

Danuta Ulicka

Language and Experience : on the Subject and Method of Ingarden's Philosophy of Literature

Literary Studies in Poland 24, 47-73

1991

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.

Danuta Ulicka

Language and Experience

On the Subject and Method of Ingarden's Philosophy of Literature

The Forgotten Links

Among Roman Ingarden's writings on the philosophy of literature there is a special group of treatises which are rarely commented upon by those who examine his ideas. This group includes articles on Aristotle's *Poetics* and Lessing's *Laocoön*, on "various understandings of truthfulness in the work of art", on the form and content of the work of art, and a number of studies concerned with the aesthetics of empathy. Judging from the literature written on the subject, experts on Ingarden's writings classify them tacitly as the phenomenologist's minor works or, at best, as less important for the understanding of his programme. This peculiar conspiracy of silence also involves all of Ingarden's essays on philosophy regarded from a historical perspective.

Indeed, if one reads these studies concentrating on the theses explicitly put forward, especially if one confronts them with the object they deal with, they may not arouse any special interest. On the contrary, they may arouse suspicion. It is relatively easy to prove that Ingarden's interpretations are by no means free of incompetence, schematization or presentism. As a matter of fact, such objections have been raised, even though their form was perhaps more euphemistic and they were accompanied by explanations recalling the phenomenological principle of the neutralization of the existing knowledge (the principle which, as we shall see, is not at all obligatory in the case of Ingarden). The point is not, however, that we can criticize the philosopher for not being objective in interpreting other people's thoughts, for taking up a wrong ahistorical attitude towards them or for bending their content to his own reflections. Reading Ingarden in this way does not seem to be appropriate insofar as it adds

nothing new to the studies of Ingarden's own ideas and, at best, it may only contribute a little to an appreciation of his personality as a scholar. These treatises, however, turn out to be extremely valuable material, shedding light on a number of statements he made about literature and the study of it he initiated, provided they are looked at from the perspective of the method the philosopher applied (which he termed "style") to his analyses of the tradition of aesthetics and literary theory.

From this point of view the above-mentioned studies show, above all, that Ingarden's poetics, which specifies and concretizes his phenomenological philosophy (this is why we term it "the philosophy of literature", an expression that covers all the aspects of Ingarden's reflection on the art of writing literature, not just one of the specialized "types and branches" - as he put it - of its study), can be placed in the context of twentieth-century analytic philosophy or, more precisely, within the linguistic approach to it, in the analytic philosophy of language. The facts that justify such classification are the semantic angle of Ingarden's analyses, their order and type of reasoning as well as the priority he gave to the so-called ordinary language as the criterion for the choice and initial treatment of an object on the one hand, and the last resort, determining whether the reasoning is correct, on the other. This is also why Ingarden's concepts seem to be akin to the research into the ordinary language as carried out by English-speaking philosophers, and to similar inquiries made by some of the scholars of the Lvov-Warsaw school.

In Ingarden's philosophy of literature, however, the so-called ordinary language functions not only as the criterion delimiting the scope of investigations or the frame of reference for the results obtained later, through "direct" phenomenological experience, but also as a tool ("a code", as one might say, were it not inappropriate to apply this term to Ingarden's approach to language) with which they are conveyed and which makes it possible to get through to the reader. The fact that the philosopher chose to use this particular type of language in his discourse on the philosophy of literature is also one of the reasons why his concept can be placed in yet another context, namely that of the neo-idealistic approach. Placing Ingarden's poetics in this realm of thought is fairly reasonable, especially if we consider the functions ("the mission") which his reflections were meant to fulfil.

What is the point in interpreting, from a historical perspective, what Ingarden said about literature, except perhaps that such interpretation may fill a major gap in the study of Ingarden's thought, as recent research has shown

that this issue has been consistently avoided? In the first place, we can expect that it will help to clear up a few misconceptions about Ingarden's theory. It is easy to observe that those who comment on the philosopher's writings are often put in a dilemma, trying to reconcile some of his views (e.g. those on the truthfulness of a work of art or on the meaning of linguistic formations) which are clearly incompatible or even contradictory. They are usually labelled as "contradictions and inconsistencies", which are supposed to be inevitable if one deals with such a complex theory in all its multifarious ramifications. At the same time, these explanations are coupled with opinions which stress the coherence of the system created by the philosopher, the elaborate structure of his multi-facet reflection. The two points of view cannot be reconciled, even though each of them is partly accurate. This raises the question of the source of all these "contradictions" in the coherent structure built by the phenomenologist. One possible reason for it is that their roots were twofold, as they developed simultaneously on the neo-idealistic and the analytic bases. It is this overlap of the two intellectual trends, developing in Ingarden's day, which is responsible for the cracks occurring in his theory.

