# Review

*Reexamining Berkeley's Philosophy*. Stephen H. Daniel, ed.
Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007. xiv + 235 pp.

This book contains the editor's introduction and eleven papers by three generations of Berkeley scholars from seven countries. Most of the papers arose from a conference, organized by the book's editor, that was held in April 2003 at Texas A&M University to commemorate the 250th anniversary of Berkeley's death. The essays fall into roughly three groups: essays by Michael Ayers, George Pappas, Richard Glauser, Marc Hight, and Ralph Schumacher deal largely with Berkeley's immaterialist view of the sensible world; essays by Phillip Cummins, Genevieve Migely, and Bertil Belfrage deal with Berkeley's views about the mind, and essays by Roomet Jakapi, Laurent Jaffro, and Wolfgang Breidert deal with less well-trodden topics. The book is well-edited and beautifully produced; I did not notice a single misprint. In this review I shall try to convey the core of each essay, and I shall make some critical remarks about some but not all of them.[1] The length that I allocate to each essay reflects my level of interest in its topic rather than any judgment of its quality or importance.

Michael Ayers's piece, "Berkeley, Ideas, and Idealism," argues that:

> Berkeley is not a mainstream idealist. . . [For] he is not a philosopher who holds that the objects of our knowledge and thought, things as we conceive of them, are shaped by the ways in which we apprehend and comprehend the world, by our forms of sensibility and/or thought. (21)

As Ayers's language suggests, "mainstream idealism" is for him essentially Kantian idealism. Ayers argues convincingly that Berkeley's idealism is very different from both some early versions of idealism that anticipate Kant, such as Burthogge's in 1678, and some contemporary versions that he finds in Putnam and Davidson. He also thinks that Berkeley's idealism is inferior to what he calls "the heart of the idealist tradition" (22), telling us, for example, that unlike Berkeley, "Kant does not incoherently discard the category of things as they are in themselves" (18), and that

> Berkeley is liable to the charge of simply trying to have his cake and eat it by separating the notion of existence in the mind, or [Cartesian and scholastic] objective existence, from its opposition to real or formal existence. These are surely correlative notions, and each has significance only in relation to the other. (17)

These remarks are suggestive, but they would need to be worked out in more detail to demonstrate the incoherence that Ayers seems to think plagues Berkeley's thought. It

[1] The abbreviations I shall use for the titles of Berkeley's works are as follows: DHP = *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous;* NB = *Notebooks;* NTV = *An Essay Towards a New Theory of Vision*; PHK = *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge* I.

would be interesting, too, to know how Ayers thinks Berkeley stacks up against Absolute Idealists such as Hegel, Bradley, and others whom he does not even mention.

George Pappas' contribution, "Berkeley's Assessment of Locke's Epistemology," argues that two different Berkeleian arguments designed to show that Locke's position leads to external-world skepticism are ineffective. The "conformity argument"—that we do not have knowledge of physical things because we cannot know that our ideas conform to them—fails because such knowledge requires for Locke only that there *be* such a conformity, not that we know that there is. The "inference argument"—that we do not have such knowledge because no inference from mere ideas to physical objects can work—fails because Locke, even if we attribute to him a representational theory of perception, does not and need not hold that perceptual knowledge requires any inference, but only that it be generated by a reliable process.

Pappas' piece is clear and very carefully argued, but I think that it seeks to defend Locke by weakening requirements for perceptual knowledge that Locke arguably holds, despite Pappas' claims to the contrary. Thus, regarding the conformity argument, Pappas thinks that Locke is committed only to "weak conformity," that is, to the view that "real knowledge" requires only that there *be* a conformity between our ideas and things, and not to "strong conformity," which would require that we *know* that there is such a conformity. But it seems that mere conformity of our ideas with things could obtain by mere luck, and that Locke would not count such a case of conformity as knowledge. In order for there to be knowledge, it seems that one would at least have to be *justified* in believing that there is conformity. But then Berkeley's reasons for thinking that we could not be so justified kick in and need to be addressed. With regard to the inference argument, Pappas admits that the "concurrent reasons" Locke gives in *Essay* IV.11 amount to an inferential defense of the senses. But he thinks that although Locke's "concurrent reasons are needed to establish the general reliability of the senses," they are not needed to justify particular perceptual judgments. I do not see, however, how a doubt concerning the general reliability of the senses could fail to infect particular perceptual judgments, nor do I think that Locke makes the sharp distinction between a generalized doubt of the senses and doubts about specific cases that would be required to insulate particular perceptual judgments from the generalized doubt.

Richard Glauser's essay, "The Problem of the Unity of a Physical Object in Berkeley," is a powerful critique of the view, expressed by Pitcher, Tipton, Muehlman, Flage, Raynor, and Olscamp, that "in some sense finite minds make [Berkeleian] physical objects" (51). Glauser argues that such a view would place Berkeley much further away from common-sense realism than *esse is percipi* already takes him, and that it would abolish his distinction between sensible ideas and ideas of imagination (though he acknowledges that Berkeley himself occasionally blurs this distinction). Near the end of his essay, Glauser gives plausible interpretations of passages where Berkeley *seems* to say that we create objects, as well as convincing reasons against the idea that "physical objects are made by God in conjunction with finite minds" (72).

Glauser argues that although *kinds* or *sorts* of physical objects are made by finite minds for their own purposes, *particular* objects are not; that is, "the fact that we make sorts and kinds . . . by selectively focusing on certain resemblances . . . and . . . might therefore have produced a different scheme of classification, does not show that we make individual physical objects" (64). Glauser adds that "sortal ideas can be roughly construed as a Berkeleian equivalent to Lockean nominal essences" (68), and he cites passages where Berkeley seems to presuppose that the way we count objects is wholly sortal-dependent. It seems to follow that for Berkeley at least the *number* of objects that there are is established by finite minds. But this does invite the question: in what sense exactly are particulars *not* created by our minds, if the number of particulars that exist is determined by our thought? Is it that the component ideas that constitute Berkeleian physical objects are individuated and characterized independently of the sorts or kinds that we establish? Then it seems that we do not make all sorts or kinds—that there are natural kinds and a Berkeleian equivalent to Lockean *real* essences. Or is it that there are bare particulars that can be individuated and counted in a sortal-independent way? Surely Berkeley would object to those as illegitimate abstractions. Glauser does not pursue these questions, and indeed he says that "there is no positive theory of the unity of a physical object in Berkeley, although there is a theory of the objective foundation upon which we base our act of considering a physical object as one" (72, cf. 56). Despite the questions it leaves open, this is a rich paper that should be read by anyone interested in questions about the nature of Berkeleian physical objects and whether they are mind-dependent in a sense stronger than *esse is percipi* already implies.

