

Review Article

George Berkeley's Philosophy in Polish Studies

Marta Szymańska

Polish studies on George Berkeley have a tradition of nearly a hundred years. During that time, however, only eight books have been published on his philosophy. They are mostly academic pieces, the main focus of which is detailed analysis of Berkeley's epistemology and ontology. The aim of this article is to present an overview of these works and to show the main tendencies in Polish commentaries on Berkeley's ideas. In addition, I describe the translations of Berkeley's works that have contributed to the reception of his philosophy among readers and commentators in Poland.

* * *

Berkeley's philosophical ideas as they are presented in his works are known to Polish readers mostly from their English editions. Only four of Berkeley's works have been fully translated into Polish. *A Treatise concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge* was first translated by Feliks Jezierski in 1890.¹ A translation of the work which is commonly used nowadays was made by Jan Leszczyński in 1956. *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous* were first translated by Janina Sosnowska in 1927, and it was republished together with Leszczyński's translation of *A Treatise concerning the Principles of Human knowledge* in 1956 by Polish Scientific Publishers PWN in a series devoted to classic works in philosophy, "Biblioteka Klasyków Filozofii" [The Library of Philosophy Classics].² This 1956 edition is considered to be the basic Polish translation of the two works by Berkeley. More recent translations of the two works were made by Janusz Salamon (*Treatise*) and Michał Filipczuk (*Three Dialogues*) and published by Wydawnictwo Zielona Sowa in 2005³ and 2006⁴ respectively. Both of them are accompanied by an afterword that contains a brief presentation of Berkeley's philosophy. An anonymous translation of *De Motu* dates from 1915,⁵ but it was not published until

¹ George Berkeley, *Rzecz o zasadach poznania* przeł. z ang. [transl. from English by] Feliks Jezierski, pod red. Henryka Struvego [ed. by Henryk Struve] (Warszawa: Kasa im. Mianowskiego, 1890).

² George Berkeley, *Traktat o zasadach poznania ludzkiego. Trzy dialogi między Hylasem i Filonousem*, przeł. [transl. by], J. Leszczyński J. Sosnowska (Warszawa: PWN, 1956).

³ George Berkeley, *Traktat o zasadach ludzkiego poznania, w którym poddano badaniu główne przyczyny błędów i trudności w różnych dziedzinach wiedzy oraz podstawy sceptycyzmu, ateizmu i niewiary*, przeł. [transl. by] Janusz Salamon SJ (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Zielona Sowa, 2005).

⁴ George Berkeley, *Trzy dialogi między Hylasem a Philonousem. Przeciw sceptykom i ateistom*, przeł. [transl. by] Michał Filipczuk (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Zielona Sowa, 2006).

⁵ This date together with a stamp of Seminarium Filozoficzne Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego can be seen on the script of the translation.

1988.⁶ Berkeley's *Notebooks* [*Philosophical Commentaries*] appeared in Polish in 2007 in a translation by Bartosz Żukowski.⁷

Some works exist in Polish only in parts. These are old Polish translations of the medical paragraphs of *Siris*⁸ dating from 1781 and *The Querist*⁹ made in 1751. However, they are mostly of only historical significance. As far as Berkeley's works on vision are concerned, *An Essay Towards a New Theory of Vision* and *The Theory of Vision Vindicated and Explained* were translated into Polish between 1995-1998 by Prof. Miłowit Kuniński and his students at the Jagiellonian University in Krakow, but the translations have not yet been published.

The situation of a rather poor availability of Polish translations of Berkeley's works makes access to them more difficult for the average Polish reader. Nevertheless, critical studies of his philosophy in Polish have contributed to making it more widely known. Two books can be mentioned as exemplary in this respect. One of them is a 1997 Polish translation of David Berman's short book *Berkeley: Experimental Philosophy*.¹⁰ A book with a similar aim, *Berkeley znany i nieznan* [*Berkeley known and unknown*], was written by the Polish author Beata Szymańska and published in the "Science and Knowledge for Everyone" series of the Polish Academy of Sciences (PAN) ten years earlier.¹¹

In her book Szymańska describes Berkeley not only as a British empiricist but also as a scientist and even mystic (an interpretation generally unknown to Polish readers). She

⁶ George Berkeley, *O ruchu*, [w:] in Stefan Sarnowski, *Berkeley. Zdrowy rozsądek i idealizm* (Warszawa: Klub Otrycki Colloquia Communia, 1988).

