blackwell great minds

berkeley

margaret atherton

WILEY Blackwell

berkeley

Blackwell Great Minds

Edited by Steven Nadler

The Blackwell Great Minds series gives readers a strong sense of the fundamental views of the great western thinkers and captures the relevance of these figures to the way we think and live today.

1 *Kant* by Allen W. Wood
2 *Augustine* by Gareth B. Matthews
3 *Descartes* by André Gombay
4 *Sartre* by Katherine J. Morris
5 *Charles Darwin* by Michael Ruse
6 *Schopenhauer* by Robert Wicks
7 *Shakespeare's Ideas* by David Bevington
8 *Camus* by David Sherman
9 *Kierkegaard* by M. Jamie Ferreira
10 *Mill* by Wendy Donner and Richard Fumerton
11 *Socrates* by George H. Rudebusch
12 *Maimonides* by T.M. Rudavsky
13 *Wittgenstein* by Hans Sluga
14 *Locke* by Samuel Rickless
15 *Newton* by Andrew Janiak
16 *Berkeley* by Margaret Atherton

blackwell great minds

berkeley

Margaret Atherton

WILEY Blackwell

This edition first published 2020
© 2020 John Wiley & Sons Ltd

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by law. Advice on how to obtain permission to reuse material from this title is available at http://www.wiley.com/go/permissions.

The right of Margaret Atherton to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with law.

Registered Offices
John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, USA
John Wiley & Sons Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

Editorial Office
9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, customer services, and more information about Wiley products visit us at www.wiley.com.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats and by print-on-demand. Some content that appears in standard print versions of this book may not be available in other formats.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty
While the publisher and authors have used their best efforts in preparing this work, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this work and specifically disclaim all warranties, including without limitation any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. No warranty may be created or extended by sales representatives, written sales materials or promotional statements for this work. The fact that an organization, website, or product is referred to in this work as a citation and/or potential source of further information does not mean that the publisher and authors endorse the information or services the organization, website, or product may provide or recommendations it may make. This work is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services. The advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for your situation. You should consult with a specialist where appropriate. Further, readers should be aware that websites listed in this work may have changed or disappeared between when this work was written and when it is read. Neither the publisher nor authors shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Atherton, Margaret, author.
Title: Berkeley / Margaret Atherton.
Description: First Edition. | Hoboken : Wiley, 2018. | Series: Blackwell great minds ; 16 | Includes index. | Description based on print version record and CIP data provided by publisher; resource not viewed.
Identifiers: LCCN 2018035609 (print) | LCCN 2018038183 (ebook) | ISBN 9781119532057 (Adobe PDF) | ISBN 9781119532071 (ePub) | ISBN 9781405149167 (hardcover) | ISBN 9781405149174 (pbk.)
Subjects: LCSH: Berkeley, George, 1685-1753.
Classification: LCC B1348 (ebook) | LCC B1348 .A84 2018 (print) | DDC 192–dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2018035609

Cover Design: Wiley
Cover Image: George Berkeley. Line engraving by William Holl published by Wellcome Library, London is licensed under CC BY.

Set in 9/12pt Trump Mediaeval by SPi Global, Pondicherry, India

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

For Toby, without which…

contents

preface

Reading Berkeley

George Berkeley wrote the books we will be concerned with in the early years of the eighteenth century. He wrote for an early eighteenth-century audience and not for a twenty-first-century audience. This means, as historians of philosophy are fond of pointing out, that there will be special challenges to readers of the twenty-first century. We cannot hope to just pick up a work of Berkeley's and read it through with understanding. The books Berkeley had been reading, against which he was measuring his own ideas, are not the same as the books being read now, the very nature of philosophy, what counts as philosophy, was different in the early eighteenth century than is the case today, and even the vocabulary in which Berkeley expressed his ideas is different from the way in which we use similar words today. And of course, the early eighteenth century presented a cultural milieu and political and social demands quite different from our own. All these and more represent significant challenges to the contemporary reader and so will have to be addressed in a book like this one that seeks to help a modern reader to understand historical work.

