

Danuta Ulicka
Uniwersytet Warszawski
ORCID: 0000-0001-6638-6661

Roman Ingarden's Spaces of the Word. Part 2

Abstract: The article delves into the literary oeuvre of Roman Ingarden, the prominent Polish phenomenologist, philosopher, aesthetician and literary theorist. While his scholarly contributions are globally acknowledged, his literary output, in stark contrast, remains largely undiscovered, archived within the confines of his family collection, with only sporadic references in dispersed texts. Intriguingly, some portions of his literary creations were purportedly prepared for publication by the author himself. This corpus of work, primarily comprising poetry but also prose, drama and autobiographical writings, unveils not only Ingarden's artistic predilections – ranging from thematic and stylistic inclinations to genre preferences and rhythmic patterns, exhibiting clear affiliations with Young Poland's poetry – but also provides insight into the implicit conception of subjectivity embedded in his poetic compositions. This nuanced understanding significantly supplements and reinforces the overtly articulated notion of subjectivity present in his writings addressing Edmund Husserl's philosophy. Additionally, Ingarden's poetic works, when juxtaposed with the poetry of his contemporaries – such as Kazimierz Twardowski, Stefania Skwarczyńska, Maria Dłuska, Roman Jakobson and Victor Shklovsky – assumes a pivotal role as an artifact, offering a lens through which to comprehend the prevailing cultural milieu of the epoch. Simultaneously, it provokes the question of why outstanding innovators in literary studies exhibited an intriguing conservatism in their own literary endeavours.

Keywords: archive, Young Poland, phenomenology, symbolisms, dialogical subject, scene of the mind, semantics of sounds

Przestrzeń słowa Romana Ingardena

Streszczenie: Artykuł podejmuje próbę analizy dokonań pozafilozoficznych i pozaliteraturoznawczych Romana Ingardena. Te ostatnie, powszechnie znane, nie wyczerpuje jego pisarstwa. W rodzinnym archiwum zachowały się kajety z wierszami, fragmenty prozy i dramatu, a z innych źródeł wiemy także o przekładach z poezji niemieckiej i staraniach ich publikację. W części pierwszej artykułu dorobek ten został szczegółowo omówiony i zilustrowany licznymi przykładami. W drugiej autorka stawia tezę o zakorzenieniu pisarstwa Ingardena w literaturze i krytyce literackiej Młodej Polski. Wskazuje, że można je czytać jako wpisane w poezję i młodzieńczy dziennik intymny

konceptualizację podmiotowości, radykalnie odmienną niż Husserlowska i niejako wyprzedzającą przyszłe polemiki w tej sprawie z twórcą fenomenologii. Finalnie sytuuje dokonania poetyckie Ingardena w kontekście pisarstwa innych wybitnych literaturoznawców międzywojennych, by zasygnalizować problem: jak wytłumaczyć, że nowatorzy w polu nauki wykazywali zastanawiającą archaiczność w polu sztuki.

Słowa kluczowe: archiwum, Młoda Polska, fenomenologia, symbolizm, podmiot dialogowy, scena mentalna, semantyka brzmień

5. The Birth of Ingarden's Literary Philosophy out of the Spirit of Young Poland's Poetry and Literary Criticism

What remains striking is the simultaneity of issues addressed in Ingarden's aesthetics and philosophy of literature, on the one hand, and in his poems, on the other. Indeed, many of the poems could almost be translated into future philosophical treatises, regardless of whether the themes elaborated later in scholarly works are taken up by the first-person subject or the modernist indeterminate subject.¹

Furthermore, for almost all key concepts presented in his works on aesthetics and the philosophy of literature, antecedents can be found in the pre-modernist so-called literary criticism of Young Poland. To demonstrate this, it would be sufficient to compare Ingarden's arguments with Edward Abramowski's programmatic article "Co to jest sztuka? (Z powodu rozprawy L. Tołstoja 'Czto takojie iskusstwo?') [What is Art? (In Connection with L. Tolstoy's Treatise What is Art?)]", which advocates anti-utilitarianism and the autonomy of artistic phenomena.² If there was any difference in the approach to these phenomena, proposed by Abramowski as an autonomous, separate subject of study, it lay in the uncritically accepted value of intuition after Bergson, which Ingarden treated with distance from the very beginning (as his diary notes testify). One can also compare Ingarden's views with the beliefs about the autonomy of the artistic realm held by other anti-positivist literary historians and critics such as Ignacy Matuszewski, Stanisław Przybyszewski, or even Piotr Chmielowski, who, albeit moderately, also emphasized its distinctiveness or at least freedom from non-artistic

¹ Ingarden conceptualized this subject following Ortwin. See: Roman Ingarden, "O tzw. 'prawdzie' w literaturze," in: his *Studia z estetyki...*, Vol. 1, p. 415. Ortwin presented his theory in the article published in 1924 "O lirycie i wartościach lirycznych," reprinted in: his *Żywe fikcje. Studia o prozie, poezji i krytyce*, ed. Jadwiga Czachowska, PIW, Warszawa 1970, pp. 105–116.

² Abramowski's article appeared in *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 1898, Vol. 3 (passages reprinted in: *Programy i dyskusje literackie okresu Młodej Polski*, ed. Maria Podraza-Kwiatkowska, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wrocław 2000, pp. 183–212). Ingarden could have known it, as discussions with Tolstoy had a pan-European scope. Additionally, he emphasized in his Lviv diary the reading not only of Romantic and Young Poland poets but also contemporary periodicals (see: Roman Stanisław Ingarden, *Roman Witold Ingarden. Życie filozofa w okresie toruńskim (1921–1926)*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK, Toruń 2000, p. 14).

obligations – “disinterested love of beauty” and “not subjecting one’s art to purely external influences.”³

Instead of speculating, we may invoke direct evidential material demonstrating the roots of Ingarden’s works in the poetry and literary criticism of Young Poland, namely – the protocols of his “Lviv Thursdays” – *privatissima* and seminars held at the University of Lviv from 1934 to 1937.⁴ During these sessions, Ingarden analysed works by Mickiewicz and Słowacki, Goethe and Schiller, poems by Staff and Wierzyński, dramas by Wyspiański⁵ and Rostworowski, Maeterlinck and Ibsen, Żeromski’s prose, and, of course, Rilke’s poetry.⁶ Participants also discussed composers such as Scriabin, Debussy and Szymanowski, occasionally mentioning works by Grażyna Bacewicz and fugues by Max Reger.⁷ The discussions covered the views of empathy theorists (Friedrich Theodor Vischer, Theodor Lipps and Johannes Volkelt), Bergsonian philosophy of intuition, Dilthey’s concept of the subject of the humanities, and Max Nussberger’s work of art. Dessoir’s theory of aesthetic experience, juxtaposed with Kant and Schopenhauer’s views on contemplation, and Nietzsche’s perspective on the relationship between literature and philosophy were also considered. Separate attention was given to the concepts of Heinrich Wölfflin, Benedetto Croce and Alois Riegl. The predominant issues revolved around the ontology of a work of art, its relation to phenomena independent of human consciousness, and to other texts of the time. The discussions also delved into the issues of reference (imitation and mimetism, as it was called then), truth in art, and its reception, especially the relationships between emotional experience and intellectual knowledge, as well as between direct experience of the object and its “linguaging” [*językowanie*].⁸

This neoromantic literary and philosophical canon remained durable. In later essays, as well as in lectures given at the Jagiellonian University in the

³ Piotr Chmielowski, “Jeszcze o sztuce,” *Pamiętnik Literacki* 1904, Vol. 3/1/4, p. 8.

