

# Locke, Arnauld, and Abstract Ideas\*

Kenneth L. Pearce  
Trinity College Dublin

January 18, 2017

A great deal of the criticism directed at John Locke’s theory of abstract ideas, including George Berkeley’s famous critique (PHK, Intro §§7–21),<sup>1</sup> assumes that a Lockean abstract idea is a special kind of idea which by its very nature either represents many diverse particulars or represents separately things that cannot exist in separation (see Intro §10).<sup>2</sup> I will call this the *intrinsic theory* of abstraction, since it holds that abstract ideas differ intrinsically from concrete (i.e., non-abstract) ideas. The claim that Locke held the intrinsic theory has been challenged by scholars such as Kenneth Winkler and Michael Ayers who regard it as uncharitable to Locke in light of the obvious problems faced by this theory of abstraction. Winkler and Ayers argue that Locke instead followed Antoine Arnauld in holding that to have an abstract idea is to attend selectively to some portion of the content of a particular idea. On this view, to have an abstract idea is not to have a special kind of idea but to have an ordinary idea in a special way. I will call this the *extrinsic theory* of abstraction, since it holds that ideas are not intrinsically abstract but rather are abstract in virtue of the manner in which they are had (perceived).<sup>3</sup>

I argue that the case made by Winkler and Ayers for the attribution of the extrinsic theory to Locke rests on a misinterpretation of Arnauld. I begin, in §1, with a more careful definition of the difference between the intrinsic and extrinsic theories of abstraction. Then, in §2 I show that, despite Arnauld’s talk about selective attention, Arnauld holds an intrinsic theory. In §3, I show

---

\*This is a pre-publication draft circulated by the author for comment. Comments and criticisms are welcome on the web at [http://blog.kennypearce.net/archives/philosophy/metaphysics/philosophy\\_of\\_mind/the\\_way\\_of\\_ideas/locke\\_arnauld\\_and\\_abstract\\_idea.html](http://blog.kennypearce.net/archives/philosophy/metaphysics/philosophy_of_mind/the_way_of_ideas/locke_arnauld_and_abstract_idea.html) or by email to [pearcek@tcd.ie](mailto:pearcek@tcd.ie).

1. Although Berkeley makes this assumption, it is unclear what role, if any, it plays in his argument. See, e.g., Bolton 1987; Winkler 1989, ch. 2; Pappas 2000, ch. 3; Pearce 2017, 15–29. I am here focused on the interpretation of Locke and Arnauld, and will therefore not be addressing this question.

2. In the secondary literature on Berkeley, these two kinds of abstraction have been dubbed ‘generalizing abstraction’ and ‘singling abstraction’. See Rickless 2012. A predecessor of this distinction can be found in the Port-Royal *Logic*’s distinction between four kinds of “knowledge by parts,” three of which are said to be species of abstraction (Logic, 37–38). Varieties 2 and 3 are kinds of singling abstraction, the fourth and final variety is generalizing abstraction.

3. The distinction between the intrinsic and extrinsic theories of abstraction roughly corresponds to the distinction between the ‘paradigm instance’ and ‘schematic representation’ theories drawn by C. C. W. Taylor (1978).

that a consistent interpretation of Locke’s remarks on abstract ideas can be developed on the assumption that Locke did indeed follow Arnauld in this. Thus, contrary to Winkler and Ayers, both textual and contextual evidence favors the attribution of the intrinsic theory to Locke.

## 1 Intrinsic and Extrinsic Theories of Abstraction

According to intrinsic theories of abstraction, abstract ideas differ intrinsically from concrete ideas. This naturally fits with a more general theory according to which the intrinsic nature of an idea determines its representational content. If ideas are internal, immediate objects of thought, then this theory will imply what Winkler calls ‘the content assumption’: “the assumption that the content of thought is determined by its object” (Winkler 1989, 39). Winkler argues that Locke rejects the content assumption by endorsing an extrinsic theory of abstraction according to which “we may be thinking of a particular triangle or of triangularity in general while confronting one and the same idea, *depending on how much of the idea we attend to*” (39). Similarly, according to Ayers, “The abstract idea just is the phenomenal particular currently before the mind and representing all particulars which precisely resemble it in the respect upon which the mind is focused in abstraction” (Ayers 1991, 1:249).