⁷ George Berkeley, *Dzienniki filozoficzne*, przeł. i oprac. [transl. and ed. by] Bartosz Żukowski (Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo "Słowo/Obraz Terytoria," 2007).

⁸ The first Polish translation is *Dwa sekreta doświadczone y dziwnie skuteczne. Pierwszy do uleczenia ludzi na różne choroby utyskujących. Drugi na przerwatę bydła tymi czasy gęsto w Polsce odchodzącego. Z języka angielskiego i niemieckiego przetłumaczone. A z prawdziwej ku ojczyźnie i ziomkom swoim miłości po kolendzie komunikowane*, tłum.[transl. by] J. A. Z[ałuski] (Warszawa 1747). This translation was reprinted in Grodno in 1781 under the title *Woda żywiczna przez sławnego biskupa angielskiego Berkeley światu ogłoszona tak na wszystkie prawie choroby ludzkie, jako też bydłat częstą zarazę morową ginących w dziwnych swych skutkach doświadczona. Z Angielskiego języka dla pożytku obywatelów a najbardziej na wsi mieszkających, krótko i dokładnie opisana* (Grodno 1781). See Anna Hochfeldowa, "Wczesne polskie przekłady Berkeleya," *Archiwum historii i myśli społecznej* 29 (1983), 267-68.

⁹ The Polish translation was an eight-page work based probably on a summary published in the *Monthly Review* in March 1750. It was titled *Excerpt niektórych refleksji z książki Angielskiej Jerzego Berkeley biskupa Cloyneńskiego, wydanej pod tytułem The Querist containing several Queries proposed to the consideration of the Public* - a z przydatkiem *Exhortacji do duchowieństwa katolickiego w Hibernyi, drukowanej w Londynie 1750, In 8^o. tłumaczonej exercitii linguae gratia przez J. Z. R. K. [Józef Andrzej Żaluski]* (Warszawa 1751). See Hochfeldowa, "Wczesne polskie przekłady Berkeleya," 269.

¹⁰ David Berman, *Berkeley: Eksperymentalna filozofia*, przeł. [transl. by] Robert Flaszak (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Amber, 1997).

¹¹ Beata Szymańska, *Berkeley znany i nieznan* (Wrocław; Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1987).

gives an overview of his life and works and, as background for understanding his ideas, provides a short presentation of the main themes in the philosophies of Descartes, Malebranche and Locke. Her discussion of Berkeley's philosophical views is organized around certain groups of problems: the character of human perception, nominalism, the forms of existence (i.e., ideas and spirits), the Molyneux problem, the *esse est percipi* formula, the proof of God's existence, monism, idealism, and the visual language theory. A separate chapter of the book is devoted to the presentation of *Siris* as a work not only rich in ideas but also in numerous references. As Szymańska points out, Berkeley's philosophical stance in *Siris* differs from his earlier one, but she sees a chance for saving the coherence in his philosophy in his visual language theory. The analyses of the book are accompanied with the question of who Berkeley was. Szymańska answers it with an inspiring account of how Berkeley was a stubborn searcher after truth who valued the act of searching as something that brings us closer to it.

Whereas Beata Szymańska's book focuses on generally unknown aspects of Berkeley's life and works, Stanisław Kijaczko's *Immaterializm: epistemologia i metafizyka. Próba interpretacji filozofii George'a Berkeley'a* [*Immaterialism: Epistemology and Metaphysics. An Interpretation of Berkeley's Philosophy*] gives a thorough academic analysis of the whole Bishop's philosophy.¹² As stated in its summary, the book aims to be "an attempt to reconstruct the methodological, epistemological and metaphysical basis of Berkeley's philosophy which, as the author claims, appears in the design of incorporating empiricist epistemology and science into a theistic metaphysics" (181). Kijaczko focuses on Berkeley's philosophy of immaterialism. He discusses its program as well as its method and shows its origins and aims in the Berkeleian system. According to Kijaczko Berkeley's immaterialism does not develop from British empiricism either as a transitional concept or as a theistic metaphysics (181). Rather, it is informed and enhanced by a theory of empiricism. In his study Kijaczko also takes up the issue of idealism. He analyses different meanings of the term "idea" including Berkeley's special use. In Kijaczko's view, ideas for Berkeley have "the status of perceived and independently existing objects which could not be explained in the framework of traditional ontology" (181). In the formula *esse est percipi aut percipere* Kijaczko shows some reference to St. Augustine's idea *quid vides ea, sunt*. The book also contains discussions of Berkeley's ethics and social philosophy as well as the importance of religion in his philosophical thought. Kijaczko addresses the problem of common sense and its ambivalence in Berkeley's philosophy, and claims that in his "justifications of moral norms and law-making and law-applying decisions" (182), Berkeley was a representative of theocentric utilitarianism. The final chapter of the book is devoted to the refutations of idealistic and realistic epistemologies by G. E. Moore and W. T. Stace respectively, as well as their analysis of the *esse est percipi* formula.

