bolingbroke's complaint was actually praise of the English constitution and nation, since if parties no longer argued about these issues it must mean that they had been settled among the public, and the state had become more stable as a result. This answer to Bolingbroke was very similar to Hume's, who was most fearful of parties based on principles rather than interests.[170] Even though Rosenstein did not cite Hume in this context, he agreed with Hume that it was impossible to prevent competition among parties for office and interests in free countries.

Unless enlightenment was pervasive, the people would depend on enlightened rulers, and they would be less able to control them through public opinion if they were ignorant.[171] This did not mean that Rosenstein was committed to 'democratic' politics. Indeed, he believed that it was the democratic systems of government rather than luxury that had caused the fall of the Roman Republic and other ancient republics. The chief problem with these states was that they were ruled by the common people, who were bribable.[172] Rosenstein agreed with Montesquieu that all power was dangerous without a counterweight. Moreover, he argued that corruption was less damaging in the large states of Europe than in the smaller city states of antiquity.

Rosenstein contended that no rights were given without concomitant duties.[173] In society, great sacrifices and even restrictions on natural rights and freedom were necessary.[174] Any enlightenment that did not inform the people of their essential duties and sacrifices would be inadequate. The 'confusion of equality' (*jemnlikhetens yra*) had recently become pervasive, Rosenstein cautioned, emphasizing that equality must have clear limitations in civil societies. Although Enlightenment philosophy was often blamed for misunderstanding these limitations, he argued that the German Peasants' War, the religious sects in the English Civil War, and Masaniello's revolt in Italy in 1647 showed that modern philosophy was not a precondition. Intolerance against subversive writers was thus counter-productive, Rosenstein warned, and pointed to the positive example of freedom of the press in England.[175]

Towards the end of the text, Rosenstein turned to the subject of revolution. The two greatest revolutions that had taken place in the history of humanity were the advent of Christianity and the Reformation. Rosenstein conceded that both events had been accompanied by violence and bloodshed – especially in the reaction against them – but stated that they had both ushered in truth and increased the happiness of human beings, even in a civil sense.[176] But this did not mean that Rosenstein was prepared to condone violence as such. Whenever it was possible to implement truth without violence, that was doubtlessly the best option. Indeed, he went further and emphasized that our duty to implement the good was matched by an equally pressing demand to implement it with 'carefulness, wisdom, humility and tranquillity'. 'All severe and violent changes are dangerous', he warned.[177]

Rosenstein reminded his readers that revolutions are more easily started than ended, and states are more quickly destroyed than built.[178] Anyone who thought about changes and improvements also needed to consider whether they could be implemented, and bear in mind that transitions are difficult and precarious.[179] Writing in the context of the French Revolution, he was worried that reason was becoming unfashionable and was being replaced by feeling, warmth and enthusiasm.[180] Indeed, he added in a footnote that at least some of his discussion about revolutions had been added since he had given the

1789 speech as a response to developments in France. Although he stressed that it was too early to evaluate this event at the time of writing (in 1793), he was keen to dissociate himself from Jacobinism:

> The unhappiest impact that the French Revolution could bring to other peoples is that a true Enlightenment became confused with some exaggerated theorems, which have been insisted upon in France. I have met people, who, when one speaks of Enlightenment, Philosophy, Freedom and human rights, have believed that one is preaching so-called Jacobinism. They are accusing the newer philosophy in general of including the just mentioned theorems [of Jacobinism]. [But] most philosophers, who have written in recent times, have said something completely different than what has been attributed to them, if a small number of authors are excluded. But it is easier to scream and accuse than to prove, read and investigate.[181]

The Rosensteinian Enlightenment

Rosenstein's *Dissertation* shows that the Enlightenment undeniably had a presence in Sweden, even though it cannot by itself demonstrate how widespread it was and further research is therefore needed. Yet the reception of the text provides more than a flavour of at least the upper echelon of the intellectual and political zeitgeist. Frängsmyr argued that Rosenstein's text had a limited impact, since its lateness in publication meant that it was quickly overshadowed by Romanticism. This interpretation is much too neat and may even be misleading, as we must note how celebrated, debated and controversial Rosenstein's text was by leading men of letters in the 1790s, despite the difficult climate after the king's assassination.[182] Carl Gustaf af Leopold called it the most philosophical text in the Swedish language. On his receipt of the *Dissertation*, the proto-liberal political economist Anders Chydenius dubbed Rosenstein 'the most prominent defender of Freedom of Thought and Enlightenment in the Nordic countries', and in the same letter he stressed that he had himself sought to advance the cause of enlightenment since the 1760s, when he actively worked to pass the Freedom of the Press Act.[183] Carl Wilhelm Böttiger (1807–78), professor of literature at Uppsala University, spoke of the 'Rosensteinian Enlightenment' half a century after his death.[184] Johan Albrecht Ehrenström (1762–1847) criticized Rosenstein's *Dissertation* by arguing that the French Revolution had been inspired by Voltaire, Helvetius, Rousseau, Raynal, d'Alembert and Diderot.[185] Whether or not this was fair to these Francophone authors, the association with Rosenstein was clearly unfair as we have seen that he was more influenced by Scottish thinkers, and wrote against Rousseau.