While an intrinsic theory of abstraction fits naturally with the content assumption, it does not *entail* the content assumption. There are (at least) two ways of rendering an intrinsic theory of abstraction consistent with the rejection of the content assumption. First, even if ideas in general do not have their representational content in virtue of their own intrinsic natures, it might still be due to an intrinsic difference between abstract and concrete ideas that abstract ideas are abstract. For instance, one might hold a causal theory of representation while holding that concrete ideas are sense images and abstract ideas are not. Second, Winkler and Ayers both argue that Locke’s text contains an ambiguity between ideas considered as perceptual acts and ideas considered as objects (Winkler 1989, 41–42; Ayers 1991, 1:56–57).<sup>4</sup> Adopting an act theory of ideas severs the connection between the intrinsic theory and the content assumption, since the idea is no longer the object of thought.

The intrinsic theory of abstraction thus does not entail the content assumption. Conversely, however, the content assumption and the view that ideas are objects of thought together entail the intrinsic theory: if the content of one’s thought is fully determined by what idea one has, then there must be some intrinsic difference between the idea of a particular triangle and the abstract general idea of a triangle to explain why acts directed at the former represent particularly and acts directed at the latter represent generally.

The intrinsic theory, then, holds that abstract ideas are a special kind of

---

4. John Sergeant was probably the first philosopher to charge Locke with this ambiguity (Sergeant 1697, 142).

ideas that differ intrinsically from concrete (i.e., non-abstract) ideas. The extrinsic theory denies this. The particular version of the extrinsic theory that is attributed to Arnauld and Locke by Winkler and Ayers holds that an abstract idea is just a concrete idea to which the mind attends selectively. In other words, to have an abstract idea is just to attend to some particular feature or features of a fully determinate concrete idea to the exclusion of its other features. I will now argue, against Winkler and Ayers, that both Arnauld and Locke held the intrinsic theory.

## 2 Arnauld on Abstraction

That Arnauld held the intrinsic theory rather than the extrinsic theory of abstraction is apparent both from direct textual evidence and from systematic considerations. I begin with the textual evidence.

In the Port-Royal *Logic*, Arnauld (with his collaborator Pierre Nicole), describes abstraction as follows:

Suppose, for example, I reflect that I am thinking, and, in consequence, that I am the I who thinks. In my idea of the I who thinks, *I can consider a thinking thing without noticing that it is I*, although in me the I and the one who thinks are one and the same thing. *The idea I thereby conceive* of a person who thinks can represent not only me but all other thinking persons. By the same token, if I draw an equilateral triangle on a piece of paper, and if I concentrate on examining it on this paper along with all the accidental circumstances determining it, I shall have an idea of only a single triangle. But if I *ignore all the particular circumstances* and focus on the thought that the triangle is a figure bounded by three equal lines, *the idea I form* will, on the one hand, represent more clearly the equality of lines and, on the other, be able to represent all equilateral triangles (*Logic*, 38, emphasis added).

This text is quite explicit that selective attention results in the formation of a new idea. In the first example, I focus on myself *qua* thinking thing and thereby conceive an idea that includes only this thinking, without my particularities, and is therefore suited to represent all thinking things. In the second example, I attend only to the fact that the thing in question “is a figure bounded by three equal lines” and thereby form a new idea containing only this content and therefore suited to represent all equilateral triangles.

The point is even clearer in *On True and False Ideas*. There, Arnauld tells the following story:

The philosopher Thales, having to pay twenty workers one drachma each, counted twenty drachmas and paid each worker. He would not have been able to do this unless there were at least two perceptions in his mind: one of twenty men and one of twenty drachmas . . . Having

some spare time he began to reflect, and thinking about what the two *perceptions* or *ideas* have in common, namely that there is 20 in both, he abstracts from what is particular in them the abstract idea of the number 20 . . . This is a third idea or perception (TFI, 74).

Arnauld must not hold that to have the abstract idea of the number 20 is just to have the idea of some particular group of 20 things attending only to the number, for he here says explicitly that the abstract idea is a *third* idea, in addition to the two ideas of particular groups of 20.

These texts clearly show that Arnauld adopted the intrinsic theory of abstraction, holding that an abstract idea is a special kind of idea formed by a process involving selective attention. Additionally, there are systematic reasons why Arnauld could not have adopted the extrinsic theory.

