

IV.—A CATALOGUE OF BERKELEY'S LIBRARY.

BY R. I. AARON.

It is not generally known to writers on Berkeley that there exists a catalogue, or at least what purports to be a catalogue, of his library. Apart from one article, which I wish to consider here, I have seen no other reference to it in Berkeleian literature either at home or abroad. Yet it is clearly an important document which ought not to be neglected. I propose in this article, firstly, to describe the catalogue briefly; secondly, to consider certain claims made for it by the one scholar who has, so far as I know, discussed its importance; and, lastly, to estimate its value as a source of information in connection with Berkeley's reading.

We owe the existence of the catalogue to the lucky chance that the books were put up for sale by Messrs. Leigh & Sotheby on Monday, June 6th, 1796, and the five following days, and that a record was kept of the sale. This record was included in a volume of such records (11th Dec., 1795, to 11th June, 1796) bound by Messrs. Leigh & Sotheby and afterwards sold to the British Museum in 1848. It was first stocked in the Newspaper Room and remained there until 1914 when it was transferred to the North Library, where it now rests.¹ The catalogue of Berkeley's library was not itself catalogued at the Museum as a separate item under Berkeley's name until 1912. In this year the library officials realised the importance of the document and accordingly inserted it in the general catalogue.²

¹ Its present catalogue number is S.c.S. 28.

² No doubt, had it been inserted earlier, reference to it would have been made in Mead's admirable bibliography of Berkeley (*A Bibliography of George Berkeley. Univ. of California. Library Bulletin 17, 1910*). And A. C. Fraser would certainly not have missed this opportunity of learning something as to the contents of Berkeley's library. For the above information in connection with the history of the catalogue I have to thank the Superintendent of the North Library.

Twenty years have passed since the insertion and it is strange that so little notice of it has been taken.

The catalogue itself consists of forty-six printed pages, being a numbered list of 1613 books.¹ The name of each book is given, together with the place and date of the edition. These printed pages are pasted on to a larger page, and alongside each item is inscribed in ink the price secured and the name of the purchaser. The sale realised £324 15s. 9d. Two books fetched a considerable price, viz., No. 424, *Statii Opera, Delph. 2 tom, Par. 1685* (£18 7s. 6d.), and No. 1543, *Ciceronis Epistolae ad Atticum, Brutum et Quintum Fratrum, Venet. 1470*, a first edition (£6 12s. 6d). The title-page opens in the following manner:—

A
CATALOGUE
OF THE
VALUABLE LIBRARY
OF THE LATE
RIGHT REV. DR. BERKELEY, LORD BISHOP OF
CLOYNE.
TOGETHER WITH THE

LIBRARIES of his SON and GRANDSON, the late Rev.
GEORGE BERKELEY, D.D., PREBENDARY of CAN-
TERBURY, and the late GEORGE MONK BERKELEY,
Esq.

.....

N.B. Several EDITIONES PRINCIPES in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

It will be noticed from the above that the catalogue is not only of Berkeley's library but also of his son's and grandson's. And it is obvious at the first glance at the catalogue itself that many of the books could not have been purchased by Berkeley, for they are published after his death. About five hundred or so can be ruled out as clearly not Berkeley's for this reason.

¹The list is numbered 1-1546, but for some reason sixty-eight numbers are used twice, making a total of 1614. I also noticed that number 1101 was missing, and some other numbers may also be missing. Many of the books consist of more than one volume, so that the number of volumes is well over 2000.

The classification of the remaining eleven hundred or so has already been undertaken by the one student who has interested himself in the matter. In 1929 M. René Maheu published an article in the *Revue d'Histoire de la Philosophie*¹ entitled *Le Catalogue de la Bibliothèque des Berkeley*. According to M. Maheu the books can be divided into four classes:—

I. Modern Philosophy 26, Mathematics, Astronomy, Physics 28.

II. Languages 21, Travel 104, Italian literature 107, Spanish literature 48, French literature 47, General literature 42, English literature 12, History, Politics, Law, Curiosities (including some music) 116.