From his enforced exile in Hamburg, the poet, political reformer and proto-feminist Thomas Thorild (1759–1808) wrote a pamphlet against Rosenstein's *Dissertation*, in which he attacked it for promoting truth with the aid of violence.[186] As we have seen, this was hardly Rosenstein's view, but it had indeed been the position for which Thorild himself had been condemned. Thorild's modern editor, Stellan Arvidsson, has rather unfairly said that Rosenstein was a supporter of the French Revolution 'and could with some justice be accused of Jacobin thought, even if he in one footnote rejected "Jacobinism"'.[187] Against much scholarship, Arvidsson downplays the fact that Thorild was writing to win favor with Reuterholm, *de facto* regent on account of the new king's minority, at a time when Reuterholm sought to separate the king from Rosenstein, who was still the king's teacher,

and when Thorild was eager to ingratiate himself with the government to orchestrate an end to his exile. Henrik Gabriel Porthan (1739–1804), known as the father of Finnish History, reacted strongly against Thorild's pamphlet, calling it 'a pitiful quibbling, and the reasoning of a madman, who also speaks as a dictator'. Rosenstein was at first indifferent as he thought that Thorild had completely misunderstood him, but he later became more disconcerted and was grateful when Leopold defended him in *Extra-Posten*.[188]

Whatever the degree of Thorild's opportunism, it seems clear that the reaction against the French Revolution and further restrictions to the liberty of the press could not prevent Enlightenment debates from featuring in Swedish literary journals in the late 1790s. *Läsning i blandade ämnen* (*Readings in Various Subjects*), edited by Georg Adlersparre as a continuation of *Readings for Farmers* (1795–6) and with Leopold as its principal writer, frequently discussed Rosenstein's *Dissertation* in 1797. It further translated Kant's *Was ist Aufklärung* (1784), discussed forms of government with reference to Hume, and luxury with a long quotation from Ferguson.[189] The essay on forms of government began with Hume's quotation of Pope ('whate'er is best administered is best')[190] and concluded in agreement with Rosenstein that 'one should not unconditionally give priority to either Monarchical or Republican forms', since governments of either kind could advance 'secure freedom'. The journal concurred with Ferguson ('a great author') that man was a progressive animal, and that the advanced stages of development were as 'natural' as humanity's earlier rudeness. It also argued that humanity seems furthest away from its true purposes – described as enlightenment, virtue, and happiness – in the so-called natural, but more properly called rude, state. For the remainder of the 1790s, the journal condemned the atrocities of the French Revolution as a betrayal of the Enlightenment, discussed political economy with reference to Smith, and celebrated Swedish 'Enlighteners', including Kellgren and Anna Maria Lenngren. The spirit of *Readings in Various Subjects* was in harmony with the 'Rosensteinian Enlightenment', which had been heavily indebted to the Scottish philosophy of the middle decades of the eighteenth century.

At the turn of the nineteenth century, the expansion of censorship under Gustav IV Adolf made intellectual and political discussion increasingly difficult, and Adlersparre's journal was closed in 1801. Adlersparre was the leader of the 1809 coup that led to the king's deposition and a new constitution that was particularly inspired by Montesquieu's separation of powers theory.[191] Moreover, in the 1790s Kantianism started to become a force to be reckoned with in Swedish philosophy at the universities, and Rosenstein complained in 1796 that he did not have time to keep up with the new developments.[192] But it was also at this time that the works of the Scottish Enlightenment were really starting to make themselves felt in Sweden, as we see in *Readings in Various Subjects*. The year after the *Dissertation* was published, Leopold began writing his *Idéer till en populär-philosophi öfver Gud och odödligheten* (*Ideas for a Popular Philosophy on God and Immortality*), which was strongly influenced by Scottish moral sense as well as common sense philosophy and was finally published in 1802.[193] Even though the *Wealth of Nations* was not translated in its entirety until 1909, substantial parts of it were published in book form at the start of the nineteenth century.[194] We have already noted that Robertson's *History of Charles V* was published in a Swedish translation with a preface by Rosenstein around the same time. At the start of the nineteenth century, the intellectual giants Esaias Tegnér (1782–1846) and Carl Adolph Agardh (1785–1859) were both influenced by the

Scottish Enlightenment, and the latter referred to Hume and Ferguson when he dismissed social contract theory and wrote of the spontaneous emergence of the state.[195] In other words, the victory of the social contract theorist Kant in Sweden was by no means total, and the impact of Rosenstein's Enlightenment, heavily influenced by Scottish thinkers, appears to have been stronger than the historiography has recognized.

The Enlightenment in Sweden has not been given much attention from international scholars since Frängsmyr denied its existence in 1981. This article has shown that even though Rosenstein may not have provided any individual insights that were completely original, the way he framed his arguments as a defence and a theory of the Enlightenment makes it a noteworthy text for the period. Historians have recently turned their attention to the Enlightenment in Denmark-Norway,[196] but this article has demonstrated that Sweden is also a fruitful case study, especially for thinking about the impact of Scottish philosophy abroad, and the politicization of the late Enlightenment independently of the French Revolution. The French Revolution formed a key part of the political backdrop to the publication of the *Dissertation*, but its intellectual content was more indebted to the Scottish Enlightenment. The purpose of enlightenment was ultimately to prevent revolution for Rosenstein, in agreement with Kellgren, who was more positive about the French Revolution, even if he appears to have changed his mind when it took a violent turn.[197]