The above-mentioned schools of thought played a significant role in Polish philosophy in the 20-year period between the two world wars. It followed two directions, and in both cases the inspiration came from outside, transplanted from contemporary Western philosophy and enthusiastically welcomed by Polish scholars, who were eager for novelty and change. Despite the fact that Ingarden's attitude towards those trends was negative, as he considered them alien to his phenomenology, which was supposed to be different, they, nevertheless, formed the nearest setting for his proposition. Considering the relations between Polish neo-idealism and analyticism on the one hand, and Ingarden's version of Husserlian phenomenology on the other, one should not rely on the opinions expressed by the philosopher. For one thing he had a mistaken idea about other people's opinion on him, and for another his self-portrait is a mystification. Neither K. Twardowski, the founder of the Lvov-Warsaw school, nor his followers (K. Ajdukewicz, L. Blaustein, I. Dąbmska, W. Tatarkiewicz, S. Szuman, W. Witwicki), nor the neo-idealistic literary historians (W. Borow, J. Kleiner, Z. Łempicki) can be said to have been the philosopher's radical opponents. On the contrary, they sought to get closer to him, to reach some kind of understanding (there were even a few instances of collaboration between them), and they held his ideas in high esteem, yet many years had passed before Ingarden finally gave them their due.

Still, the philosopher laid particular stress on the influence the neo-idealists had on his research whereas he completely disregarded the inspiration he drew from the philosophers of analysis. The latter trend (which he termed, with a certain tinge of irony, "so-called analytical philosophy") was one he never spoke favourably of, at least not in the studies he published. It was probably because of the fact that the philosopher was not well-versed in different varieties of analyticism, and he treated them all as one and the same thing, namely he identified them with neopositivism of the Vienna Circle type, or with formal logic, and he totally ignored the analytic philosophy of language, which was the nearest thing to his own approach.

Thus, on reading Ingarden's philosophy of literature from the point of view of its links with its native historical background, one can detect the specific configuration of trends existing on the map of the twenty interwar years. At that time, unlike anywhere else, Poland witnessed an unprecedented interaction of various intellectual tendencies. This was evident in the careers of the scholars we have already mentioned. To give just a few examples - Twardowski came from Brentano's Austrian school, just like Husserl, Ingarden's mentor; Ingarden himself studied at Göttingen and under Twardowski, and, in a manner, also under Bergson; Ajdukiewicz studied in Germany under the same professors as Ingarden; Blaustein was probably more strongly influenced by Husserl and Ingarden than by Twardowski; Łempicki and Kleiner came from the Lvov-Warsaw school.

The development of the analytic movement in the sixties, and of late post-Heideggerian hermeneutics, which was, as a matter of fact, shaped by neo-idealism, especially by its Diltheyan variety, makes one wonder whether this hybrid of ideas was truly unprecedented. Maybe it was the specific situation which made it appear in Poland earlier and in a more conspicuous way than in other ethnic philosophies. The ten years that elapsed between 1960 and 1970 were a period when analyticians and phenomenologists (hermeneuticians) called for dialogue, demonstrated that their collaboration was possible, and pointed out that the differences between them were merely an illusion. Those who were in favour of closer collaboration showed that the basic categories used by thinkers of both schools, such as the ordinary language, "naive" consciousness and commonsense, could be, for a variety of reasons, regarded as synonyms. There is some evidence to suggest that such collaboration was possible, e.g. in the field of literary studies: investigations carried out by theoreticians who examined speech acts, especially those conducted by

J.R.Searle, but also by R.Ohmann and S.E.Fish, have their roots in J.L.Austin's analytic philosophy of language, and they are unexpectedly close to the phenomenological approach.