Marc Hight's essay, "Why My Chair Is Not Merely a Congeries: Berkeley and the Single-Idea Thesis," argues against, and proposes an original alternative to, the view that for Berkeley, "commonsense objects are straightforwardly nothing more than collections of ideas" (82). Hight initially presents his position this way:

> My intent here is to demonstrate that there are textual as well as philosophical reasons for holding that Berkeley holds a slightly more sophisticated view. *From the perspective of finite minds,* commonsense objects are single ideas associated with collections of sensory ideas. Metaphysically, commonsense objects are collections, but when we recognize Berkeley's inclusion of an explicitly distinct epistemic element, a superior theory emerges. The word "chair," for instance, names a single idea that is in turn associated with a collection of sensory ideas. The word we use to name a putatively macro-object names the single idea and only indirectly the set of the sensory ideas with which the single ideas are associated. In our ordinary lives single ideas serve as epistemic unifiers of diverse possible sensory experiences. In this epistemic sense, commonsense objects are single ideas. In metaphysical reality, commonsense objects are collections associated with these single ideas. (82)

On the one hand, this account seems not to be consonant with the texts, where commonsense objects are typically treated by Berkeley as collections of ideas that come to be called by a single name because several of their members frequently occur together in our experience. But on the other hand, the account seems to differ only verbally from such a view: if Hight's only point is that any such collection of ideas can also be regarded

as a single, complex idea, then it seems quite innocuous. Evidently, however, Hight thinks that his account differs substantially from what he calls the "collection view" (CV). But I find it difficult to see how his account so differs, except in places where he glosses it in ways that seem to me to involve either errors or misinterpretations. Here are four examples:

1. Hight rightly says that "on CV readings, perceiving a group of sensory ideas and perceiving the object are the same perceptual process," and he rightly attributes such a view to George Pappas (83). But he takes this to mean that "when one perceives some object, that it is perceived *as* something (an apple, for example) is not an additional fact" (83-84). This seems to ignore the difference between the non-epistemic, purely objectual perception that Pappas has in mind, on which perceiving one or more members of a collection of ideas that constitute an object R amounts to perceiving R, and the higher-level perceptual achievement of perceiving something *as* an R, which Pappas is not concerned with in the relevant context. Tabby the cat may perceive a magnet by having an idea of a U-shaped object, but presumably Tabby does not perceive it *as* a magnet, since Tabby does not know what a magnet is.

2. Hight speaks, quite intelligibly, if not consonantly with Berkeley, of a "unifying single idea, represented by a name" (86), but he also says this:

> Thus, *for us*, the single idea *is* the commonsense object (we consider that idea or name to be the object). . . . A single idea, a name, represents a plurality of particular things. (84-85)

Surely the locutions "idea or name" and "a single idea, a name" are not right here: for Berkeley, no less than for Locke (who devotes book II of his *Essay* to "ideas" and Book III to "words"), ideas and names are different things.

3. Hight also speaks of using names as single ideas (85), of using an idea as a name (86), and of "the single ideas that name objects and the collections with which they (the single ideas) are associated" (106n11, cf. 88). But what is it to use a name as an idea, or to use an idea as a name, or for an idea to name an object? Hight does not explain these odd locutions, and I am left thinking that they are just references to his view that names of common objects stand for single ideas that in turn are comprised of a multitude of sensory ideas. That would make sense, but the resulting analysis seems only trivially different from the standard "collections" view that Hight opposes.

4. Hight asserts that the single ideas that he equates with commonsense objects are "ideas of the imagination" (88, 89). But as Glauser notes (77n14), this flies in the face of Berkeley's explicit distinction between ideas of the imagination, which are produced by finite minds, and ideas of sense, which occur in finite minds but are caused by God.

This is not to say that there is nothing of value in Hight's contribution. Like Glauser, he forces us to think about what exactly a Berkeleian commonsense object is: what, for example, is the coach that Berkeley discusses in DHP I? Does it include the visual ideas of wheels and horses that the sound we hear suggests to us? And if it does, then can we easily dismiss Hight's suggestion that commonsense objects are (at least partly) composed of ideas of imagination? Hight also includes a brief but worthwhile discussion of the extent to which the good Bishop really "sides with the mob" (92-94): Hight memorably says: "It is just not true"; and he includes a sensitive though inconclusive account of the differences between Pitcher and Winkler–Pappas regarding whether Berkeley thinks that we immediately perceive commonsense objects. I say "inconclusive," because in one place Hight endorses Winkler and Pappas' view that Berkeley distinguishes "between objects immediately *and* properly perceived as opposed to objects merely immediately perceived" (98); yet in another place he says that for Berkeley, "*all* immediate perception is proper to some sense modality or faculty" (99).

Ralph Schumacher's relatively brief but subtle and difficult piece, "Berkeley on Visible Figure and Extension," begins with the broad question of "how sensory cognition is supposed to be directed to objects in the perceiver's environment" (108). Schumacher immediately substitutes for this question a more specific one, tailored to Berkeley's work (especially the *New Theory of Vision*), namely, "how visual ideas are supposed to contribute to the mind's directing awareness to the geometrical properties of physical objects" (108). Further, he stipulates (a) that the geometrical properties of objects are identical with their *tangible* two and three-dimensional shapes, and (b) that for Berkeley there are no common sensibles, so that the direct objects of sight and the direct objects of touch are entirely different.

Against this pregnant background, Schumacher turns to an apparent contradiction in the *New Theory of Vision.* On the one hand, Berkeley says:

> All that is properly perceived by the visive faculty amounts to no more than colours, with their variations and different proportions of light and shade …. planes are no more the immediate object of sight than solids. What we strictly see are not solids, nor yet planes variously colored: they are only diversity of colours. (NTV 156, 158; cited at 108)

Taking Berkeley at his word, Schumacher reads this passage as claiming that "only light and colors are immediate objects of sight. . . Two and three-dimensional shapes, in contrast, are supposed to be exclusive objects of touch, which are the proper objects of geometry" (108). However, as he points out, in several places in NTV Berkeley also talks about "visible figure" and "visible extension," and treats these as directly perceived, inasmuch as they "are *marks* of tangible shapes," and "we indirectly see tangible shapes by directly seeing the visible marks that stand for them" (109). The contradiction that seems to emerge, then, is that visible figure and extension both are and are not directly seen. Schumacher also notes that the passages where Berkeley affirms that visible figure and extension are immediate objects of sight cannot be ignored because that view is

important both to his attack on the primary/secondary quality distinction and to his analysis of visual misperception (109-110). So, he says that:

> In view of the importance of the claim that visible figure and extension are directly perceivable by sight, one has to look for an interpretation that reconciles this claim with Berkeley's view that light and colours are the only direct objects of sight. (111)

The central part of Schumacher's essay explores the hypothesis (he calls it an "interpretation") that the contradiction can be avoided by saying that for Berkeley

> visible figure and extension are nothing but patterns of light and colours *which are regarded as visible shapes, because they are marks of tangible shapes.* (111, his italics)

Although Schumacher finds this hypothesis "plausible at first sight," I confess that I don't find it so, and that I wonder what could qualify light and colors as falling into "patterns" except their having or filling out certain shapes. But let me not press these doubts, for Schumacher goes on to criticize the hypothesis and eventually rejects it. His reasons are, first, that "being a certain visible shape must be entirely independent of standing for a certain tangible shape," because "we can perceive by sight something as broken [e.g., an oar partly immersed in water] without this visible figure being a mark of a broken tactile shape" (111). The second reason, which he says is "more important," is also more difficult to grasp. Here is part of what Schumacher says:

> Berkeley emphasizes repeatedly that . . . visible shapes do not represent tangible shapes by virtue of their intrinsic properties. There is nothing in their nature that constitutes their representational character. Just like Locke's simple sensory ideas, *visible shapes do not have intrinsic intentionality.* All Berkeley intends to say by maintaining that visible shapes constitute a "universal language" or a "language of nature" is that independently of human perceivers there exists some *co-variation* between certain visible and tangible shapes. Therefore, our interpretation of certain combinations of colours as visible shapes that signify tangible shapes has to be based on the observation of this kind of co-variation. . . . [W]e have to acquire empirical knowledge about the co-variation of certain patterns of light and colours, on the one hand, and certain tangible shapes, on the other, in order to regard the former as visible shapes that stand for geometrical properties of physical objects. . . . It is this kind of empirical knowledge that distinguishes us from the Molyneux man. . . . As a consequence of this conception, not only does the visual perception of tangible shapes mediated by visible marks depend on empirical knowledge, but also the recognition of combinations of colours as visible shapes, *because a certain combination of colours only becomes a visible shape by being associated with a certain tangible shape.* Visual awareness of tangible shapes thus involves ideas of two different kinds: first-order visual ideas; and second-order ideas that refer to these sensory ideas, representing them as standing in relations of co-variation to tangible shapes. Therefore, both kinds of visual perception have to be regarded as cases of indirect perception because Berkeley characterizes *indirect* perception in terms of

> inferences and associations based on experience. Visible figure and extension cannot be direct objects of sight, because as objects of immediate awareness visual ideas are bereft of any representational character. (110-112, his italics)

The latter part of this passage is difficult; it is not clear to me what the two kinds of ideas and the two kinds of visual perception are supposed to be.[2] But the key point of the whole passage seems to be this: if we assume that a visible shape is nothing but a color that signifies a certain tangible shape, then a color only acquires the status of being a visible shape as a result of an empirically learned association between that color and that tangible shape. But in that case, visible shape cannot be directly seen or immediately perceived, since according to Berkeley's concept of immediate perception no item that is perceived only as the result of some associative mechanism or activity can be perceived directly. The consequence is that the hypothesis that colors become visible shapes by being marks of tangible shapes cannot explicate in what sense visible figure and extension are directly perceived, and *a fortiori* cannot explicate it in such a way as to show that the contradiction between the claim that they are directly perceived and the claim that only light and colors are directly seen is only an apparent contradiction.

Schumacher next argues that Berkeley cannot avoid the contradiction by saying that visible figure and extension are perceived *indirectly*, because "we cannot even regard visible figure and extension as *indirect* objects of sight" (117, my emphasis). His argument for this is not clearly stated, but seems to involve the following steps.

1. In order for visible figure and extension to be indirect objects of sight, it must be possible to see patterns of color and light *as* visible shapes.

2. In order for it to be possible to see patterns of color and light *as* visible shapes, it must be possible to distinguish between real colors and apparent colors.

3. For Berkeley, there is no distinction between real and apparent colors, since "all possible mistakes are [merely] mistakes about the *relations* between the objects of direct sensory perception" (116).

4. So, for Berkeley visible figure and extension cannot be indirect objects of sight.

Schumacher makes this argument even more opaque by glossing it as the claim that Berkeley's theory "does not provide the conceptual resources to account for the influence of judgments on the content of sensory perceptions" (114), which resources he sees as necessary for "the concept of *seeing as*" to apply. But let me confine myself to the argument as I have summarized it. Step (3) could be resisted (though perhaps not by appealing to anything that Berkeley says explicitly), for it might be said that for Berkeley,

[2] As Schumacher notes (120n8), "second-order idea" and "bereft of representational character" are expressions used by Martha Bolton in "Locke on Sensory Representation," in Ralph Schumacher, ed., *Perception and Reality from Descartes to the Present* (Paterborn: Mentis, 2004), 146-167, specifically 153 and 147.

no less than for the phenomenalists whom he inspired, the difference between "appearance" and "reality" *is* precisely a difference in the relations among the objects of direct perception. Premise (1) is plausible, I suppose, if one assumes that color and light are the only objects of direct perception; so that if shapes are seen at all, they are seen by dint of some interpretive or associative mental act. But what about premise (2)? Schumacher says, drawing on an example of Locke's but without any explanation, that being able to distinguish the real color of a globe of uniform color from the pattern of different apparent colors that appears to us in direct perception is "just a precondition for saying that we perceive a pattern of different colors as the visible shape of a globe of uniform color" (117). Thus, his point seems to be that the ability to distinguish real from apparent colors is a necessary condition of seeing colors as shapes. Why? Presumably, because the colors that co-vary or correlate with tangible shapes would at least have to be real colors of things, for merely apparent colors vary depending on so many different conditions that they simply do not correlate in any systematic or regular way with the tangible or geometrical properties of objects. If this is Schumacher's point, then it seems to be right—would that he had bothered to state it!

Having argued that visible shape and extension can serve the cognitive function of directing awareness to objects' real geometrical properties neither by being direct objects of sight (albeit ones with color "surrogates," so to speak) nor by being indirect objects of sight signified by colors, Schumacher argues that the best course for Berkeley to have taken would be "to describe a visible shape as a distinct kind of *direct* object of sight that *intrinsically* represents a tangible shape" (118). As he points out, this is tantamount to abandoning the view that the correlation between visible and tangible shapes is empirically learned; that is, it is tantamount to rejecting the empiricist answer to the Molyneux problem. In the end he thinks that only psychological research can answer the question of whether and how vision manages to "direct our visual awareness to the geometric properties of objects" *sans* empirically learned associations.

One problem with this solution is that it does not resolve the initial contradiction between saying that only colors are directly seen and saying that shapes are directly seen. But beyond that, I am not convinced that Berkeley's theory of perception can be rescued only by such a drastic revision of its empiricist orientation. Schumacher says that the motivation behind saying that only colors are directly seen is Berkeley's rejection of common sensibles. But that rejection *does not really require denying that visible shape and extension are directly seen*. All that it requires is distinguishing between visible shape and extension, which can be seen but not touched, and tangible shape and extension, which can be touched but not seen. Interestingly enough, Schumacher notes that on his own proposed revision of Berkeley, "it is still possible to regard visible and tangible shapes as different entities" (118). He seems not to notice, or at least he seems to discount, the fact that so regarding them both preserves Berkeley's heterogeneity thesis and gives him a perfectly consistent position: there is no contradiction between saying that only visible color and visible figure and extension (which *per* PHK I 10 are inseparable) are directly seen, and that tangible figure and extension are not directly seen but only suggested to the mind by visible figure and extension *cum* color.