⁴ See: *Lwowskie czwartki Romana W. Ingardena 1934–1937. W kręgu problemów estetyki i filozofii literatury*, ed. Danuta Ulicka, PIW, Warszawa 2020. Incidentally, Thursday is a special day in Ingarden’s teaching; *privatissima* at his home in Krakow also took place on Thursdays in the 1950s when Ingarden was deprived of the right to teach at the Jagiellonian University due to political reasons. See: *Spotkania. Roman Ingarden we wspomnieniach*, ed. Leszek Sosnowski, Księgarnia Akademicka, Kraków 2020, pp. 185, 238.

⁵ The titles of Ingarden’s presentations were recorded in the Literary Circle’s notebook: “O ‘Igrzysku’ Leopolda Staffa,” “O ‘Legendzie’ Stanisława Wyspiańskiego,” “Rzecz o Stanisława Wyspiańskiego ‘Wyzwoleniu’ oraz o innych dramatach tego twórcy.”

⁶ In the diary, there is also a mention of *Prolegomena. Uwagi i szkice* by Jerzy Żuławski (Towarzystwo Naukowe, Lviv 1902), in which – importantly – the author emphasizes that there is no difference between poetry and philosophy. Additionally, there is a mention of his play “Dyktator” [Dictator] (1903), Feldman’s book on Ibsen (presumably referring to lectures by Feldman published in 1906, delivered in Zakopane during summer courses in 1905), as well as references to Hofmannsthal, Emerson, Bergson and Brzozowski (without specific works mentioned) and Reymont’s *Justly*.

⁷ There is nothing surprising about this given the fact that musicologists Zofia Lissa and Stefania Łobaczewska actively participated in the meetings.

⁸ “Linguaging” [*językowanie*] is Roman Ingarden’s own expression. See his “O tłumaczeniach,” in: his *Z teorii języka i filozoficznych podstaw logiki*, PWN, Warszawa 1972, p. 100.

1960s and in discussions during meetings of the Aesthetics Section of the Polish Philosophical Society, Ingarden cited the same examples as he did in the Lviv meetings and studies, invoking the same thinkers and authors.⁹ However, his intuitive convictions, metaphorically presented in Young Poland's reflections on art and in his own literary works, received a disciplined, philosophically restrained, rational and analytical shape, sparing in emotional and associative comparisons and metaphors. Ingarden rejected impressionism, understood as identifying criticism and art,¹⁰ aiming to establish the philosophy of literature as a rigorous science – in the sense of Husserl's first philosophy and in line with Twardowski's demand for a clear philosophical style.¹¹ He argued against prevailing beliefs about the cognitive status of the Bergsonian intuition and what was referred to as "philosophy of literature" (including the concepts of Martin Heidegger and Juliusz Kleiner). He ontologized the modernist, symbolist belief in artistic theurgy, discovering a new, third world of intentional beings. However, like the Young Poland writers, he always emphasized the indefinable need for creation and the enduring nature of the produced works. In Ingarden's view, these works – born from consciousness and embedded in it – remain indestructible, possessing a metaphysical value as works of art.¹²

Generally, in Ingarden's aesthetics and philosophy of literature, modernist tendencies are intertwined with phenomenological and analytical approaches. This becomes evident in his position on two of the most important issues for writers of the Young Poland period: expression and empathy.

Expressionism provided Ingarden with an impulse to conceptualize the first phase of the creative process, in which the artist seeks to "fix, articulate,

⁹ Władysław Stróżewski writes that Ingarden retained his Lviv notes for aesthetics lectures from 1932/1933 and 1938 and made corrections and additions to them during his lectures in Kraków. See Stróżewski, "Wstęp," in: Roman Ingarden, *Wykłady i dyskusje z estetyki*, ed. Anita Szczepańska, PWN, Warszawa 1981, p. 5.

¹⁰ As Michał Głowiński points out, such an understanding of "Impressionism," similar to "Expressionism," was oversimplified but very widespread. See Głowiński, *Ekspresja i empatia. Studia o młodopolskiej krytyce literackiej*, WL, Kraków 1997.

¹¹ Nonetheless, it must be noted that not all of Young Poland's literary scholars advocated for equating cognitive reflection with art. Regarding the repercussions of the disputes of that time in the subsequent era, see Dariusz Skórczewski, "Czy krytyka literacka jest sztuką? Wokół jednego z wątków międzywojennych sporów o granice krytyki," *Pamiętnik Literacki* 2001, Vol. 4, pp. 45–73. The author traces these disputes back to earlier Romantic and Neo-Romantic discussions, invoking approaches of figures such as Stanisław Brzozowski, Karol Irzykowski, Emil Breiter and Stefan Napierski.

¹² These echoes of Young Poland manifest themselves most vividly in the pre-war essays, *Człowiek i przyroda oraz Człowiek i jego rzeczywistość* (reprinted in: Roman Ingarden, *Książeczka o człowieku*, WL, Kraków 1998, pp. 13–24, 29–38). Maria Podraza-Kwiatkowska explicitly links Young Poland's reflections on the superiority of culture over nature, and on creationism to phenomenological intentional beings. She emphasizes that Ingarden's "metaphysical quality" remains closely connected to aesthetic value, and it is often challenging to make a distinction between them. For a more detailed discussion, see her book *Młodopolskie harmonie i dysonanse*, PIW, Warszawa 1969, pp. 210 ff.

express, reveal, externalize that which is a hidden, subjective course of processes, about which nothing is known, which are unformed,”¹³ in the pursuit of “breaking the loneliness” and “overcoming the transience of everything, [...] the passage of time.”¹⁴ In the subsequent phases, Ingarden highlighted the dynamics of the creative act and the procedural transition from the emotional phase to the reflective-cognitive phase. He emphasized that it is impossible to consider a work solely from the perspective of the artist's expression because, at different stages of creation, the artist is also its recipient. Expressionism was also rejected due to its entanglement in psychologism. In his essays on the philosophy of art and literature, Ingarden even dismissed both the term “soul” [*ducha*] intensively used in his poetry, and any speculation about the “stuffiness” [*duchowość*] processes occurring in it, as he sarcastically remarked, pointing to an “Old Polish” adjective.¹⁵ This did not imply an adoption of *Psychologie ohne die Seele*¹⁶ but rather the necessity of changing the vocabulary: Ingarden proposed replacing the term “soul” with “psychic dispositions.” Another consequence of his critique of Expressionism was the concept of the lyrical (textual) subject, resulting from the advocated anti-psychologism and the decisive exclusion of the empirical author from literary studies. Thus, Ingarden's approach – outlined during the Lviv meetings and discussed with Ostap Ortwin, who inspired it – was perhaps the most radical proposal in Polish interwar literary theory.

By the same token, Ingarden's approach to reception as a process of concretization is both characteristic of the Young Poland period and goes beyond it. The decisive polemic with the concepts of empathetic understanding and feeling of the work was nonetheless accompanied by the retention of the “initial emotion,” recognized – since the discussions on Lviv Thursdays and despite the resistance of many participants – as the irreducible beginning of this process.¹⁷

Therefore, if “expression” and “empathy” are slogans that evoke Young Poland's reflection on art (not only literary), then Ingarden's approaches decidedly go beyond it while retaining the impulses flowing from it. Similarly,

¹³ Roman Ingarden, *Wykłady i dyskusje...*, p. 182.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 184.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 201.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 198. Ingarden clearly rejected psychoanalysis. He expressed his views on Freud's concept, stating, “his entire interpretation of dreams, the symbols he establishes in it, make the impression of some ‘Egyptian dream book’ rather than a scientific discovery” (*Ibid.*, p. 201). Such a stance was not isolated within Twardowski's school.