As the above question lies outside the scope of our discussion about Ingarden's philosophy of literature, we cannot dwell on it here. It should, however, be dealt with in separate studies, which particularly ought to examine the general (ontological and epistemological) circumstances surrounding the dialogue between the two styles of thinking predominant in the 20th century. As for Ingarden's position, it is enough to keep in mind the prospects it opens up. Our task for today is to show that it really opens them up. For this purpose, the treatises which state the phenomenologist's approach to language and the role it plays in cognition are of vital importance.

Phenomenology as Language Analysis

As have been mentioned before, Ingarden's reflections on the art of writing have a lot in common with linguistic analysis. The starting point for them is usually other people's views on the subjects in which the philosopher was interested. Ingarden makes a critical examination of those views from the standpoint of the language and notions their holders used, and gives an assessment of them where the basic criterion is their instrumental value. Regarded from this angle, the discourses under consideration are made clearer and more effective to provide the best basis for answering the questions posed by the philosopher. To Ingarden, the process of eradicating all the flaws and abuses in the sphere of notions is an essential prerequisite for getting the correct answers.

In Ingarden's view, many long-time disputes in aesthetics and the study of literature were provoked by the wrong use of language. To him, all the "headaches" connected with the question of truth and truthfulness of the work of art are a result of an ambiguous and imprecise use of the notions they intended to clarify. He says:

Time and time again the theory of art as well as aesthetics and numerous detailed critical studies bring up the question of truth in the work of art or truthfulness of the work of art (...) Frequent arguments, often heated, have been held on the subject, yet none of them clarified the matter. I believe that the main reason for

this was that in those disputes the words “truth” and “truthfulness” were used in an extremely ambiguous and obscure fashion.

For similar reasons, all the polemics focusing on true sore points of aesthetics such as the work of art itself, its form, content, function and value, seemed to have no end. In Ingarden’s opinion, those problems remained unresolved because the language applied to them was misused:

No attempts were made to elucidate age-old ambiguities lurking in the concept of form and content (or matter). This is why the difficulties could not have been settled, as the very question, meant to be a starting point for research, now became ambiguous. Worst of all, they got various things muddled up in such a way that nobody knew any longer what questions were supposed to be answered. The same is true of the concept of the value of a literary work, which has not been explained at all.

As a result, the philosopher says, it is impossible to agree with any of the sides taking part in this historical debate. Those who had their say confused various issues, and the obscurity of basic notions distorted their standpoints. Also, because of the wrong and misleading use of those notions the opponents were often at cross-purposes and the whole argument became irrelevant. In Ingarden’s opinion, that was the case e.g. with the polemic over form and content between F.T. Vischer and Zimmermann:

the whole of their discussion is beside the point. To Zimmermann, the most important thing is the possibility of justifying the objective and commonly-accepted aesthetics in respect of the theory of values, whereas to Vischer, it is the preconceived notion that all the “spiritual” or “vital” content has fundamental value, while “sensual” things are of secondary or even of no value at all. Thus, in fact, the two sides talked different languages, even though they used the same words, and in consequence they struggled for incommensurable objectives and were not able to understand each other, let alone reach some kind of agreement.

Having localized the inflammation focus of the diseases affecting philosophy, aesthetics and literary studies, Ingarden prescribes an appropriate therapy. The remedy he recommends should, in the first place, act on the language. Only when it is cured shall we be able to eradicate the effects the epidemic has had on the whole body of those branches of study:

any statement about the relationship between form and content, and, in particular, about their so-called “unity” is meaningless unless we specify the way we understand the words “form” and “content”. Only then can we verify those statements

- says the phenomenologist, confident, like the analyticians, that the remedy he prescribed will be effective.