According to Rosenstein, one of the greatest problems with the French Revolution was that it risked sullying the reputation of useful improvement. Since the spirit of improvement had spread across Europe before the Revolution, he feared that the backlash might lead to a return to former prejudices and errors as a reaction.[198] Like other late Enlightenment thinkers such as Edward Gibbon and Volney, Rosenstein was acutely worried about the prospect of decline in the last decade of the eighteenth century. If Rosenstein was wary about the French Revolution, he was more upbeat about the American Revolution. He called the American constitution the best thinkable one, but he qualified this remark by highlighting that this did not mean that it was suitable in other countries.[199] Rosenstein's pragmatic and contextual approach to politics is too often explained away by the precarious climate after Gustav III's assassination and Louis XVI's execution – the 'iron age' of the Reuterholm regency and late Gustavian autocracy. This article has instead shown that it is better understood as a style of political and philosophical thought which he had in common with the leading thinkers of the Scottish Enlightenment. To call this version of the Enlightenment either 'moderate' or 'court-sponsored' – which is how Jonathan Israel has characterized the Enlightenment in the final decades of the eighteenth century in Sweden, without mentioning Rosenstein specifically – does not do justice to the ambitions of Rosenstein.[200]

Notes

1. All translations in this article are my own, and eighteenth-century spelling of Swedish words has been kept.
2. See esp. Sagar, *The Opinion of Mankind* and Robertson, *The Enlightenment*.
3. Kontler, *Translations, Histories, Enlightenments* and Oz-Salzberger, *Translating the Enlightenment*.
4. Segerstedt, *Moral sense-skolan och dess inflytande på svensk filosofi* – with a short chapter on Rosenstein (240–54); Lagerlund, "The Reception of David Hume's Philosophy in Sweden";

Magnusson, *Äran, korruptionen och den borgerliga friheten*, 51–80, 121–41; Torbjörn Vallinder, "Adam Smiths genombrott i Sverige."

5. Frängsmyr, *Sökandet efter upplysningen*. On Frängsmyr, see Heilbron, "Tore Frängsmyr." Frängsmyr's contribution to historiography is critically discussed in Anton Jansson and Hjalmar Falk, "Religion i det svenska idéhistorieämnet."
6. Frängsmyr, *À la recherche des Lumières.*
7. Frängsmyr, "The Enlightenment in Sweden."
8. His discussion of Sweden is preceded by a chapter on the French Enlightenment.
9. Frängsmyr, "The Enlightenment in Sweden," 164.
10. Nyman, *Upplysningens spegel*; Christensson, *Lyckoriket*. See also Hallberg, ed., *Ljus över landet?*, which includes an essay on Rosenstein's friend Kellgren, but none on Rosenstein.
11. Aronsson, "Bönderna och upplysningen."
12. Lundell, "Upplysningen i provinsen," 68. See also Skuncke, "Was there a Swedish Enlightenment?"
13. Butterwick et al., eds. *Peripheries of the Enlightenment*.
14. For the absence of eighteenth-century debates about the term "Enlightenment" in other places than Germany, see Nisbet, "Was ist Aufklärung?," 83, but see also Butterwick, "What is Enlightenment (*oświecenie*)?" for Poland as a partial exception.
15. On definitions of *Aufklärung* in late eighteenth-century Germany, see esp. Schmidt, ed., *What is Enlightenment?*
16. Frängsmyr, *Wolffianismens genombrott i Uppsala*; Israel, "Northern Varieties."
17. Ljunggren, *Svenska vitterhetens häfder efter Gustaf III:s död*, II, 93–4. Rosenstein is also mentioned briefly as a disciple of Francis Bacon and Locke in Gérando, *Histoire comparée des systèmes de philosophie.*
18. Segerstedt, *Moral sense-skolan*, 252–3.
19. Lindroth, *Svensk lärdomshistoria*, IV, 166–9.
20. See esp. Robertson, *The Enlightenment* and Robertson, *The Case for the Enlightenment*. For a different and more specific, though controversial, interpretation of the Enlightenment, see the works of Jonathan Israel, esp. *A Revolution of the Mind*. More relevant for Rosenstein's Enlightenment as presented here is Vincenzo Ferroene's interpretation of the Enlightenment as a "cultural revolution" within the old regime, drawing on the work of Robert Darnton. See Ferrone, *The Enlightenment*, esp. chs. 13–14 and "Afterword."
21. On this, see Segerstedt, *Moral sense-skolan*, esp. 252–4.
22. Lindroth, *Svensk lärdomshistoria*, IV, 166–9., 192. See also Nyblæus, *Den filosofiska forskningen i Sverige*, I, 190.
23. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 10; Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, xvii.
24. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 85–97.
25. Rosenstein, *Samlade skrifter*, I, 259–72.
26. Rosenstein, *Samlade skrifter*, I, x; Böttiger, *Nils von Rosenstein*, 11; Segerstedt, *Nils von Rosenstein*, 340–1.
27. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 168.
28. Ibid., 149, 136.
29. *Försök till historien om borgerligt samhälle, af Adam Ferguson.*
30. *Stockholms-Posten*, no. 279, 1790. For attribution, see Segerstedt, *Moral sense-skolan*, 242–3.
31. *Herr David Humes Politiske afhandlingar om handel och yppighet; Smärre afhandlingar i allmänna hushållningen, af David Hume*.
32. Ferrone, *The Enlightenment*, chs. 10 and 14.
33. Skjönsberg, "Charles Francis Sheridan".
34. Frängsmyr, *Sökandet efter upplysningen*, 201–2.
35. Robertson, *The Case for the* Enlightenment; Hont, *Jealousy of Trade.*
36. Frängsmyr, *Sökandet efter upplysningen*, 203. See also Nordin, *Ett fattigt men fritt folk*, 186.
37. Cited by Lönnroth, *Den stora rollen*, 78.
38. See esp. Skuncke, *Gustaf III.*
39. Launay, "J. J. Rousseau et Gustave III de Suède."