Berkeley himself, however, seemed to think that his work presented challenges to any reader, even one of his own time, thoroughly immersed in the culture existing when the books were written. In each of his two major works, Berkeley wrote prefaces in which he issued requests to his readers to help them overcome what he saw as difficulties peculiar to the books they will be reading. In the Preface to the *Principles of Human Knowledge*, Berkeley urged his readers to impartially consider the truth of what he had written. In order to help them in this endeavor, he told his readers:

> I make it my request that the reader suspend his judgment, till he has once *at least*, read the whole through with that degree of attention and thought which the subject matter shall seem to deserve. (PHK, Preface, p. 23)

Berkeley's advice is excellent. It is always a good idea to read a piece of writing through from beginning to end before rushing to judgment. But Berkeley also seems to think that there are special problems attached to reading a piece of philosophy such as the one he has written. Reading philosophy is

hard. It is never the case that you can pick up a work of philosophy and read it through hastily and expect to understand it. Berkeley is aware that his work contains claims that are perhaps unusual and so will be very easily misunderstood. The remedy is to go slow, to pay attention to actual conclusions drawn, rather than what might immediately appear to follow, to see where the arguments lead and, in general, to read painstakingly and thoughtfully.

While Berkeley removed this Preface from later editions of the *Principles*, he did not back off his faith in the efficacy of the advice it contained, for he added a Preface to later editions of *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous* giving similar, if more elaborate advice.

> It remains, that I desire the reader to withhold his censure of these Dialogues, till he has read them through. Otherwise, he may lay them aside in a mistake of their design, or on account of difficulties or objections which he would find answered in the sequel. A treatise of this nature would require to be once read over coherently, in order to comprehend its design, the proofs, solution of difficulties, and the connexion and disposition of its parts. If it be thought to deserve a second reading; this I imagine, will make the entire scheme very plain: especially, if recourse be had to an Essay I wrote, some years since, upon *vision*, and the Treatise concerning the *Principles of Human Knowledge*. Wherein divers notions are further pursued, or placed in different lights, and other points handled, which naturally tend to confirm and illustrate them. (3D, Preface, p. 169)

Again, Berkeley is giving excellent advice to any reader. Naturally, no one likes to think that they are misunderstanding or misinterpreting what they read. Berkeley is saying that the procedure you need to follow in order to ensure that this is the case is, first, read the work through from beginning to end, so that you understand its structure, where the various proofs and arguments are heading, so that you can pin down exactly what claims are required, and how objections might be answered. Then when you have an understanding of the structure of the argument, read it through again a second time, so that you can work your way through what confusions remain. Finally, pay attention to other works written by the same author, which will augment your understanding or correct remaining misunderstandings.

Excellent advice, as I have said. Inasmuch as it is advice Berkeley himself provides to his readers, it would seem that any reader of Berkeley, in justice to the author, ought to heed this advice. Such advice, moreover, might be particularly helpful as an antidote to our modern culture, which tends to think in article-length chunks and by means of easily regimented arguments. It can be a little too tempting to pull out easily named pieces of argument and discuss them without attention to the context in which they appear, and many contemporary philosophers writing on Berkeley have fallen prey to this temptation. Berkeley addresses his advice to readers, however, and not to critics or expositors like myself, and it is not obvious how critics and authors of books like this one should follow his advice. It would seem that the most natural