Although they contain some general information about the life and philosophy of George Berkeley, the other Polish critical studies present Berkeley's philosophical ideas in a more specialized way.

¹² Stanisław Kijaczko, *Immaterializm: epistemologia i metafizyka. Próba interpretacji filozofii George'a Berkeley'a* (Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, 2002).

The first example is the earliest Polish study on Berkeley, a book entitled *Pojęcie idei u Berkeleyya* [‘Idea’ in Berkeley’s philosophy] by Juliusz Kleiner and published in Lvov in 1910.¹³ It is a short but detailed analysis of the category of “idea” in Berkeley’s philosophy, which may be considered to be preparatory to the understanding of the whole system. Kleiner is interested in understanding the term with regard to both Berkeley’s metaphysics and epistemology. According to Kleiner, Berkeley’s use of the term throughout his works remains incoherent, because the metaphysical use of the term is contrary to the epistemological one. That is the reason, Kleiner claims, why Berkeley eliminates activities of the soul from the definition of idea, thus saving his system of metaphysics by not having to face the problem of the identity of spiritual substance and idea. Kleiner also attempts to show the differences between ‘notion’ and ‘idea’ and, in distinguishing kinds of ideas, points at the problem of ideas of affections in God.¹⁴ Kleiner concludes his little book with the following statement: “There is some inconsequence in Berkeley’s system, the source of which lies in the introduction of the metaphysical point of view into psychology and epistemology. Both inconsequence and unclearness serve as one of many proofs in philosophy for the futility of trying to eliminate the differentiation between cognition and being” (18).

It should be stressed that the concern of most Polish studies on Berkeley is the problem of subjective idealism and commonsensical realism. For instance, Roman Ingarden raised this point in his *Niektóre założenia idealizmu Berkeleyya* [Some of the tenets of Berkeley’s idealism], published in 1931 also in Lvov.¹⁵ Ingarden starts his analysis with a contention that Berkeley’s system is an example of idealism later characterized as psycho-theological. Ingarden considers its most important claims from the point of view of metaphysics, ontology and epistemology, among which Berkeley does not clearly differentiate. The Polish philosopher makes an attempt to find that difference because, he argues, it is helpful in solving the problem of idealism and realism in Berkeley’s system. Limiting himself to the *Principles of Human Knowledge*, Ingarden points out the main tenets and analyses them very thoroughly and carefully. In his opinion Berkeley lacks a clear method in his epistemic inquiries and a precise description of their relation towards those metaphysical and ontological ones. This is what confuses potential commentators on his philosophy. The mixing up of the nature of inquiries within one claim leads to its different interpretations and make a coherent commentary impossible. It is also the source of the debate on idealism and realism with regard to his philosophy. Although Ingarden argues for treating Berkeley’s thought as an example of idealism, he does not deny that there are terms and epistemic criteria which recommend a realistic interpretation.

What is characteristic about the book by Ingarden is the originality of the discourse. As he claims at the beginning, he does not repeat Berkeley’s words. As a disciple of Edmund

¹³ Juliusz Kleiner, J., *Pojęcie idei u Berkeleyya* (Lwów: Polskie Towarzystwo, 1910).

¹⁴ It was also the object of study of W. Woyczyńska in “‘Idea’ i ‘notion’ w filozofii Berkeleyya [‘Idea’ and ‘notion’ in Berkeley’s philosophy]” published in *Przegląd Powszechny* in 1928.

¹⁵ Roman Ingarden, *Niektóre założenia idealizmu Berkeleyya*, [w:] in *Księga Pamiątkowa Polskiego Towarzystwa Filozoficznego* (Lwów, 1931).