Arnauld frames his dispute with Nicolas Malebranche over the nature of ideas as a dispute about whether ideas are ‘representative beings’ “actually distinct from our mind as well as from the [external] object” (63). Arnauld rejects this claim, thereby endorsing a direct realist theory of perception and cognition. Yet Arnauld continues to speak of ideas. This has led some interpreters to question whether Arnauld is really the direct realist he claims to be (see, e.g., Hoffman 2002; Van Cleve 2015). However, most interpreters agree that chapter 6 of *On True and False Ideas* is intended to give a semantics for ‘idea’ talk that is consistent with Arnauld’s rejection of representational intermediaries. In the absence of perceptual intermediaries, Arnauld’s word ‘idea’ must refer either to the perceptual act or to its external object. The former interpretation is widely held and has been developed in detail by Steven Nadler (1989).<sup>5</sup> I have defended the latter interpretation (Pearce 2016).

I here assume that Arnauld really is a direct realist. However, it will not matter to my argument whether Arnauld identifies ideas with perceptions or with external objects; on either interpretation, Arnauld’s direct realism is inconsistent with the extrinsic theory of abstraction.

The inconsistency is easiest to see on the act interpretation. If the idea just is the perceptual act, then a different perceptual act—such as one that attends to a different aspect of the object—just is a different idea.

The external object interpretation is somewhat more complex, but yields the same result. According to this interpretation, ‘idea’ is an extrinsic denomination of the external object (see TFI, 67, 89–90; Pearce 2016, 382–383). The Port-Royal *Logic* defines an ‘extrinsic denomination’ as a mode “taken from something that is not in the substance, such as ‘loved,’ ‘seen,’ and ‘desired,’ names derived from the actions of something else” (*Logic*, 32). Thus it is my act of perceiving (for instance) the sun that makes it correct to apply the name ‘idea’ to the sun.

On this interpretation, the word ‘idea’ functions semantically like an adjective in that it signifies a mode distinctly but indirectly and signifies the subject of that mode confusedly but directly (see *Grammar*, ch. 2.2; *Logic*, 74–75). What

5. Other advocates of this interpretation include Cook 1974; Radner 1976; and Watson 1994, 267–270.

is peculiar about an extrinsic denomination is that the subject signified by the extrinsic denomination is not the substance that is actually (metaphysically speaking) modified by that mode. The mode that is distinctly but indirectly signified by ‘idea’ is a perceptual act and the substance it modifies must be a mind. However, the substance that is confusedly but directly signified is not that mind but rather the external object. In this way, the word ‘idea’ functions semantically like the word ‘perceived’ in the phrase ‘perceived object’.

This yields the result that, if there are two acts of conceiving the sun, then the sun is, in a certain sense, an idea ‘twice over’ and in this sense there are two ideas. (For comparison: a two-pronged fork is, in a certain sense, pointy ‘twice over’ and we say that it has two points. These points are modes of the fork.) Thus we arrive ultimately (though by a more circuitous route) at the same conclusion: wherever there are two perceptual acts, there are two ideas. This conclusion is again inconsistent with the Winkler-Ayers interpretation: the abstract idea Thales has when he conceives of the number twenty is a different idea than the one he has when he conceives twenty drachmas.

What, then, is the role of selective attention in Arnauld’s theory of abstraction? Here, *On True and False Ideas* is particularly illuminating. In that work, Arnauld draws a distinction between *implicit* and *explicit* reflection. Implicit reflection is the kind of awareness of one’s own thinking that, according to Arnauld, accompanies all thought. Explicit reflection “occurs when we examine our perception by means of another perception” (TFI, 71). That is, explicit reflection involves a perceptual act that is directed toward another perceptual act.<sup>6</sup>

According to Arnauld, explicit reflection:

occurs above all in the sciences, which are constituted through the reflections men have made on their own perceptions, as when a geometer finds in examining his perception of a triangle that, having conceived it as a figure bounded by three straight lines, it must have three angles, and that these three angles are equal to two right angles (71).

The story of Thales, the beginning of which was quoted above, illustrates this process in more detail: Arnauld goes on to show how Thales, beginning from these reflections, can prove, for instance, that “2 is the only even number which is *prime*” (75). The process of abstraction, therefore, involves *explicit* reflection, which is by definition an additional perceptual act and therefore an additional idea.