Of course, this way of interpreting Berkeley, which I presume is fairly standard, does not solve the *textual* problem posed by his claim in NTV 156 and 158 that color, not planes, are the only direct objects of sight. I do not know why Berkeley says this, since he does not *need* to say it in order to preserve the heterogeneity of the objects of sight and touch. Further, it seems that he *should not* say it, because it conflicts with his claim in PHK 10 and elsewhere that a color without a shape is inconceivable, and it seems to imply that our ideas of colors are abstract general ideas of the kind he repudiates. I venture to speculate, then, that perhaps all he meant to assert is that *tangible* planes are not direct objects of sight. Such a reading, I think, also does much less violence to Berkeley's texts than does dropping the idea that the relation between direct objects of sight and objects of touch is empirically learned. It also has the significant merit of harmonizing with Berkeley's discussion of figure and extension in DHP I, where Philonous speaks firmly and at length of "the very figure and extension which you perceive by sense."

Finally, notice that even if we grant that visible figure and extension are directly seen, all is not smooth sailing for Berkeley's doctrine that these are marks of tangible shapes. For the visible shapes in question are presumably only apparent shapes, like the different shapes seen by a mite, by minute "creatures less than a mite," and by a human upon looking at a mite's foot that Philonous mentions in DHP I. But just as apparent colors do not systematically co-vary with tangible shapes, likewise (merely) apparent visual shapes do not systematically co-vary with tangible shapes. To take a simple example, the elliptical shape seen by viewing an elliptical plate from directly overhead does not correlate with (tangible) elliptical shape, since this seen elliptical shape would also present itself to someone viewing a round plate from an angle. Only *real* visible shapes, if I may use such a term, have any chance of correlating with tangible shapes. But before such correlations can be known, real visible shapes must be extrapolated from apparent visible shapes, and this feat of extrapolation appears no less difficult—indeed perhaps even more difficult—than that of correlating real visible shapes with tangible shapes.

Phillip Cummins' impressive paper, "Perceiving and Berkeley's Theory of Substance," argues that "Berkeley had an idiosyncratic but intelligible theory of substance" (121). The basic *premise* of the reasoning that leads to that theory is the *esse is percipi* principle, namely, the doctrine that a sensible thing or quality can exist only by being perceived, and is thus identical with an idea. From this, together with Berkeley's deep-seated assumption that a sensible thing or quality cannot perceive itself, it follows that if there is a sensible item, then there must be something *else*—call it a mind—that perceives it. Furthermore, this mind qualifies as a substance, according to the most traditional notion of substance. For on that notion, an item that depends ontologically on something else for its existence is not a substance, but the entity on which it so depends is a substance (Cummins calls this "the superordination conception of substance"). This does not mean that the superior entity must be able to exist absolutely alone (the "autonomy conception of substance," found for example in Descartes and notably in Spinoza), but only that it must not depend in the same way on the subordinate item. But this is precisely the way in which a mind and the sensible things (=ideas) that are said by Berkeley to exist "in" that mind are related. The sensible thing, being only an idea, cannot exist unless a mind perceives it. And while it is true that a mind, whose essence is *percipere*, cannot exist

unless it perceives something, Cummins denies that there is a symmetrical relationship of dependence here:

> Perceiving is something that a perceiver does. Unlike the case of sensibles, the state that constitutes or grounds the existence of a mind is something that it has or does, not a state *bestowed* on it in virtue of what some other thing has or does. A mind, then, is not ontologically dependent. Further, by perceiving, a mind does what is required for a sensible's existence. Sensibles are ontologically dependent entities and minds are the entities upon which they depend. (125)

The core of Cummins' paper is his account of what the dependence of sensibles on minds consists in for Berkeley. It consists solely in their being *perceived* by minds; it does *not* consist in their being modes or qualities that *inhere* in the mind. Thus, when Berkeley says that minds and minds alone can "support" ideas or sensible things, all this means is that only minds can perceive these things. Here are two key passages where Cummins advances this interpretation:

> I contend [that Berkeley] rethought ontological dependence. Within the substance tradition a quality existed in and was dependent upon the substance of which its name was predicated, so that *to be* for qualities was to inhere in (be supported by) a substance. Berkeley rejected the relation of inherence, at least for sensibles and perhaps entirely, and used perceiving to redefine dependence on a substance. (127-28)

> My interpretive hypothesis is that Berkeley provided content or determinate meaning to "support," as applied to substances and sensible objects, in terms of perceiving, an activity which could plausibly be said to yield a contrast between a subordinate entity, the sensible whose existence consists in and depends upon being perceived, and a superior entity, or mind, whose awareness or perceiving is an indispensable condition for the existence of a sensible. The perceiver, as non-causal ground for the existence of an ontologically subordinate sensible, fills the role of substance. (127)

Not only does this account provide content for Berkeley's positive theory of mind, but just as importantly, it explodes the idea that sensible qualities could inhere in an unthinking material substance. For if (i) "supporting a sensible quality" means "perceiving a sensible quality," and (ii) no unthinking substance can perceive a sensible quality, then it follows that (iii) no unthinking substance can support a sensible quality. To quote once again from Cummins' powerful exposition:

> This [account] totally precludes non-perceiving substance. It does so by making perceiving the experiential meaning of "supports," the relation with reference to which substance had been defined. . . . Matter, meaning material substance, is impossible because being an unthinking thing precludes perceiving sensible qualities, the only way in which those qualities can be supported, given their newly revealed nature. Incapable of supporting qualities in the only way allowed as

> intelligible, an insentient thing cannot be a substance. It cannot perform the substance function. (127-29)
>
> Substance is . . . conceptualized and validated by Berkeley with reference to perceiving, that is, with reference to the mind, that which perceives. There are intelligible notions of supporting and of substance in the case of mind and its objects. Supporting is perceiving. Substance is that which perceives. . . . In contrast, material substance is defined as an unperceiving substance which supports sensible objects or the sensible qualities they comprise; so defined, it is a contradiction in terms, since "support" means "perceives." (131)

Cummins develops several implications of (and addresses a number of possible objections to) his account, and there is much to be learned from his insightful and closely argued analysis. I shall discuss only one of its implications. This is that the so-called inherence interpretation of Berkeley's theory of substance is wrong. That certainly is a corollary of Cummins's account, since on his view, sensible qualities exist "in the mind" not in the sense of inhering in it or being properties or states of it, but rather, just as Berkeley says at PHK 49 and DHP 237, by being perceived by it. Yet Cummins's account does invite some questions. As he notes, *inhering in* is standardly taken as "the ontological relationship underlying predication and thus signified by singular propositions such as 'Socrates is short'" (136). Proponents of the inherence interpretation break the link between inherence and predication, so as to avoid having to say things like "the mind is blue" or "the mind is square." They are then left, as Cummins says, with the problem that once inherence is divorced from predication, inherence becomes inexplicable. Cummins's Berkeley, on the other hand, rejects the inherence model of predication. When it comes to sensible things like the die that Berkeley discusses in PHK 49, this rejection does not deprive him of an underlying relationship that allows for predicating hardness and squareness of the die, because the die can be conceived as a bundle of qualities, and predicating a quality of it can be conceived as saying that this quality is a member of that bundle. But the same maneuver cannot be applied to the mind, since it is not a Humean bundle but a substance.

