# A TREATISE OF HUMAN NATURE

By David Hume

# CONTENTS

VOLUME I

INTRODUCTION BY THE AUTHOR.

BOOK I OF THE UNDERSTANDING

PART I OF IDEAS, THEIR ORIGIN, COMPOSITION, CONNEXION,

ABSTRACTION, ETC.

SECT. I OF THE ORIGIN OF OUR IDEAS.

SECT. II. DIVISION OF THE SUBJECT.

SECT. III. OF THE IDEAS OF THE MEMORY AND

IMAGINATION.

SECT. IV. OF THE CONNECTION OR ASSOCIATION OF IDEAS.

SECT. V. OF RELATIONS.

SECT. VI. OF MODES AND SUBSTANCES

SECT. VII. OF ABSTRACT IDEAS.

PART II. OF THE IDEAS OF SPACE AND TIME.

SECT. I. OF THE INFINITE DIVISIBILITY OF OUR IDEAS OF SPACE AND TIME.

SECT. II. OF THE INFINITE DIVISIBILITY OF SPACE AND TIME.

SECT. III. OF THE OTHER QUALITIES OF OUR IDEA OF SPACE AND TIME.

SECT. IV. OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

SECT. V. THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

SECT. VI. OF THE IDEA OF EXISTENCE, AND OF EXTERNAL EXISTENCE.

PART III. OF KNOWLEDGE AND PROBABILITY.

SECT. I. OF KNOWLEDGE.

SECT. II. OF PROBABILITY, AND OF THE IDEA OF CAUSE AND EFFECT.

SECT. III. WHY A CAUSE IS ALWAYS NECESSARY.

SECT. IV. OF THE COMPONENT PARTS OF OUR REASONINGS CONCERNING CAUSE

AND EFFECT.

SECT. V. OF THE IMPRESSIONS OF THE SENSES AND MEMORY.

SECT. VI. OF THE INFERENCE FROM THE IMPRESSION TO THE IDEA.

SECT. VII. OF THE NATURE OF THE IDEA OR BELIEF.

SECT. VIII. OF THE CAUSES OF BELIEF.

SECT. IX. OF THE EFFECTS OF OTHER RELATIONS AND OTHER HABITS.

SECT. X. OF THE INFLUENCE OF BELIEF.

SECT. XI. OF THE PROBABILITY OF CHANCES.

SECT. XII. OF THE PROBABILITY OF CAUSES.

SECT. XIII. OF UNPHILOSOPHICAL PROBABILITY.

SECT. XIV. OF THE IDEA OF NECESSARY CONNECTION.

SECT. XV. RULES BY WHICH TO JUDGE OF CAUSES AND EFFECTS.

SECT. XVI OF THE REASON OF ANIMALS

PART IV. OF THE SCEPTICAL AND OTHER SYSTEMS OF PHILOSOPHY.

SECT. I. OF SCEPTICISM WITH REGARD TO REASON.

SECT. II. OF SCEPTICISM WITH REGARD TO THE SENSES.

SECT. III. OF THE ANTIENT PHILOSOPHY.

SECT. IV. OF THE MODERN PHILOSOPHY. SECT. V. OF THE IMMATERIALITY OF T OF THE IMMATERIALITY OF THE SOUL.

SECT. VI. OF PERSONAL IDENTITY

SECT. VII. CONCLUSION OF THIS BOOK.