¹⁷ Ortwin highlighted the possibility that co-experiencing and rational understanding are not mutually exclusive and may even be simultaneous. Michał Głowiński even suggests that Ingarden's concept of reception was inspired by Ortwin's article “Żywe fikcje” (1909). See: Głowiński, “Wstęp,” in: Ostap Ortwin, *Żywe fikcje...*, p. 19. It appears that Ingarden's approach can also be compared with the concepts of Womela, who considered empathetic experiencing as the starting point of the process of understanding. It was then subjected to rational, conscious analysis, requiring the correlation of “co-experiences” with the artistic procedures that evoke them. See: Katarzyna Sadkowska, “Wstęp,” in: *Programy i dyskusje lwowskiej krytyki literackiej*, ed. Katarzyna Sadkowska, Wydział Polonistyki UW, Warszawa 2015, p. 11.

one can interpret his concept of “truth” in art, which stems from pre-modern beliefs in the superiority of artistic knowledge over its rational counterpart.¹⁸ This concept is precisely outlined in Ingarden’s analysis of truth’s “different understandings,”¹⁹ which can be read as an ordering of the complicated, ambiguous uses of the concepts of “truth” and “truthfulness” in the artwork, a criticism already voiced by the representatives of Young Poland.²⁰ The interpretation of the autonomy of artistic creations is also both characteristic of the Young Poland period and goes beyond it, inspired by the slogans of pre-modern thinkers who championed precisely autonomy rather than the slogan “Art for Art’s Sake.”²¹ Ingarden expanded this concept, resorting to logic and considering the seemingly affirmative character of sentences (declarative) in literature, labelled as quasi-judgments.

In his writings on aesthetics and the philosophy of literature, Ingarden also addressed Young Poland’s synaesthesia. He did not negate it, but he attempted to reconcile the vague convictions of its advocates with his own concept of a system of aesthetic qualities that underpins aesthetic value and metaphysical quality. Recognizing analogies between words, images, sounds, smells and haptic qualities, in his view, required a systematic approach – an understanding of the relationships that connect these qualities. Ingarden maintained that some of these relationships are necessary, while others exclude each other. Only the development of a system of obligatory connections, he argued, would enable a responsible, non-impressionistic synthesis or critique of the possibility of their coexistence.²²

That is why, in his commentary to a Young Poland poem quoted at the beginning of this text, Ingarden asserted: “neither does the soul have a roof, nor can there be violet on that roof. Besides, turquoise fragrances cannot exist. As for the possibility that sounds are violet – that, in my opinion, cannot be excluded.”²³

¹⁸ Ingarden formulates such a conviction in his discussion with Waław Borowy, among others. See: Roman Ingarden, “O tzw. ‘prawdzie’ w literaturze...,” p. 417.

¹⁹ See: Roman Ingarden, “O różnych rozumieniach ‘prawdziwości’ w dziele sztuki,” in: his *Studia z estetyki*, Vol. 1, PWN, Warszawa 1956, pp. 373–389.

²⁰ Many critics, including Ostap Ortwin, who had similar views to Ingarden, pointed out this ambiguity and obscurity in a polemic with Władysław Witwicki. See: Ostap Ortwin, “O prawdę w sztuce” (1908), in: his *Żywe fikcje...*, pp. 35–69.

²¹ “The slogan ‘Art for Art’s Sake’ should be replaced by the call for its most extreme autonomy, for the independence of art in its very foundations and its fundamental pulling away from non-artistic factors”, Zygmunt Lubicz-Zaleski, “Istota i granice krytyki literackiej,” *Museion* 1913, Vol. 6; quoted in: *Programy i dyskusje literackie okresu Młodej Polski...*, p. 609.

²² Ingarden advocated for this system already in the Thursday seminars in Lviv. Later, he made several attempts to develop it, including presentations at the meetings of the Aesthetics Section of the Polish Philosophical Society in 1962–1963 and in a paper delivered in 1964 at the Fifth International Congress of Aesthetics in Amsterdam. (for an extended Polish version, see: Roman Ingarden, “Zagadnienie systemu jakości estetycznie doniosłych,” in: his *Studia z estetyki*, Vol. 3, PWN, Warszawa 1970, pp. 288–315).

²³ Roman Ingarden, *Wykłady i dyskusje z estetyki...*, p. 394.

6. About Oneself as Another

Ingarden's poems touch only on the periphery of the stylistic and worldview aspects expressed in the themes, motifs and versification that intersect with Young Poland's poetry. The concept of the subject implied in his poetic oeuvre undeniably exceeds the position of this artistic movement. This is already signalled by the title of the poetry cycle "Sam na sam ze sobą" [Alone with Myself] and many of the poems included in it. They take the form of a dialogue between the lyrical "I" and the "other." This "other" is still the Young Poland "soul" – one of the key words of the era – which appears in the titles of two parts of the cycle (part XI "Do duszy wołanie" [Call to the Soul] and part XII "Śpiewy do duszy" [Songs to the Soul]) and in the titles of individual poems ("Duszę mi spowił mrok" [Darkness Wrapped My Soul] from part VI "Z melodii jesiennych" [From Autumn Melodies]; "Dusza – ja" [The Soul – I] and "Nie rozumiem cię, duszo" [I Don't Understand You, Soul] from part XII). This "soul" is always felt as otherness. It remains non-identical to the "I," which observes it from a distance, sometimes giving a strongly emotional expression to its amazement at the soul's otherness, as in the poem "Dziw" [Wonder] from part XII: "Soul! / Oh, how strange you are!"

Even in the seemingly identifying title of the poem, "Dusza – ja" [The Soul – I], the "soul" is obscure to the "I" and signifies otherness: "My soul is like depths / like the silent depths of the abyss." This "other," the "soul," can be the direct addressee of the text. In such cases, the otherness of "you" becomes particularly pronounced. The "soul" then represents what is clear ("white") and active, unattainable for the passive "I" engaging in a dialogue with it:

Ty żyjesz, ja patrzę jeno!
Patrzę w inną stronę, duszo!
[...]
Żyjesz tuż koło mnie²⁴

You live, and I only look!
I look in another direction, soul!
[...]
You live right next to me.

An example of such internal dialogue is the poem "Nie rozumiem cię, duszo" [I don't understand you, soul] from part XII. The "soul" with which the "I" argues is metonymically related to the state of the presenting subject, which – as in the Baroque poetry of Mikołaj Sęp Szarzyński – remains "fragile, unaware, torn within itself."²⁵

Even when the rhetorical "you" is not invoked, and the poem seemingly takes the form of internal monologue, the thematized "I" still feels itself as the "other" with whom it engages in dialogue:

²⁴ From the poem "Ty żyjesz" [You're Alive], part XII, "Śpiewy do duszy" [Songs to the Soul].

²⁵ By referencing Sęp Szarzyński's sonnet, I indicate that the tradition of conversations with the soul is much older than the Young Poland movement. This text is not suitable for an in-depth exploration of this matter. It seems that Ingarden drew direct inspirations from the poetry, philosophy and psychology of the Young Poland period.