In the story, Thales’ introduction to arithmetic begins by raising the question of “what the two *perceptions* or *ideas* [of twenty men and twenty drachmas] have in common” (74). This is a question *about* the ideas (not about the objects) and so asking and answering it requires having ideas *of those ideas*. To have such higher-order ideas is to engage in explicit reflection. This reflection allows

---

6. On this distinction in Arnauld see Nadler 1989, 118–122 and Kambouchner 1995, 184–190.

Thales to compare his two first-order ideas and identify what is in common between them. He thereby forms “the abstract idea of the number 20, which can subsequently be applied to twenty horses, twenty houses, twenty stadiums.” Arnauld explicitly asserts that this abstract idea “is a third idea or perception” in addition to the other two (TFI, 74).<sup>7</sup>

Selective attention for Arnauld is a kind of explicit reflection. In selective attention, one thinks about one’s ideas and identifies certain features of them.<sup>8</sup> To construct an abstract idea, one reflects in this selective way and thereby constructs a new idea containing only the selected features. This idea, like all Arnauldian ideas, has the representational content it does just in virtue of the intrinsic nature of the perceptual act (TFI, 53–54, 152–155; Nuchelmans 1983, 72; Nadler 1989, 126–127, 167–170, 177–178; Pearce 2016, 378–379).

### 3 Locke on Abstraction

Like Arnauld, Locke frequently speaks of abstract ideas as new ideas formed by a process involving selective attention. For instance, Locke says that after children have perceived the similarities between many different human persons, “they **frame** an *Idea*, which they find those many particulars do partake in” (EHU, §3.3.7).<sup>9</sup> Similarly, after concluding this account, Locke says, “this is the way, whereby Men first **formed** general Ideas” (§3.3.9). Again, in the notorious ‘inconsistent triangle’ passage, Locke says that “it . . . require[s] some pain and skill to **form** the *general idea* of a *Triangle*” (§4.7.9).

The evidence for the influence of Arnauld, and especially the Port-Royal *Logic*, on Locke is extensive.<sup>10</sup> As we saw above, Arnauld held that selective attention is part of a process for constructing intrinsically abstract ideas. Locke’s usual way of talking about abstract ideas appears to presuppose this as well, by speaking of a process of ‘framing’ or ‘forming’ them. This, I believe, is sufficient to make the attribution of the intrinsic theory to Locke the default interpretation: if this was not what Locke meant, he should have said so.

However, specific textual evidence has been adduced by scholars aiming to show that Locke *did* say so. I will show that, in their textual and historical context, the passages in question are better interpreted as agreeing with Arnauld in taking selective attention to be part of a process whereby intrinsically abstract

7. Really there are five ideas: two first-order ideas, two second-order ideas, and one abstract idea. Arnauld does not enumerate the second-order ideas, but implies their existence by describing Thales as thinking about the first-order ideas.

8. On the act interpretation, to think about one’s ideas is to think about one’s perceptual acts. On the external object interpretation, to think about one’s ideas is to think about objects not as they are in themselves but as they are represented in one’s perception. It is this distinction between how objects are in themselves and how they are conceived that is the key element in reflection on one’s ideas and that makes such reflection crucial to ‘the art of thinking’ and thereby justifies the project of part 1 of the Port-Royal *Logic*. See Pearce 2016, §5.

9. Due to the frequent use of italics in Locke’s text, I use boldface for added emphasis, here and in what follows.

10. See, e.g., Yolton 1975, 146–147, 153; Bolton 1992; Schaar 2008.

ideas are formed.