The therapy, which - in Wittgenstein’s words - should allow a fly to find its way out of a glass fly trap, ought to consist, according to Ingarden, of a number of stages. At stage one, it is necessary to make an analysis of the way the terms which are to be clarified are used in the existing scholarly concepts and in ordinary language in order to separate them and delimit their extension. Thus, the philosopher begins his studies of the “truthfulness” of the work of art with compiling a kind of dictionary entry which lists different meanings and uses of a term. The material he collected was based on statements made by the students who attended his 1945-6 seminar at the Jagiellonian University. Thus, what he analyzed were the actual meanings occurring in colloquial speech, in daily communication practice, as well as theoretical uses, typical of aesthetics and literary studies. To Ingarden, both kinds of material had the same character because both of them were representative of the same kind of awareness, or rather unawareness, of the native speakers. According to him, pre-phenomenological studies, just like everyday communication, use language in an unconscious, uncritical and careless way. For instance, literary studies

are concerned with facts: they examine “truly” existing individual literary works (...) The first fact (...) that is acknowledged, even though hardly ever explicitly, is that a certain work of art does exist. This fact, however, is rarely deliberated on (...) and it is acknowledged in a slightly naive way (...)

In this respect, the language of the existing academic theories does not differ from ordinary language: they both lack self-awareness, and both serve to carry prereflective and dogmatic views. The meanings of the word “truth” with respect to a work of art, mentioned in the seminar discussions, reflected both kinds of awareness at the same time. This is why they were perfectly fit to become the basis for an entry. Ingarden’s task was to single them out and arrange them in an orderly way:

during my seminar on aesthetics (attended by people who had mostly completed their academic education, some of them were even university teachers) I held a discussion on truthfulness (...) Most of the uses I am trying to specify here were “nabbed in the act”, even if those participating in our discussion did not make a clear-cut distinction between them,

he says about the procedure he followed. The philosopher applied the same method to his discussion about values. He took under consideration comments made by those who attended meetings arranged by the Aesthetics Section of the Polish Philosophical Society, focusing less on the examples given than on the analysis of hypotheses, put forward in the course of many-hour debates, as to the meanings of terms and notions existing in the theory of art. These analyses, too, contributed to the compilation of a specific dictionary of basic concepts and categories of a theory of values developed later on.

The second stage of Ingarden's analysis involves establishing the actual rules of “language games”: specifying the objective circumstances in which a certain concept is used (by characterizing the object it refers to, the communication situation and its context) as well as the subjective circumstances (the speaker's cognitive objective, the “atmosphere” surrounding his/her cognition, knowledge and experience, and comments made by other participants in the discussion). Both types of conditions determine the semantics of a given expression.

According to Ingarden's studies, a critic having collected “various understandings” and rules governing the usage of a term, can try to classify them by grouping closely-related meanings together into a “family”, quite distinct from the other “families”. The fourteen-item list of the possible meanings of the word “truth” as understood in art, as well as the separation of four basic meanings of the term “form”, and sixteen meanings of “content”, are the results of the semantic analyses carried out by the phenomenologist.

The treatise on the form and content of the literary work is, together with the article “O różnych rozumieniach ‘prawdziwości’ dzieła sztuki” and the study of Aristotle's *Poetics*, a brilliant display of Ingarden's mastery of analysis, a masterpiece of the art of analysis. It commands respect not only because the semantic analysis Ingarden used is both penetrating and subtle, but also because the method he applied is absolutely precise.

The philosopher begins his discussion with a separation of issues pertinent to the question of form and content in philosophy, aesthetics and literary

studies. Concentrating on the two tricky terms, he writes a set of questions which should be asked in all those fields of study if one is to delimit clearly the area of investigation. He names two basic groups of problems: 1. those related to the object which will be examined, and 2. the aspect from which it will be looked at, and he makes a careful distinction between existential, constitutive and descriptive problems. It is now that he begins the semantic analysis proper. The starting point are various general concepts related to the form and content of any object, the next step are their specific uses related to any work of art, then to a work of art of a specific type and kind, and then - to concrete individual objects of art. Again, in his analysis Ingarden draws on "everyday" language and awareness, i.e. on "prescientific" aesthetic concepts (developed e.g. by F.T. Vischer, J. Volkelt and B. Croce) which made use of the terms the philosopher was interested in. However, he concentrates now not only on the terms used, but also on the order of argument, on the structure of the authors' thinking. Thus, his analysis of other people's language becomes an analysis of their reasoning.