Husserl, he wants to get to the bottom of Berkeley's philosophy from the phenomenological point of view. In order to achieve his aim he uses contemporary terms, which were unknown to the Bishop. One of them is "pure consciousness," which according to Ingarden signifies Berkeley's meaning of "idea." Ingarden's choice of words, although specific, is not confusing for a reader as the author remains very conscientious in defining the newly introduced terms. If read with accuracy, the book gives a clear picture of the complexity of Berkeley's philosophical views as they were presented in *A Treatise concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*.

Ingarden's view of immanent and subjective idealism in Berkeley's philosophy was shared by Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz, a famous member of the Lvov-Warsaw School. He expressed it in two studies, an article, "Epistemologia i semantyka" ["Epistemology and Semantics"]¹⁶ and a book, *Zagadnienia i kierunki filozofii* [*Issues and trends in philosophy*].¹⁷

The theme of idealism and realism is also the object of interest of Henryk Elzenberg's "Domniemany immanentyzm Berkeleya w świetle analizy tekstów" ["The Alleged Berkeley's Immanentism in the Light of the Analysis of His Works"] published in 1964.¹⁸ But contrary to Ingarden and Ajdukiewicz, Elzenberg argues against treating Berkeley's philosophy as an example of subjective idealism. His article has three sections. He first reconstructs the *esse=percipi* thesis and points out that despite clarifications it remains open to different interpretations, especially that of immanent idealism. He then criticizes Berkeley, pointing out how both realistic and immanent interpretations of the thesis were shared simultaneously by K. Fisher, A. Fraser, and J. Laird. According to Elzenberg, realistic commentaries of Berkeley's thesis start with the publications of J. Wild and Luce's edition of Berkeley's *Philosophical Commentaries*. It should be stressed that in his criticism of treating Berkeley as an immanentist, Elzenberg does not deny that in several notes in the first notebook of *Philosophical Commentaries*, Berkeley did present an immanent view. This was, however, only an episode in his philosophical development. Against the immanent interpretation, Elzenberg critically analyses two issues, namely, the meaning of the phrase "in the mind" and the use of term "idea." He concludes his study with a statement that neither of the analyzed issues gives reasons for immanentism.

In 1988 Stefan Sarnowski published a study of Berkeley's philosophy entitled *Berkeley. Zdrowy rozsądek i idealizm* [*Berkeley. Common sense and idealism*].¹⁹ It gives a solid picture both of general philosophical tendencies in 17th and 18th century thought (e.g.,

¹⁶ Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz, "Epistemologia i semantyka," (1948) in Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz, *Język i poznanie* (Warszawa: PWN, 1965) 2: 107-117.

¹⁷ Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz, *Zagadnienia i kierunki filozofii* (Kraków: Czytelnik, 1949).

¹⁸ Henryk Elzenberg, "Domniemany immanentyzm Berkeleya w świetle analizy tekstów" (1964), in Henryk Elzenberg *Z historii filozofii* (Kraków: Znak 1995): 312-337. The article was also written in French. See Henryk Elzenberg, "L'idéalisme de Berkeley est-il un idéalisme immanent?" (1953), [w:] in Henryk Elzenberg, *Z historii filozofii* (Kraków: Znak, 1995): 258-68.

¹⁹ Stefan Sarnowski, *Berkeley. Zdrowy rozsądek i idealizm* (Warszawa: Klub Otrycki Colloquia Communia, 1988).

Bacon's experimental philosophy, empiricism, idealism, metaphilosophy, atheism) and Berkeley's life and ideas. It highlights striking parallels to Engels and Lenin when ideas on matter are discussed. What is important is that the book contains a selection of some fragments of Berkeley's works translated into Polish. This seems to make the book attractive for a wide range of readers. The book focuses on Berkeley's epistemological and ontological views. Sarnowski belongs to a group of Polish commentators who consider Berkeley to be a supporter of common sense, realism in epistemology, and spiritualism in ontology. He assumes the attribution of solipsism to Berkeley's philosophical stand to be absurd, and stresses that both idealism and immanentism were criticized by Berkeley as early as in the *Principles of Human Knowledge* and the *Three Dialogues*. In favor of the realistic interpretation of Berkeley's philosophy, Sarnowski points to its sociopolitical and economic ideas and notes that the health of body was partly an object of concern in *Siris*. In his opinion, for Berkeley the real in the world refers only to the subjects of human experience (34). Just as a materialist metaphysics supports atheism, so Berkeley's immaterialism supports his religious apologetics.

