

Roman Ingarden

Lectures on aesthetics

Literary Studies in Poland 11, 15-37

1983

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Roman Ingarden

Lectures on Aesthetics

Lecture Thirteen

It can give us perhaps a better insight into the problem at stake here, namely the problem of relationship of the ontological, particularly physical foundation to a completed work of art.

Perhaps the problem looks simplest and clearest in the case of literary works. Immediately let us introduce certain constraints: an oeuvre in the sense I want to refer to here is literary when formulated in a given language and primarily in spoken form of it. Naturally, there are also written works. But then the matter becomes complicated because on the one hand we have this recording and on the other a creation in which there is a sound factor. Within a certain period of time or in certain languages—it may seem that the problem of written works or record is something that altogether does not belong to a literary *oeuvre*, that we should then limit a literary work of art only to those pieces which are vocalized or spoken, to use another phrase. But it also is a fallible view. Thus we have to explain certain issues: participation or coparticipation of the following fragments or elements of a literary work of art: the graphic side, that means the recording, the aspects or if you will stratum of the language sound, linguistic-sonic we may call it. This is a body of linguistic sounds of a linguistic creations, and here I am not saying “words” at all—because this is only a special case of this sound element in a literary work. The third element or stratum is the stratum of senses, meanings somehow related to the sound creation and perhaps also to the graphic creation, or the record.

The fourth one is the stratum of what we talk about, i.e. the stratum of objects represented—and here the word “object” is used rather loosely, it may stand both for things as well as for people, processes or events. And, finally, there is in this register a fifth element—the element of external appearances, generally speaking an element of visual perception in the literary art. All of them are somehow inter-related and in such a way that if we take particular phases of a literary work, this second aspect of development of a literary work from the beginning to the end, then in each of its phases there appear diverse strata of literary works of art as given above. As I just said they are diverse but I did not say “all of them”—because first of all there is an issue how it is with this graphic recording and secondly, now, there is a certain difficulty about these external appearances, about this visual perception which occurs in a literary work of art. At any rate, at least some of these elements must co-occur in order to make up a phase of a literary work of art.

The second aspect is already not a multi-stratum one but a multi-phase aspect of a literary work. Every oeuvre of literature consists of at least one sentence—a single word does not create a literary work of art unless accompanied by an exclamation mark or something like that so that it could be regarded a kind of acronymic sentence. Consequently, the minimal unit of sense which comes into play here is a sentence. How and of what that sentence is constructed is a new question and in many languages it can be solved in different ways since it depends on the structure of a given language. In general, the analyses performed in this country are implemented with a certain specific linguistic material, namely, with the Indo-European languages. How these problems appear, for example, in Chinese or in various Indian languages is not for me to comment on here. I simply do not know much about it.*

It is an open question whether analyses I carried out in my book are also applicable to products in Chinese or Indian languages of one or another type. In effect, the validity scope of my statements that are considered true is not so vast perhaps as to embrace

* Professor Milewski studies the matter in Poland.

all human languages in total. I do not want to engage myself in that issue, perhaps it is so, perhaps it is not.

Let us now deal a little closer with the role of the graphic or possibly sonic factors. I said that in different periods of time things could look differently. But undoubtedly such a period existed when men were recounting diverse tales and histories while being unable to jot them down. Writing as such was not known then and even if it was it had been mastered by only a select group, so, in effect, literary works of art were transmitted by oral communication. It simply was necessary to know how to memorize them, repeat, tell long tales, or even sing. When a form of taking record became available—one or another, it is quite immaterial, be it a writing system using Latin alphabet or Greek or the cuneiforms, or still something else, some writing system anyway—it could seem at first that this writing and the sound are two completely different things, totally independent of each other and not creating any unit or entity with the framework of a literary work of art. Particularly since only a few were able to read and write. Yes, we can say the following: literary works of art totally devoid of the graphic factor were and are possible. But then this graphic factor virtually began to co-occur with the sonic one and today we are so much accustomed to it that for us, if I may say so, the “physical” aspect—it is erroneous wording but let us leave it aside for the moment—of a word or a language is “doubleformed” as it were: next to the visual aspect, a certain graphic record, there is a phonetic aspect of the vocal sound. Once we master a given language well enough then both aspects somehow conflate. When speaking we sometimes imagine a sort of graphic shape; while writing, or reading, we recall the sound form of the word. So there is some sort of “doublefacedness” of the “physical” aspect of the word and of a language in general. If, in addition, it seems to us that writing is phonetically perfect (which, naturally is a gross prejudice since there is no strictly phonetic writing, it is always more or less non-phonetic; and the degree to which it is non-phonetic we learn about when leaving our native tongue that we consider written phonetically)—then this “physical” side of the word in terms of sound and sight seems to us as if growing together in one entity. When, however, we understand that phonetic writing is an unreachable goal then we realize that the sound of word