III. Latin authors 113, Greek 94, Ancient Philosophy 33, Medicine, Magic, Natural History 39.

IV. Works of Piety and Hebrew Literature 230, Theology 51, Patrology 17.

This classification seems to me a sound one. M. Maheu proceeds to give a list of those books which in his opinion influenced Berkeley philosophically in the later periods of his life, and follows this up with some very useful comments on the catalogue as a whole. He first suggests a reason for the comparative fewness of books in the first section, a matter we shall consider later; he then goes on to assert that the list as it stands shows how wide were Berkeley's interests and how general his reading; thirdly, the large number of theological books and works of piety testify primarily no doubt to the office of the Bishop and of his son, but also to Berkeley's real interest in the subject and in the theological and Deist disputes of the age; fourthly, the comparatively large number of Spanish books, most of which were published in Spain before 1716, enables M. Maheu to make the acute and plausible suggestion that Berkeley might have visited Spain sometime between 1718 and 1720. As far as I know there is no evidence to disprove this possibility.

But in the course of his comments M. Maheu makes a claim for the catalogue which we must consider more carefully. He claims that in it we find the counterpart of the *Commonplace Book*. Just as the latter reveals to us Berkeley's mind, and the influences which were at work, in the formative 1706-8 period, so this catalogue of his library shows the influences which played upon him in the later periods of his life. "En réalité," he remarks,² "bien qu'infiniment moins directement

¹ Avril-Juin, 1929. 20 pp.

² p. 16.

utilisable, nous sommes convaincus que le Catalogue peut jouer à l'égard de la deuxième et troisième période de la vie de Berkeley un rôle comparable à celui, si remarquable, du *Commonplace Book* à l'égard de la première." We should note the careful qualification "infiniment moins directement utilisable". M. Maheu does not, of course, claim that the catalogue is as valuable as the *Commonplace Book*, but he thinks it will enable us to understand the influences at work on Berkeley in the second and third periods of his life, that is, the periods of *Alciphron* and *Siris* respectively. If this is true, the catalogue is obviously of the first importance in the study of the later Berkeley. Before we can accept this view, however, certain prior enquiries must be made, so as to test its validity.

For M. Maheu's assertion brings up the central problem in connection with this catalogue. How many of these books were actually in Berkeley's library when he prepared himself for the writing of *Alciphron* and *Siris*? And, secondly, are all the books contained in that library listed in this catalogue? I propose to deal with these problems separately. With regard to the first, it has already been noticed that about five hundred of the books could not have been in Berkeley's library, since they were not published until after his death. In the same way we should rule out all books published after 1732 if we wish to consider the influences on *Alciphron* (published in that year), and after 1744 for *Siris*. But, again, we cannot assume that every book listed in the catalogue and published before 1732 influenced Berkeley in writing the *Alciphron* or was read by him. M. Maheu himself gives us¹ an instance of a book published in 1724 and listed in the catalogue, of which Berkeley knew nothing in 1751, so that it must have been a later acquisition. And even were we able to show that such and such a book was actually in Berkeley's library before 1732 we should still have to show that he read it. Thus it would be very unwise to assume that every book in this catalogue and published before 1732 was known to Berkeley at the time of writing *Alciphron*. None the less, we have sufficient ground for believing that a large majority of the thousand or so books included in the catalogue and published before Berkeley's death were in his library and were known to him personally. As I shall try to show when dealing with the second question, we can see that some of them must have been there. Again, most of the Italian books were obviously gathered in Berkeley's period of

¹ p. 6.

travel in Italy, and, if M. Maheu's suggestion is admitted, the Spanish books also were collected by Berkeley himself in Spain. Finally, Messrs. Leigh & Sotheby were evidently under the impression that many, if not most, of the books they had to offer came from Bishop Berkeley's library. We should not, of course, draw false conclusions from the fact that Berkeley's name is given greater prominence on the title-page than those of his son and grandson. That might have been done out of deference to the greatest figure of the three, and out of a natural desire to make the list appear as imposing as possible. Yet, the answer we ought to make to the first question seems fairly obvious. Most of the books published before 1753, and listed in the catalogue, must have come from Berkeley's own library. They are frequently books we should have expected him to possess. (For instance, it is natural to believe that two books dealing with America published in 1724, which are found in the catalogue,¹ were purchased by Berkeley when they first appeared, and when he himself was so anxious to gain information that would prepare him for his missionary trip to the Bermudas.)