VOLUME II

BOOK II OF THE PASSIONS

PART I OF PRIDE AND HUMILITY

SECT. I DIVISION OF THE SUBJECT

SECT. II OF PRIDE AND HUMILITY, THEIR OBJECTS AND

CAUSES

SECT. III WHENCE THESE OBJECTS AND CAUSES ARE

DERIVED

```
SECT. IV OF THE RELATIONS OF IMPRESSIONS AND IDEAS SECT. V OF THE INFLUENCE OF THESE RELATIONS ON
PRIDE AND HUMILITY
   SECT. VI LIMITATIONS OF THIS SYSTEM
  SECT. VII OF VICE AND VIRTUE
   SECT. VIII OF BEAUTY AND DEFORMITY
  SECT. IX OF EXTERNAL ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES SECT. X OF PROPERTY AND RICHES SECT. XI OF THE LOVE OF FAME SECT. XII OF THE PRIDE AND HUMILITY OF ANIMALS
  PART II OF LOVE AND HATRED
   SECT. I OF THE OBJECT AND CAUSES OF LOVE AND
HATRED
   SECT. II EXPERIMENTS TO CONFIRM THIS SYSTEM
  SECT. III DIFFICULTIES SOLVED
SECT. IV OF THE LOVE OF RELATIONS
SECT. V OF OUR ESTEEM FOR THE RICH AND POWERFUL
SECT. VI OF BENEVOLENCE AND ANGER
SECT. VII OF COMPASSION
   SECT. VIII OF MALICE AND ENVY
   SECT. IX OF THE MIXTURE OF BENEVOLENCE AND ANGER
WITH COMPASSION
                     AND MALICE
  SECT. X OF RESPECT AND CONTEMPT SECT. XI OF THE AMOROUS PASSION, OR LOVE BETWIXT
THE SEXES
  SECT. XII OF THE LOVE AND HATRED OF ANIMALS
  PART III OF THE WILL AND DIRECT PASSIONS
   SECT. I OF LIBERTY AND NECESSITY
  SECT. II THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED

SECT. III OF THE INFLUENCING MOTIVES OF THE WILL

SECT. IV OF THE CAUSES OF THE VIOLENT PASSIONS

SECT. V OF THE EFFECTS OF CUSTOM

SECT. VI OF THE INFLUENCE OF THE IMAGINATION ON THE
PASSIONS
  SECT. VII OF CONTIGUITY AND DISTANCE IN SPACE AND
TIME
   SECT. VIII THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED
  SECT. IX OF THE DIRECT PASSIONS
   SECT. X OF CURIOSITY, OR THE LOVE OF TRUTH
```

# BOOK III OF MORALS

PART	T OF	VIRTIE	$\Delta ND$	VTCE	TN	GENERAL
LUIL	T OI:	A T I ( T O F)	שות	VICE	TIN	

- SECT. I MORAL DISTINCTIONS NOT DERIVED FROM REASON
- SECT. II MORAL DISTINCTIONS DERIVED FROM A MORAL

# SENSE

- PART II OF JUSTICE AND INJUSTICE
- SECT. I JUSTICE, WHETHER A NATURAL OR ARTIFICIAL

# VIRTUE?

- SECT. II OF THE ORIGIN OF JUSTICE AND PROPERTY
- SECT. III OF THE RULES WHICH DETERMINE PROPERTY
- SECT. IV OF THE TRANSFERENCE OF PROPERTY BY CONSENT SECT. V OF THE OBLIGATION OF PROMISES
- SECT. VI SOME FARTHER REFLECTIONS CONCERNING

# JUSTICE AND INJUSTICE

- SECT. VII OF THE ORIGIN OF GOVERNMENT
- SECT. VIII OF THE SOURCE OF ALLEGIANCE
- SECT. IX OF THE MEASURES OF ALLEGIANCE
- OF THE OBJECTS OF ALLEGIANCE SECT. X
- SECT. XI OF THE LAWS OF NATIONS
- SECT. XII OF CHASTITY AND MODESTY

# PART III OF THE OTHER VIRTUES AND VICES

- SECT. I OF THE ORIGIN OF THE NATURAL VIRTUES AND VICES
  - SECT. II OF GREATNESS OF MIND
  - SECT. III OF GOODNESS AND BENEVOLENCE
  - SECT. IV OF NATURAL ABILITIES
- SECT. V SOME FARTHER REFLECTIONS CONCERNING THE

#### NATURAL VIRTUES

SECT. VI CONCLUSION OF THIS BOOK

APPENDIX TO THE TREATISE OF HUMAN NATURE

\* \* \* \* \*

# VOL. I OF THE UNDERSTANDING.

# ADVERTISEMENT.

My design in the present work is sufficiently explained in the

Introduction. The reader must only observe, that all the subjects I have

there planned out to myself, are not treated of in these two volumes.

The subjects of the Understanding and Passions make a compleat chain

of reasoning by themselves; and I was willing to take advantage of this

natural division, in order to try the taste of the public. If I have the

good fortune to meet with success, I shall proceed to the examination

of Morals, Politics, and Criticism; which will compleat this Treatise of

Human Nature. The approbation of the public I consider as the greatest

reward of my labours; but am determined to regard its judgment, whatever

it be, as my best instruction.

# INTRODUCTION.

Nothing is more usual and more natural for those, who pretend to

discover anything new to the world in philosophy and the sciences, than

to insinuate the praises of their own systems, by decrying all those,

which have been advanced before them. And indeed were they content with

lamenting that ignorance, which we still lie under in the most important

questions, that can come before the tribunal of human reason, there are

few, who have an acquaintance with the sciences, that would not readily

agree with them. It is easy for one of judgment and learning, to

perceive the weak foundation even of those systems, which have obtained

the greatest credit, and have carried their pretensions highest

to accurate and profound reasoning. Principles taken upon trust,

consequences lamely deduced from them, want of coherence in the parts,

and of evidence in the whole, these are every where to be met with in

the systems of the most eminent philosophers, and seem to have drawn

disgrace upon philosophy itself.