and its graphic image or record are two different signs. We realize this when we start in operating with a foreign language. Let us suppose that we are in a situation where we come into contact with English first *via* printing and then they start talking to us, etc. At the moment we talk mostly with those who arrived to visit us, or who were learning here and somehow we understand them, and then one day you suddenly land in London or New York and you are frightened because you understand absolutely nothing. The graphic aspects of the word which you considered a physical reconstruction of sonic words is so different that listening to a word in its phonetic form you cannot at all link that phonetic shape of the language with its graphic aspect. Especially if someone was learning the Latin alphabet and then suddenly found himself in the area of the English alphabet where the phonetic value of *i* is other than the Polish *i*, usually closer to Polish *aj*, and the English *e* is *i* in Polish, etc. They are taught this from the very beginning but we entered and grew up within the realm of the Latin variety of the alphabet, even keeping Latin names for letters. It is quite an interesting thing that today, in fact, there exist two English languages; I do not want to talk about the British and the American varieties and that there exist diverse slangs, etc. but at any rate there are the printed and the spoken forms of the language. Similarly, there are two French languages—the printed and the spoken, and naturally there are also two Polish languages, the printed and the spoken, except that we do not realize this as clearly until we meet with a proposal to accept a new way of spelling and they tell us to write *nusz w bżuhu*, *nusz* instead of *nóż*, etc., then we get annoyed and ask why these words are to be written like that since after all it would be simplest to write the way we write. Then we become aware of the discrepancies between the written and the spoken forms of language. Due to these differences when we read Homer in Greek today we actually have no Homer in the original since we only have Greek records; we allegedly know how to read it but was it really read that way or is it truly the original Greek or the Neo-Greek, is this the original and proper one, the element of the work of literary art, well, we do not know it. There is a wide range of varieties which we cannot analyze very precisely. In Latin the situation is the same — when a small boy I used to say “spacium” and now we say “spatium.” or “Cycero”

turned into "Kikero," "Kezar," etc. Philologists tell us now that this is the way to pronounce but for example when you go to Paris and the Gospel is read from the pulpit you absolutely cannot comprehend the Latin text that you know because it is pronounced in a completely different manner. Why that particular pronunciation is to be much better than ours is not clear to me; in Italy they pronounce it in still a different way and I will not even mention how they read Latin in America. It shows here that at such immaterial things as a news item from journalists or any other news item it does not matter whether something is pronounced in a way slightly different from the written text as long as the communication process is on. In a work that is to be an oeuvre of literature in the sense of the work of art that problem begins to grow very important—what form of the vocalized language is linked with what form of written language in order to become an element of a work of literary art. For people reading in their native tongue it is a normal thing and situation that the physical side of the word has, so to say, two faces—graphic and sonic. And that structure of that aspect of language which is factual plays an essential role in the entire construction of a literary work of art. What is important here is not only the adequateness of pronunciation of particular words in relation to the picture which the graphic signs are but primarily the matter of boundaries of the word form—we speak so rapidly, and are not aware of that, that one word links with another; it is a wave of sounds and knowing a language well we discern individual words, phonetic units. When, however, my mastery of a foreign language is not good then the first difficulty I come across is to hear individual words in that wave of vocal sounds. When I have them in a written text there are no such difficulties because every word is written in isolation, there is a break between one word and another (it was not always so since there were times when writing involved a continuum of signs—in old manuscripts). In the graphic form of language there is a multiplicity of elements and these elements are individual words. In the sound form this multiplicity is realized because we have grown accustomed to see the word in its graphic shape and that shape immediately slices the entire wave of spoken sounds in an utterance into particular words. It does happen that in live speech we make breaks between words; I do not know at the moment

what language that is, I think it must be Oriental, that I tune in on the ratio at times—someone speaks very rapidly but between each word I hear stops, some split-of-a-second long fractions between one word and another, so that immediately the whole thing breaks up sonically as if into a string of pearls. But when I listen to the French or the English the wave keeps coming—and I suppose it is the same when I speak Polish—and then it is necessary to isolate units in it. Here the visual form of the literary work is of help. Similarly, the visual limits of language units of higher order, i.e. clauses or phrases within the sentence framework, these so-called diverse graphic stops are also marked, in speech they are relatively clear and in our everyday life we often do fail to realize how varied they are; the marking of a comma or a full stop or some other pause—I can hear all this only when I listen, for example, to my own speech recorded on tape. In marking various stops in the sound version of a text we are also helped by special graphic signs, commas, semicolons, full stops or exclamation marks, etc. In my opinion, since every such a stop is not due only to the functioning of our breathing mechanism—although it is also related to it—such a stop has also a function in the logical structure of language, of a linguistic creation, then such signs called “punctuation” are getting a wrong name since indeed they are logical signs which mark the logical structure of a given language formation, not in the vocalic but in the semantic sense.