40. Cited by Barton, "Gustav III and the Enlightenment," 9.
41. Ibid., 21–22.
42. Beccaria, *Afhandling om brott och straff*.
43. Frängsmyr, *Sökandet efter upplysningen*, 204–206.
44. Munck, *Conflict and Enlightenment*, 39–40.
45. Johannisson, "Naturvetenskap på reträtt."
46. Frängsmyr, *Svensk idéhistoria*, 342–65.
47. Cited by Barton, "Sweden and the War of American Independence," 420.
48. Price, "Louis XVI and Gustavus III: Secret Diplomacy and Counter-Revolution, 1791–1792."
49. Barton, "Gustav III and the Enlightenment," 29–30.
50. For his biography, see Hans Järta's biographical sketch in the first volume of his *Samlade skrifter* and Segerstedt, *Nils von Rosenstein*.
51. Lagerlund, "The Reception of David Hume's Philosophy in Sweden," 227–8.
52. Segerstedt, *Nils von Rosenstein*, 59–63.
53. Böttiger, *Rosenstein*, 6; Segerstedt, *Nils von Rosenstein*, 241–3.
54. Cited by Lindroth, *Svensk lärdomshistoria*, IV, 184.
55. Ljunggren, *Svenska vitterhetens häfder*, I, 438, 456. There had been strong currents of mysticism in Swedish improvement literature; see Lindroth, *Paracelsismen i Sverige till 1600-talets mitt*. See also Häll, *I Swedenborgs labyrint*.
56. Frängsmyr, *Svensk idéhistoria*, 396–401.
57. Göransson, "Johan Henric Kellgren som upplysningsförfattare," 129.
58. Maury, ed., *Une correspondance inédite de madame de Staël*, 642.
59. *Ur Nils von Rosensteins brefsamling*,200.
60. Ibid., 203.
61. Rosenstein, *Samlade skrifter*, III, 235.
62. Böttiger, *Rosenstein*, 27.
63. Lönnroth, *Den stora rollen*, 180–1. See also Segerstedt, *Svenska Akademien i sin samtid* and Delblanc, *Ära och minne*, ch. 10.
64. Lindroth, *Svensk lärdomshistoria*, IV, 187, 190.
65. As he remarked in a letter to Lars von Engeström in February 1789, cited by Böttiger, *Rosenstein*, 189.
66. *Ur Nils von Rosensteins brefsamling*, 241.
67. Ibid., 242.
68. Ibid., 249.
69. Göransson, "Johan Henric Kellgren som upplysningsförfattare," 133.
70. Barton, "Late Gustavian Autocracy in Sweden."
71. *Ur Nils von Rosensteins brefsamling*, 22: "Jag talade om upplysning, sökte att visa, hvaruti rätta och sana kunskaper bestå och att vederlägga Rousseau's sats, att de äro skadeliga för samhället."
72. Segerstedt, *Nils von Rosenstein*, 26–8. See also Skuncke, "Jean-Jacques Rousseau in Swedish Eyes Around 1760."
73. Maury, ed., *Une correspondance inédite de madame de Staël*, 645.
74. Frängsmyr, *Svensk idéhistoria*, 382–386.
75. Rosenstein, *Samlade skrifter*, III, 66–116.
76. Staël, *Lettres sur les écrits et le caractère de J. J. Rousseau*, 3–6.
77. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 16. Rosenstein's hailed D'Alembert's preliminary discourse in his *Lefvernes-beskrivning över D'Alembert* (1787) in *Samlade skrifter*, I, 93–4.
78. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 149.
79. Ibid., 5–6.
80. Ibid., 149.
81. I have translated *människan*, which is feminine in Sweden, as "Man" since there is no singular feminine equivalent. For this reason, I have also had to render *hon* (she) as "he."
82. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 53.
83. Ferguson, *An Essay on the History of Civil Society*, 12.

84. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 12.
85. Ibid., 33.
86. Ibid., 24–5.
87. Ibid., 35.
88. Ibid., 202.
89. Ibid., 21.
90. Ibid., 178.
91. Ibid., 24.
92. For the importance of the pursuit of happiness in the Enlightenment, see recently Robertson, *The Enlightenment*.
93. Hutcheson, *An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*, 125.
94. See note 31 above.
95. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 28.
96. Ibid., 29–30.
97. Ibid., 37.
98. Ibid., 38.
99. Ibid.
100. Smith discussed the problem of education of the labouring poor in the commercial age marked by the division of labour in the *Wealth of Nations*, II, 774–86.
101. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 40.
102. Ibid., 44.
103. Rosenstein uses "state" and "society" (*stat* and *samhälle*) interchangeably.
104. On this, see especially Hont, *Jealousy of Trade*, introduction.
105. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 46.
106. See note 71 above.
107. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 47; Rousseau, *The Discourses and Other Early Political Writings*, 18–20, 122, 201–2; Rousseau, *The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings*, 91.
108. Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 50, 83. The literature on the debate between Rousseau and Smith is now extensive. See especially Rasmussen, *The Problems and Promise of Commercial Society*; Istvan Hont, *Politics in Commercial Society*; Griswold, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Adam Smith*. See also Sagar, *Adam Smith Reconsidered*, esp. ch. 3.
109. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 50.
110. Ferguson, *Essay*, 43, 51.
111. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 51.
112. Ibid., 65.
113. Ibid., 52.
114. Ibid.
115. Alexander Pope, *An Essay on Man. Address'd to a Friend. Part I* (London, 1733), 54.
116. *Ur Nils von Rosensteins brefsamling*, 203; Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 200.
117. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 55.
118. Ibid., 53.
119. E.g. in Barton, "Gustav III and the Enlightenment."
120. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 56.
121. Ibid., 171.
122. Ibid., 60.
123. Ibid., 65.
124. Ibid., 66–7.
125. Frängsmyr, *Svensk idéhistoria*, 385–9.
126. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 68.
127. Hume, *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding*, 83.
128. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 70.

129. Ibid., 69; Ferguson, *Essay*, 119. On this see, Smith, "The Scottish Enlightenment, Unintended Consequences and the Science of Man"; Hamowy, *The Scottish Enlightenment and the Theory of Spontaneous Order*; Berry, *The Social Theory of the Scottish Enlightenment*.
130. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 70–1; Hume, *Essays*, 408.
131. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 71.
132. Ibid., 141–2; Rousseau *The Social Contract*, 127, 131, 139.
133. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 144.
134. Ibid., 73–5. For the contrast between the ancients and moderns as key for the Enlightenment, see Edelstein, *The Enlightenment*.
135. Rousseau, *The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings*, 95.
136. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 35.
137. Ibid., 76.
138. Ibid., 78; Hume, *Essays*, 87.
139. Gravina was the author of *De Romano imperio* (1712) and *Origines juris civilis* (3 vols., 1713). Rosenstein justified his inclusion of Gravina since he had inspired Montesquieu; see Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 77.
140. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 79.
141. Ibid., 83.
142. Ibid., 84.
143. Ibid., 98.
144. Ibid., 99.
145. Ibid., 108.
146. Ibid., 109.
147. For discussion, see Skjönsberg, "Adam Ferguson on Partisanship, Party Conflict, and Popular Participation," esp. 5–10, and the literature cited there.
148. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 124.
149. Ibid., 123.
150. Ibid., 115.
151. Ibid., 159.
152. Ibid., 129.
153. Ibid., 130.
154. Ibid., 132.
155. Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, 341. See also 99 and idem, *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 50.
156. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 157–8.
157. Ibid., 106–7.
158. Ibid., 149.
159. Magnusson, *Äran, korruption och den borgerliga ordningen*, 128.
160. Anders Chydenius, *Anticipating The Wealth of Nations*.
161. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 153.
162. Ibid., 155.
163. Ibid., 147–8.
164. Ibid., 214; Hume, *Essays*, 349–65.
165. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 190; Ferguson, *Essay*, esp. 24–9; Hume, *Treatise*, 540–1.
166. Voltaire, *Political Writings*, 7–11, 149–58.
167. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 160.
168. Segerstedt, *Nils von Rosenstein*, 244.
169. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 165–6; Bolingbroke, *Political Writings*, 70, *passim*. See aslo Skjönsberg, "Bolingbroke's Theory of Party and Opposition."
170. Hume, *Essays*, 54–63, 493. See also Skjönsberg, *The Persistence of Party*, ch. 4.
171. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 163.
172. Ibid., 173.
173. Ibid., 183.
174. Ibid., 184.
175. Ibid., 185–6.

176. Ibid., 195.
177. Ibid., 197.
178. Ibid., 198.
179. Ibid., 208.
180. Ibid., 199.
181. Ibid., 201–2.
182. Ljunggren, *Svenska vitterhetens häfder*, II, 92.
183. Chydenius to Rosenstein, 21 August 1793. "Brev till von (Rosenstein, 1793)." Accessed January 4, 2022. https://chydenius.kootutteokset.fi/sv/kirjoitukset/brev-till-von-rosenstein-1793.
184. Böttiger, *Rosenstein*, 58–60.
185. Segerstedt, *Nils von Rosenstein*, 337.
186. Thorild, *Samlade skrifter*, III, 379.
187. Thorild, *Samlade skrifter*, X, 140.
188. Ibid., 142–3; Ljunggren, *Svenska vitterhetens häfder*, II, 100–13.
189. *Läsning i blandade ämnen*, no. 4 1797, 84–88; No. 5 1797, 5–17, No. 7 1797, 15–32.
190. See note 115 above.
191. Barton. "Late Gustavian Autocracy in Sweden"; Rönström, "Forskardebatten kring 1809 års regeringsform."
192. Rosenstein, *Samlade skrifter*, III, 5–6. Daniel Boëthius had introduced Kant at Uppsala at the end of the 1780s.
193. Lagerlund, "The Reception of David Hume's Philosophy in Sweden," 229–31.
194. Smith, *Undersökning om kongl. stora sjö- och gränse-tullar, samt acciser och små-tullar, med flera consumtions-afgifter*; Smith, *Handbok för statshushållningen efter Adam Smiths grundsatser*; Smith, *Politisk undersökning om lagar, som hindra och tvinga införseln af sådana utländska varor, som kunna alstras eller tillverkas inom landet*. See Magnusson, *Äran, korruptionen och den borgerliga ordningen*, 121–41.
195. Liedman, "Upplysningens tre ansikten."
196. See, e.g. Reinert, "Northern Lights" and Langballe Jensen, "Contests about Natural Law in Early Enlightenment Copenhagen."
197. Rosenstein, *Samlade skrifter*, I, 297.
198. Rosenstein, *Försök til en afhandling*, 215.
199. Ibid., 214–5.
200. Israel, "Northern Varieties," 45.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank Janet Chan, Ben Dew, Robin Douglass, Ian Stewart, and Tim Stuart-Buttle for their comments on an earlier draft of this article, as well as the journal's anonymous reviewers and editors for their feedback. A shorter version of the article was presented as the 'Winter Lecture' at Coventry University's 'Premoderns' research cluster on 20 February 2023.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