This leaves us with some questions. First, can we predicate of the mind anything at all? It seems that the answer must be yes, unless we are prepared to admit that the mind is wholly indescribable. But what then can we predicate of the mind? The Berkeleian answer, it seems, is that we may say that the mind is *active*; we can predicate of it two kinds of actions, perceiving and willing. But then we may ask: what is the ontological relationship that underlies those predications? One possible answer would be that the perceiving and the willing are bundled together. But it is not clear what would hold such a bundle together, and this was certainly not the view that Berkeley advocated in his mature work. It seems, then, that Berkeley may be unable to do away with inherence altogether, in that he may be committed to the view that the actions and powers of perceiving and willing inhere in the mind in a sense equally mysterious as that in which sensible qualities are held to inhere in material substance by the materialists that Berkeley opposed.

Genevieve Migely's essay, "Berkeley's Actively Passive Mind," has three purposes:

1. To show that Berkeley's view of the mind is not inconsistent, or more precisely, to show that there is no inconsistency between passages where he says that the mind's nature is to be active and passages that say that in perception, the mind is passive.

2. To explain the sense in which mind and ideas are distinct yet inseparable.

3. To fill out and explicate Berkeley's notion of mind as being a kind of activity.

For Migely, the worry mentioned in (1) is generated by two episodes: the passage in DHP I where Philonous rejects Hylas's attempt to distinguish between an act of perception and an object of perception by arguing that in our smelling a tulip, no act of perception is discernible and the mind is entirely passive, and a passage in the 24 March 1730 letter to Samuel Johnson where Berkeley says: "That the soul of man is passive as well as active, I make no doubt" (154).[3] Migely does not dissect these passages; rather, drawing on Berkeley's work more generally, she specifies several ways in which perception, whether it be immediate or mediate, is active rather than passive. With respect to mediate perception, she rightly points out that "this type of perception [is one] in which the mind is performing operations and producing ideas different from the ideas perceived in immediate perception" (155). Her discussion of this point, however, is somewhat confusing. She sometimes writes as if the mind's activity in mediate perception always consists in volition (155, 168n11). But she also says that "in many of our mediate perceptions, we . . . do *not* determine by an act of our will which ideas go with which," and that the judgments involved in mediate perception can be "involuntary" (156, her italics). That not all mediate perception involves volition is certainly the correct view, for as Cummins rightly says:

> There is undeniable evidence that Berkeley recognized non-volitional mental doing in addition to and independent of choosing. Mediate perception provides a relevant example. On Berkeley's account of mediate perception, when upon immediately seeing a colour, I mediately perceive something else, I am doing something, something more than what occurs when I merely see the colour. The something more, the interpretive element, involves thought, even belief, but to think or believe is not to will. Mediate perceiving is not itself a volitional state nor the effect of conscious choosing. Equally, it is not the result of a process of reasoning, which could be said to involve choice. Berkeley is insistent that mediate seeing, though something the mind does, is usually or always a product of psychological conditioning or associating. It indicates an active being, but not choice or volition. (145)

Indeed, I know of no passage in Berkeley's work where he says that mediate perception involves the will, and the paradigmatic type of case of mediate perception, which

[3] Belfrage points out, however, that the view that "God is the only active being in the world" was "an important part of the first three-fifths of *Notebook A*" (173).

involves the *suggestion* of one idea or set of ideas (often of touch) by an immediately perceived idea (often of vision), is a matter of involuntary learned association that involves no volition. But despite this wrinkle, Migely is of course right to say that mediate perception always involves mental activity. For as she says:

> We may not always [ever?] have a *choice* about which ideas we relate together, but we are the *cause* of that relation of ideas. (156)

Migely argues that for Berkeley, the mind is active even in immediate perception. She finds two ways in which this is true:

> [First,] hedonic sensation is a part of all perceptions, as heat, taste, smells, and sounds are nothing but a particular pleasure or pain (DHP 177-80). Pleasure or pain always comes with desire or aversion (volitions). [Second], there is always assent involved in order to register the perception. . . (NB 777) . . . (NB 791) . . . (*Alc* VII.3, 288). Therefore, immediate perception is active since it involves activity in the evaluation and confirmation of sensory ideas. (157)

In further defense of the view that the mind is active even in immediate perception, one could also cite some insightful remarks from Cummins's article:

> That which perceives is an agent or a doer; that which is perceived is not. A contrasting case may make this clearer. If a piece of paper, M, touches a second, N, then, equally, N touches M. M and N contribute equally to the relationship and have interchangeable roles. It would, perhaps, be more perspicuous to say that M and N are touching. In contrast, if P perceives O, P and O do not have interchangeable roles. Furthermore and more importantly, P, as perceiver, does something. Hence it is not just an element in a state of affairs; it is an agent in at least a minimal sense. To the other, O, something is done. It is an object of perception in virtue of what P does. If one wants to portray perceiving as a two-term relation, so that the perceived and the perceiver are correlatives, one can still insist that only one, the perceiving subject, is active. Because perceiving by nature takes an object, there is another *relatum*, the perceived, but doing or activity belongs only to the perceiver. (133)

Migely also admits, however, there is a limited but important sense in which the mind is passive in immediate perception. This is that in typical cases of immediate perception, we do not *cause* the ideas we immediately perceive, since they are imprinted on us by another mind. As Migely puts it:

> It is in a very strict sense then that Berkeley considers the mind passive; only in immediate perception which involves no act of our will to produce the content of that sensation. . . . Accordingly, Berkeley employs "passivity" in immediate perception in a very narrow sense. Minds are "passive" in that finite perceivers are not the origin or cause of the ideas of sense. (156-57)

This is, of course, a correct description of Berkeley's position. Furthermore, the receiving of ideas of sense from the cause that transmits them to us is a crucial part of his system, if only because, as Migely says, it is the only way he can "safeguard our commonsense realism that we are not the cause of the physical world" (166).

In light of this "imprinting" doctrine, it seems doubtful to me, *pace* Migely, that Berkeley has a fully consistent view. The mind cannot be both purely active and yet be causally affected by something else. Migely herself says in a note, without demurring, that "Berkeley would still be considered inconsistent even if passivity only occurred in some, not all, perception" (169n9). In another note she says: "the mind is considered entirely active for Berkeley because it is always thinking, even though it may not always be causing the ideas about which it thinks" (169n22). There is an unresolved tension between these remarks. Perhaps Berkeley ought to have held, like Kant, that the mind is both active and passive: active insofar as it processes its data in manifold ways thanks to what Kant calls "the understanding," passive in that it also possesses what he calls "sensibility"—a faculty thanks to which it can be causally affected by an outside agency. But this would have gone against Berkeley's view that only ideas are inert and passive, and it seems to me that in the end Berkeley's sparse ontology of active minds and passive ideas does not fit with his view that finite minds are continually acted upon by the divine mind.