way to help readers to read Berkeley's work in the way in which he wished them to do would be to write traditional commentaries, step-by-step discussions of what appears in his texts, elucidating each move that he makes in the service of his overall argument. Surely, this is what he would want us to do? The last part of his advice in *Three Dialogues*, to take into account other books he has written, complicates things for the would-be commentator, however. This is because the theory laid out in both *Principles* and *Three Dialogues* is pretty much the same theory, but the argument structure of each book is quite different. Philosophers writing about Berkeley therefore have a choice of pulling together a single theory, calling upon what is written in each book to explain that theory, in which case they will not be respecting the different argument structures, or they can give pride of place to each argument in turn, at the cost of repetition. Most philosophers have chosen the first approach, but, in light of the great store Berkeley set in reading his books sequentially from beginning to end and paying attention to the argument, I have chosen the second approach for this book. I have tried to abide by his advice and, in discussing his work, after a preliminary chapter on some issues in *An Essay Towards a New Theory of Vision*[1] to go through, first, the *Principles* and then *Three Dialogues* in commentary form. One advantage to this approach is that I have been able to pay attention to the ways in which the books supplement and not just repeat one another. More importantly however, what I have written here is the result of the task I set myself, to do a slow read through each book, in which I did not write about a paragraph until I was clear in my mind how that paragraph followed from the preceding one, and how it fit into the prevailing goals of the section of writing I was working on. I will leave it to the reader to decide how useful the result is, but I do want to say that, for myself, I found such a slow read to be both interesting and illuminating. Passages I had thought I understood for years revealed themselves to be saying something different. For, while Berkeley recommends two readings, in the case of complex texts like his, there is always something new to discover, no matter how many times you have read them. While I hope others will find interesting and illuminating the interpretation that my slow reading process allowed me to come up with, the goal I am most dedicated to is that of encouraging readers of Berkeley and others to follow his advice for doing good reading. Take it as a whole, take it slow, never jump to conclusions, and always be thoughtful.

note

1 Those readers interested in a commentary on the *New Theory* can consult my *Berkeley's Revolution in Vision* (Cornell University Press, 1990).

acknowledgments

I have been privileged to be able to present my ideas about Berkeley to numerous departments and conferences and I am grateful to the audiences at all these places for their helpful responses. I am especially grateful to those Berkeley scholars I have frequently encountered over the years and from whom I have received much that is valuable, particularly Ken Winkler, Martha Bolton, Lisa Downing, George Pappas, Richard Glauser, and Sam Rickless. I am equally grateful to them for their illuminating publications, and to all those, far too numerous to mention, whose publications have taught me a great deal. I have been teaching seminars on Berkeley at UWM for a long time, and I cannot sufficiently express my pleasure at being able to work through Berkeley's texts with so many groups of talented students. Thanks, all. And finally and especially, my gratitude to Bob Schwartz.

abbreviations

Berkeley

Correspondence	*The Correspondence of George Berkeley*, edited by Marc A. Hight (Cambridge University Press, 2013)
NTV	*An Essay Towards a New Theory of Vision*
PC	*Philosophical Commentaries*
PHK	*A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*
3D	*Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*
TVV	*The Theory of Vision Vindicated and Explained*
Works	All quotations from *The Works of George Berkeley Bishop of Cloyne*, edited by A.A. Luce and T.E. Jessop (Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1948–1957)

Descartes

Optics	*Dioptrics*, in *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes,* translated by John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff, and Dugald Murdoch (Cambridge University Press, 1985)

Locke

ECHU	*An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*

Malebranche

ST	*Search After Truth*, translated by Thomas Lennon (Ohio State University Press, 1980)

chapter 1

berkeley's life and work

George Berkeley was born on 12 March 1685 in Ireland, in or near Kilkenny. His father, William, came from an English Staffordshire family, and has been described as a gentleman farmer, and his mother, although this is not certain, may have been an Elizabeth Southerne, daughter of a Dublin brewer. This seems to leave the possibilities for his nationality somewhat open, but there is no doubt that Berkeley did, in fact, identify Ireland as his nation. In his early notebooks, the *Philosophical Commentaries*, he refers to Isaac Newton as being of a "neighbouring nation" and more than once uses the phrase "we Irish." However, the "we" with whom Berkeley identified was, most likely, a severely limited group, namely, the Protestant upper class who were at that time ruling Ireland and who found the mercantile restrictions imposed by the English Parliament irksome.[1] Much later, writing in *The Querist*, Berkeley illustrates the ambiguous nature of his "we." There, wanting to establish the common interests of England and Ireland, he asks: "Whether we are not as much *Englishmen* as the children of old Romans, born in Britain, are still Romans?" (Works, VI, 112) Berkeley's understanding of his national identity was that of a member of a particular class in a particular context. Thus, in assessing the background against which Berkeley wrote his various works, it is necessary to recognize the specific context in which he grew up as a member of the Protestant Ascendancy in Ireland. But it is equally important to recognize the very cosmopolitan life enjoyed by a member of what was a highly cosmopolitan milieu.