According to Winkler, EHU, §2.13.13 is “the decisive text” in favor of the attribution of a selective attention-based version of the extrinsic theory to Locke (Winkler 1989, 40). Ayers also appeals to this passage, which he says is “reminiscent of the Port Royal *Logic*” (Ayers 1991, 1:251).<sup>11</sup> The passage in question reads as follows:

The parts of pure Space are inseparable one from the other; so that the Continuity cannot be separated, neither really, nor mentally . . . to divide mentally, is to make in the Mind two Superficies, where before there was a Continuity, and consider them as removed one from the other; which can only be done in things considered by the mind, as capable of being separated . . . 'Tis true, a Man may consider so much of such a *Space*, as is answerable or commensurate to a Foot, without considering the rest; which is indeed a partial Consideration, but not so much as mental Separation, or Division; since a Man can no more mentally divide, without considering two Superficies, separate one from the other, than he can actually divide, without making two Superficies disjoin'd one from the other: But a partial consideration is not a separating. A Man may consider Light in the Sun, without its Heat; or Mobility in Body without its Extension, without thinking of their separation. One is only a partial Consideration, terminating in one alone; and the other is a Consideration of both, as existing separately.

This passage does indeed appear to favor an extrinsic interpretation of the sort advocated by Winkler and Ayers. However, it must be balanced against other passages, such as EHU, §3.3.6, where Locke says “*Ideas* become general, by **separating** from them the circumstances of Time, and Place, and any other *Ideas*, that may determine them to this or that particular Existence.” Assuming (as both Winkler and Ayers do) that the ‘partial consideration’ of §2.13.13 is abstraction,<sup>12</sup> we have Locke asserting that abstraction is a separating and also that abstraction is not a separating. If we are to avoid convicting Locke of contradiction, we must say that he is using the word ‘separating’ in two different senses.

Fortunately, Locke explains in §2.13.13 precisely what he means by mental separation, and it does not seem to be the same kind of separation that, according to §3.3.6, is involved in abstraction. When Locke says, “to divide mentally, is to make in the Mind two Superficies,” he is talking about forming a positive

11. Thomas Lennon (1993, 344–348) also cites this passage as the primary basis for attributing a selective attention-based version of the extrinsic theory to Locke. However, unlike Winkler and Ayers, Lennon emphasizes the differences between Locke and Arnauld generated by their differing views on ideas and essences.

12. Jonathan Walmsley (1999, 130–134), in criticizing Ayers, argues that this section is not about abstraction at all. This also resolves the contradiction, and does so in a way that is consistent with my overall interpretation of Locke on abstraction. Nevertheless, I will continue to operate under the assumption—favorable to my opponents—that the ‘partial Consideration’ here is or involves abstraction.

conception of the two parts of space *as* separated. Locke emphasizes this point again later when he says “a Man can no[t] . . . mentally divide, without considering two Superficies, separate one from the other,” and again at the very end of the quoted passage when he distinguishes “a partial Consideration, terminating in one alone” from “a Consideration of both, as existing separately.” In other words, what we cannot do is *believe in* or *conceive of* the existence of two separate spaces. On the other hand, what we can do is “consider so much of such a *Space*, as is answerable or commensurate to a Foot, without considering the rest.” This, however, is precisely what Locke, in EHU, §3.3.6, calls ‘separation’: he is talking about removing certain circumstances from our conception, so that we no longer conceive of them.

We should therefore distinguish between what we might call ‘negative’ and ‘positive’ separation. Negative separation proceeds by the removal of certain content from an idea, and this is what is involved in the process of abstraction. Positive separation is the construction of a positive conception of two portions of that content as existing separately. It is by just this sort of distinction that Arnauld and Nicole can hold, simultaneously, that it is *not* possible to conceive a mode as existing apart from its substance and that it *is* possible to abstract a mode from its substance (Logic, 30–31).

A more serious problem for the attribution of the intrinsic theory to Locke is EHU, §3.3.11, where Locke writes:

*Ideas* are general, when they are set up, as the Representatives of many particular Things: but universality belongs not to things themselves, which are all of them particular in their existence, even those Words, and *Ideas*, which in their signification, are general. When therefore we quit Particulars, the Generals that rest, are only Creatures of our own making, their general Nature being nothing but the Capacity they are put into by the Understanding, of signifying or representing many particulars. For the signification they have, is nothing but a relation, that by the mind of man is added to them.

C. C. W. Taylor (1978, 106) has employed this text to argue that Locke anticipates the Berkeleian view that general ideas, like general words, stand for the many objects in their extension by convention only (see PHK, Intro §12).

I am in general agreement with Taylor’s interpretation of Berkeley (see Pearce 2017, 31–36), and I concede that this passage appears to support Taylor’s interpretation of Locke. Once again, however, other texts put pressure on the interpretation and ultimately lead us to realize that another interpretation is possible, and indeed preferable.