The most successful part of Migely's essay is her explanation of how a mind and its ideas are distinct yet inseparable (listed above as point 2). To say that the mind and its ideas are distinct, she maintains, is just to say that they have totally different natures: the mind is active, ideas are passive; this is what she calls Berkeley's "dualism." But this dualism does not imply that minds and ideas can exist separately; on the contrary, they cannot. For on the one hand, an idea can exist only by being perceived by a mind, and on the other hand, a mind can exist only when it thinks, and thinking is having and operating on ideas. But this does not mean that a mind is *identical* with its ideas; just as, to use Migely's nice example, the second floor of a house is "inseparable" from the first floor in that the second floor cannot exist unless the first floor exists, yet the second floor is not identical with the first floor. From these considerations, which Migely explains persuasively (160-62), she draws the conclusion that

> it is simply false to say [with Robert Adams] that Berkeley "uses 'substance' in one of its classic senses, to mean a being that is conceivable as existing separately." (162)[4]

In the last part of her essay, Migely tries to explain what Berkeley means by saying that the mind is an active substance (point 3 listed above). Here, like other interpreters of Berkeley, she must contend with the fact that Berkeley says little about the mind save that it is an active substance whose activities consist in understanding (perceiving) and willing. How is this to be fleshed out? Migely writes that

[4] Thus she agrees with Cummins that Berkeley subscribes to the "superordination" (but not the "autonomy") conception of substance (131-33).

> The substantial mind is an integrated, unified system of activity in which the will and the understanding operate. . . . It is a system of activity with interrelated, interdependent items. (163)

She goes on to say some interesting things about this "system" view of the mind, notably that the mental items that constitute the mind, unlike the parts of a physical system like a watch, cannot retain their identity if they are removed from the system. She then tries to fill out her account by appealing to Stephen Daniel's work. She reports that "Daniel provides a semantic account of substance" (165) based on Ramist logic, according to which the mind is not a *thing* at all, but "is essentially linguistic and rhetorical" (164, quoted from Daniel).[5] She quotes a number of passages from Daniel, including this one:

> To say that an idea exists means nothing more than that it is the object of mind, and to refer to the substance or being of a mind is to refer to the existence of its ideas. Therefore, to think that minds *exist* in the same way that ideas exist is to think that minds are *things* like ideas; and that is something Berkeley repeatedly cautions against. (165)[6]

I confess that from reading what Migely quotes and says, I can only withhold judgment as to the coherence of Daniel's interpretation.[7] She says that "Daniel and I arrive at virtually the same basic conclusion regarding the Berkeleian mind: it is activity" (165). But if "to refer to the substance or being of a mind is to refer to the existence of its ideas," and if, as Berkeley insists, ideas are wholly passive and inert, then how can the mind be active? Furthermore (to cite another sentence that Migely quotes from Daniel), if "the subsistence of minds or souls is nothing other than the existence of ideas" (164), then how is one to avoid a bundle theory of the mind that Daniel would reject?[8]

Migely adds that, in contrast to Daniel's semantic account, "I retain an ontological account of substance" (165). But in recapping that account, she just reverts to describing the mind as an active substance whose activities are perceiving and willing. She explains that

> the will and the understanding are not parts of the mind; they constitute the mind itself. They are not parts of the system; they *are* the system. Thus, by the system I am not referring to a collection of things that are part of a whole to serve some function. Rather, by the system, I mean one simple, undivided, substantial unity of activity. (164)

---

[5] See Stephen Daniel, "Edwards, Berkeley, and Ramist Logic," *Idealistic Studies* 31 (2001), 56.

[6] See Stephen Daniel, "Berkeley's Pantheistic Discourse," *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 49 (2001), 184.

[7] Daniel's most recent defense of his views about the Berkeleian mind is Stephen H. Daniel, "Berkeley's Stoic Notion of Spiritual Substance," in Stephen H. Daniel, ed., *New Interpretations of Berkeley's Thought* (Amherst, NY: Humanity Books, 2008), 203-230.

[8] See Stephen Daniel, "Berkeley, Suárez, and the *Esse-Existere* distinction," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 74 (2000), 633.

This account seems to require the notion of pure activity—activity that is not performed *by* some substantial thing like the brain or some spiritual counterpart of the brain like Descartes' *res cogitans*. That does not appear to me to be an intelligible notion. I am inclined to think that Berkeley's most defensible account of mind is Cummins's view that it is a substance that supports ideas, where the relation of supporting is reinterpreted as perceiving, and that the mind is active both in the sense that perceiving is "a type of minimal doing" (141), and that it has the power to create ideas insofar as it can will them into existence, classify them, and manipulate them.

Bertil Belfrage's piece, "Berkeley's Four Concepts of the Soul," traces the evolution of Berkeley's view of the mind from his early notes in 1707 to the view he published in PHK in 1709. Belfrage deliberately refrains from defending any one of the four views he finds in these writings; thus he says: "The traditional question (which I shall not ask) is: Which is Berkeley's 'real' concept of mind (presuming that he never changed)?" (184n3) His meticulously researched and documented essay thus limits itself to carefully expounding each view.

He opens the essay by laying out four "assumptions" that Berkeley makes early in *Notebook A*, calling them "Berkeley's Early Principles." He notes that these assumptions, which imply that there is no knowledge, reasoning, or meaningful discourse about things of which we have no ideas, are in conflict with the "conventional concept of the soul," according to which it is "a separate active being which 'thinks' (NB 437)" (174). By citing relevant entries (e.g., NB 576), he shows that despite this conflict, early in *Notebook A* Berkeley favors the conventional concept of the soul.

However, just a few entries later Berkeley starts to adumbrate a second concept of the soul, namely, a bundle theory. Belfrage expounds this concept in detail, making subtle observations and distinctions along the way. He expounds Berkeley's view that "the will" is not a faculty but rather is "a set of particular volitions" that strive to attain a state of "complacency" or satisfaction (176). He explains that Berkeley's view, that "the concept of a person is identified with will and understanding" (177), means that "the term 'person' is used for an unbroken chain of volitions and ideas succeeding each other without (conscious) interruption" (178). He discusses whether the person/mind/soul bundle ceases to exist during periods of (presumably dreamless) sleep, thus having an intermittent existence, and he shows how Berkeley may avoid such a paradoxical consequence by appealing to the notion of a person's "*private* time" (178-79), according which no such time elapses between falling asleep and awakening because one experiences no succession of ideas between these.

What led Berkeley to abandon the bundle theory and move toward the view that he embraces in PHK, Belfrage thinks, is the development in his views about perception. As long he saw perception only as the passive reception of ideas imprinted by God—a view that he expresses as early as NB 499—he did not need to think of a finite mind as anything more than a bundle of ideas caused by God. But Berkeley's psychological investigations in NTV led him to the view that many ideas are "perceived" only by being suggested to the mind. This—together with the views that (a) no ideas are altogether void

of the pleasure or pain we seek to obtain or to avoid and (b) affirmation and negation of any perceptual content involves activity—led him to reject the views that to think is just to experience a succession of ideas and that to will is just to have a series of volitions. Instead, Berkeley was driven toward his third concept of mind or soul, according to which the soul is "Pure Act" (182). In support of attributing this conception to Berkeley, Belfrage cites NB 829:

> Substance of a Spirit is that it acts, causes, wills, operates, or if you please (to avoid the quibble $y^t$ might be made on $y^e$ word it) to act, cause, will, operate & it's substance is not knowable not being an Idea.