Jan Sarna's 1996 *Filozofia G. Berkeleyya: idealizm czy realizm* [*The Philosophy of George Berkeley: Idealism or Realism*] challenges Sarnowski's sympathetic interpretation of Berkeley's philosophy.²⁰ Sarna's book thematizes the problem of subjective idealism and commonsensical realism in Berkeley's philosophical system, arguing in favor of a subjective idealist reading and against commonsense realism (54). He sees the essence of Berkeley's philosophy as raising "the issue of the relationship between the subjective and the objective in sense impressions, the issue of the objective character of causality and the problem of different ways of being" (9). For Sarna, Berkeley's philosophy is "an attempt to combine subjective and idealistic epistemology with objective and idealistic ontology" (64). His aim in the book is to demonstrate the falsity of the *esse est percipi* thesis. He claims that it can be true only with regard to pictures of imagination. Otherwise it is false because, as he writes, our perceiving of things is not necessary for their existence. If not for God in whose creative activity ideas exist, human souls would not be able to have perceptions. For Berkeley, the world results from God's freely acting on human minds. But this does not require the existence of spiritual substances, and in accepting their existence Berkeley contradicts the epistemic consequences of his doctrine. Throughout his writings (even in *Siris*), Berkeley consistently maintains his sensualist views. But in accepting the existence of a God who is sensually unperceived, Berkeley gives up being a sensualist. He does this to avoid solipsism and the anti-Christian religious implications of such a position. This, Sarna concludes, is an overriding concern for Berkeley, especially regarding his ethics.

In the light of the above studies on Berkeley's philosophy, it may be claimed that Polish studies focus mostly on commenting on Berkeley's *esse est percipi* thesis. A reader can find supporters of treating his philosophy as an example of both subjective idealism and realism. However, it seems that Polish commentators tend to accept the former view. This

²⁰ Jan Sarna, *Filozofia G. Berkeleyya: idealizm czy realizm* (Opole : Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, 1996).

is also the view defended in the recent Polish Encyclopedia of Philosophy.²¹ Thus, the general Polish readership may identify Berkeley's philosophy mostly with subjective idealism and immanentism.

Even though the debate about his idealism versus realism has been the central topic of much Polish Berkeley scholarship, other issues have arisen as well, particularly his theology and theory of vision. For example, in "Kryzys teologii naturalnej: George Berkeley" ["The Crisis in Natural Theology: George Berkeley"] (1971)²² and "George Berkeley wobec teologii naturalnej" ["George Berkeley and Natural Theology"] (1980),²³ Anna Hochfeldowa deals with the problem of apologetics and natural theology in Berkeley's philosophy. Highlighting its great importance with regard to the Bishop's philosophy, she claims that Berkeley's theology was not traditional and rational. Instead, she describes it as "an early forerunner of the shift in the development of theological thought which found its full expression in the writings of Cardinal Newman."²⁴ Berkeley's theology is also the focus of "Teologia Berkeley'a" ["Berkeley's Theology"] by Adam Drozdek (1997).²⁵ The problem of Berkeley's religious apologetics has been discussed recently in Adam Płachciak's (2004) "Świat Berkeley'a jako epifania Boga" ["Berkeley's World as God's Epiphany"].²⁶

Berkeley's theory of vision has also been the object of recent Polish studies. Stefan Zabieglik's "Berkeley'a teoria widzenia" ["Berkeley's theory of vision"] summarizes the theories of vision and visual language described in Berkeley's *Essay towards a New Theory of Vision* (1709) and *Theory of Vision, or Visual Language* (1733) but does not delve critically into the central issues raised by Berkeley's remarks.²⁷

By contrast, Przemysław Spryszak's 2004 *Filozofia percepcji George'a Berkeley'a* [*George Berkeley's Philosophy of Perception*]²⁸ is an excellent critical study of Berkeley's theory of vision.²⁹ In the opinion of its reviewer, Miłowit Kuniński, Spryszak's book "gets to the essence of [Berkeley's] philosophy, to the problems which are the crucial for understanding not only the Bishop's philosophical system but also

²¹ Jerzy Tupikowski, "Berkeley," in *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii*, red. [Ed.] A. Maryniarczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2000), 1: 534-37.