The central problem for Taylor’s interpretation is that, as Taylor explicitly recognizes (Taylor 1978, 107–108), this view undermines Locke’s insistence that all meaningful words (except ‘particles’) must stand for ideas and that differences in meaning must be accounted for by differences in the ideas for which words stand (see, e.g., EHU, §§3.1.2–4). If, as Berkeley claims, general words and general ideas represent generally in precisely the same way, then positing

ideas behind the words makes no explanatory progress. The claim that words get to be meaningful by being conventionally associated with ideas can serve as an explanation of the meaningfulness of words only if the representational capacity of ideas is prior to and independent of the meaningfulness of words.

With this issue in mind, let us return to EHU, §3.3.11. Locke’s central, overarching point is that both general words and general ideas are particular objects and not Platonic or Aristotelian universals. When we say these words and ideas are general, we mean only that they represent or signify generally. In other words, the distinction is between the features they *have* and the features they *represent*. Since it is itself particular, the abstract idea *apple* is fully determinate: for every possible feature, it either has or lacks that feature. Yet it *represents* generally, and this implies that there are certain properties such that it represents neither those properties nor their negations. Examples would include *being located in England* and *being red*. Since some apples have and some apples lack these features, neither they nor their negations can be part of the representational content of the abstract idea *apple*.<sup>13</sup>

So far so good. However, the most serious problem for the attribution of the intrinsic theory to Locke comes at the end of the quoted passage, where Locke says that their generality is a “Capacity they are put into by the Understanding” and “a relation, that by the mind of man is added to them.” Both of these phrases make it appear that a general idea is an idea *used* in a certain way, just as Berkeley would have it.

To clarify what Locke has in mind here, it is helpful to attend to his discussion of the relationship between general names and general ideas in the very next section:

That then which general Words signify, is a sort of Things; and each of them does that, by being a sign of an abstract *Idea* in the mind, to which *Ideas*, as Things existing are found to agree, so they come to be ranked under that name; or, which is all one, be of that sort. Whereby it is evident, that the *Essences of the sorts, or . . . Species* of things, are nothing else but these abstract *Ideas* . . . From whence it is easy to observe, that the essences of the sorts of things, and consequently the sorting of Things, is the Workmanship of the Understanding, since it is the Understanding that abstracts and makes those general *Ideas* (§3.3.12).

This last claim, that sorts are “the Workmanship of the Understanding,” is the central thesis of the whole chapter in which Taylor’s passage occurs. Locke defends this thesis by arguing that the names of sorts stand for abstract general ideas which are made by the understanding, and not for pre-existing universals.

The abstract general ideas in which Locke is most interested, and which he certainly has most in mind in this passage, are the abstract ideas that signify

---

<sup>13</sup> On my reading, it is this feature of abstract ideas, and not their (alleged) status as indeterminate images, that is the primary target of Berkeley’s critique. See Pearce 2017, ch. 1.

sorts of substances. Unlike the ideas of mixed modes, which are likewise abstract but may be put together any which way (EHU, chs. 2.22 and 3.5), “the Mind, in making its complex *Ideas* of Substances, only follows Nature; and puts none together which are not supposed to have an union in Nature” (§3.6.28). Further, in such cases, we suppose that there is a “real essence, on which the Properties depend” (§3.6.6), i.e., that the similarity in the observed qualities is explained by a similarity in the unknown inner constitution of the things.

For Locke, then, “set[ting] up [ideas] as the Representatives of many particular Things” is a matter of using them for these classificatory purposes, and this is indeed something “that by the mind of man is added to them” (§3.3.11). Nevertheless, Locke holds that “the Understanding . . . abstracts and **makes** . . . general Ideas” for this purpose (§3.3.12). Our use of these ideas as the nominal essences of sorts (genuses) is what makes them *general*, but it is not what makes them *abstract*. What makes them abstract is that they lack the sort of determinacy that is characteristic of the ideas we initially get from the senses—“the circumstances of Time, and Place, and any other *Ideas*, that may determine them to this or that particular Existence” are omitted from them (§3.3.6). Thus although generality is, in a sense, dependent on our use of these ideas, the ideas that are used in this way must be, by their own intrinsic nature, abstract rather than concrete. Our classificatory practices require the construction of new ideas by means of abstraction.<sup>14</sup>