Berkeley's life divides itself up neatly into three periods. From his birth in 1685 to 1713, when he moved to London, Berkeley's life is centered in Ireland. In the middle period, 1713–1734, his life is geographically much more varied. Although he did return occasionally to Dublin, for the most part Berkeley either lived in London, or traveled remarkably widely, either on the European continent, or most notably to North America, where he lived for three years in Newport, Rhode Island. For the last period of his life, 1734–1753, Berkeley returned to Ireland, living chiefly at the site of his bishopric, in Cloyne. At the

Berkeley, First Edition. Margaret Atherton.
© 2020 John Wiley & Sons Ltd. Published 2020 by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

very end of his life, however, he and his family left Ireland to go to Oxford to be near his son, George, who was studying there. It was in Oxford that Berkeley died, and is the place where he is buried. In each of these periods, Berkeley led the life of a Man of Letters, writing and publishing frequently, although, as will be seen, in each of these periods. Berkeley typified a different style in which one could be a Man of Letters in the eighteenth century.

1685–1713

Berkeley's education began in Kilkenny, at the Duke of Ormonde's school, later and to this day called Kilkenny College, and termed by A.A. Luce, the "Eton of Ireland."[2] At the age of 15, he entered Trinity College, Dublin, an institution with which he was to be connected for much of the first part of his life. The curriculum there was quite standard for its time; Luce says that Berkeley studied mathematics, logic, philosophy, and languages, especially Latin and Greek, and in Berkeley's case, French and Hebrew. The curriculum, if standard, was not as stultifying as William Molyneux, Locke's friend, found it a generation earlier, when philosophy instruction was dominated by Aristotelian commentaries and disputations. Thanks to the efforts of men like Molyneux, works of recent origin such as Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* formed part of the curriculum. Many of those associated with Trinity, starting with Molyneux himself, who represented Trinity in Parliament, Provosts, such as St George Ashe, later bishop of Clogher, and Peter Browne, as well as men like William King, archbishop of Dublin, a former fellow of Trinity and an official visitor for Trinity, were energetic contributors to current debate. Berkeley therefore came of age at a time of rich intellectual activity.

Berkeley took his BA in 1704 and, while waiting for a fellowship vacancy, worked on some mathematical issues, the results of which he published in 1707 as *Arithmetica* and *Miscellanea Mathematica*. He was a successful competitor for a fellowship in 1707 and took his MA a month later. He was ordained deacon in 1709 and priest in 1710. While he undertook various tasks in the college, including librarian, junior dean, Greek lecturer, divinity lecturer, senior proctor, and Hebrew lecturer, he also devoted time to the preparation of the works that have subsequently secured his reputation. We can trace the course of Berkeley's research in connection with these works through notebooks that he kept beginning in 1707.[3] While these notebooks have proved endlessly fascinating to Berkeley scholars, one of the most concrete pieces of information they provide is a good account of the reading Berkeley was doing during this period that he was preparing his major works. One clear fact that emerges was that Berkeley was reading widely during the time he was working with his notebooks. We find some 22 names mentioned between one and three times. These comprise a varied group that include those now classified as philosophers, and also mathematicians and

physicists, but, with very few exceptions, limited to works written within the past 50–100 years.[4] Berkeley was not in any serious sense framing his work against a wider historical context but instead restricting his attention to his contemporaries and their immediate predecessors. This general impression is further supported when we turn our attention to those thinkers Berkeley mentioned a significant number of times. By far the greatest number of references are to John Locke. At 71 references, there are four times as many references to Locke than to any other person. The nearest contenders are: Descartes and Cartesianism with 16 references, Isaac Newton also at 16, Malebranche with 15, and Hobbes with 13. What emerges is that the influences on Berkeley were many and even those who were most important to Berkeley were encountered as part of a wider group of thinkers. It would be a mistake to think of Berkeley as reacting to only one thinker, even one as important to him as Locke.