This work was supported by The Leverhulme Trust [Grant Number ECF-2021-456].

Notes on contributor

Max Skjönsberg, FRHistS, is a Leverhulme Early Career Fellow at the University of Cambridge, having previously been a Postdoctoral Research Associate at the University of Liverpool, and a lecturer in history and politics at the University of St Andrews and the University of York. He is the author of *The Persistence of Party: Ideas of Harmonious Discord in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021) and the editor of Catharine Macaulay's *Political Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023).

Bibliography

Aronsson, Peter. "Bönderna och upplysningen: En historia med förhinder?" *Ugglan* 2 (1993): 20–33.

Barton, H. Arnold. "Sweden and the War of American Independence." *William and Mary Quarterly* 23, no. 3 (1966): 408–430. doi:10.2307/1919238.

Barton, H. Arnold. "Gustav III and the Enlightenment." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 6, no. 1 (1972): 1–34. doi:10.2307/3031560.

Barton, H. Arnold. "Late Gustavian Autocracy in Sweden: Gustav IV Adolf and His Opponents, 1792–1809." *Scandinavian Studies* 46, no. 3 (1974): 265–284.

Beccaria, Cesare. *Afhandling om brott och straff*. Stockholm, 1770 [1764].

Berry, Christopher. *The Social Theory of the Scottish Enlightenment*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997.

Bolingbroke. *Political Writings*. Edited by David Armitage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997

Böttiger, Carl Wilhelm. *Nils von Rosenstein: minnesteckning: uppläst på Svenska akademiens högtidsdag 1876*. Stockholm: Norstedts, 1877.

Butterwick, Richard. "What is Enlightenment (*oświecenie*)? Some Polish Answers, 1765–1820." *Central Europe* 3, no. 1 (2005): 19–37. doi:10.1179/147909605x44218.

Butterwick, Richard, Simon Davies, and Gabriel Sánchez Espinosa, eds. *Peripheries of the Enlightenment*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2008.

Christensson, Jakob. *Lyckoriket: Studier i svensk upplysning*. Stockholm: Atlantis, 1996.

Chydenius, Anders. *Anticipating The Wealth of Nations: The Selected Works of Anders Chydenius (1729–1803)*. Edited by Maren Jonasson and Pertti Hyttinen, and translated by Peter C. Hogg. London: Routledge, 2012.

Delblanc, Sven. *Ära och minne: Studier kring ett motivkomplex i 1700-talslitteratur*. Stockholm: Bonnier, 1965.

Edelstein, Dan. *The Enlightenment: A Genealogy*. Chicago: University Press of Chicago 2010.

Ferguson, Adam. *Försök till historien om borgerligt samhälle, af Adam Ferguson . . . Öfversättning ifrån engelskan, efter fjerde förbättrade uplagan, utgifven i London år 1773*. Stockholm, 1790.

Ferguson, Adam. *An Essay on the History of Civil Society*, Edited by Fania Oz-Salzberger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Ferrone, Vincenzo. *The Enlightenment: History of an Idea*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015 [2010].

Frängsmyr, Tore. *Wolffianismens genombrott i Uppsala: Frihetstida universitets filosofi till 1700-talets mitt*. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet/Almquist & Wiksell, 1972.

Frängsmyr, Tore. "The Enlightenment in Sweden." In *The Enlightenment in National Context*, edited by Roy Porter and Mikuláš Teich. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Frängsmyr, Tore. *Svensk idéhistoria. Bildning och vetenskap under 1000 år. Del 1 1000–1809*. Stockholm: Natur och Kultur, 2000a.

Frängsmyr, Tore. *À la recherche des Lumières: Une perspective suédoise*. Bordeaux: Presses universitaires de Bordeaux, 2000b.

Frängsmyr, Tore. *Sökandet efter upplysningen: Perspektiv på svenskt sjuttonhundratal*. Stockholm: Natur och Kultur, 2006 [1993].

Gérando, Joseph Marie de. *Histoire comparée des systèmes de philosophie, relativement aux principes des connaissances humaines*. Paris, 1804.