We may now turn to the second and more difficult question. Have we before us in this catalogue a complete list of Berkeley's books? Or is it at best merely a selection? I hope to show that the second view is the truer. The catalogue gives us some of Berkeley's books, but certainly not all of them. If this view is the true one, it follows that the catalogue is never a safe guide as to what Berkeley was reading at any time, and in particular as to the influences which worked upon him in writing *Alciphron* and *Siris*. It also follows that M. Maheu's statements on this matter need to be qualified considerably.

It is not very difficult to believe that Berkeley must have possessed at different times more books than the thousand or so contained in the catalogue. He purchased as many books for Yale, and it is not likely that his own library would have been so small. Again, many of the books he used in writing *Alciphron* at Whitehall, Rhode Island, were not brought back to England in 1732, but were given away in America.² Lastly, the books were sold by Leigh & Sotheby forty-three years after the death of Berkeley, and in that long period many of the books in the collection when he died might have disap-

¹ No. 517: *Labat: Voyage aux Isles de l'Amerique.* 1724.

519: *Lafitau: Mœurs des Sauvages Américains.* 1724.

² cf. Hone and Rossi, *Bishop Berkeley*, p. 164, and also Benjamin Rand, *Berkeley's American Sojourn*, pp. 42, 61.

peared. There are general reasons of this sort for holding that the library of Berkeley must have been bigger than the library listed by Leigh & Sotheby. But a more exact proof of this is possible. *Alciphron* and *Siris*, as is well known, differ from the earlier works in the frequency of reference to earlier writers. Whereas in the *New Theory of Vision*, the *Principles*, and the *Three Dialogues*, mention of other writers is rare, the later works are full of such references. Thus Berkeley himself in his later works makes quite clear to the reader what books he had been reading and what influences were at work upon his mind. Frequently he gives page references to such books, so that they must have been in his possession at the time of writing, and in his own library. For *Alciphron* was composed (if not written) on Rhode Island, and *Siris* at Cloyne, and in neither place would Berkeley have access to a college library, or to any library other than his own—and those of friends, if such existed near him. Consequently, practically all the works to which he refers directly in these two books must have been in his own library, and if the catalogue gives us a complete list of Berkeley's library at least all of these books should be contained within it. There should be few, if any, exceptions.

Here then is an excellent test of the reliability of the catalogue as a guide to Berkeley's reading in the years 1713 to 1744. Before we carry out the test, however, a word should be said about the period up to 1713. M. Maheu's explanation of the fact that few of the books which Berkeley would have used in this early period appear in the list is surely correct. Up to 1713 Berkeley would have relied largely on the library of Trinity College. He himself was not rich, and would probably buy as few books as possible. Certain of the books listed in the catalogue might well have been used in his first reflections. For instance, 663 is *Newton's Opticks* (1704); 434 *Molyneux on putting a Telescope to a horizontal Dial* (1686); 393 *Newtoni principia Mathematici* (1687); 188 *Descartes De Homine* (1677); 1507 *Locke on Understanding* (1700); and 1078 is *Norris's Miscellanies* (1706). But again these might have been purchased later. And with these doubtful exceptions the other books which he must have read in this period are not mentioned. (Indeed, the absence of books which we know to have influenced him in his youth strikes us immediately in reading the list. For instance, a copy of Locke's tractate on *Education* is found in it, but this with the *Essay* exhausts the books by Locke. Yet we know that Berkeley

read other works of his. Again, Berkeley must have possessed at some time or other books written by Malebranche, but not a single book of Malebranche's is listed here. In the same way, no work of Spinoza's appears in the catalogue.¹) On the whole, however, for the reason given by M. Maheu we should not expect to find in the catalogue many of the books which influenced him in the earliest period. What of the second and third periods?