He interprets this passage as saying that

> It is misleading . . . to use the term "it" for the soul in phrases such as "*It* acts," "*It* wills," and so on: "spirit" means "to act," "cause," "will." . . . It is as mistaken to hypostatize spirit and take it as an "it" as to take "gravity" to denote an actor and attribute to "it" such qualities as "is red" or "is moving." (182)[9]

According to Belfrage, however, even this third conception of the soul is not the one that Berkeley ultimately defended in PHK. The reason is that the conception of the soul as pure act seems again to imply that the soul has an intermittent existence. (Evidently, then, Belfrage does not think that Berkeley was satisfied with the appeal to a "private time" to avoid this consequence.) Belfrage reports that, in an unpublished manuscript at the end of PHK that Luce and Jessop did not include in their edition of Berkeley's works, Berkeley tries to soften this paradox by a mystical appeal:

> The subsistence of the soul, finally, is explained by an element of mysticism: when the soul does not exist, it subsists in the divine mind. (183)

But, as Belfrage adds, "this is not the view that [Berkeley] published" (183).

Instead, Berkeley reverted in the published text of PHK to his fourth view of the soul, the "metaphysical concept of the soul," according to which "spirits are separate beings" (183-84). I say "reverted" because it seems to me that this concept is no different (except perhaps for the emphasis on, and the more specific description of, spirits' activity) from the "conventional concept" of the soul as a "separate active being which 'thinks' (NB 437)" (174) that Belfrage says Berkeley began with. The evolution of his thought about the nature of the mind from 1707 to 1709, then, seems almost to have come full circle.

Roomet Jakapi's essay, "Christian Mysteries and Berkeley's Alleged Non-Cognitivism," persuasively defends the thesis that Berkeley took Christian doctrines about mysteries such as the Trinity, the resurrection, and heavenly rewards to be literally true, and thus not to be reducible (as some scholars have proposed) to non-cognitive expressions of emotion or purely pragmatic devices for instilling faith and good works. According to

---

[9] Note the similarity between this conception of the soul and the conception advocated by Migely.

Jakapi, some scholars have been encouraged by Berkeley's discussion—particularly in the Introduction to PHK of uses of language other than "the communicating of ideas marked by words," such as "the raising of some passion, the exciting to, or deterring from an action, the putting the mind in some particular disposition"—to extend this then-innovative view of language to statements about Christian mysteries, in such a way that such statements "(1) are neither true nor false; (2) do not provide information; (3) are cognitively meaningless; and (4) are typically written or spoken merely to provoke emotions, attitudes, or actions" (189). Throughout his essay, Jakapi robustly opposes any such reading. He cites passages, especially from *Alciphron* VI and VII, to support his view that for Berkeley,

> a mystery is primarily a religious *truth* or *doctrine* that cannot be discovered or fully explained by human reason. It is only via divine revelation that human beings know it . . . . Berkeley always held the relevant propositions in the Bible to be true. For, in sharp contrast to typical examples of non-cognitive or other uses of language, as examined in contemporary theories of meaning, in the case under observation, God, not man, is the speaker. He speaks by the mediation of divinely inspired writers (see *Alc* VI.6-10, 227-40). And for Berkeley, of course, God does not lie or speak nonsense. In other words, the propositions in question are true simply because they come from God and because they are to be found in the Scripture, the written word of God. This is an orthodox theological position that Berkeley does not seem to question in any of his writings at any stage of his philosophical development. (190)

Nevertheless, Jakapi says, Berkeley was quite prepared to *defend* beliefs in Christian mysteries by appealing to the beneficial effects of holding such beliefs. Thus Jakapi writes,

> The core of Berkeley's defence of the belief in the Christian mysteries (developed specifically in *Alciphron* VII) lies in his account of the usefulness of such belief, which, in turn, is related to the doctrine of "other uses" of language. (194)

But Jakapi also insists that this pragmatic way of defending belief in Christian mysteries is consistent with his literalist interpretation. Thus, after quoting a passage from *Alciphron* VII where Euphranor extols the value of assenting to the doctrine of the Trinity even in the absence of having a clear and distinct idea of it, Jakapi writes:

> The idea that propositions enunciating the doctrine of the Trinity have a good influence on those who assent to them is perfectly consistent with the view that these propositions are true and reveal something important about God and his relation to us. The passage is meant to promote and assure belief in the Trinity and to defend this belief by means of the semantic doctrine in question. No doubt is cast on the existence of the Trinity, authority of the Bible, or authenticity of the revelation. (194-95)

In Jakapi's essay, then, we have a strong affirmation of Bishop Berkeley's religiosity. As Jakapi says in concluding: "My point is simply that, while interpreting passages related to the mysteries, we should take Berkeley's religious commitments seriously" (196).

On the other hand, Jakapi's essay presents us with a Berkeley who, at least as a philosopher of language and meaning, seems not to have a truly coherent view. If as the scholars Jakapi criticizes think, uses of language employing terms for which we lack (clear and distinct) ideas could be treated as non-cognitive, then Berkeley would have unified view, according to which language is used cognitively only when linked to (clear and distinct) ideas and non-cognitively when not so linked. But on Jakapi's view, Berkeley's position cannot be rescued in such a manner, for Berkeley's uses of religious language are not reducible to non-cognitive ones even in the absence of linkage to (clear and distinct) ideas. One might try to defend Berkeley by sharply distinguishing between his roles as philosopher and "as a Christian and cleric" (195). But Jakapi rejects such a schizophrenic picture of Berkeley as "unnatural" and as likely to lead to the erroneous view that "Berkeley did not really believe in the resurrection" (195). So, we are left with a Berkeley whose religious persuasion remained in tension with his philosophical views on language and meaning.

Berkeley's religious commitments also come to the fore in Laurent Jaffro's learned, rich and highly polished essay, "Berkeley's Criticism of Shaftesbury's Moral Theory in *Alciphron* III." Now the foil is no longer non-cognitivism of any sort, but rather Shaftesbury's naturalized, moral sense ethical theory. At bottom, Berkeley's rejection of this theory stems from his commitment to "a divine command account of the source of normativity," on which "Berkeley's God is the source not only of obligation but also of utility" (210)—an account that sets him against any theory that would make moral values independent of religion. Thus Jaffro writes:

> In Berkeley's opinion, the moral philosophers are the minute ones, who believe in the existence of a moral and social realm, as if the order of morality were autonomous and did not depend on the divine command. On the contrary, Christianity saves us the trouble of developing a so-called moral philosophy insofar as it provides us with a religion, in which there is everything necessary not only to our salvation hereafter but also to the conduct of our life here-below. Thus it should be no surprise that Berkeleian ethics could not be expressed as a "moral philosophy." (201)[10]

Jaffro does not content himself with pointing out that in light of Berkeley's divine command view, "we should renounce all thought of piecing back together Berkeley's moral philosophy" (201). Rather, the bulk of his essay is devoted to a close exposition of

---

[10] Here Jaffro has a deft note quoting George Pitcher, *Berkeley* (London: Routlege and Kegan Paul, 1977), 228: "It is surprising that Berkeley does not devote more of his energies to moral philosophy. . . . Of course he has views on these matters, but it cannot be said that he anywhere provides, or tries to provide, adequate backing for them." Later Jaffro approvingly quotes another passage from Pitcher, in which Pitcher attributes the divine-command view of morals to Berkeley.