Göransson, Sverker. "Johan Henric Kellgren som upplysningsförfattare." In *Ljus över landet? Upplysningen som drivkraft i 1700-talets svenska vetenskap och vitterhet*, edited by Paul Hallberg, 123–135. Göteborg: Kungl: Vetenskaps- och Vitterhets-Samhället, 2005.
Griswold, Charles L. *Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Adam Smith: A Philosophical Encounter*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2018.
Häll, Jan. *I Swedenborgs labyrint: Studier i de gustavianska swedenborgarnas liv och tänkande*. Stockholm: Atlantis, 1995.
Hallberg, Paul, ed. *Ljus över landet? Upplysningen som drivkraft i 1700-talets svenska vetenskap och vitterhet*. Göteborg: Kungl: Vetenskaps- och Vitterhets-Samhället, 2005.
Hamowy, Roland. *The Scottish Enlightenment and the Theory of Spontaneous Order*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987.
Heilbron, John. "Tore Frängsmyr," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 162, no. 3 (2018): 313–319.
Hont, Istvan. *Jealousy of Trade: International Competition and the Nation-State in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005.
Hont, Istvan. *Politics in Commercial Society: Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Adam Smith*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015.
Hume, David. *Herr David Humes Politiske afhandlingar om handel och yppighet*. Stockholm, 1767.
Hume, David. *Smärre afhandlingar i allmänna hushållningen, af David Hume*. Stockholm, 1791.
Hume, David. *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Edited by L. A. Selby-Bigge, 1739–1740. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
Hume, David. *Essays, Moral, Political and Literary*, Edited by Eugene F. Miller. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1987.
Hume, David. *Enquiries concerning Human Understanding and concerning the Principles of Morals*, Edited by L. A. Selby-Bigge and P. H. Nidditch. 1748, 1751. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
Hutcheson, Francis. *An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*, Edited by Wolfgang Leidhold. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2004.
Israel, Jonathan. "Northern Varieties: Contrasting the Dano-Norwegian and the Swedish-Finnish Enlightenments." In *Eighteenth-Century Periodicals as Agents of Change Perspectives on Northern Enlightenment*, edited by Ellen Krefting, Aina Nøding, and Mona Ringvej, 17–45. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
Israel, Jonathan. *A Revolution of the Mind: Radical Enlightenment and the Intellectual Origins of Modern Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
Jansson, Anton, and Hjalmar Falk. "Religion i det svenska idéhistorieämnet." *Lychnos* (2017): 75–95.
Johannisson, Karin. "Naturvetenskap på reträtt: en diskussion om naturvetenskapens status under svenskt 1700-tal." *Lychnos* (1979–1980): 107–154.
Kontler, László. *Translations, Histories, Enlightenments: William Robertson in Germany, 1760–1795*. New York: Palgrave, 2014.
Lagerlund, Henrik. "The Reception of David Hume's Philosophy in Sweden." In *The Reception of David Hume In Europe*, edited by Peter Jones, 225–232. London: Bloomsbury, 2005.
Langballe Jensen, Mads. "Contests about Natural Law in Early Enlightenment Copenhagen." *History of European Ideas* 42, no. 8 (2016): 1027–1041. doi:10.1080/01916599.2016.1182045.
Läsning i blandade ämnen. Stockholm, 1797–1801.
Launay, Michael. "J. J. Rousseau et Gustave III de Suède." *Revue de la littérature comparée* 32 (1958): 496–509.
Liedman, Sven-Eric. "Upplysningens tre ansikten." In *Ljus över landet? Upplysningen som drivkraft i 1700-talets svenska vetenskap och vitterhet*, Edited by Paul Hallberg, 37–48. Paul: Göteborg: Kungl. Vetenskaps- och Vitterhets-Samhället, 2005.
Lindroth, Sten. *Paracelsismen i Sverige till 1600-talets mitt*. Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksell, 1943.
Lindroth, Sten. *Svensk lärdomshistoria*. 4 vols. Stockholm: Norstedts, 1975–1981.
Ljunggren, Gustaf. *Svenska vitterhetens häfder efter Gustaf III:s död*. 5 vols. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1873–95.
Lönnroth, Erik. *Den stora rollen: Kung Gustaf III spelad av honom själv*. Stockholm: Atlantis, 2008 [1986].
Lundell, Patrick. "Upplysningen i provinsen: Om lärostånd et i Linköping på 1790-talet." *Scandia* 63 (1997): 47–76.
Magnusson, Lars. *Äran, korruptionen och den borgerliga friheten*. Stockholm: Atlantis, 2001.