Lockean abstract ideas are constructed by negative separation, i.e., by the omission of portions of the content included in the original ideas of sensation or reflection from which they are constructed. Locke’s most careful and detailed account of this construction process is found in §3.3.7:

the *Ideas* of the Persons Children converse with . . . are like the Persons themselves, only particular. The *Ideas* of the Nurse, and the Mother, are well framed in their Minds; and, like Pictures of them there, represent only those Individual . . . Afterwards, when time and a larger Acquaintance has made them observe, that there are a great many other Things in the World, that in some common agreements of Shape, and several other Qualities, resemble their Father and Mother, and those Persons they have been used to, they frame an *Idea*, which they find those many Particulars do partake in; and to that they give, with others, the name *Man*, for example. And *thus they come to have a general Name*, and a general *Idea*. Wherein they make nothing new, but only **leave out** of the complex *Idea* they had of *Peter* and *James*, *Mary* and *Jane*, that which is peculiar to each, and retain only what is common to them all.

A few sections later Locke tells us that the “*Idea* of *Man* differ[s] from that of *Peter*, and *Paul* . . . in the **leaving out something**, that is peculiar to each Individual; and retaining so much of those particular complex *Ideas*, of several particular Existences, as they are found to agree in” (§3.3.9).

14. A similar account is briefly suggested by Bolton 1992, 411.

It is unclear whether, or to what extent, this process involves reflection on our ideas themselves, as oppose to comparison of the objects conceived. What is clear is that the construction of the abstract idea *man* involves comparing different particular humans and separating (in the negative sense) the qualities in which they differ from those they have in common.

## 4 Conclusion

The attribution of the extrinsic theory to Locke was supposed to be supported both by certain textual evidence and by the influence of Arnauld. Both of these sources of support have been undercut: textual and contextual factors both favor the attribution of the intrinsic theory to Locke. However, this gives rise to a new problem: as Ayers has argued in great detail, textual and contextual factors also favor the attribution to Locke of an imagistic conception of ideas (Ayers 1991, vol. 1, ch. 5 *et passim*).<sup>15</sup> Many philosophers have thought it obvious that images cannot be intrinsically abstract (see, e.g., Pyle 2013, 52–53).<sup>16</sup> I am sure that some scholars will think that interpretive charity requires us to avoid the attribution of this combination of views to Locke. Still, unpalatable as this conclusion may be to Locke’s supporters, when Locke’s text is read against its historical background, the available evidence supports the conclusion that Locke has combined the imagist empiricism of Hobbes with the anti-imagist rationalism of Arnauld in a way that appears to be incoherent.

## Abbreviations

- EHU      Locke, John. (1690) 1975. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Edited by Peter H. Nidditch. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grammar      Arnauld, Antoine, and Claude Lancelot. (1660) 1975. *General and Rational Grammar: The Port-Royal Grammar*. Edited and translated by Jacques Rieux and Bernard E. Rollin. *Janua Linguarum*. The Hague: Mouton. French edition: *Grammaire Générale et Raisonnée*. Paris: Prault Fils L’Aîné, 1754.

15. The context here is not Arnauld—Arnauld and Nicole explicitly reject imagism (Logic, 26)—but rather Hobbes (and possibly also Gassendi). In addition to Ayers, see Lennon 1988, 234–236. On the question of the extent of Gassendi’s influence on Locke, see Michael and Michael 1990; Lennon 1993, §18 *et passim*; Milton 2000.

16. Some interpreters have held that Berkeley’s criticism rests on this point (e.g. Lennon 1988). However, not everyone has found it obvious that images cannot be abstract. See, e.g., Jolley 1999, 51–53.

- Logic      Arnauld, Antoine, and Pierre Nicole. (1662) 1996. *Logic or the Art of Thinking: Containing besides common rules, several new observations appropriate for forming judgments*. Edited and translated by Jill Vance Buroker. Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. French edition: *La Logique ou L'Art de Penser*. 2nd ed. Edited by Pierre Claire and François Girbal. Textes Philosophiques. Paris: J. Vrin, 2012.
- PHK      Berkeley, George. (1710) 2008. *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*. In *Philosophical Writings*, edited by Desmond M. Clarke, 67–149. Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- TFI      Arnauld, Antoine. (1683) 1990. *On True and False Ideas*. Translated by Stephen Gaukroger. Classics of Philosophy and Science. Manchester: Manchester University Press. French edition: *Des Vraies et Des Fausses Idées*. In *Œuvres Philosophiques de Antoine Arnauld*, edited by Jules Simon, 25–264. Paris: Adolphe Delahays, 1843.