Stałem się obcy własnym moim snom
i własnej duszy nie znam dzisiaj wcale
i kiedy płaczę, dziwię się mym łzom
i jak na zimne patrzę się opale²⁶

I became alien to my own dreams
and today I don't know my soul at all
and when I cry, I'm astonished with my tears
and look at myself as if at cold opals

In this context, a particularly noteworthy poem is “Dusza” [The Soul].²⁷ The lyrical “I” appears here in the form of the pronoun “you,” to which the “soul” speaks, playing the role of the substitute “I.” The transposition of both personal pronouns and communicative functions becomes apparent only at the end of this elaborate lyric. It begins with the first-person statement of the “soul”: “I am guilty, sinful, small,” and subsequent stanzas – confessions – are interrupted by recurring refrains of one-line statements of the “soul” to itself (e.g., “And yet it wasn’t me, it wasn’t me who was guilty”; “O, what, what was I then”). That it is not a monologue is evidenced by a singular turn from the “soul” to the “you” (“you know about it”), transforming the monologue into a dialogue. A similar, even more explicit transposition occurs in the poem “Dusza mówi” [The Soul Speaks].²⁸ The formal lyrical “I,” the “soul” (“bright, white”), opposes the “you”, characterizing it as “dust” and a “shadow,” “a phantom of superstitious beliefs,” “a treacherous enemy of my dreams,” resisting it with a cry which urges it to leave:

Cóż ty?!
Tyś proch, tyś cień [...]
Jam jasna, biała [...]
O zostaw dziś mię samą!

What are you?!
You are dust, you are a shadow [...]
I am bright, white [...]
Oh, leave me alone today!

The quoted excerpts from the poems attest to the fact that the cycle takes the form of a dialogue between the “self” and the “other.” It is no longer a confessional and emotionally charged Young Poland “diary of the soul,” akin to works in the vein of *Z czary młodości. Liryczny pamiętnik duszy (1881–1891)* [From the Cup of Youth: The Lyrical Diary of the Soul (1881–1891)] by Miriam (1893) or Staff’s “Pieśni śpiewane sobie i nocy” [Songs Sung to Oneself and the Night] from the collection *Ptakom niebieskim* [For the Blue Birds] (1905), which celebrates solitude in the form of a soliloquy. In Ingarden’s cycle, this conversation is framed as a dramatic dialogue, representing the “theatre of the mind” (*theatrum mentis*) – in this case, a first-person theatre – which holds particular significance in symbolist monodramas. Indeed, when attempting,

²⁶ From the poem “Stałem się obcy” [I Became Alien] from part VIII, “Po klęsce” [After Defeat].

²⁷ The poem’s location is unclear: it is absent from the table of contents, but I found its manuscript in the folder, where it was included in part XII, “Pieśni do duszy” [Songs to the Soul], following the poem “Dusza – ja” [The Soul – I] which opens this section. This is another clue that would suggest he worked on a cycle.

²⁸ The title of the lyric is not clear. In the table of contents, it appears as “Dusza mówi” [The Soul Speaks], and in the manuscript, it is listed as “Dusza” [Soul], but there is also a handwritten addition, i.e., the word “calls.”

albeit infrequently, to describe cognitive mental mechanisms in his later philosophical treatises, Ingarden resorts to the metaphor of dramaturgical representation and allusions to Hume's "theatre of the mind."

Let us note, in passing, that in Ingarden's youthful diary, reflections on the self-other relationship seldom invoke the concept of the soul. This is particularly striking in the earliest passages from 1909. On November 18, 1910, the seventeen-year-old diarist raises the question:

who, in fact, among these persons, temperaments, or whatever you call them, is 'me.' Where is my true self? [...] it seems to me that what is happening within me is caused by 'someone' who is within me, who is different than the observing me and who governs this observing master.

The sense of discord between these "masters," multiplied into four figures, is even more profound in a note dated a month later (December 21, 1910): "And beside these two masters, there is a third 'I' that observes those two [...]. And then there is yet another master who wants to write everything that the former two interrupt." In the subsequent years, such questions transform into a phenomenological reflection on consciousness and meta-consciousness, the non-coincidence of the experiencing and the experienced self, and the conviction expressed in a note from 1916 in a polemic with theories of empathy, that "das schlichte Erleben [simple experience] is not enough [...]. That experiencing in all its primitiveness must be aware, conscious, self-conscious." The rare presence of the key term "soul" in the diary could indicate that it is only Ingarden's poetry that remains permeated with Young Poland's thought-poetic style. This, in turn, might suggest his adherence or susceptibility to conventions considered as "literary" – but only to those conventions.

In short, Ingarden's cycle establishes a different relational concept of subjectivity, which has nothing in common with Young Poland's approaches. Already the title of his cycle anticipates this concept: *Sam na sam ze sobą* [Alone with Myself]. The poems comprising this cycle constitute an internal dialogue focused on reconstructing the dramatic non-identity of the "self" and the "other." "I" is thematized, for instance, in the poem "Hej, sen" [Hey, Dream] from part XII "Śpiewy do duszy" [Songs to the Soul]:

Jam sobie obcy
[...]
Jam obcy
i jakby wygnaniec.

I'm alien to myself
[...]
I'm alien
as if I was an exile.

This "other" is also a vigilant and critical observer of the writing "I". In the diary entries from the period when Ingarden was writing his lyrics, we find numerous comments that are distanced from the writing self. In these comments, Ingarden ruthlessly exposes the awareness of their artificiality (insincerity, as a Young Poland representative might say), literary origin, and the construction of both the written self and the writing self.

"Literature has devoured me entirely. I cannot live, think, act, or speak because it immediately seems to me that I am playing a different composition

on myself,” Ingarden notes on February 13, 1910. In line with the Romantic and Young Poland’s convention, he embodies the struggles of the writing process in the figure of the devil and spectre: “Often, when I think about my experiences, [...] I hear the whisper of the devil or the ghost: ‘Look, what a fabulous idea for a novel or poem. Sit down and write!’” (entry from November 19, 1910). These confessions resonate with harsh self-judgments: “all of this is so cheap and declamatory” (November 19, 1910), accusations of megalomania and buffoonery: “I feel that it is a comedy, a farce, that some mocking face is probably laughing at me with a terrible, distorted laughter, shouting: ‘Comedian!’, ‘Megalomaniac!’, ‘Madman!’” (November 19, 1910). There are also traces of self-awareness concerning the inadequacies of language: “Don’t you see the colossal, fathomless abyss between what I describe and the description itself?” (November 19, 1910).

The cycle can justifiably be reduced to the formula “about oneself as another,” as per Bakhtin and Ricœur. On April 19, 1916, Ingarden noted in his diary that the cycle’s theme is “becoming a stranger to oneself.” Most likely, it received its title later than the poems which comprise it.²⁹ If we consider it as the modal framework of the whole group of poems, the tempting interpretation suggested earlier – referring to his feelings towards Laura Baranowska – could be plausible. The lyrical “I” would then be the former “I,” portrayed in the poems from youthful years, while the “other” would be the subject of the later composed and titled cycle, the presenting “I.” The thoughtful arrangement of sixteen parts could then be seen as a deliberately composed sequence: youthful love (enthusiasm and delight in the world) – breaking off the relationship (grief after loss, a sense of existence devoid of meaning) – difficult maturation.