Nor is there required such profound knowledge to discover the present

imperfect condition of the sciences, but even the rabble without doors

may, judge from the noise and clamour, which they hear, that all goes

not well within. There is nothing which is not the subject of debate,

and in which men of learning are not of contrary opinions. The most

trivial question escapes not our controversy, and in the most momentous

we are not able to give any certain decision. Disputes are multiplied,

as if every thing was uncertain; and these disputes are managed with the

greatest warmth, as if every thing was certain. Amidst all this bustle

it is not reason, which carries the prize, but eloquence; and no

man needs ever despair of gaining proselytes to the most

extravagant

hypothesis, who has art enough to represent it in any favourable

colours. The victory is not gained by the men at arms, who manage the

pike and the sword; but by the trumpeters, drummers, and musicians of the army.

From hence in my opinion arises that common prejudice against

metaphysical reasonings of all kinds, even amongst those, who profess

themselves scholars, and have a just value for every other part of

literature. By metaphysical reasonings, they do not understand those on

any particular branch of science, but every kind of argument, which is

any way abstruse, and requires some attention to be comprehended. We

have so often lost our labour in such researches, that we commonly

reject them without hesitation, and resolve, if we must for ever be a

prey to errors and delusions, that they shall at least be natural and

entertaining. And indeed nothing but the most determined scepticism,

along with a great degree of indolence, can justify this aversion to

metaphysics. For if truth be at all within the reach of human capacity,

it is certain it must lie very deep and abstruse: and to hope we shall

arrive at it without pains, while the greatest geniuses have failed

with the utmost pains, must certainly be esteemed sufficiently vain

and presumptuous. I pretend to no such advantage in the philosophy I  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{am}}$ 

going to unfold, and would esteem it a strong presumption against it,

were it so very easy and obvious.

It is evident, that all the sciences have a relation, greater or less,

to human nature: and that however wide any of them may seem to run from

it, they still return back by one passage or another. Even. Mathematics,

Natural Philosophy, and Natural Religion, are in some measure dependent

on the science of MAN; since the lie under the cognizance of men, and

are judged of by their powers and faculties. It is impossible to tell

what changes and improvements we might make in these sciences were we

thoroughly acquainted with the extent and force of human understanding,

and could explain the nature of the ideas we employ, and of the

operations we perform in our reasonings. And these improvements are

the more to be hoped for in natural religion, as it is not content with

instructing us in the nature of superior powers, but carries its views

farther, to their disposition towards us, and our duties towards them;

and consequently we ourselves are not only the beings, that reason, but

also one of the objects, concerning which we reason.

If therefore the sciences of Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, and

Natural Religion, have such a dependence on the knowledge of man, what

may be expected in the other sciences, whose connexion with human nature

is more close and intimate? The sole end of logic is to explain the

principles and operations of our reasoning faculty, and the nature of

our ideas: morals and criticism regard our tastes and sentiments: and

politics consider men as united in society, and dependent on each other.

In these four sciences of Logic, Morals, Criticism, and

Politics, is comprehended almost everything, which it can any way import us to be acquainted with, or which can tend either to the improvement or ornament of the human mind.

Here then is the only expedient, from which we can hope for success in

our philosophical researches, to leave the tedious lingering method,

which we have hitherto followed, and instead of taking now and then a

castle or village on the frontier, to march up directly to the capital

or center of these sciences, to human nature itself; which being once

masters of, we may every where else hope for an easy victory. From this

station we may extend our conquests over all those sciences, which more

intimately concern human life, and may afterwards proceed at leisure

to discover more fully those, which are the objects of pore curiosity.

There is no question of importance, whose decision is not comprised in

the science of man; and there is none, which can be decided with any

certainty, before we become acquainted with that science. In pretending,

therefore, to explain the principles of human nature, we in effect

propose a compleat system of the sciences, built on a foundation almost

entirely new, and the only one upon which they can stand with any security.

And as the science of man is the-only solid foundation for the other

sciences, so the only solid foundation we can give to this science

itself must be laid on experience and observation. It is no astonishing

reflection to consider, that the application of experimental philosophy

to moral subjects should come after that to natural at the distance of

above a whole century; since we find in fact, that there was about the

same interval betwixt the origins of these sciences; and that reckoning

from THALES to SOCRATES, the space of time is nearly equal to that

betwixt, my Lord Bacon and some late philosophers [Mr. Locke, my Lord

Shaftesbury, Dr. Mandeville, Mr. Hutchinson, Dr. Butler, etc.] in

England, who have begun to put the science of man on a new footing, and

have engaged the attention, and excited the curiosity of the public. So

true it is, that however other nations may rival us in poetry, and

excel us in some other agreeable arts, the improvements in reason and

philosophy can only be owing to a land of toleration and of liberty.