With the aid of this extensive reading, Berkeley produced his three major works. In 1709, he published his first significant work, *An Essay towards a New Theory of Vision*, rapidly followed in 1710 by *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge,* originally designed as Part I of what was intended to be a much longer work. Instead of completing this project immediately, Berkeley reworked and extended the material in the *Principles* in a book that he hoped would make his ideas easier to understand and accept, *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*.[5] Berkeley took this with him in manuscript when he traveled to London and had it published there in 1713. These three volumes, the ones that will be taking up our attention here, form the basis of Berkeley's philosophical reputation to this day, and consist, first, of an account of the nature of vision, followed by two different versions of Berkeley's characteristic immaterialism.

The sole remaining work from Berkeley's Trinity period was a pamphlet, *Passive Obedience,* published in 1712, based on some sermons preached that year. In *Passive Obedience*, Berkeley argues that the negative duty not to rebel against legitimate authority ought to be regarded as a moral law, inasmuch as such a duty can be shown to have a necessary connection with the universal wellbeing of mankind, the goal we can take God to have established for all our actions. Such a duty should be understood to be exceptionless. Just as God establishes the laws of nature to be exceptionless, since it is of greater benefit that these laws hold universally, even if, in some immediate instance their consequence be damaging, so it is, in the long run, of greater benefit that moral laws be respected without exception, even if a particular application might be judged harmful. This publication, arguing against the Whiggish (and Pro-Hanoverian) position of a limited right to rebellion, earned Berkeley the reputation as a Jacobite, a supporter of the Stewart cause, even though in a slightly later pamphlet, *Advice to Tories Who Have Taken Oaths*, published in 1715, Berkeley used very similar arguments to abjure Tory clergymen to uphold their oath to George I and the Hanoverian succession.

1713–1734

The life Berkeley led during his middle years, while lively and full of incident, is of a far less familiar form to readers of today than that of his earlier years. In 1713, Berkeley secured a two-year leave of absence from his university fellowship, in order to visit London, and was able to renew this leave at two-year intervals for the next ten years, a dispensation undreamed of by modern academics. While in London, Berkeley was easily absorbed into contemporary intellectual circles, through the good offices of men to whom he had secured introductions, most notably Jonathan Swift and Richard Steele. Berkeley wrote essays for Steele's new publication, *The Guardian*, and was commissioned to complete a three-volume anthology of writings, *The Ladies Library*, published anonymously as "by a lady."[6] Berkeley's *Guardian* essays, although relatively brief and on a variety of topics, show that he was, in 1713, already concerned with the dangers of irreligion and free-thinking, a matter which he was to discuss in some depth in *Alciphron*, written at the end of this period.