In a sense, it would resemble a modernist *Entwicklungsroman* [development novel], with a difference in that, for Ingarden, maturity is characterized not so much by wise calmness as a sense of hopelessness (the penultimate part XV is titled “Myśli o zgonie” [Thoughts on Death]). Still, to arrive at such a conclusion it would be necessary to first justify the reading of a literary work as a document corroborated by other documents – thus falling into circular reasoning which Ingarden vehemently contested.³⁰ Above all, the earlier, cheerful “songs of innocence”³¹ are internally dialogized (although they differ significantly from the modern sentential verses of the “songs of experience” in versification terms: they mainly represent stanzaic syllabic and irregular accentual-syllabic verse; still, it seems impossible to draw binding conclusions from this difference).

²⁹ Ingarden’s biographers also entertain this possibility. See: Kuliniak Radosław, Mariusz Pandura, “Poeta sam na sam z sobą – dziennik osobisty Romana Witolda Ingardena,” *Konteksty Kultury* 2021, Vol. 1, p. 151.

³⁰ See: Roman Ingarden, “O niebezpieczeństwie ‘petitionis principii’ w teorii poznania,” in: his *U podstaw teorii poznania*, PWN, Warszawa 1971.

³¹ This is an allusion to William Blake’s *Songs of Innocence* and *Songs of Experience*; a biographical interpretation of the cycle points towards a potential analogy in this regard.

From a biographical perspective, but at the same time within the framework of Ingarden's philosophy, we may contend that the lyrical cycle revolves around the identity arising from the endurance of a person over time. The issue of the temporal extension of phenomena has accompanied Ingarden's readings of Bergson from the beginning, later becoming a matter of disputes with Husserl about the constitution of an object enduring in time. The conclusions they drew challenged the very concept of the transcendental subject. These discussions extended to conversations with Walter Auerbach, the author of a study on "objects that have been,"³² and eventually found expression in various ontological and aesthetic writings. The ultimate account of this issue appears in one of Ingarden's last essays, "O odpowiedzialności" [On Responsibility], from 1970.³³ In his diary, Ingarden also frequently recorded observations about the mutability of the subject, convinced of the difficulty in recognizing its identity. A poignant entry from Freiburg on April 19, 1916, reads: "In many respects, the person called Roman Ingarden today is, in fact, an entirely different person from the one who bore that name a few years ago." On November 11, 1932, he further pondered, "What was my face back then?"

The fact that we are dealing with a lyrical cycle about the quest for identity unfolding in a dialogue between the "I" and the "other" is also evident in the poem "Na Forum Romanum" [At Forum Romanum] included in the folder "Sam na sam ze sobą" [Alone with Myself]. Its fourth stanza begins with the expression of the otherness of the writing "I" in relation to the written "I," experienced also in the dreamlike space-time:

Czuje, jak dzień mój cudze dni przenikły I feel how my day was penetrated by someone else's
days,
i sen się własny z cudzym snem przeplata. and my own dream intertwines with someone else's
dream.

Drawing on autobiographical documents, one could venture the hypothesis that this was also a dialogue conducted in the face of history, which prompted the question of "selfhood" [*sobość*] and its dependence on what Ingarden calls the "Beyond-I" [*Poza-ja*]. This is evidenced by the entry in the diary from November 11, 1932:

Once upon a time, [...] my own self took center stage, overshadowing the world, a reality no less powerful and monstrous than today's (the war years), and yet somehow happening in the shadows, on the periphery. Today, I have shrunk in the face of reality, living as if outside of myself. The reality of the European and non-European world weighs heavily on personal life [...]. When was I more of myself?³⁴

³² Walter Auerbach, "O przypomnieniach," *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 1933, Vol. 1/2, pp. 167–198. In his diary, in the notes from 1933, Ingarden mentions this essay by Auerbach and their discussions concerning epistemological issues related to the constitution of past objects, which, according to him, invoke the experiences and memories of others.

³³ Roman Ingarden, "O odpowiedzialności i jej podstawach ontycznych," trans. Adam Węgrzecki, in: his *Książeczka o człowieku...*, pp. 71–169.

³⁴ In earlier notes, dating back to 1910, Ingarden grapples with the problem of being "involved in events." He invokes Brzozowski's philosophy of history to support his reflections, being

7. Facing Young Poland's *Ślowiarstwo*³⁵ and Tuwim's *Zaum*³⁶

The poetic style of Young Poland somewhat “makes visible” Ingarden’s philosophical-aesthetic convictions in a series of phenomenological appearances.³⁷ In this context, one could even interpret the dispute with Husserl about the transcendental subject and argue that it also stemmed from a disagreement on Husserl’s conceptualization of this type of subject: stripped of emotional-bodily experiences, which can rightly be called “direct data of consciousness” or “sensory data,” and which, according to Ingarden, Husserl considered as separate from the “I.”³⁸

In the context of the Young Poland program, which forms the foundation for both Ingarden’s poetic and philosophical endeavours, along with his artistic predilections for music, the previously noted simplicity of the sound layer in the poems is intriguing. This simplicity might imply the secondary significance of this layer. However, in his discussions on the philosophy of literature and language, Ingarden asserted that this very layer is constitutive for both the layer of meaning founded on it and for the subsequent layers that derive from it.

In Ingarden’s view, suprasegmental, prosodic elements of speech (“tone,” “melody of the sentence,” intonation), which remained superior to rhythm, not only conveyed emotional qualities but also served as carriers of meaning.³⁹ His sensitivity to the semantic aspects of sound is further evidenced by his reflections on translations. When invoking his favourite of Rilke’s poems, “Schlußstück,” Ingarden highlights the untranslatable meanings of the original arising from the qualities of sounds. He notes that the lyric begins with “Der Tod ist gross,” where “Tod” carries a special pathos with its deep, dark “o” and hard “t,” and then a soft “d,” while in Polish, the word “*śmierć*” has a somewhat disdainful character.⁴⁰ Connecting sounds and meanings, he even entertained the idea of a Cratylean resolution. He pondered:

aware of the influence, even commenting ironically on Brzozowski’s concept of the will with the aside: “(Ha, ha! Mr. Brzozowski is at work)” – after an earlier remark: “I still hear the voice of Stanisław Brzozowski around my ears: ‘Summon the will, you who are creating Young Poland.’”

³⁵ I.e., word artistry. Here, the term is used in reference to autotelic, language-oriented features of poetry in the Young Poland period [translator’s note].

³⁶ *Zaum* (“transrational language”) refers to the linguistic experiments and innovations in sound symbolism and language formation pioneered by Russian Cubo-Futurist poets [translator’s note].

³⁷ Ingarden’s practice of “making things visible” in lectures is remembered by his listeners. Janina Makota provides an evocative example of an old umbrella, constantly repaired, which Ingarden was said to invoke in complex considerations about the identity of objects enduring through time. See: her “...studia to nie musztra żołnierska...”, in: *Spotkania...*, p. 216.

³⁸ See: Roman Ingarden, “Moje wspomnienie o Edmundzie Husserlu,” trans. Zenon H. Mazureczak, Stanisław Judycki, *Studia Filozoficzne* 1981, No. 2, pp. 20–21.