The procedure Ingarden follows brings to mind the analytic process adopted by Kazimierz Twardowski, whose lectures the philosopher attended before he went to Göttingen. To the founder of the Lvov-Warsaw school, observation of language was the focal point of analysis. As Twardowski wrote in his treatise *O czynnościach i wytworach* (On Actions and Products), language provides the first and the most important stimuli to theoretical reflections. The differences occurring in it are not only grammatical in character; they are also differences of a "logical", i.e. ontological nature. The distinction between a verb and a gerund made Twardowski separate the two concepts occurring in the title of his treatise: judgement as an action and as a "product", an outcome of the process of judging. The opposition between them was the pivotal part of his concept, and, at the same time, it implicitly showed the parallelism between the structure of language and the structure of the world, which was later discussed by Ajdukiewicz.

It is hard to say whether Ingarden would have accepted this parallelism. What he said about a partial explanation of the relationship between sound and meaning, about the symmetry between the structure of a name and the object it designates, makes us believe that he would not have contested this idea, even though he would have probably distanced himself from Ajdukiewicz's concept of the notional apparatus, especially from the conventionalistic conclusions drawn from it. Anyway, at the start his position on the role of language in

philosophical studies tallies with the views held by analyticians. As for the method of examining this language and the order of others' "ordinary" reasoning, the procedure adopted by the phenomenologist resembles G.E. Moore's three questions procedure.

Embarking on his discussion of the existing theories, widely circulating among scholars, Ingarden tried to gain an insight into the meaning of the statements made by a particular author. Whenever the material allowed it, he began by asking the question: what did he mean by using a given notion, what did it mean to him? The answer were definitions quoted *in extenso*. The second question was about the meaning in which this notion was actually used in the theory under examination, the meaning it really had, usually different from what the author thought, or about the meanings it implied. Then the philosopher considered the polemics written by the author, for they showed clearly all the semantic shifts vis-à-vis the denotation of the notion explained in its definition. This is how he examined the meanings in which the terms "content" and "form" were used by Vischer. He made the following observation:

If(...) we take a closer look at Vischer's polemic against the "formalists" (against Zimmermann), we shall find out, to our surprise, that what the argument is all about is the introduction of a different concept of form rather than the acknowledgement that what we call "beauty" also involves - according to Vischer - a factor termed "content", "subject matter", "sense", "meaning" etc. (...)

For that purpose he also confronted the author's definition of a notion with the examples he gave to illustrate it. They, too, enabled Ingarden to disclose the hidden meanings of the terms he examined.

In Ingarden's opinion, all the semantic transgressions of this type were committed unintentionally; even authors such as Croce, who were well aware that the categories they used were ambiguous, and who strove to remove those ambiguities, did not realize that the actual meanings of the terms they employed differed from what they intended to express. According to Ingarden, one of the reasons was that their unspoken sympathies lay with certain theories, and they preferred solutions of a specific nature, which affected the whole process of their reasoning. This is how he explained inconsistencies occurring in Volkelt's theory: he pointed out that despite Volkelt's polemic against both the aesthetics of form and the aesthetics of content, he was, in fact, in favour of

the former, and he smuggled its conclusions into his own theory. Such unintentionally-accepted assumptions and unspoken, but often decisive, premises are often a source of ambiguities: this is why Ingarden considered it particularly important to expose them. As a matter of fact, his intention fitted in with the idea of phenomenology as a philosophy which is free of pre-judgements distorting cognition. At this point, the suggestions made by the analyticians correspond with the programme adopted by the phenomenologist.

On the basis of the analysis described above and corresponding with the first two stages of Moore's procedure, Ingarden presented his own detailed version of the definition of a term given by the author he was writing about: he listed all the meanings with which the term was used in the author's theory, and at the end of his discussion he mentioned the effects it had on the content of the author's analyses. This also helped Ingarden to find out that an outline of the concept that a work of art has two dimensions to it can be traced back to Aristotle's *Poetics*, where it is clearly present, even though, contrary to what he said, it was not put forward in plain words:

As to the theory of the structure of the literary work, we do not find in Aristotle a clear and theoretically sophisticated distinction between the two different dimensions of the work (...) Nevertheless, Aristotle (...) describes two separate divisions of the work: those (...) which are encompassed within the several "strata" of the work, and those which he calls "quantitative parts" or magnitudinal. Agreement to their inclusion compels the recognition, in a general theory, of a second dimension of the work: its span from beginning to end and its multiphase character.