²² Anna Hochfeldowa, "Kryzys teologii naturalnej: George Berkeley," *Archiwum historii filozofii i myśli społecznej* 17 (1971): 169-206.

²³ Anna Hochfeldowa, "George Berkeley wobec teologii naturalnej," *Człowiek i światopogląd* 7 (1980): 34-42.

²⁴ Hochfeldowa, "Kryzys teologii naturalnej," 206.

²⁵ Adam Drozdek, "Teologia Berkeley'a," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 33 (1997): 124-32.

²⁶ Adam Płachciak, "Świat Berkeley'a jako epifania Boga," *Przegląd Religioznawczy* 2 (2004): 37-42.

²⁷ Stefan Zabieglik, "Berkeley'a teoria widzenia," *Principia* 27-28 (2000): 171-85.

²⁸ Przemysław Spryszak, *Filozofia percepcji George'a Berkeley'a* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ, 2004).

²⁹ Spryszak also wrote an article on Berkeley's doctrine of mediate perception entitled "Postrzeganie 'pośrednie': Analiza wybranych tez 'Nowej teorii widzenia' G. Berkeley'a," *Principia* 27-28 (2000): 187-208.

contemporary philosophy of mind and epistemology in general.”³⁰ Spryszak initially discusses general problems of the philosophy of perception and subsequently points out which of them are dealt with more or less consciously by Berkeley. After reviewing Berkeley’s method of philosophizing and the main tenets of his philosophy and theory of vision, he analyzes two crucial terms in Berkeley’s thought, mediate and immediate perception. In Spryszak’s view, Berkeley’s definition of immediate perception lacks precision and as such raises difficulties that could have been avoided if perception had not been defined as an activity but rather as a state. What follows is a discussion of the definition of ideas and their kinds as different objects of perception. Special attention is devoted to the problem of the experience of colors and sounds. Spryszak considers the meaning of the *esse est percipi* formula and how it raises the problem of representationalism and realism. He points out that Berkeley’s criticism of representationalism is grounded on weak premises, and he concludes that Berkeley’s treatment of things as conglomerates of immediately perceived objects remains contrary to common assumptions about the nature of sensual perception. By developing a criterion for judging Berkeley’s realism, Spryszak provides a means for addressing the problem of whether Berkeley’s stance is an example of realism or subjective idealism. Specifically, a real thing is continuous, complex, dimensional, and related to the mind. But Berkeley ends up rejecting this last feature, claiming that ideas are independent of the subject’s will. According to Spryszak the realism of perceived objects makes it impossible to treat them as sensual impressions of the mind. Nonetheless, a sensation of pain whose existence is subject-dependent might exist outside of a mind. As Spryszak puts it, what Berkeley seems to dismiss is still theoretically possible.

Even though no other books on Berkeley’s thought have been published in Polish since 2004, interest in his thought has not diminished. Kijaczko, Sarnowski, and Spryszak still work on Berkeley, and other commentators continue to publish articles on his philosophy. As I have indicated, many different Polish scholars since 1910 (including well-known figures such as Ingarden, Ajdukiewicz, and Elzenberg) have discussed Berkeley, but in most cases the main focus of studies is his epistemology or ontology. Work on his theology and theory of vision has been limited, and even though commentators are aware of his ethics and socio-political philosophy, no thorough analysis of this aspect of his thought has yet appeared in Polish. That situation may change as more scholars become interested in Berkeley. According to data presented by the Polish National Library, six articles have been published since 2005. This is three times more than in the period between 1996 and 2004. A similar process of change may be anticipated with regard to the scope of problems under discussion on Berkeley in Poland. Hopefully, we may expect that the recent translation of the *Philosophical Commentaries* will turn out to be a great opportunity for the debate to be broadened and to be made popular among the wider readership in Poland.³¹

³⁰ Miłowit Kuniński, *Recenzja pracy doktorskiej p. mgra Przemysława Spryszaka pt. ‘Filozofia percepcji George’a Berkeley’a’* (Kraków, 2001), 1.

³¹ I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Miłowit Kuniński for his helpful hints and support in preparing this article.

Jagiellonian University
martaewa.szymanska@gmail.com