³⁹ Even when Ingarden mentioned communication with his dog, Dżok, he emphasized recognizing its “quasi-words,” as he termed them, through the “tone” of barking. See: his *Wykłady i dyskusje...*, pp. 224, 228.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 234.

there is a question, however, whether there is a connection between the sound of a word – I am taking into consideration only its purely phonetic side, completely abstracting from the emotional side [...], whether there are any significant attributions between the designated object, meaning, and sound.⁴¹

Furthermore, by stating that he does not intend to settle the dispute between Cratylus and Hermogenes, Ingarden aligned himself with a cultural concept of language as an image of the world. He invoked the theory of the scholar of Celtic languages, Leo Weisgerber, who believed that different languages generate different experiences. Following Weisgerber, Ingarden observed “some very strict correlation between the language in its full richness of sound and certain aspects of the world, certain cultures, certain ways of understanding the world.”⁴² Finally, he entertained the possibility of “orienting” oneself in linguistic communication to “purely voice material.”⁴³

In this context, the critique of Tuwim’s “mirohlady”⁴⁴ – juxtaposed with the slightly over a decade older but still accepted “Słopiewnie”⁴⁵ – is astonishing. For Ingarden, the key issue in both works is: “How far in a literary work can ‘deformation’ of the presented reality be taken [...] by distorting the normal structure of sentences and meaning formations?”⁴⁶ This leads to the question: “Are creations of this kind [...] literary works in the strict sense of the word?”⁴⁷ Ingarden’s discussion of these issues – in which the frequent use of the word “normal,” only once enclosed in quotation marks, is striking (and symptomatic, since “abnormal,” “sick” were characterizations of Young Poland used by its opponents) – concludes with the statement that, unlike “Słopiewnie,” still resembling “normal” language, “mirohlady” are neither musical nor literary works; at best, they are creations “from the borderland of literature.”⁴⁸

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 226.

⁴² Ibid., p. 237.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 224.

⁴⁴ “Mirohlady” are poems composed, at least in part, of inexistent words. Julian Tuwim, who coined the term, published the text “Atuli mirohlady”... in *Wiadomości Literackie* 1934, No. 31, p. 3, citing various examples of “estranging” practices in both older and more recent literature. The two-line verse that perturbed Ingarden, “Atulli mirohlady, grobowe ucichy / Mój młodniu, moje bulle i moje pupichy,” was, according to Lechoń, supposedly penned by “some footman or stable boy in a manor.” Ingarden’s critique, primarily directed at this two-line verse “Jeszcze ‘atulli mirohlady’” appeared in *Wiadomości Literackie* 1934, No. 43, p. 4. It had two reprints under a modified title. See: Roman Ingarden, “Graniczny wypadek dzieła literackiego,” in: his *Szkice z filozofii literatury...*, pp. 87–94; his *Studia z estetyki...*, Vol. 3, pp. 177–183 (Ingarden supplemented this volume with an introduction dated 1969, so he certainly made the decision to reprint it, indicating his continued adherence to his earlier position). As a side note: in the title of Tuwim’s article, “atuli” is spelled with one “l,” while in the quoted passage – with two.

⁴⁵ Ingarden, as far as I know, never mentioned whether he was familiar with the Lviv performance of two songs from this cycle, namely – “Święty Franciszek” and “Wanda” for which Karol Szymanowski composed the music in 1921. The composer’s sister performed these songs, accompanied on the piano by Edward Steinberger, during a recital in Lviv on January 17, 1922.

⁴⁶ Roman Ingarden, *Szkice z filozofii literatury...*, p. 84.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 87.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 93. It is important to add that the criticism of “mirohlady” is evident in the light of Ingarden’s concept of the layered structure of a work, but completely incomprehensible in the light of the concept of meaning.

Ingarden most likely knew little about the non-rational poetry advocated by Tuwim, about Futurism, or about the interwar transformations of poetics. Well-established in Kraków, Warsaw, Poznań and Zakopane, Formalism and Futurism were hardly recognized in Lviv. In the local press market, which was “clearly delayed,”⁴⁹ not much happened. *Lamus* (1908–1913) promoted Wolski, Staff and Kasprówicz, published translations of José-María de Hérédia, Jules Laforgue and Émile Verhaeren, and contained an “Inedita” section, featuring primarily Polish Romanticism. Information about new art was also scarce in *Gazeta Lwowska* and its supplement, *Przewodnik Naukowy i Literacki*. Some studies on “more recent” Polish painting suggest that modern Western, Central, and Eastern European trends struggled to make their way into Lviv; and if they were known, it was only superficially.⁵⁰ In the 1920s and 1930s, the avant-garde offensive was led mainly in theatre and, not without resistance, in visual arts.⁵¹

Perhaps, Ingarden inherited prejudices against futurism from Witwicki. After all, the problem that concerned Witwicki was the possibility of reducing a literary work to the sound layer.⁵² Still, rejecting the works cited by Tuwim, especially the two-line verse that clearly irritated Ingarden, clearly runs afoul of both Ingarden’s philosophy of language and his concept of meaning.

In explicating his perspective on meaning, Ingarden formulated the postulate of ontological-semantic parallelism. In his view, the accuracy of a name

⁴⁹ Tymon Terlecki, “O Lwowie,” *Miesięcznik Literatury i Sztuki* 1934, No. 3, reprinted in: his *Od Lwowa do Warszawy*, ed. Edward Krasieński, Mariola Szydłowska, Instytut Sztuki PAN, Warszawa 2016, pp. 484–490.

⁵⁰ Mieczysław Treter, *Nowsze malarstwo polskie w Galeryi Miejskiej we Lwowie*, H. Altenberg, Lviv 1912, <https://polona.pl/item/newsze-malarstwo-polskie-w-galeryi-miejskiej-we-lwowie,Njc4NjkoMDY/17/#info:metadata>; accessed: 15.04.2023. Treter discusses the already assembled collections of “modern painting,” mentioning Artur Grottger, Juliusz Kossak, Franciszek Tępa, and other forgotten painters from the second half of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, assessing their paintings by the standard of the “Dutch.” It is significant that, in the letter to Ingarden dated May 17, 1922, Witwicki connects the provocative statement “We want to pee in all colors” with Chwistek and the Formists, while the actual author of the proclamation was Tristan Tzara (“Chronique Zurichoise 1915–1919,” in: *Dada Almanach*, ed. Richard Huelsenbeck, Erich Reiss Verlag, Berlin 1920, p. 13). See: “Nie gniewaj się na mnie, że gderzę i zrzedzę”. Listy Władysława Witwickiego do Romana Ingardena (wybór), ed. Maciej Dombrowski, *Sztuka Edycji* 2017, No. 2, <https://apcz.umk.pl/sztukaedycji/article/view/SE.2017.0028/14166>; accessed: 20.02.2023.

⁵¹ However, not without a blend of Expressionism, Futurism and Surrealism. The initial manifestations of Expressionism (later called Formism) in painting encountered rather unfavorable reception from conservative art critics. It was only in the early 1930s that the attitude towards avant-garde movements began to change. See: Andrij Bojarov, “Majaki and Маяки: Modernist Art in the Interwar Lviv. Chronological Outline,” in: *Lviv. City, Architecture, Modernism*, ed. Bohdan Cherkas, Andrzej Szczerski, Museum of Architecture, Wrocław 2016, pp. 327–349.