While commenting on other thinkers' reasoning, i.e. on establishing the "real" sense of the terms they used, Ingarden clearly makes a translation from the author's language into his own language, the language of his own theory of the literary work. In the Lvov-Warsaw school, this kind of reading, ignoring the original context of the theory and its original notional apparatus, was initiated by Twardowski. Many of his students followed suit.

In Ingarden's philosophy of literature the best examples of this kind of translating from one language into another are his analyses of Aristotle's *Poetics* and of Lessing's *Laocoön*. Both treatises were not only read in the light of the phenomenological theory, but also faithfully translated from beginning to end into its language. To Ingarden, the basic categories used by Aristotle and

Lessing are exact equivalents of the concepts he introduced in his treatise *O dziele literackim* (The Literary Work of Art). Therefore in both treatises he finds a lecture on the four strata and two dimensions of a literary object of art, as well as numerous analogies to the way he deals with the main problem of his poetics: what makes a literary work different from other forms of linguistic act. Besides, Aristotle and Lessing are also supposed to present an identical interpretation of the question of truth and truthfulness of the literary work and its relations with the outside world. To both of them, literary sentences are quasi-judgements, but their apparently assertive character results from the functions performed by an utterance, not from its organization. Thus, to both of them the world of art is not an imitation of reality - it is a kind of quasi-reality, autonomous and specific, which only pretends that it really exists. From the standpoint of his own double-aspect (subjective-objective) philosophy of literature, Ingarden emphasizes that both Aristotle and Lessing look at the literary work of art from two perspectives: that of an objective thing "in itself" and that of a thing whose purpose is to influence the audience. Moreover, in both cases this influence means enabling the reader to feel aesthetic emotions and to form an aesthetic value. Also, the methods of research used by the authors of *Poetics* and *Laocoön* correspond to the phenomenologist's stipulations, as they both adopt a non-psychological approach, treating the literary work of art as independent of its creator's experience, and describe it in a purely theoretical way, without a trace of normativism, on the basis of "direct", "empirical" (in the phenomenological sense of the word) experience.

From the point of view of the links between the methods used by the phenomenologists and the analyticians, the objections Ingarden raises to the theories examined are fairly symptomatic. In his comments on *Poetics* and *Laocoön*, in his analysis of the concepts developed by Vischer, Volkelt and Croce, he makes a lot of critical remarks. They are always made from the standpoint of the principles of clear, unambiguous thinking. As was mentioned before, Ingarden points out various mistakes in the use of language: ambiguities in basic categories, lack of precise meaning which results from confusion between various extensions and uses of a term, their obscurity and vagueness. He also made the same kind of critical comment on the treatises written by analyticians, such as Kotarbiński and Twardowski, and by representatives of formal logic. It is clear from his criticism that his purism goes far beyond the standards of accuracy accepted by those who promoted the idea of "clear thinking".

Another type of objections Ingarden raised to other people's reasoning is lack of logical accuracy in what they said. The philosopher looks at various concepts from the standpoint of consistency in the theses expressed in them. More often than not he proves that the authors' statements are based on a *petitio principii*. As a matter of fact, he detects this error (as well as psychologism) in every theory examined, i.e. not only in those developed by the neo-positivists, but also in those propounded by Bergson and by Husserl during his period of transcendental idealism. He also detects this "viscious circle" in studies written by literary theoreticians such as Kleiner and Łempicki, whom he held in relatively high esteem.

To Ingarden, the logical order of a discourse, appropriate reasoning and sound justification, as well as precise terms and lack of ambiguity, are the necessary components of the ideal model of thinking. This ideal falls in exactly with the standards set by the analyticians who took the descriptionistic approach.