To take *Alciphron* first, a comparison of references and catalogue makes it clear that the catalogue certainly does not contain a complete list of the works used by Berkeley in composing *Alciphron*. I noted forty-seven such direct references, but I can only find one of the forty-seven books in the catalogue. This is Origen's *Contra Celsum* (1203). In a more general way one finds the *opera* of Plato, Aristotle, Livy, Cicero, Horace, Virgil, Seneca, Josephus, Dionysius, Bacon and Newton in the catalogue, and these writers are referred to or quoted in *Alciphron*. But one can argue little from this fact. No doubt such *opera* would be found in all the good private libraries of the period. The only possible conclusion that can be drawn from a fair comparison of references and catalogue is that the latter cannot help us greatly to determine the direct influences which were at work on Berkeley's mind when he wrote *Alciphron*. Probably many of the philosophical books which he used at Rhode Island never returned to England and so could not possibly be contained in this list.²

When, however, one turns to *Siris* the position is altered. We find a sufficiently close resemblance between references in *Siris* and the catalogue to justify us in holding that the latter must include a fair proportion of the books used at Cloyne. Direct references to books, with occasionally a page reference, are fewer than in *Alciphron*. Of the sixteen which I noted four are found in the catalogue:—

¹ A work by a man named Spinoza which was published at Milan in 1580 is listed (no. 964).

² At the same time, one item in the list is of very real interest in connection with the publication of *Alciphron*. In 1715 Bergler published at Leipzig the first complete edition of the letters of Alciphron, a second-century Greek, who wrote a collection of letters dealing with the life of the country and the town, the troubles of social parasites and courtesans. This work is included in the catalogue (849) and no doubt Berkeley felt that the degenerate and rather jaded mood of the letters had its counterpart in the English life of his own time, particularly in the Freethinking which he disliked so intensely. Hence the title of his own work.

480 *Grew's Anatomy of Plants*. 1680 (*Siris*, § 30).

506 *Simplicii Comment. in Aristotelem de Anima*. Venet. ap. Ald. 1527 (*Siris*, § 315).

756 *Proclus in Platonis Theologiam*. Hamb. 1618 (*Siris*, § 333).

1483 *Plinii Historia Naturalis*. Delphini Par. 1685 (*Siris*, § 11 ff.)

Also, in *Siris* (§ 270) there seems to be a fairly explicit reference to Clarke's work *On the Attributes* which is also included in the catalogue (1037). Furthermore, amongst the sixteen books mentioned are many medical works and it is not impossible that some of these works were never contained in Berkeley's library, and not known by him at first-hand, but that he had his information about them from Le Clerc's *Histoire de la Médecine* (Amst. 1702), or from *Miscellanea Curiosa Medico-Physica* (Lips. 1670), both of which appear in the catalogue (Nos. 414 and 1454 respectively). (The most striking omission amongst books actually mentioned in *Siris* is Cudworth's *Intellectual System*. Both direct and indirect references are made to it in *Siris*, and one would have expected it to be in the catalogue, but I cannot trace it.)