⁵² In the letters from Warsaw dated April 23 and May 17, 1922, Witwicki, with his characteristic irony, commented on Chwistek’s participation in the one-day publication *Nuż w bzużu, 2 jednolitościwa futurystów*. Extraordinary editions. It featured a fragment of the seventh chapter of Chwistek’s *Wielość rzeczywistości* titled “O Poezji,” in which he promoted “formist” poetry, considered not as the “music of noises” but as an innovative attempt to expand the boundaries of language. See: “Nie gniewaj się na mnie, że gderzę i zrzedzę”...

required a correspondence between the direct experience of an object and the structure of its "linguistization" [*ujęzykowanie*]. If in the existing language the phenomenological thinker does not find a word that meets this requirement, then he or she can arbitrarily connect any sound with any meaning. Ingarden granted approval for linguistic creationism in every domain of the discursive field, including science, where, as he writes, "when we need to express an entirely new experience for the first time, we do not know how to put it into words – we must forge the meaning and embed it in a sound symbol."⁵³ He characterized his own writing practice as a free play between experience and its language representation.⁵⁴ However, he warned against automatism, dramatically describing a ready, petrified language as "deformed" and "degenerate."⁵⁵ Following Jan Michał Rozwadowski, he acknowledged that such dead language distorts cognition because it acts like a machine that "masters the person guiding it. [...] we become dogmatic adherents of past experiences: our cognitive activities cease to be free and subject to guidelines provided by experience, and instead, ready linguistic patterns take over."⁵⁶

Against the backdrop of the previously mentioned postulates regarding language in phenomenology, the rejection of "mirohlady," or at least their restrained, conditional acceptance as a "creation from the borderland" also raises questions. In the vein of Young Poland, Ingarden advocated for evoking meanings in the reader's consciousness. Paradoxically, the devaluation of *zaum* (transrational language) might have been influenced by the attachment to the Young Poland aesthetic – specifically, symbolism rather than Young Poland's *słowiartstwo* (word artistry). The enduring nature of this attachment is evident in the very style of criticism applied to Tuwim's peculiarities by the phenomenologist. Ingarden uses distinct Young Poland expressions to describe their para-linguistic aspects, such as "nebulous seedbed" [*mgławicowa zaródź*], he contemplates "transient, nascent, and rather hazy" situations delineated in them, and projecting their reception suggests that "intoxicated by all this, we allow ourselves to be carried away and enveloped in that potential, fleeting mist of vague and indeterminate situational seedbeds [*zarodzie sytuacyjne*]."⁵⁷

⁵³ Roman Ingarden, "O języku i jego roli w nauce," in: his *Z teorii języka i filozoficznych podstaw logiki*, PWN, Warszawa 1972, p. 100.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 110.

⁵⁵ Ingarden referred to the reflections of the Indo-Europeanist Jan Michał Rozwadowski from 1911 on the phenomenon of deautomatization and the tendency of psychic energy (*Zjawisko dysautomatyzacji i tendencja energii psychicznej*). Rozwadowski first reported his discovery in 1911 in a paper presented during the proceedings of the Philosophical Section of the XI Congress of Polish Physicians and Naturalists in Kraków. A note on this presentation and its summary was published in *Ruch Filozoficzny* 1911, No. 1. The article itself appeared ten years later in *Kwartalnik Filozoficzny* 1922, Vol. 1, No. 1. The acceptance of phonetic-semantic freedom is indirectly evidenced by Ingarden's notes from 1922 titled "Spis słów Dzidziusia" [List of Baby Words], in which the philosopher mirrored the speech of his almost two-year-old son, Roman Stanisław, recording childish neologisms, including syntactic ones (the construction of negative and interrogative sentences). See: Roman Stanisław Ingarden, *Roman Witold Ingarden. Życie filozofa...*, pp. 80–81.

⁵⁶ Roman Ingarden, "O języku i jego roli w nauce...", pp. 112–113.

⁵⁷ Roman Ingarden, "Graniczny wypadek...", pp. 92–93.

8. Borderlands

Ingarden was not the only philosopher of literature and poet in the Central and Eastern European region whose work combined modernist and Husserlian impulses. In fact, the continuum of symbolism's legacy extended to the Russian Formalists as well, encompassing not only those affiliated with the so-called right wing of the Moscow Linguistic Circle – led by Gustav Shpet, who demonstrated phenomenological inclinations – but also those aligned with the left wing. The latter is typically linked to futurist influences, especially transrational poetry, and, in methodological terms, to linguistics. It is also known for the critique of symbolism carried out by Futurism-oriented linguists. Noteworthy, this critique was selective, focusing on poetic imagery rather than the poetic invention of meanings. Without Alexander Potebnya's Humboldtian views on the internal form of words, it is difficult to imagine Victor Shklovsky's "estrangement device" or his prose and prose poems, or the poems of Aleksei Kruchenykh. Moreover, without the influence of French symbolism, it is hard to imagine the translations and poems of Roman Jakobson. For Jakobson, during the years 1915–1920 when he chaired the Moscow Circle, Husserl's *Logical Investigations* were more significant than de Saussure's *Course in General Linguistics*.

Therefore, the intricate affinities between Symbolism, Formalism and phenomenology necessitate a reconsideration, one that is oriented – as per the shared vocabulary borrowed from Husserl by both formalists and Ingarden – not towards ruptures and turns, but rather towards continuity. Such a reconsideration should extend beyond theoretical and methodological treatises to encompass other modes of expression.

Fortunately, Jakobson's poems, prose and translations, as well as Shklovsky's prose, reminiscent of modernist free verse, and his unquestionably modernist poems, have been published.⁵⁸

Nonetheless, the divergences and convergences between their literary and literary-critical works have not been thoroughly examined. Ingarden's case has allowed us to demonstrate the borderline nature of both forms of expression, their partial overlap and partial difference. Still, we are also aware of cases where they completely diverge. In Polish literary studies, such a case is represented by Franciszek Siedlecki, whose symbolist prose is incongruent with the pre-structuralist systematics of poetry and Maria Dłuska, an advocate of accentual verse, whose poetics seem to have little in common with it.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ Cf. Roman Jakobson, *Mój futuryzm*, trans. Danuta Ulicka, PIW, Warszawa 2020, pp. 185–205; Victor Shklovsky, *Jeszcze nie wszystko skończone...*, trans. Aleksandra Berkiet, Jolanta Skruna, ed. Danuta Ulicka, Sedno, Warszawa 2016. The prose poem, Shklovsky's literary debut from the same year as the indisputably symbolist "Resurrection of the Word," is titled *Swincowy żrebij. Dar Wiktora Szklowskiego Łazarietu diejatiel' iskusstva* [Lead Destiny. Viktor Shklovsky's Gift to the Infirmary of Art Workers], Tip. 3 Sokolinskogo, Piotrograd 1914.

⁵⁹ See: Artur Hellich, "Żywa nauka Franciszka Siedleckiego," *Pamiętnik Literacki* 2021, Vol. 1. Maksymilian Odrzywółek is currently engaged in an examination of the voluminous

The most interesting developments occur at the intersections and borders not only of epochs, cultures and worldviews, as Bakhtin suggested,⁶⁰ but also of discourses. Venturing into a generalization, based on preliminary observations, one could formulate a hypothesis – at least for the realm of Polish writing culture – that literary discourses appear to manifest a certain temporal lag when juxtaposed with their literary-critical counterparts.