Between Analytical Philosophy and Neo-Idealism

In the light of the above-mentioned similarities between the method of thinking used by the analyticians and the one used by Ingarden it seems surprising that the phenomenologist should have taken a negative stance on the procedures they followed. It is true that he characterized phenomenology as the philosophy of analysis:

From the outset phenomenology was designed to be a kind of open philosophy, whose style of examining or, in other words, its analytic method of examination, was outlined in *Ideas*, and employed in a variety of cases, and therefore made quite clear

- and he thought that its programme corresponded with later tendencies in analytical philosophy:

If several dozen years later a certain tendency in twentieth-century positivism called itself analytical philosophy, it proved that the research postulates put forward by phenomenology were justified

- but - even though he approved of the line of inquiry and the attitude of this philosophy - he definitely questioned the methods it employed. In his

opinion, analytical philosophy could be considered a continuation of the phenomenologists' ideas and practice,

if this new analytical philosophy were really able to carry out analyses. However, *Philosophical Investigations* and later studies by Wittgenstein show clearly how helpless this philosophy is when it faces problems it is just beginning to become aware of, and this happens several dozen years after they were tackled by the phenomenologists.

It is not important here that on expressing this opinion Ingarden made the same kind of linguistic error that he criticized other thinkers for, namely he used the expression "analytical philosophy" to describe theories as different as neo-positivism and Wittgenstein's second philosophy, as it is called. The phenomenologist did not know very well the differences between various kinds of analyticism, and while talking about them he usually misused the term. We should rather try to find out why he said that the procedures they used were uneffectual and in what way they were different from phenomenological analysis, as he did not explain it clearly.

In order to understand Ingarden's position, it is worthwhile to compare two critical comments against Kotarbiński made by Ingarden and Ajdukiewicz. Even though they deal with different studies (Ajdukiewicz discusses *Elementy teorii poznania, logiki formalnej i metodologii nauk* (The Elements of the Theory of Knowledge, Formal Logic and Methodology of Science), whereas Ingarden analyses the treatise *W sprawie istnienia przedmiotów idealnych* (The Problem of the Existence of Ideal Objects)) and they are not equally important, they can be compared owing to the kind of reasoning used in them.

Both Ajdukiewicz and Ingarden analyse Kotarbiński's ideas in accordance with the classical rules of philosophical linguistic analysis: they examine the terms he used and the order of his reasoning, and they point out the linguistic and logical failings occurring in it. Ingarden shows that the terms used by Kotarbiński are ambiguous, unclear and imprecise, which results in a contradiction between certain statements, whereas Ajdukiewicz, who uses the same method, shows lack of correspondence between the author's stipulation that the language of philosophy be free of hypostatizations, and his own language, with its numerous void names. The difference between both polemics is that Ajdukiewicz does not go further than his linguistic-logical objections, whereas to Ingarden they are the starting point of the criticism proper. He proves that

Kotarbiński committed some linguistic errors and therefore went wrong in rejecting the concept of ideal objects. In Ingarden's opinion, their negation would not have been possible if the author of the treatise had not shown such inaccurate understanding of the terms "feature", "class" and "set". Thus, the objective of Ingarden's polemic is radically different from Ajdukiewicz's. By criticizing the notional apparatus the phenomenologist aims at ontological conclusions, while the analytician stops at that. Kotarbiński's reaction to the two polemics was an indirect confirmation of that difference. Significantly, he ignored Ingarden's objections, even though they were apparently more serious, whereas the review written by Ajdukiewicz disturbed him profoundly. He published it *in extenso*, without a word of comment, in the second edition of his book, thus expressing a tacit admission that the analysis was correct. By doing this, he also pointed out, in a manner of speaking, that the subjects and the hierarchy of problems in phenomenological philosophy and in analytical philosophy were radically different.

To an analytician, the true - and often the only - value of a thought is its precision. As to Polish analytical philosophy, this ideal was frequently formulated by Twardowski, who e.g. preached the following sermon in his treatise on Nietzsche:

skilful philosophy can never get too tired of stating and restating its sensible and irrevocable stipulation that the accuracy of expression be the prime requirement for philosophical analysis. He who does not accept that is lost to philosophy.

This idea was not alien to Ingarden either. He also used to begin his reasoning with analytical problems, with semantic and logical analysis. He, however, treated it in a different way, as an instrument for further analysis rather than its ultimate goal. Unlike the analyticians, he was not interested in debates on language alone. What he discussed were the existing "everyday" terms; he examined them closely, established the actual extension with which they were used in various concepts, sorted them out and grouped into "semantic families" in order to get at the things they labelled with the aid of the means thus clarified, for the basis on which he formulated, justified and verified his opinions was not linguistic or logical observations but direct knowledge.