Nor ought we to think, that this latter improvement in the science of

man will do less honour to our native country than the former in natural

philosophy, but ought rather to esteem it a greater glory, upon account

of the greater importance of that science, as well as the necessity it

lay under of such a reformation. For to me it seems evident, that the

essence of the mind being equally unknown to us with that of external

bodies, it must be equally impossible to form any notion of its powers

and qualities otherwise than from careful and exact experiments, and the  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

observation of those particular effects, which result from its different

circumstances and situations. And though we must endeavour to render all

our principles as universal as possible, by tracing up our experiments

to the utmost, and explaining all effects from the simplest and fewest

causes, it is still certain we cannot go beyond experience; and any

hypothesis, that pretends to discover the ultimate original qualities

of human nature, ought at first to be rejected as presumptuous and chimerical.

I do not think a philosopher, who would apply himself so earnestly to

the explaining the ultimate principles of the soul, would show himself a

great master in that very science of human nature, which he pretends to

explain, or very knowing in what is naturally satisfactory to the mind

of man. For nothing is more certain, than that despair has almost the

same effect upon us with enjoyment, and that we are no sooner acquainted

with the impossibility of satisfying any desire, than the desire itself

vanishes. When we see, that we have arrived at the utmost extent of

human reason, we sit down contented, though we be perfectly satisfied in

the main of our ignorance, and perceive that we can give no reason for

our most general and most refined principles, beside our experience

of their reality; which is the reason of the mere vulgar, and what it

required no study at first to have discovered for the most particular

and most extraordinary phaenomenon. And as this impossibility of making

any farther progress is enough to satisfy the reader, so the writer

may derive a more delicate satisfaction from the free confession of his

ignorance, and from his prudence in avoiding that error,

into which so

many have fallen, of imposing their conjectures and hypotheses on the

world for the most certain principles. When this mutual contentment and

satisfaction can be obtained betwixt the master and scholar, I know not

what more we can require of our philosophy.

But if this impossibility of explaining ultimate principles should be

esteemed a defect in the science of man, I will venture to affirm, that

it is a defect common to it with all the sciences, and all the arts, in

which we can employ ourselves, whether they be such as are cultivated

in the schools of the philosophers, or practised in the shops of the

meanest artizans. None of them can go beyond experience, or establish

any principles which are not founded on that authority. Moral philosophy

has, indeed, this peculiar disadvantage, which is not found in natural,

that in collecting its experiments, it cannot make them purposely, with

premeditation, and after such a manner as to satisfy itself concerning

every particular difficulty which may be. When I am at a loss to know

the effects of one body upon another in any situation, I need only put

them in that situation, and observe what results from it. But should

I endeavour to clear up after the same manner any doubt in moral

philosophy, by placing myself in the same case with that which I

consider, it is evident this reflection and premeditation would so

disturb the operation of my natural principles, as must render it

impossible to form any just conclusion from the phenomenon. We must

therefore glean up our experiments in this science from a cautious

observation of human life, and take them as they appear in the common

course of the world, by men's behaviour in company, in affairs, and

in their pleasures. Where experiments of this kind are judiciously

collected and compared, we may hope to establish on them a science which

will not be inferior in certainty, and will be much superior in utility

to any other of human comprehension.

# BOOK I. OF THE UNDERSTANDING

PART I. OF IDEAS, THEIR ORIGIN, COMPOSITION, CONNEXION, ABSTRACTION, ETC.

# SECT. I. OF THE ORIGIN OF OUR IDEAS.

All the perceptions of the human mind resolve themselves into two

distinct kinds, which I shall call IMPRESSIONS and IDEAS. The difference

betwixt these consists in the degrees of force and liveliness, with

which they strike upon the mind, and make their way into our thought

or consciousness. Those perceptions, which enter with most force and

violence, we may name impressions: and under this name I comprehend

all our sensations, passions and emotions, as they make their first

appearance in the soul. By ideas I mean the faint images of these in

thinking and reasoning; such as, for instance, are all the perceptions

excited by the present discourse, excepting only those which arise from

the sight and touch, and excepting the immediate pleasure or uneasiness

it may occasion. I believe it will not be very necessary to employ many

words in explaining this distinction. Every one of himself will readily

perceive the difference betwixt feeling and thinking. The common degrees

of these are easily distinguished; though it is not impossible but in

particular instances they may very nearly approach to each other. Thus

in sleep, in a fever, in madness, or in any very violent emotions of

soul, our ideas may approach to our impressions, As on the other hand

it sometimes happens, that our impressions are so faint and low, that

we cannot distinguish them from our ideas. But notwithstanding this near

resemblance in a few instances, they are in general so very different,

that no-one can make a scruple to rank them under distinct heads, and

assign to each a peculiar name to mark the difference [Footnote 1.].