Translated by Jan Burzyński

Bibliography

- Abramowski Edward, "Co to jest sztuka? (Z powodu rozprawy L. Tołstoja 'Czto takoję iskusstwo?')", *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 1898, Vol. 3.
- Auerbach Walter, "O przypomnieniach," *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 1933, Vol. 1/2.
- Bachtin Michaił, *Pogranicza twórczości słownej. Studia i notatki archiwalne*, transl. Danuta Ulicka, PIW, Warszawa 2022.
- Bojarov Andrij, "Majaki and Маяки: Modernist Art in the Interwar Lviv. Chronological Outline," in: *Lviv. City, Architecture, Modernism*, ed. Bohdan Cherkes, Andrzej Szczerski, Museum of Architecture, Wrocław 2016.
- Chmielowski Piotr, "Jeszcze o sztuce," *Pamiętnik Literacki* 1904, Vol. 3/1/4.
- Dłuska Maria, *Wiersze*, ed. Stanisław Dziedzic, Exartim, Bochnia 1992.
- Głowiński Michał, *Ekspresja i empatia. Studia o młodopolskiej krytyce literackiej*, WL, Kraków 1997.
- Hellich Artur, "Żywa nauka Franciszka Siedleckiego," *Pamiętnik Literacki* 2021, Vol. 1.
- Ingarden Roman, "Graniczny wypadek dzieła literackiego," in: his, *Szkice z filozofii literatury*, Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza "Polonista", Łódź 1947.
- Ingarden Roman, *Graniczny wypadek dzieła literackiego*, in: his, *Studia z estetyki*, Vol. 3, PWN, Warszawa 1970.
- Ingarden Roman, "Jeszcze 'atulli mirohłady'" appeared in *Wiadomości Literackie* 1934, No. 43.
- Ingarden Roman, *Książeczka o człowieku*, WL, Kraków 1998.
- Ingarden Roman, "Moje wspomnienie o Edmundzie Husserlu," trans. Zenon H. Mazurczak, Stanisław Judycki, *Studia Filozoficzne* 1981, No. 2.
- Ingarden Roman, "O języku i jego roli w nauce," in: his, *Z teorii języka i filozoficznych podstaw logiki*, PWN, Warszawa 1972.
- Ingarden Roman, "O niebezpieczeństwie 'petitionis principii' w teorii poznania," in: his, *U podstaw teorii poznania*, PWN, Warszawa 1971.
- Ingarden Roman, "O tłumaczeniach," in: his, *Z teorii języka i filozoficznych podstaw logiki*, PWN, Warszawa 1972.
- Ingarden Roman, "O tzw. 'prawdzie' w literaturze," in: his, *Szkice z filozofii literatury*, Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza "Polonista", Łódź 1947.
- Ingarden Roman, *Studia z estetyki*, Vol. 1, PWN, Warszawa 1956.
- Ingarden Roman, *Studia z estetyki*, Vol. 3, PWN, Warszawa 1970.
- Ingarden Roman, *Wykłady i dyskusje z estetyki*, ed. Anita Szczepańska, PWN, Warszawa 1981.

and varied corpus of works by Maria Dłuska, a collection that extends beyond what has been publicly accessible (see: her, *Wiersze*, ed. Stanisław Dziedzic, Exartim, Bochnia 1992). His forthcoming article, "Nieuchwytność istnienia dźwięku. O wierszach Marii Dłuskiej w kontekście teorii wiersza (Marii Dłuskiej)," explores this subject within the context of poetic theory. I wish to extend gratitude to the author for generously providing access to the article.

⁶⁰ Michaił Bachtin, *Pogranicza twórczości słownej...*, p. 291.

- Ingarden Roman Stanisław, *Roman Witold Ingarden. Życie filozofa w okresie toruńskim (1921–1926)*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK, Toruń 2000.
- Jakobson Roman, *Mój futuryzm*, trans. Danuta Ulicka, PIW, Warszawa 2020.
- Kuliniak Radosław, Mariusz Pandura, "Poeta sam na sam z sobą – dziennik osobisty Romana Witolda Ingardena," *Konteksty Kultury* 2021, Vol. 1.
- Lubicz-Zaleski Zygmunt, "Istota i granice krytyki literackiej," *Museion* 1913, Vol. 6.
- Lwowskie czwartki Romana W. Ingardena 1934–1937. W kręgu problemów estetyki i filozofii literatury, ed. Danuta Ulicka, PIW, Warszawa 2020.
- "‘Nie gniewaj się na mnie, że gderzę i zrzedzę’. Listy Władysława Witwickiego do Romana Ingardena (wybór)," ed. Maciej Dombrowski, *Sztuka Edycji* 2017, No. 2, <https://apcz.umk.pl/sztukaedycji/article/view/SE.2017.0028/14166>; accessed: 20.02.2023.
- Ortwin Ostap, "O liryce i wartościach lirycznych," in: his, *Żywe fikcje. Studia o prozie, poezji i krytyce*, ed. Jadwiga Czachowska, PIW, Warszawa 1970.
- Podraza-Kwiatkowska Maria, *Młodopolskie harmonie i dysonanse*, PIW, Warszawa 1969.
- Programy i dyskusje literackie okresu Młodej Polski*, ed. Maria Podraza-Kwiatkowska, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wrocław 2000.
- Rozwadowski Jan Michał, „Zjawisko dysautomatyzacji i tendencja energii psychicznej,” *Kwartalnik Filozoficzny* 1922, Vol. 1, No. 1.
- Sadkowska Katarzyna, "Wstęp," in: *Programy i dyskusje lwowskiej krytyki literackiej*, ed. Katarzyna Sadkowska, Wydział Polonistyki UW, Warszawa 2015.
- Shklovsky Victor, *Jeszcze nie wszystko skończone...*, trans. Aleksandra Berkiet, Jolanta Skrunda, ed. Danuta Ulicka, Sedno, Warszawa 2016.
- Shklovsky Victor, *Swincowyj żrebij. Dar Wiktora Szklowskiego Łazarietu diejatielej iskusstwa* [Lead Destiny. Viktor Shklovsky's Gift to the Infirmary of Art Workers], Tip. 3 Sokolinskiego, Piotrograd 1914.
- Skórczewski Dariusz, "Czy krytyka literacka jest sztuką? Wokół jednego z wątków międzywojennych sporów o granice krytyki," *Pamiętnik Literacki* 2001, Vol. 4.
- Spotkania. Roman Ingarden we wspomnieniach*, ed. Leszek Sosnowski, Księgarnia Akademicka, Kraków 2020.
- Stróżewski Władysław, "Wstęp," in: Roman Ingarden, *Wykłady i dyskusje z estetyki*, ed. Anna Szczepańska, PWN, Warszawa 1981.
- Terlecki Tymon, *Od Lwowa do Warszawy*, ed. Edward Krasieński, Mariola Szydłowska, Instytut Sztuki PAN, Warszawa 2016.
- Terlecki Tymon, "O Lwowie," *Miesięcznik Literatury i Sztuki* 1934, No. 3.
- Treter Mieczysław, *Nowsze malarstwo polskie w Galeryi Miejskiej we Lwowie*, H. Altenberg, Lviv 1912, <https://polona.pl/item/nowsze-malarstwo-polskie-w-galeryi-miejskiej-we-lwowie,Njc4NjkoMDY/17/#info:metadata>; accessed: 15.04.2023.
- Tuwin Julian, "Atuli mirohlady" ... in *Wiadomości Literackie* 1934, No. 31.
- Tzara Tristan, "Chronique Zurichoise 1915–1919," in: *Dada Almanach*, ed. Richard Huelsenbeck, Erich Reiss Verlag, Berlin 1920.
- Żuławski Jerzy, *Prolegomena. Uwagi i szkice*, Towarzystwo Naukowe, Lviv 1902.