At the end of 1713, Berkeley embarked on the first of his European travels, this time as chaplain to the Earl of Peterborough, who was traveling to Italy to attend the coronation of the king of Sicily. Berkeley himself seems to have gone no further than Livorno, pausing in Paris where letters written by Berkeley during this period speak of a planned visit to Malebranche. Berkeley was back in England by 1714, but, balked of his initial efforts to gain preferment in the church, in 1716 he set off upon a much longer European journey, this time as tutor to St George Ashe, the son of the bishop of Clogher. This trip lasted four years, and covered large parts of Italy, including not only the standard tourist centers of Rome, Naples, Venice, and Florence, but also largely untraveled areas, such as Apulia.[7] Berkeley was chiefly occupied with the art and architecture of the region, but his philosophical interests remained sufficiently alive for him to complete on the trip home a short work in Latin on motion, *De Motu*, which he submitted unsuccessfully for a prize offered by the Academie des Science in Paris, and which he published back in London in 1721. *De Motu* (On motion) is an example of a work by Berkeley which is not explicitly immaterialistic, and indeed seems to contradict immaterialism by asserting the existence of bodies. The position for which Berkeley argues, however, that force is not a property of bodies, because bodies are essentially inert and only minds are active, is fully compatible with the theory developed in the *Principles* and *Three Dialogues*. Berkeley shows how "force", although strictly speaking metaphorical, can nevertheless be applied meaningfully to bodies in physical theories.

Berkeley returned to England to discover it in the throes of an economic crisis brought on by the bursting of the South Sea bubble, that is, on speculation on trade in South America. Berkeley's *An Essay towards Preventing the Ruin of Great Britain*, published in 1721, finds him offering economic advice – he urges a return to a sound financial footing of manufacture and trade,

and an end to speculation – but also deploring what he takes to be the low morals exhibited in Great Britain. Berkeley takes himself to be witnessing not merely an economic calamity, but a moral collapse.

It is more than likely that it was this extremely discouraging view that Berkeley was taking towards the prospects of Great Britain that led him to embark upon what was the greatest adventure of his life. Some time in 1722 or 1723, Berkeley conceived a project to be based in the New World – an Anglican University to educate both the sons of colonists and of Native Americans. Berkeley's purpose in both cases was a missionary one. He thought there would never be enough Anglican churches to meet the religious needs of the colonists if all members of the clergy had to be educated in England and Ireland, and he thought that Native Americans would be more easily converted to Christianity if their own children were educated to perform the conversions. While Berkeley himself saw this project as filled with high moral purpose, it is somewhat startling today to read that while he hoped friendly tribes would send their children to his university voluntarily, he also recommended kidnapping the children of enemy tribes.[8] In 1724, Berkeley published *A Proposal for the Better Supplying of Churches*, in which he laid out his plans for his university, to be situated in Bermuda. Berkeley believed the climate in Bermuda to be peculiarly salubrious, and the inhabitants of remarkably good morals. He also judged Bermuda to be well situated between the West Indian and continental plantations and adequately supplied with a fleet to travel conveniently among the various locations. As well, he thought it important that, while the climate was good for growing food, there were no commodities that might tempt the members of the university into trade. Berkeley devoted his time from 1723 to 1728 to lobbying for this project, and, at least initially, things went well. He secured for himself the deanship of Derry, which provided him with a good income without requiring his attendance, and more surprisingly, he was left a legacy by a woman he had never met, Esther Van Homrigh, more widely known as Jonathan Swift's Vanessa. Berkeley was able to secure a royal charter, substantial sums from private subscriptions, and a promise of 20 000 pounds from the British Parliament.

In 1728, he was persuaded that his plans would not be taken seriously, and the money from Parliament would not be forthcoming until Berkeley himself went to North America. In September, he set sail, accompanied by a small group, including his new wife, Anne Forster, and settled, not in Bermuda, but in one of the largest port cities of North America, Newport, Rhode Island. Berkeley bought a farm and built a house, intended later to supply his college, and lived in Rhode Island for three years, until it became clear that the parliamentary grant was never to be forthcoming. In 1731, Berkeley with his wife, and now a small son, returned to London via Boston, his hopes dashed. Although Berkeley failed in his mission, he was not without impact on higher education in North America. He gave substantial gifts of books to both Harvard and Yale, and gave his farm in Rhode Island to Yale, with the proviso that the income from the farm be used to establish fellowships at Yale. Early holders of these

fellowships include men who went on to found and to become presidents of such notable American universities as Dartmouth, Princeton, and Columbia.[9]

Upon his return to England, Berkeley took a house in London and lived there for the remainder of this period, awaiting preferment. Friends in high places in London initially sought to procure for him a lucrative deanship, that of Down, but this met with opposition in Ireland, and instead Berkeley was offered the bishopric of Cloyne, so that, as Berkeley wrote to his old friend Tom Prior, "those who formerly opposed my being Dean of Downe have thereby made me a bishop" (*Correspondence*, 362).