## References

- Ayers, Michael. 1991. *Locke: Epistemology and Ontology*. 2 vols. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bolton, Martha Brandt. 1987. “Berkeley’s Objection to Abstract Ideas and Unconceived Objects.” In Sosa 1987, 61–81.
- . 1992. “The Epistemological Status of Ideas: Locke Compared to Arnauld.” *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 9 (4): 409–424.
- Cook, Monte. 1974. “Arnauld’s Alleged Representationalism.” *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 12 (1): 53–62.
- Hoffman, Paul. 2002. “Direct Realism, Intentionality, and the Objective Being of Ideas.” *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 83 (2): 163–179.
- Jolley, Nicholas. 1999. *Locke: His Philosophical Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kambouchner, Denis. 1995. “Des Vraies et des Fausses Tenébrès: La Connaissance de l’Âme d’après la Controverse avec Malebranche.” In *Antoine Arnauld: Philosophie du Langage et de la Connaissance*, edited by Jean-Claude Pariente, 153–190. Histoire de la Philosophie. Paris: J. Vrin.
- Lennon, Thomas M. 1988. “Berkeley and the Ineffable.” *Synthese* 75 (2): 231–250.
- . 1993. *The Battle of Gods and Giants: The Legacies of Descartes and Gassendi, 1655–1715*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Michael, Fred S., and Emily Michael. 1990. "The Theory of Ideas in Gassendi and Locke." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 51 (3): 379.
- Milton, J. R. 2000. "Locke and Gassendi: A Reappraisal." In *English Philosophy in the Age of Locke*, vol. 3 of *Oxford Studies in the History of Philosophy*, edited by M. A. Stewart, 87–109. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nadler, Steven. 1989. *Arnauld and the Cartesian Philosophy of Ideas*. Studies in intellectual history and the history of philosophy. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Nuchelmans, Gabriel. 1983. *Judgment and Proposition: From Descartes to Kant*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Pappas, George S. 2000. *Berkeley's Thought*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Pearce, Kenneth L. 2016. "Arnauld's Verbal Distinction Between Ideas and Perceptions." *History and Philosophy of Logic* 37 (4): 375–390.
- . 2017. *Language and the Structure of Berkeley's World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pyle, A. J. 2013. *Locke*. Classic Thinkers. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Radner, Daisie. 1976. "Representationalism in Arnauld's Act Theory of Perception." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 14 (1): 96–98.
- Rickless, Samuel C. 2012. "The Relation Between Anti-Abstractionism and Idealism in Berkeley's Metaphysics." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 20 (4): 723–740.
- Schaar, Maria van der. 2008. "Locke and Arnauld on Judgment and Proposition." *History and Philosophy of Logic* 29 (4): 327–341.
- Sergeant, John. 1697. *Solid Philosophy Asserted, Against the Fancies of the Ideists: Or, the Method of Science Farther Illustrated*. London: Roger Clavil / Abel Roper / Thomas Metcalf.
- Sosa, Ernest, ed. 1987. *Essays on the Philosophy of George Berkeley*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Taylor, C. C. W. 1978. "Berkeley's Theory of Abstract Ideas." *Philosophical Quarterly* 28 (111): 97–115.
- Van Cleve, James. 2015. "The Sun in the Sky and the Sun in My Mind: Or, Why Arnauld is not Steadfastly a Direct Realist." Appendix H to *Problems From Reid*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Walmsley, Jonathan. 1999. "Locke on Abstraction: A Response to M. R. Ayers." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 7 (1): 123–134.
- Watson, Richard A. 1994. "Malebranche and Arnauld on Ideas." *The Modern Schoolman* 71 (4): 259–270.

- Winkler, Kenneth P. 1989. *Berkeley: An Interpretation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Yolton, John W. 1975. "Ideas and Knowledge in Seventeenth-Century Philosophy." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 13 (2): 145–165.