Again, when we turn to authors (rather than to particular books) mentioned in *Siris* many of them are little known generally and would not be commonly found in private libraries. Yet they are found in this list. Of the forty-two authors mentioned, I noticed that works of nineteen are included in the catalogue. They are Boyle, Hippocrates, Boerhave, Plutarch (much of it spurious), Diogenes Laertius, Jamblichus, Simon Portius, Plato, Aristotle, Galen, Plotinus, Vossius, Descartes, Virgil, Cicero, Lucretius, Philo, and the editors Ficinus and Alexander Aphrodisiensis. Here, again, it is evident that Berkeley used the historical works of Plutarch and Diogenes Laertius extensively, and he might have known of many of the other authors to whom he refers, indirectly through such books, so that it is not strange that their works are not to be found in the catalogue. But whether this be so or not, the fact that so many of the authors referred to in *Siris* are also found in the catalogue supports the view that the latter is a correct list of some of the books in Berkeley's library at Cloyne. The student researching into Berkeley's *Siris* in future will have the advantage of knowing what actual editions of several works mentioned in the text were used by Berkeley, and for this reason alone the catalogue is tremendously valuable. But even here he will need to tread carefully, for in *Siris*, § 332, Berkeley refers his reader to "the seventy-eighth page of the second

tome of Aldus's edition of Plato's works", which he presumably had beside him at the time. Yet I cannot trace this edition amongst the various editions given in the catalogue. Thus the fact that such and such an edition appears in the catalogue is never of itself sufficient proof that Berkeley made use of this edition.

If we now return to the second question which we asked, a definite answer can be given. The catalogue certainly does not supply us with a complete list of Berkeley's books. This is obviously true of the period when *Alciphron* was composed; and though the list does contain many of the books upon which Berkeley worked when at Cloyne there are here again obvious gaps. At most, it gives us a representative, but not exhaustive, list of the books in Berkeley's library. There can be no doubt that many of these books were possessed by Berkeley and no doubt also that, though they are part only, they give us the flavour of the whole. M. Maheu is quite justified in holding that the catalogue suggests a book-lover of wide and varied taste and of sound culture. The list is too long to be given in full here. The major part of the books are not philosophical nor even scientific. Berkeley seems to have been genuinely interested in all learning, and in his reading never confined himself to any particular field. In this sense the catalogue does give general information about Berkeley's reading which confirms the impression one gains in reading his works. When one comes to a detailed use of the catalogue, however, the greatest care is necessary, for, on the one hand, not all the books listed are Berkeley's, and, on the other, Berkeley most certainly used many books not listed in the catalogue.

To conclude, the main purpose of this article has been to point to the existence of the catalogue. But I have also sought to show in connection with it, firstly, that it cannot be neglected by close students of Berkeley, secondly, that it is not a complete and exhaustive list of Berkeley's books, thirdly, that it does not throw much light on the period up to 1713, nor indeed on the second period from 1713 to 1734, but that it becomes very valuable in dealing with the third or Cloyne period. For most of the books which Berkeley used at Cloyne are probably listed within it. M. Maheu's claim that the catalogue is important is certainly justified. Perhaps, he over-emphasises its importance in the comparison with the *Commonplace Book*, a comparison which might easily lead to misuse of the catalogue. It should not be used blindly. Its evidence will need to be constantly confirmed by information gained elsewhere before

we can wholly rely upon it. None the less, used carefully and wisely, it ought to help materially in future research upon Berkeley.

APPENDIX.

I append a list of a few of the more important books (philosophically speaking) which are found in the catalogue. The spelling of the catalogue is followed throughout.