Well, but what is this graphic formation or vocalic formation that belongs to a work of literature? I agree that graphic signs also belong to a literary work somehow. A certain book was printed, let's say, in 1000 copies, and what does it really mean? One thousand copies—this means one thousand slips of paper or something else covered with print. There is a thousand graphic signs or let us put in a better way, drawings of these signs—one thousand is the same number as the number of the copies—and these particular drawings are nothing else but a certain quantity of some chemical substance glued onto another chemical substance which may be paper, for example—in other words, it is printing ink and some sort of paper. And of course this is one thousand physical entities which undergo change in a natural way, becoming warmer, colder, faded from light, etc., and they differ among themselves. Not only there are many of them but they are also different, namely in one spot the

printing ink stuck better to the paper producing a good imprint of a letter and in another place it looks worse, in one spot the image is blurred, in another a piece of a letter is missing, etc. — if we looked at all this through a magnifying glass or a microscope it would turn out that each of those blotches of ink is quite different from one another, although we say the same word is written. What is this “same written word”?—that means the same graphic symbol of a word—is it a physical object?—No. Physical objects here are these one thousand drawings; in addition, we cannot even say, just as it is said in Poland by logisticians and positivists who always like *die Schwereinerei lokalisieren*—that it is a mono-shaped inscription, the word is a monoshaped inscription; “monoshaped inscriptions” is a technical terminus here. Thus we have one thousand physical objects, words are inscriptions, sentences are inscriptions, there is one thousand objects of similar shape, and it is said that they are very similar to one another, they are not identical because they cannot be, they certainly differ in their shape, not only in their chemical composition and they are also differing in details. If you have a good magnifying glass or a microscope then it can be revealed that the shapes differ very much from one another and that an identical shape is simply not there. This is fiction if one speaks of the same shape. But it is not fiction if we say that what is a graphic representation of the word is a single shape, the same that can be found in many more or less similar physical objects, it can be so to say imputed to this physical object which shows one and the same identical shape. This “one shape” is not a physical object any more but something which appears on a physical object, provided that my attitude while I am reading is appropriate. But it is not yet a word symbol because in order to become one this single shape which I impute in my perceptual attitude, and ascribe to an individual object, something else must be added. Namely, this shape must have a function that is not strictly speaking a physical function but a function of sign symbol. It is not some kind of blackness or this or that colour on paper—since in itself it cannot play a role of this type, it is nothing of physical quality. Physical, may be shape or temperature, this or that kind of movement, reflection of light rays in one way or another, positioning of magnetic fields in one or another deployment; to be a sign of something, well, not a single physical object can do it in and by

itself, it is nothing physical, it cannot be registered with any observation, physical apparatus. Sentences or words are not simply inscriptions—these are inscriptions with some specific feature or function (as you like) that is somehow fulfilled by that single shape which reveals itself to us on many diverse physical objects with a certain special attitude on our part.

These physical objects are only ontological foundations, which must be joined by some psychic subject and used in a certain way in order to have a typical graphic shape of word revealed, which now I must endow with a separate function of being a representative of certain meaning, pointing to something, referring to something, etc. This does not overlap with the so-called physical aspect of the word. The same applies to the sound form of the word. We must distinguish very clearly the vocal material which I produce to attain the word-sound effect, which is new each time, which at its basis (in a physical sense) has a certain body of waves in an elastic medium. What we come in touch with is not the body of waves in the elastic medium itself, it is only now a certain specific form of physical objects that appears to us, namely sound quality, a sound formation conditioned on the one hand by configuration of waves in the elastic medium and on the other by a person who receives this configuration of waves through the ear and neurocenters and in effect experiences perception of the sound. But this is already something entirely different, something which is not similar to the waves of the elastic medium. But even this concrete sound that I produce is not identical with the word-sound. The word *pies* (dog) in Polish is one, or in other words, it has one word-sound, but if I repeated it two or three times then each time I produced somewhat different concrete sound forms, different vocal material, slightly different because one time I said it slightly louder, or with a little lower voice, another time—very sharply or very softly, with hoarser or less hoarse voice, at one time I spoke with my usual voice, next time I did it the way my wife does it, rising the pitch of my voice, etc. All these changes which take place between those vocal materials are certain realia which belong to the world of some vibrating medium. But these are not the elements of language.

I do not claim that only purely language sound-form of the word belongs to the work of literature—something else belongs there.

too: the enunciation, tone with which one speaks—again typical and not individual—all these somehow belong to the literary oeuvre (as we shall see later, it applies in particular to dramas). But at this point I am only referring to the fact that the word-sound is neither a configuration of waves within an elastic medium, nor it is a concrete sound, vocal material produced by myself but it is a certain typical sound-form on the background of vocal material which reveals to myself when I take an appropriate perceptual attitude. Thus I can listen to vocal material without having any words. In this way I usually listen to the barking of my dog, where some vocal materials present themselves to me and I do not take them for the sound-form of words which my dog addresses to me. In certain situations today when I already know this dog very well and know his behaviour I realize that he not only produces certain sound material but is barking, as I say, in a characteristic manner: now he wants to go for a walk and is angry with me if I sit home too long while he should have been out long ago. Or he comes to me, positions himself behind me and produces a low growl—this a matter of a quasi-word, he somehow signals something to me, I already know what because I have learned it. Consequently, not only within the range of human language but also within the framework of some modes of behaviour of animals towards us we can be either oriented on pure vocal material or we can treat it as the sound of one word or another from a specific language. Only those typical word forms that are nothing physical consist for elements of a literary *oeuvre*.