The time spent in London before this elevation was filled by a return to active publishing. Berkeley brought with him from Newport a manuscript, *Alciphron, or the Minute Philosopher,* written in dialogue form and describing much of the countryside around Newport. In this work, Berkeley mounted a sustained attack on free-thinking which he had been sniping at in his *Guardian* essays and other works. Although soon after its publication *Alciphron* was recommended by no less a person than Queen Caroline, the work today is more often and quite correctly referred to as "unjustly neglected." As a piece of religious apologetics it might be assumed to be of little philosophical interest and that it is directed against free-thinkers might add to its lack of contemporary appeal, since "free-thinking" has a more positive ring to it today than Berkeley intended. Free-thinking is in fact what the deist, Anthony Collins, called his views and so *Alciphron* is in fact a defense of a robust revealed religion against the deism that claimed that religion should be reduced strictly to what can be demonstrated by rational means. Berkeley took such free-thinking seriously as a social phenomenon with pernicious moral consequences. That he appended *The New Theory of Vision* to the first appearance of *Alciphron* is an indication that he took his earlier philosophical ideas to have important implications for the moral and religious philosophy to be found there. In fact there is much interesting philosophical material in the pages of *Alciphron*, not merely concerning morals and philosophy of religion, but also, for example, about language and science.[10]

Berkeley did not limit himself to revising *The New Theory*. This publication was followed by revised editions of both *Principles of Human Knowledge* and *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*, published together in 1734. In addition, in 1733 Berkeley also published the work now known as *Theory of Vision Vindicated*.[11] This was a response to a letter in the London *Daily Post-Boy* praising *Alciphron* but attacking the *New Theory*. The last work Berkeley completed before leaving to take up residence in Cloyne was *The Analyst or a Discourse Addressed to an Infidel Mathematician*, in which Berkeley applied themes developed in *Alciphron* to mathematics.[12] Clearly, Berkeley's life and many of his publications in the period since his move to London in 1713 centered on the public arena. It is noteworthy, however, that, finding himself with a period of relative inactivity, Berkeley not only published philosophical works that reflected the missionary concerns that took him to North America, but accompanied these new works with the rethinking and republishing of his old

ones. It becomes hard not to conclude that Berkeley considered all of his work to that date, both theoretical and practical, to be of a piece.

1734–1753

In the summer of 1734, Berkeley moved with his family to his new bishopric at Cloyne. Cloyne, some 20 miles from Cork, is a small town, but the territory of the bishopric extended over half a million acres. Here Berkeley lived for 18 years, leaving only twice, once for a family holiday in Killarney, and once in 1737, when Berkeley spent the winter in Dublin and took the seat in Parliament to which he was entitled as a bishop. Apart from these few ventures, Berkeley's life revolved around his family and his duties as bishop. It is not remarkable that Berkeley should have been a resident bishop, since non-resident bishops were being widely condemned. What is perhaps more remarkable is that, once having achieved the see at Cloyne, Berkeley did not, as did many of his predecessors, seek a better situation, but, in fact, according to Luce, turned one down when it was offered him, explaining that he was not moved by ambition.

Berkeley's life while at Cloyne must have been a busy one. We know from a letter that his wife, Anne, wrote to their second son, George, that the education of their children was carried out entirely by their father. "You were not for our ease trusted to mercenary hands," she wrote, "in childhood you were instructed by your father – he, though old and sickly, performed the constant tedious task himself, and would not trust it to another's care."[13] Berkeley reared four children at Cloyne, three sons and a daughter, although one son, William, died at age 16, to Berkeley's great sorrow.[14] Berkeley did hire music teachers for his children and letters to Prior suggest they studied art as well. Indeed a letter from a visitor to Cloyne gives a picture of a domestic establishment distinguished by a great variety of music and art.