40. Platonis Opera a Ficino, 5 tom	Lugdun. ap. Tornaes	1550
60. Pensees de Pascal	Par.	1679
165. Clarendon on Hobbes's Leviathan		1676
167. Behme's Aurora, or Day Spring		1712
188. Des Cartes de Homine	Amst.	1677
203. Virgillii Opera, a Valkenier	Amst.	1646
225. Stobaei Sententiae	Francof.	1581
226. Platonis Opera, Ficini, 2 tom	Francof.	1602
242. Plotini Opera Philosophica	Basil,	1580
244. Aristotelis Opera ab Erasmo	Basil,	1531
250. Josephi Opera	Basil,	1544
280. Ciceronis Epistolae ad Familiares	Amst.	1645
286. Ciceronis Opera omnia 20 tom	Glasg.	1749
392. Majemonides de Sacrificiis	Lond.	1683
393. Newtoni principia Mathematici		1687
432. Newtoni Optice		1706
467. Philo Judaeus	Par. ap. Turneb.	1552
485. Baconi Opera		1665
531. Hutcheson's Moral Philosophy	Glasg.	1747
575. Platon (Les Oeuvres de) par Dacier, 2 tom	Amst.	1700
649. Dionysii Opera	ap. Junt.	1516
655. Limborch de Veritate Religionis	Goudae.	1687
659. Lucretius de Rerum Natura	Lugdun. ap. Gryph.	1540
673. Butler's Analogy of Religion		1736
704. Gulielmini Opera Mathematica	Genev.	1719
724. Des-Cartes Opera Philosophica		(No date)
757. Hippocratis Opera, a Foesio	Genev.	1657
798. Fenelon Dialogues des Morts	Amst.	1727
849. Alciphroni Epistolae (Gk. Lat.) a Berglero	Lips.	1715
851. Boetius de Consolatione Philosophiae	Lug. Bat.	1656
853. Locke on Education		1693
883. Plutarchi Opera ab Henrico Stephano	Par.	1572
911. Hutchinson's Works, 12 vols.		1709
919. Newton's Opticks		1730
926. Collier's Discourses		1725
946. Vossii Variarum Observationes	Lond.	1685
964. Spinoza Dialogo en Laude de las Mugeris	Milan,	1580
974. Barrow's Works, 2 vol.		1687
978. Mosis Majiemonidis Constitutiones de Fundamentis Legis	Amst.	1638
1013. Strabo (Gk. Lat.) a Xylandro	Lut. Par.	1620
1014. Galeni Opera, Graece, 5 tom	Venet. ap. Ald.	1525
1037. Clarke on the Attributes		1725
1059. Boerhaave's Aphorisms		1755

1084.	Platonis Dialogi juxta edit. Serani	.	.	.	Dublin,	1738
1085.	Clarke and Leibnitz's Papers	1717
1090.	Plinii Epistolae	.	.	.	Oxon.	1686
1100.	Locke on Understanding, 2 vol.	1748
1121.	Seneca's Morals, by l'Estrange	1682
1139.	Reeves's Apologies of Justin Martyr, etc.	1709
1153.	Steele On Conic Sections	1723
1162.	Dodwell's Christianity not founded on Argument	1743
1169.	Scaligeri Opuscula	.	.	.	Par.	1610
1203.	Origen Contra Celsum ab Hoeschelio	.	.	.	Aug. Vind.	1605
1230.	Origenis Opera	.	.	.	Rothomagi,	1668
1277.	Horatii Opera	1642
1315.	Butler's Hudibras	1744
1346.	Campbell on the Original of Moral Virtue	1733
1399.	Browne's Christianity not mysterious	1697
1434.	Aristotelis Opera. Gk. et Lat. a Sylburgio	.	.	.	Francof.	1587
1445.	Acta Eruditorum (1682-1701), 24 vols.	.	.	.	Lips.	1682
1462.	Boyle's Philosophical Works	1725
1469.	Smith's Optics, plates, 2 tom	.	.	.	Camb.	1738
1487.	Thome de Aquino super Libris Boetii	.	.	.	Tholossa.	1481
1507.	Locke on Understanding	1700
1515.	Cardani Opera Philosophici ac Medici	.	.	.	Lugd.	1663
1527.	Plutarchi Opera a Xylandre	.	.	.	Francof.	1620
1541.	Alexandri Aphrodisiensis in Sophisticcos Aristotelis Elenchos Commentaria	.	.	.	Venet. ap. Ald.	1520



OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Mind Association

A Catalogue of Berkeley's Library

Author(s): R. I. Aaron

Source: *Mind*, New Series, Vol. 41, No. 164 (Oct., 1932), pp. 465-475

Published by: Oxford University Press on behalf of the Mind Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2250186>

Accessed: 15/10/2009 10:53

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=oup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Oxford University Press and Mind Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Mind*.

<http://www.jstor.org>