Lecture Fourteen

May 24, 1960

Last time I talked about the ontological foundation of a work of literature in contrast with itself and I distinguished between the vocal material from the sounding of word (analogically, it is necessary to separate writing from auditory form of word). Writing can either be equally diversified, non-homogenous, as the vocal material of particular individuals reading or singing a given work, or in a certain way it can approximate the sound of word. Namely, I was saying that the sound of word in a language is a certain typical form, typical sound quality, one and the same, appearing on diverse backgrounds of voice material. The writing of individual persons is as

variable and diversified as voice is, a concrete voice material or manners of speaking. On the other hand, printing or even the writing used in copying books e.g. in medieval times, are both equally typified to the same extent as word sound is. The point is to retain possibly the same graphic shape that is repeated multiply as very similar. Naturally, this shape is never identical because printing ink may stick to paper in different ways. nevertheless that special form of print *resp.* writing, artificial writing, so to say, used in copies and incunabula, old manuscripts, points to the fact that in formal terms writing was adapted to word sounds as typical entities. It is one of the arguments for saying that word is not a concrete sound but a typical sound entity revealing itself in that concrete sound. In both instances there is a greater or lesser similarity between a concrete vocal material and a typical sounding and that similarity may be relatively far advanced. In general, however, it is rather relatively limited similarity and therefore we must very skilfully orient ourselves precisely on that typical sounding in order to understand our interlocutor, especially if it is a language foreign to us that we do not use in our everyday life. Even if we deal with a Polish dialect, a provincial mode of speaking alien to us, also here we must abstract from diverse detail of the mode of speaking and aim at this allegedly revealing itself to us form of the Polish language that we are listening to. Thus any similarity between a literary work and its physical foundation takes place only as the said approximated form of concrete material in relation to word sound. Because all the rest present in a literary work, i.e. meaning, presented object, appearance—goes beyond what can be approximated by vocal material. A literary work cannot be identified with this concrete vocal material *resp.* drawings. What is more—it cannot be done because the three remaining strata and all of their properties go beyond what can be realized in vocal material *resp.* in drawing. When someone says that a sentence is an inscription on the blackboard commits a falsity since the inscription, that is a certain quantity of chalk on the blackboard, may have properties of some similarity or subordination, at least some formal resemblance in relation to the typization, but as regards other matters connected with setting up some order between word-sound and that drawing there is no meaning on the blackboard, no presented object nor appearance, etc. Therefore, we speak of a theory of sentences which

claims that sentences are inscriptions, that it is a physicalistic concept of sentence, analogically as in the case of the psychologistic concept in which sentence meaning and also its sound are identified with certain conscious experiences. Both these concepts are false but I cannot remain with it here.

One more thing has to be kept in mind at this point. A work of literature consists not only of words but also of sentences *resp.* a certain multiplicity of words ordered in some way and linked into an entity by their meanings. Now, when we are talking about word-sounds, their characteristic is their being some phonetic units, certain forms appearing sequentially but not linked into a continuum just like meanings of particular words do form a continuum. And one more thing that calls for attention. I do not know if anyone here has heard of it—maybe there is a philologist or a linguist here—there exists the so-called sentence intonation, that is, certain words within a sentence functioning in it as a subject, verb, attribute or some pronoun etc. are sequenced in a certain way and in a certain way they are, so to say, intoned by the speaker; there are special ways of stressing the subject or the verb. I am not talking about those special ways of “intoning” or the sing-song used by the French, who utter a sentence with a certain melody—we are talking about the sentence tune or sentence intonation. This tune or intonation of sentences is of course realized in some concrete vocal material—but here we must distinguish between an individual case of intonation and typical sentence intonation characteristic for a given language; it is different in Polish, other in German, still other in English or French, etc. It is simply a purely formal auditory equivalent of sentence structure and it is subordinated to it. In German there is the so-called *Wortfolge*, i.e. certain rules of sequencing of particular words—first must be the subject, then the verb, then something else, and so forth; if we deal with a clause, a relative clause, the verb must land at the very end of one sentence or else we make a mistake. If there is the so-called inverted word order, if a sentence begins with some other part rather than with the subject, then that part must be followed first by the verb, then the subject, etc. All these rules on word order are accompanied by appropriate sentence intonations—when I speak German and first produce the subject, follow it with a relative clause as a closer

description of that subject then I must, of course, hold my breath long enough to utter that verb since I must mark that the verb belongs to the words in the clause, yet at the same time I must breathe in such a way that no one should think it is the end of the sentence, that he knew that later on, after the relative clause comes the main clause, or the verb, or something like that. Thus, diverse syntactic structures are already marked by appropriate modes of uttering as regards the sense of the sentence, marked by appropriate sounding of sentences which as typical ought to be distinguished from individual concrete utterance, which naturally is an individual object that varies, depending on any given instance.