In addition, Berkeley's conception of his ecclesiastical duties was extensive, as he wrote in the Advertisement to the *Querist* that "to feed the hungry and clothe the naked, by promoting an honest industry, will, perhaps, be deemed no improper employment for a clergyman who still thinks himself a member of the commonwealth" (*Works*, VI, 103). In the service of these endeavors, Berkeley started a spinning school for children, a workhouse for "sturdy vagrants," and engaged in planting both flax and hemp. In so doing, Berkeley was putting into practice the recommendations of the Dublin Society, of which Thomas Prior and Samuel Madden, who saw *The Querist* through the press, were members. The Dublin Society encouraged the increased use of land for tillage as opposed to grazing, and Prior supplied Berkeley with flax and hemp seed. Anne Berkeley was also occupied with such activities. At the end of a long letter to Sir John James, Berkeley tells him that his wife "is become a farmer of late. In these hard times we employ above a hundred men every day in Agriculture of one kind or another all which my wife directs. This is a charity wch pays

for itself" (*Correspondence*, 433). Finally, Berkeley was concerned with matters of health, his own and that of his family, and increasingly, in light of several severe epidemics, in that of his neighbors. It was this growing interest in medicine that formed the basis for Berkeley's final project, the dissemination of tar-water as a panacea.

Despite the demands made on Berkeley as a family man and a bishop, he did not neglect the scholarly side of his life, but instead, his wife tells us, was accustomed to rise early to study and to pray. He produced two especially notable pieces of work during this period, *The Querist* and *Siris*, as well as several contributions to the pamphlet literature. Each of these significant pieces of work is as remarkable for its form as for its content. *The Querist* was originally released in three parts, in 1735, 1736, and 1737, first in Dublin and then in London, and was reprinted in heavily revised editions several times in Berkeley's lifetime, and finally was included, again after revisions, in his *Miscelleny* of 1752. It concerns economic issues prevailing in Ireland and consists entirely of rhetorical questions, somewhat loosely arranged. Berkeley's approach stems from the view that Ireland's situation constitutes a special case, to which the mercantilist assumption that a nation's wealth is built on foreign trade does not apply. Berkeley points out that, in the case of Ireland, the export of agricultural goods and the import of luxuries led to the general impoverishment and, still worse, lack of ambition, in the native Irish population. He argues that it is necessary to redefine a nation's wealth, not in terms of gold and silver, but by the wellbeing of the population through full employment. It is the task of the state to provide the conditions of employment, in part through motivating citizens to industry and in part through ensuring an adequate circulation of money. This, in turn, requires rethinking the nature of money, understanding it, not as grounded in metal, but rather as a ticket or counter that gives power to its possessor. The monetary policies of the state, therefore, should be dedicated to ensuring that money can serve as power in proportion to industry. This policy can best be achieved, Berkeley thought, in what is apparently a novel contribution, through the use of paper money, determined by a national bank, and grounded in land. While economic historians like Patrick Kelly argue that Berkeley's views on paper money can be explained entirely in terms of the problem Berkeley was seeking to solve, the creation of a self-subsistent economy for Ireland, philosophers like David Berman read Berkeley's talk of money as a ticket or counter in terms of the theory of signs found in other of his writings.[15]

There are several important lessons to be learned from Berkeley's continued involvement with *The Querist* throughout the period of his life at Cloyne, as Ellen Leyland has emphasized.[16] The first is that Berkeley did not retreat to the quiet of Cloyne to become a recluse, but instead remained actively involved with the economic and political life of Ireland. His stay in Dublin during the winter of 1737–1738, may well have been to encourage the passage of a bill setting up a national bank, an important element of his recommendations in *The Querist*.[17] The acerbic nature of the pamphlet Berkeley penned, but did