Berkeley's *internal* criticisms of Shaftesbury. Jaffro is an expert in the history of moral philosophy, and I shall not try to do justice to his refined analysis of what he sees as two different Berkeleian critiques of two different stages of Shaftesburyan moral sense theory. Roughly speaking, the first stage seeks to base morality on an untutored and spontaneous moral sense, whereas the second stage seeks to base it on a learned, cultivated moral sense analogous to "some kind of connoisseurship" (208). Berkeley's internal criticism of the former is that "the moral sense is arbitrary and in any case superfluous," and his internal criticism of the latter is that "the moral sense as a cultivated taste might be unattainable to the average human being" (208). Jaffro elaborates on these points in ways that should interest any student of moral sense ethical theory or Berkeley's objections to it. Among other things, he points out that "Berkeley's conscience is a supernatural sense of right and wrong. Actually, it is not a 'sense' at all. . . . [Berkeley] makes use of the term 'conscience' as if it were the antonym of 'moral sense' or of any 'sense' whatever" (201). Jaffro further agues that Berkeley's critique (through Euphranor) of the first stage of Shaftesbury's moral sense theory is weakened by Berkeley's failure to distinguish "the moral sense as a subjective disposition . . . from the whim of passion" (204). The problem with moral sense as a subjective disposition is not that it "would merge conscience and passion," but that it "does not give a satisfactory account of the universality of moral rules" (204-5). Jaffro also points out, in agreement with George Pitcher, that although "it is a commonplace that Berkeley was responsible for the first presentation of rule consequentialism" (213n16), it would be a mistake to see Berkeley as a rule-utilitarian. As he puts it:

> The promotion of the well-being of mankind is an effect of Christian principles; it does not prove that Christian principles are true only insofar as they are favourable but that there must be some truth in Christian principles which produces such an effect. If utility were the criterion, then since pagan religions also sometimes have utility value, we should equally consider being pagan. In fact, utility is not a criterion, but rather a sign of the truth of practical principles. Therefore we should express the matter the other way around: if pagan religions are also sometimes useful, they must contain some principles of such a nature as to produce these effects, that is, Christian principles. . . . Even though Berkeley gives a seemingly rule-consequentialist account of morality in some passages of *Alciphron* and *Passive Obedience,* his discussion about the origin of moral rules shows that his point is not that a law is divine and should be obeyed because it is useful to mankind, but that it is useful to mankind because it is the law of God. (210-11)

Wolfgang Breidert's essay, "Berkeley Poetized," is a fitting dessert to this feast of a book. Breidert is not concerned with Berkeley as a poet, or with how Berkeley may have influenced poets and artists; nor does he discuss how poets may have addressed Berkeley's biography. Rather, his innovative project is to examine how poets have responded to Berkeley's immaterialist philosophy. His method is to quote lines or stanzas of poems that allude to Berkeley's immaterialism and to comment on them, asking whether they reflect an accurate understanding of his thought or are merely satirical, as many of them turn out to be. The poets he cites include Alexander Pope, Lord Byron, William Butler Yeats, and several 20$^{th}$ century figures: René François Armand Sully

Prudhomme (winner of the first Nobel Prize in literature in 1901), Lutz Geldsetzser (a German philosopher who wrote a history of philosophy in verse), Richard Aquila (author of the well-known *Limerick History of Philosophy*), Paul Muldoon (an Irish poet), Irving Layton (a Romanian poet who emigrated to Canada), Charles H. Sisson (an Anglican poet), Donald Davie (an English poet and literary critic), Kenneth Rexroth (an American poet), and Christian Morgenstern (a well-known German poet). Ronald Knox also earns a mention in the endnotes for his famous limerick about the tree in the quad. I presume that most of these writers are not well-known to philosophers, and it is a testament to Breidert's erudition that he contextualizes their poems by telling us interesting things about each of them and their work.

In several cases Breidert's comments are very astute, as in his demonstration that the following single stanza by Prudhomme misrepresents Berkeley in no less than *five* different ways:

> Berk'ley, inspired by the horror of crude senses
> examines hostilely their proofs and evidences:
> control of body, empty phantom, soul usurps.
> God only, nothing else, that human mind disturbs,
> Adjudged by Hobbes is human knowledge of all matter
> As cause of Being but without sensitive patter.
> God, Spirit, could they be? Mere words, no entities!
> – They are the whole! Tis Berk'ley's answer; Matter lies! (217)

In other cases they Breidert's remarks are provocative, as when he argues that

> In this verse [by Muldoon] the author speaks of a child who is said to be a *non-entity*, but if the poet or philosopher is talking about a non-entity, he is thinking about it, and therefore it is perceived in some way; that is, it has to exist in a Berkeleian sense. It would seem as if Berkeley's doctrine cannot be expressed negatively. Saying "the unperceived does not exist" implies thinking about the unperceived; thus it *is* perceived and must *exist*. (222)

It seems to me that what Breidert says here shows only that one cannot consistently deny ("express negatively") Berkeley's doctrine *if one is a Berkeleian*, but clearly enough Breidert is here touching on difficult issues about negative existential statements.

Breidert ends his essay this way:

> My brief survey of poetry that deals with Berkeley and/or his philosophy allows me to conclude that many of these poems were written more satirically than out of admiration. In many cases Berkeley has been misunderstood (and misinterpreted) by poets, and even philosopher-poets are occasionally guilty of distorting his ideas. It is nevertheless interesting to notice how elements of his philosophy (especially his immaterialism) and his biography make their way into poetry. Most of these poems mention God as creator, guarantor, and observer of the world, whereas it is

> astonishing that poets do not refer to either Berkeley's general theory of language or his special conception of visual language. (226)

The essays from which this reviewer learned the most are the ones on Berkeley's theory of mind. Cummins's essay is the best treatment of the Berkeleian mind's relation to its ideas that I have ever read; Migely's essay very usefully underscores issues about the coherence of Berkeley's view of the mind, and Belfrage's essay is a careful account of the historical development of Berkeley's views on the mind. Indeed, Migely's contribution can be seen as defending the third view that Belfrage attributes to Berkeley and Cummins' essay can be seen as explicating the fourth. Among the essays dealing with Berkeley's view of the sensible world, it seems to me that Glauser's lucid piece is a must-read. Jakapi's and Jaffro's essays are powerful reminders that Berkeley was not just a great philosopher: he was also a deeply committed and evidently quite orthodox cleric and theologian.

Georges Dicker
The College at Brockport
State University of New York
gdicker@brockport.edu