One more thing must be raised concerning the sound aspect of a work of literature and its physical individual base. The word, namely, has different functions to fulfil—one of those functions is the possession of meaning and designation with this meaning a given object, a given state of affairs, as regards sentence. This is what one of the 20th-century language theorists, Bühler, calls the function of representation or *Darstellungsfunktion*. It was Bühler who properly used the term that had been introduced earlier by others. He defined with it the function of word based on representation of objects or states owing to the fact that word has meaning. Besides this function of representation, that is, besides reference of a word—a noun or a verb—to something else owing to its meaning, there are also other functions of the spoken word—the expressive function, expressing what goes on within a given speaker in psychic *resp.* psycho-physical terms. Thus someone uttering a word in anger emits it with some excitement, violently, etc., someone else produces words a bit monotonously, unclearly, without intonation—then we say this mode of speaking expresses tiredness. Briefly, it is what is called the tone of speaking—we say: “He used this or that tone when talking to me.” This tone functions as an unwitting source of information for the hearer, telling him about what is with the speaker, about his psychic states, experiences, joys or sorrows, and such like. We say: “He said it to me with a sharp tone”—and it means that the speaker either willingly or unwittingly wanted to express his anger; or we say: “He spoke to him with such advance kindness that the other felt completely overwhelmed” etc. He could equally be speaking using

indulgent tone, kind tone, the tone of someone in love etc. All what happens on stage or show ramp is classified as declamation, i.e. artificial realization of the expressive function which then is not related to the sense or meaning but to a psychic state of the speaker and somehow reveals that mental state.

How it happens that the expressive function reveals mental states and is completely different from the function of meaning, of designation function in particular—these are especially difficult problems in the theory of language which, naturally, I cannot tackle here. It is a general belief that it is easier to understand what is expressed i.e. by means of the expressive function, than to grasp the content or intellectual sense of a given speech. It is said for example, although I do not know if it is justified, that dog understands his master in such a way that indeed it does not understand, i.e. does not know the Polish language, does not know what it means as they say—but from the tone of his master's voice it can figure out whether the master is angry with it or gives an order or shows a friendly attitude to it—it means the expressive function is embraced and actualized here. It is commonly believed, however, that dog does not understand the sense or meaning of words spoken to it. It is an experience easy to meet with and supported by the general thesis that in a live language we more easily grasp the expressive function than the representative function realized by meaning. I think that at least in regard to some domestic animals, dogs, cats, cows, etc. it is not true that they react only to the tone and expressiveness since, a strange thing to notice, we can say something with the same tone in Polish, or in English or in French—and the dog either reacts or does not react at all depending on the dog being accustomed to a given language, on his “learning” or not of that language. On various occasions in the United States I asked in Polish families in what language their dogs should be addressed—English or Polish—otherwise it would not react. Certainly the dog is aware of the expressive function and reacts to it but it seems it also reacts to something else. In some way it realizes the sense of what is being said to it. What is the miracle that works here is a problem in itself which, however, is not any more difficult than a question what makes a child understand some day that it is being

spoken to, that is, how it begins to realize that these are not simple sounds but that these sounds consist for an object with an order and in this way mean or possibly designate something.

The expressive function is fulfilled in general by concrete vocal material, by this sound form that is realized in a given conversation. Naturally, if later on we use it in declamation then we typify again—those who declaim or actors learn these typical ways of speaking which express certain mental or psychic states. There was a famous actor named Żółkowski, a comedian from Warsaw, who one day came to the post office and while talking to the girl selling postage stamps he started stammering awfully. She says: “Mr. Żółkowski, we all know you very well from the stage, you speak so well, why are you playing tricks now pretending you stammer,” and to that he says: “When on stage I only pretend I do not stammer.” It is a good joke, of course, and that is besides the point. But somehow actors pretend on stage, pretend to be sad or joyful, and produce typical behaviour that goes with such moods, particularly the typical sound forms of concrete vocal material. Yet it is known that this typization is much more difficult to attain here than in the case of typical sound form as an element of language. Different actors have, so to say, different methods for vocalization of various psychic states and some of these methods carry greater—as we say—expressiveness, others lesser, but at the same time they fulfil in effect the more important aesthetic functions, etc.

The expressive function typified in some vocal material also belongs to at least some literary works, namely to all those in texts of which there are quotations of words used by *dramatis personae*. The simplest example is any drama written or printed and then, naturally, put on stage. In such a work of literature we have simple quotation of the persons speaking. Also in some novels—depending on a category of novel—the author often resorts to plain quoting of words, entire conversations between some people, him and her, or some gentlemen, etc. But in graphic work in particular this expressive function is not marked at all, graphics is used only to outline the word meaning while intonation is physically unmarked, it is not typified, it simply is not there and one has to use one’s imagination as to what is the tone when the characters talk, quarrel or make love, etc. This is why in drama, for instance, there is so

much room for talents and intuition of actors but also of directors. Directors suggest in which way a given play ought to be performed, that means, what intonation ought to be applied to particular sequences in order to fulfil the expressive function.

Besides this there are also other functions—functions of impressing or affecting the spectator or listener, these functions being understood in a broad sense. The impression relies on triggering in the listener his understanding of the sense but it also affects the listener differently, in such a way that he begins to correspond in sadness, joy or reacts to this joy with sadness, with sadness to joy, with fear to anger, etc. That is this further function of affecting the listener and this affecting has multiple features since first of all it evokes understanding, that is mental acts with the same meaning or with the same meaning adopted in a given text in a given language. It is one of the functions of impressing or affecting. Another one consists in evoking comprehension not of the sense but of the function of expressiveness typified somehow in a given work. Then there is the impressing by evoking of diverse emotional states, some or other, depending on the text of a literary work and on the mode of utterance, i.e. on typified vocal material in its tone. And finally, there is one more thing playing a role in the affecting function, namely evoking in the listener more or less vivid imaginary pictures—so that the listener not only understands what is spoken to him but also visualizes in the form of more or less adequate, more or less vivid images from this or that domain, which can be visual, auditory or olfactory in nature, etc., or a series of such images that again are typical and belong to the work of art—these are the very external looks that I talked about as constituting one of the strata of a literary work of art.