[Footnote 1. I here make use of these terms, impression and

idea, in a sense different from what is usual, and I hope

this liberty will be allowed me. Perhaps I rather restore

the word, idea, to its original sense, from which Mr LOCKE

had perverted it, in making it stand for all our

perceptions. By the terms of impression I would not be

understood to express the manner, in which our lively

perceptions are produced in the soul, but merely the

perceptions themselves; for which there is no particular

name either in the English or any other language, that  ${\tt I}$ 

know of.]

There is another division of our perceptions, which it will be

convenient to observe, and which extends itself both to our impressions

and ideas. This division is into SIMPLE and COMPLEX. Simple perceptions

or impressions and ideas are such as admit of no distinction nor

separation. The complex are the contrary to these, and may be

distinguished into parts. Though a particular colour, taste, and smell,

are qualities all united together in this apple, it is easy to perceive

they are not the same, but are at least distinguishable from each other.

Having by these divisions given an order and arrangement to our objects,

we may now apply ourselves to consider with the more accuracy their

qualities and relations. The first circumstance, that strikes my eye, is

the great resemblance betwixt our impressions and ideas in every other

particular, except their degree of force and vivacity. The one seem to

be in a manner the reflexion of the other; so that all the perceptions

of the mind are double, and appear both as impressions and ideas. When

I shut my eyes and think of my chamber, the ideas I form are exact

representations of the impressions I felt; nor is there any circumstance

of the one, which is not to be found in the other. In running over my

other perceptions, I find still the same resemblance and representation.

Ideas and impressions appear always to correspond to each other. This

circumstance seems to me remarkable, and engages my attention for a moment.

Upon a more accurate survey I find I have been carried away too far by

the first appearance, and that I must make use of the distinction of

perceptions into simple and complex, to limit this general decision,

that all our ideas and impressions are resembling. I observe, that many

of our complex ideas never had impressions, that corresponded to them,

and that many of our complex impressions never are exactly copied in

ideas. I can imagine to myself such a city as the New Jerusalem, whose

pavement is gold and walls are rubies, though I never saw any such.

I have seen Paris; but shall I affirm I can form such an idea of that

city, as will perfectly represent all its streets and houses in their

real and just proportions?

I perceive, therefore, that though there is in general a great,

resemblance betwixt our complex impressions and ideas, yet the rule is

not universally true, that they are exact copies of each other. We may

next consider how the case stands with our simple, perceptions. After

the most accurate examination, of which I am capable, I venture to

affirm, that the rule here holds without any exception,

and that every

simple idea has a simple impression, which resembles it, and every

simple impression a correspondent idea. That idea of red, which we form

in the dark, and that impression which strikes our eyes in sun-shine,

differ only in degree, not in nature. That the case is the same with

all our simple impressions and ideas, it is impossible to prove by a

particular enumeration of them. Every one may satisfy himself in this

point by running over as many as he pleases. But if any one should deny

this universal resemblance, I know no way of convincing him, but by

desiring him to shew a simple impression, that has not a correspondent

idea, or a simple idea, that has not a correspondent impression. If he

does not answer this challenge, as it is certain he cannot, we may from

his silence and our own observation establish our conclusion.

Thus we find, that all simple ideas and impressions resemble each other;

and as the complex are formed from them, we may affirm in general,

that these two species of perception are exactly correspondent. Having

discovered this relation, which requires no farther examination, I am

curious to find some other of their qualities. Let us consider how they

stand with regard to their existence, and which of the impressions and

ideas are causes, and which effects.

The full examination of this question is the subject of the present

treatise; and therefore we shall here content ourselves with

establishing one general proposition, THAT ALL OUR

# Thank You for previewing this eBook

You can read the full version of this eBook in different formats:

- HTML (Free /Available to everyone)
- PDF / TXT (Available to V.I.P. members. Free Standard members can access up to 5 PDF/TXT eBooks per month each month)
- > Epub & Mobipocket (Exclusive to V.I.P. members)

To download this full book, simply select the format you desire below