Maury, Lucien, ed. *Une correspondance inédite de madame de Staël: lettres à Nils von Rosenstein*, in *Journal des débats politiques et littéraires: Revue bleue*. Vol. 5. 1905.
Munck, Thomas. *Conflict and Enlightenment: Print and Political Culture in Europe, 1635–1795*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
Nisbet, H. B. "Was ist Aufklärung?: The Concept of Enlightenment in Eighteenth-century Germany." *Journal of European Studies* 12, no. 46 (1982): 77–92. doi:10.1177/004724418201204601.
Nordin, Jonas. *Ett fattigt men fritt folk: Nationell och politisk självbild i Sverige*. Stockholm: Brutus Östlings bokförlag Symposion, 2000.
Nyblæus, Axel. *Den filosofiska forskningen i Sverige från slutet af adertonde århundradet, framställd i sitt sammanhang med filosofiens allmänna utveckling*. 4 vols. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1873–1897.
Nyman, Magnus. *Upplysningens spegel: Götheborgs allehanda om Frankrike och världen, 1774–1789*. Stockholm: Atlantis, 1994.
Oz-Salzberger, Fania. *Translating the Enlightenment: Scottish Civic Discourse in Eighteenth-Century Germany*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
Pope, Alexander. *An Essay on Man. Address'd to a Friend. Part I*. London, 1733.
Price, Munro. "Louis XVI and Gustavus III: Secret Diplomacy and Counter-Revolution, 1791–92." *Historical Journal* 42, no. 2 (1999): 435–466. doi:10.1017/S0018246X99008493.
Rasmussen, Dennis. *The Problems and Promise of Commercial Society: Adam Smith's Response to Rousseau*. Philadelphia: Penn State University Press, 2008.
Reinert, Sophus A. "Northern Lights: Political Economy and the Terroir of the Norwegian Enlightenment." *Journal of Modern History* 92, no. 1 (2020): 76–115. doi:10.1086/707503.
Robertson, John. *The Case for the Enlightenment, Scotland and Naples 1680–1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
Robertson, Ritchie. *The Enlightenment: The Pursuit of Happiness, 1680–1790*. London: Penguin, 2020.
Rönström, Emma. "Forskardebatten kring 1809 års regeringsform – Till frågan om grundlagens härkomst." *Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift* 100, no. 4 (1997): 448–467.
Rosenstein, Nils von. *Försök til en afhandling om uplysningen, til dess beskaffenhet, nytta och nödvändighet för samhället*. Stockholm, 1793.
Rosenstein, Nils von. *Samlade skrifter*. 3 vols. Stockholm: A.G. Hellsten, 1838.
Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Discourses and Other Early Political Writings*, Edited by Victor Gourevitch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997a.
Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings*, Edited by Victor Gourevitch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997b.
Sagar, Paul. *The Opinion of Mankind: Sociability and the Theory of the State from Hobbes to Smith*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018.
Sagar, Paul. *Adam Smith Reconsidered: History, Liberty, and the Foundations of Modern Liberty*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2022.
Schmidt, James. *What is Enlightenment? Eighteenth-Century Answers and Twentieth-Century Questions*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
Schück, Henrik, ed. *Ur Nils von Rosensteins brefsamling: bref från Rosenstein, Staël von Holstein, Leopold, Adlerbeth och Kellgren*. Stockholm: Bonnier, 1905.
Segerstedt, Torgny T. *Moral sense-skolan och dess inflytande på svensk filosofi*. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1937.
Segerstedt, Torgny T. *Nils von Rosenstein: samhällets människa*. Stockholm: Norstedts, 1981.
Segerstedt, Torgny T. *Svenska Akademien i sin samtid: en idéhistorisk studie*. Stockholm: Norstedts, 1986.
Skjönsberg, Max. "Lord Bolingbroke's Theory of Party and Opposition." *Historical Journal* 59, no. 4 (2016): 947–973. doi:10.1017/S0018246X15000485.
Skjönsberg, Max. "Adam Ferguson on Partisanship, Party Conflict, and Popular Participation." *Modern Intellectual History* 16, no. 1 (2019): 1–28. doi:10.1017/S1479244317000099.
Skjönsberg, Max. *The Persistence of Party: Ideas of Harmonious Discord in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021.
Skjönsberg, Max. "Charles Francis Sheridan on the Feudal Origins and Political Science of the 1772 Revolution in Sweden." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 83, no. 3 (2022): 407–430. doi:10.1353/jhi.2022.0020.
Skuncke, Marie-Christine. *Gustaf III: Det offentliga barnet*. Stockholm: Atlantis, 1993.

Skuncke, Marie-Christine. "Was there a Swedish Enlightenment?" In *Norden och Europa, 1700-1830: Synvinklar på ömsesidigt kulturellt inflytande*, edited by Svavar Sigmundsson, 25–41. Reykavik: Félag um átjándu aldar fræði, 2003.

Skuncke, Marie-Christine. "Jean-Jacques Rousseau in Swedish Eyes Around 1760." In *Peripheries of the Enlightenment*, edited by Richard Butterwick, Simon Davies and Gabriel Sánchez Espinosa 87–103. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2008.

Smith, Craig. "The Scottish Enlightenment, Unintended Consequences and the Science of Man." *Journal of Scottish Philosophy* 7, no. 1 (2009): 9–28. doi:10.3366/E1479665108000304.

Smith, Adam. *Undersökning om kongl. stora sjö- och gränse-tullar, samt acciser och små-tullar, med flera consumtions-afgifter*. Stockholm, 1800a.

Smith, Adam. *Handbok för statshushållningen efter Adam Smiths grundsattser*. Stockholm, 1800b.

Smith, Adam. *Politisk undersökning om lagar, som hindra och tvinga införseln af sådana utländska varor, som kunna alstras eller tillverkas inom landet*. Stockholm, 1804.

Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. 2 vols. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1981 [1776].

Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1982 [1759].

Staël, Germaine de. *Lettres sur les écrits et le caractère de J. J. Rousseau*. No place, 1788.

Thorild, Thomas. *Samlade skrifter*. 12 vols. Stockholm: Svenska vitterhetssamfundet, 1932–97.

Vallinder, Torbjörn. "Adam Smiths genombrott i Sverige." *Ekonomisk Debatt* 15, no. 3 (1987): 229–232.

Voltaire. *Political Writings*. Edited by David Williams. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994