But there is one more thing—we must draw attention to certain details of the so-called typical form of word, i.e. details of what I call word-sound. Namely, it should not be surmised that word-sound is only a phonetic formation, purely sonic. Naturally, I am talking about a living language now. When I say living I do not only mean one actually spoken now, but a live language used today in everyday life between subjects of all kinds who understand one another, speaking the same common language. At least some words are such that sounds of these words against, so to say, background

of the purely phonetic element display certain emotional, extra-sonic character and yet closely related to that sound. To say emotional character is perhaps too big a word. Yet some aspects of something non-physical but psychical, non-vocalic settle in this sound and characterize it in a special way. Examples from various domains are abundant in which it can be perceived that a given word in a given usage also includes some sort of extra-phonetic character imposed on the very word-sound. For example, one of German philosophers of language, Julius Stenzel—a former professor in Halle, dead now because Hitlerites killed him during the war—produced several editions of a book *Sprachphilosophie*, giving in it the following example: the first situation is taken from the Bible, it is the story of Job, who was a very wealthy man and lost everything one day etc. but in humility he says “Lord [Herr] gave, Lord [Herr] hath taken away”. This is one example. The other is set in a house at the time when there still existed the so-called *Stubmädchen* or housemaids, and the professor was going out to his lecture hall and forgot to take his umbrella from home. A maid enters and the lady of the house says to her: “*Herr* forgot his umbrella.” Well, this word “Herr” sounds differently in those two situations—not phonetically of course, even though there are slight differences in the two pronunciations because in the first case we are talking about the Lord and in the other about the master of the house. Even if we take the word ‘Herr’ in less contrastive applications than when once we talk about the Lord and then about the master of the house, and the pathos accent is gone, even then there is some difference in sound when we use the word ‘Herr’ for the head of a family and for some man in the street also called “Herr”. We know that when someone says “master” it means the owner of a house, the head of a family, etc.—and it is something quite different in meaning from some “Herr” who was walking along the street and say, broke his leg. So also in these instances there are some very distinct specific extra-sonic characters that add colour to the word-sound.

Another example from everyday life: there are the so-called dirty words. In what way are they dirty?—in what they designate?—no, because it is known that medicine in particular created numerous artificial terms that are used just to avoid using certain words regarded as vulgar, somehow dirty. The point is not to evoke someone’s

embarrassment in some situations by vulgarly naming a part of the body that must be named because it must be treated, for instance. So there is a word artificially introduced to an existing language and that word is not foul. There are words that at certain time are quite neutral as names for some social functions and later on that function becomes looked upon with contempt; for this reason we do not say today "maid-servant" because it sounds offensive. you must say "house help" otherwise it is impolite to address someone this way, or rather it is undemocratic. Why is it impolite?—after all we are talking about the same thing; meaning is not the cause of that impoliteness or contempt. Today we say "superintendent of the house," even though it already is regarded a bit contemptuous but in the past people used to say "gatekeeper" and there was nothing offensive in it—this is a social, very important function. Naturally, I believe that a pure voice phonemat, a typical one, is neither vulgar nor pathetic. It is the character that is marked on word and the phenomenon is associated with not only the so-called "strong" words but also concerns words that are non-descript in character, are very colloquial or refined or very elegant (*feine Worte* as Germans put it). They bear these characters on account of their sound. Partly it is related to the character of an object under discussion. They somehow follow from that objective character. But it is strange that in many instances terminology introduced artificially, e.g. medical terms, does not undergo vulgarization or does not acquire impolite character in spite of the fact that the object is the same and the meaning is the same, even more precise one since it was established by medical procedures. This consequently must also draw attention because the emotional characters, roughly calling them that way, can appear *in concreto* but generally they are typical, they are certain types of sound forms and these very typical sound forms are a component of a literary work of art.

Poet uses consciously words of certain sound forms, because they can fulfil a function in the entire organism of a literary work owing to those characters, particularly as regards pure lyrical work and not descriptive (I do not consider descriptive poetry as lyrical at all). Similarly we may speak about drama, comedy; here emotional characters of the word-sounds are very significant and have a very essential function to fulfil. We must realize that a drama, tragedy,

either ancient classical or that by Ibsen or any other are written in different languages. If we take Wyspiański, for example, and French comedy, it becomes clear. Concerning Polish literature, we may juxtapose e.g. Fredro and Mickiewicz's *Dziady* (*Forefathers' Eve*). It is the same epoch and in addition Fredro's verse was shaped after Mickiewicz, so in a sense it is Mickiewicz's language but one plays a dramatic role—here I mean “The Great Improvisation” or something like it, and the other functions by introducing certain atmosphere of joviality, etc. Yes, indeed, these are very essential matters.

It is an interesting thing—and student of Polish knows it—that if someone compares for example *Pan Tadeusz* and Słowacki's *Król Duch* (*King Spirit*) in terms of emotional characters, the difference in rhythm of the two works is negligible, one being a 13-syllable meter and the other 11-syllable meter—and yet it is a very significant difference, very difficult to define and analyze, in the emotional character of the sound of entire text where in both instances purely melodic formations are imposing to such an extent that it is possible to hear the entire melody of the verse of *Pan Tadeusz* and of the verse of *Król Duch*. This melody takes shape regardless of what concrete words develop there, both are very melodic and the character of the entirety changes emotionally to a high degree just because other types of words are introduced. It would be possible to write any drama by Wyspiański using the so-called colloquial language—then it will turn out that half of literary values specific of Wyspiański will vanish because certain sounds bearing pathos are deleted. Some people, particularly right after the war I met them, could not stand Wyspiański's works since he is always so solemn, etc. Such quality characters follow from the fact that there is some emotional aura set upon typical sound material and this aura characterizes not only individual words but whole phrases etc. This is the reason why it is impossible to translate faithfully good, high quality lyrical poetry and some dramas. An epic novel is easier to translate but to translate, that is to replace with sound material of another language that which occurs in a given work, while trying to retain the same meaning, is very difficult. Phonetically different elements bring in different emotional characters of the sound—that is the cause of the language being different. In the past, when I was young, I tried translating Rilke, Verlaine into Polish; tremendous difficulties connect-

ed with it are linked to the fact that emotional character of a poem changes completely because the other word sound material does not possess the same emotional character observed in a given German or French word. There is a little poem by Rilke, *Schlussstück*, which begins with "Der Tod is gross"—in Polish I must say "śmierć" (death). *Tod* has a specific pathos due to the deep and dark *o* plus hard *t* while in Polish *śmierć* sounds a bit contemptuous, somehow there is nothing great or mysterious in it. Similarly the word *gross* plays an essential role here—while Polish 'wielki' (great) somehow lacks this character etc. And reversely, some emotional values of the Polish language cannot be rendered in either German, French or English. Once I heard a quotation of the first few lines of *Pan Tadeusz*: „Oh Lithuania, my country, thou are like good health” in Yiddish jargon; and in German it also sounds very funny. These emotional characters are related not so much to the tone of utterance but to the typical sound of the words including meaning, of course, and they are also typical like that sound. They also are a part of a literary work and very essential functions are played by them in it, especially in lyrical poetry and drama.

I have discussed here all those elements of a literary work which are somehow related or linked to the vocal material, or possibly to graphics, i.e. writing. Writing lacks all those emotional characters or expressive functions. There is only a graphic symbol attributed to a typical word-sound and the whole rest simply disappears, and if we want to read such a work properly we must construct all of it in our imagination. We must, shortly speaking, imagine the tone of the utterances and what emotional value is to be ascribed to a given word or phrase. As I said, the whole rest: meaning, object, situation, external looks, all this goes beyond that side that could be marked in vocal material or in graphics or could appear in them. So if all this belongs to a literary work, we are dealing here with an object of quite a new kind than the physical, vocal or graphic ontological foundation. The situation is similar as regards the ontological foundation of a picture. As concerns a picture, the function of expressing emotions is completely absent here. Today, among the so-called literate people, a kind of double-faced physical side of the word is built, namely, the sound and the meaning so closely link into a particular entity that the moment we perceive the graphic picture

of a word immediately a strong auditory image of the word appears and together with it the emotional element of a given sound is introduced. It is so because the graphic image is associated with a typical sound--it is nothing more than association of the graphic form with a typical sound form, while the sound form is already colored emotionally one way or another.

I would like to touch upon one more issue: one linked to the entire language theory that claims that relationship between a graphic symbol and sound is fully conventional and there is no reason in fact why something must be written in this or that way--it does not matter what graphic form is used as long as there is a permanent relationship between them. What is called phonetic writing also is not any significant linking of whole letters but just some simplification or complication of marking. Instead of *ch* (in Polish) *h* is written since *ch* is not heard differently from *h* in the present-day language; when it was the case it was necessary to produce a different symbol--it was possible to draw pictures as Egyptians did or produce cuneiforms like the Assyrians did. Nota bene there is one more special case which also testifies to the fact that there is no essential relationship between the phonetic and the graphic symbol--namely the Chinese writing, based on an entirely different principle than for example the writing of Europe. There are signs being symbols of concepts--but it is not the point now, what is important is that the same text written in Chinese characters can be read by a Japanese in Japanese language and by a Chinese in Chinese language without any changes except that among words of Chinese there are many Japanese words and those drawings carry some meaning in both languages and though they are read differently, graphically they are the same. On the other hand, a Frenchman cannot read a Polish text nor a Pole can read an English text because symbolism used here is completely different. In Chinese and Japanese two phonetic systems are attached to the same graphic signs and it is clear that the relationship is quite loose. It is an old Platonic problem--is it so that there is some reific relationship between a typical word-sound and meaning or possibly the word-sound and the expressive function for that word; this is an entirely different issue which may be taken up for analysis and solution.

Generally there are very lively tendencies--produced by associative

psychology and by skeptical lines of positivism—to consider relationship between sound and meaning as totally arbitrary and conventional. And it is certainly true that we can construct an artificial language at any time. The famous Esperanto manufactured by someone who thought there was a need for some universal language, something like Latin in the past can serve as an example. Latin cannot be revived today, it is simply a dead language and there are notions that could not be expressed in Latin. So he created Esperanto which is a horrible thing, a mixture of phonetic kind of various Germanic, Slavic languages, etc. The question is whether that language fulfils the functions of all natural live languages. First of all there are greater problems with the expressive functions because simply speaking the word-sounds in it somehow do not work that way. And secondly, perhaps there is some relationship, at least in some cases, between word-sound—here I take into account only the phonetic aspect and bypass the emotional one, for if emotional features are taken into account then definitely there must be a link between meaning and sound, and so this purely phonetic aspect is isolated here and now a question is whether there is or is not any relationship between the designate, meaning and sound.

I do not intend to solve this here; at present there are two different theories—one is the old concept by Plato that there is some such relationship, and the other—by Democritus—opposes it. Both these concepts are repeated in language theory to some extent even today. This issue is important in terms of structure of a literary work and structure of lyrical pieces or formation of dialogues, etc. We feel at times that at least in certain cases there is some relationship between the sound and the object *resp.* meaning, namely at the time when we try to translate something very faithfully. It turns out that there are such phrases and such situations which cannot be rendered faithfully in translation. that only some analogon, some paraphrase can be used but then certain things disappear and they cannot be given such precise form as available in the source language. I was once in such a situation when I was writing my texts in two languages, e.g. *Der Streit um die Existenz der Welt* and then problems appeared not only with sound form but also with sound restricted by syntactic rules, sentence structure etc. I wrote *Der Streit* first in German because it had been meant for Husserl, then in Polish,

and then in both languages. I cannot say that everything was a precise translation e.g. from German to Polish or reversely. There are sections which quite clearly differ in spite of my good will to do it the same way. Namely, I managed to write some things better in Polish and some other better in German which reflected the thought more precisely—and I was not able to do it so that both would be identical. This is an important issue of relationship between some languages and cultures, between certain aspects of reality. This matter was dealt with by Professor Weisgerberg who in the twenties and early thirties published a grand work on the subject taking a stand that there is some strict relationship between language in all its wealth of sounds and some aspects of world reality, some cultures, some ways of perceiving the world. Thus there are many subjects which would turn up when examining the structure of a literary work but which I must leave alone here. They are also related to the problem what is the physical, ontological foundation of a literary work of art, what still belongs and already does not belong to such a work.

Should the representative function be regarded as a double one? Rather, we might say, there are two forms of the same function of representation except that in one case it is purely notional and in the other it immediately suggests certain visually perceivable, cognitive acts but in both cases the point is to designate an object. The object can be designated additionally by means of diverse features—I desired very much to show this in my book *Das literarische Kunstwerk*—namely, it can be designated by such features which are accessible in visual, sensory experience or by features inaccessible in direct experience. When I am talking about objects present in this room using the language of chemistry I may express myself in such a way that I will simply use a number of chemical formulas and give an account of the wooden tissue of the structures in opposition to the particle composition of tiles, etc., but I could also do it the way Zola would do it, entering the room and starting his description of the way room looked and speaking about brown cupboards and a yellow stove of glossy surface etc., characterizing them exclusively by those features which appear in experience. Someone else, for example, a Danish author Hermann Bang characterizes people only by their behaviour, not by what they experience or how they look like, simply by the way they move in different ways and

how they behave in diverse situations. It is again another way of representing by means of another selection of features but in the end all this is related to meaning, except that meaning is on one occasion such that it determines perceptible features, consequently leading to occurrence of some recreative image, or on another occasion it is a purely notional construction. For example, there are two ways of teaching geometry – they were represented by my two professors—D. Hilbert and Feliks Klein, Klein, during his lectures, was waving his hands, created solids in space and did all of it in such a way that it seemed everything was visually perceptible. Hilbert was a formalist; everything was defined operationally, nobody could visualize anything or understand much (when someone relies in his learning on eyesight then he misses the former style a lot). I think these are only two forms of the same function of representation.

Is influencing not linked to every other speech function? One must naturally realize that distinguishing the functions the way Bühler did it I perform some abstracting. Most certainly there is some coaction of all the functions or their interaction and effect of these functions is the third: influencing is not only a consequence of expressing and not only of representation but also of the mode of representation, so it is necessary to analyze here all individual cases and above all one should not speak of individual words but take into account entire phrases, expressions, sentences, etc. The expressive function is very rarely linked to a single word, rather to the whole phrase-logical units, sentences and intonation, etc.

The relation occurring between a work of literature and its ontological foundation in fact concerns only some elements or some aspects of the sound stratum of a literary work while the semantic stratum, strata of presented objects and their external appearance go fully beyond that ontological foundation and beyond any relationship or similarity to it.

Transl. by *Boguslaw Lawendowski*