Unlike analytical philosophy, Ingarden's phenomenology does not ask questions about language, but about the world expressed in this language, about

“things themselves” revealed in experience; it is interested in language insofar as it enables us to describe our experience accurately. “We are not concerned (...) with terms alone, but with the thing they are supposed to hit”, declared the philosopher in his article “O uzasadnianiu” (On Foundation), having carried out a thorough analysis of the term used in the title. Linguistic criticism is necessary, for the wrong use of language shuts us off from the thing itself. A judgement should hit the object direct; the intentional object produced by the language of judgement ought to be transparent in relation to the object examined, there ought to be an ideal correspondence between them. Language (or rather the intentional object it creates) cannot stand between a thought and the reality that the thought refers to. It is only when language is used incorrectly (or in specialized uses, e.g. in literature) that a kind of impenetrable covering, impossible to pierce through, is formed around the object, and so all sorts of dogmas arise, which prevent us from seeing “the thing itself”. In fact, this is the true substance of Ingarden’s criticism of Croce’s ideas. What he criticizes is not the expressionist’s linguistic disorder only, but the fact that this disorder blurs the things he talks about:

in Croce’s aesthetic views there are so many things muddled up, and so many basic terms linked together that the reality with which he deals and which he tries to bring under control with his theory, is, so to speak, cloudy with the haze produced by his imprecise language and imperfect notional apparatus.

If the objective of the phenomenologist’s analysis is “the thing itself” rather than the language that describes it, then the highest authority, determining whether the reasoning is correct and appropriate for the object examined, is “empirics” - the “eyewitness” contact with the object and the “insight” into its “essence”. Thus, other people’s thoughts about the object are eventually subject to verification on the basis of direct experience. Consequently, after a linguistic analysis of various concepts of form and content, Ingarden turns his attention to the literary reality: he analyses poems by Rilke, Goethe, Staff, Obertyńska, Verlaine, and Baudelaire; he mentions novels by Conrad, Rolland, Zola, Nałkowska and Reymont, classical tragedies and plays by Ibsen. On this basis he presents his own approach to the problem that preoccupies the aestheticians: to find out what is, say, the unity of form and content in a work of art. He does not share the skepticism expressed by the analyticians, who doubt that it is

possible to talk about the world. It is the world he wants to talk about, not other people's thoughts.

As to the representatives of the analytical philosophy of language, the one whose approach was akin to Ingarden's was J.L. Austin. In his treatise *A Plea for Excuses*, which offered the programme of his "linguistic phenomenology", he said:

When we examine what we should say when, what words we should use in what situations, we are looking again not *merely* at words (or "meanings", whatever they may be) but also at the realities we use the words to talk about (...). For this reason I think it might be better to use for this way of doing philosophy, some less misleading name than those given above - for instance, "linguistic phenomenology", only that is rather a mouthful.

Austin's linguistic phenomenology had no true continuation in the field of literary studies until R. Ohmann came up with his theory of speech acts.

The difference between the objective of analytical philosophy and that of phenomenological philosophy stems from the fact that they perceived in a different way the relations between a thought (the subject of cognition) and reality. In the epistemology developed by the analyticians, these relations could not be kept were it not for language, serving as an intermediary. To them, thinking (cognition) is thinking (cognition) in a language. This is why the philosopher's task is to examine various utterances about the world. Phenomenological epistemology, on the other hand, assumes and postulates the possibility of experiencing things directly, non-verbally, or rather pre-verbally. From this angle, language is no more than the necessary instrument for communicating the content of that experience, presenting the results of the direct cognition of the object, without the aid of any intermediaries, for it is only then that it shows its "true colours", its essence. As a matter of fact, were it not the phenomenologist's duty (and obligation) to share his experience with others, he could keep quiet about it, thus avoiding the danger of deforming the "essence" he has perceived, which can always happen when one puts one's experience into words.

Ingarden, however, is guided by the ideal of intersubjective knowledge; he thinks that his mission is to convey the "real" image of the world to other inexperienced (not experiencing) subjects. This is why he cannot reject language. The choice between the possible discourses that he makes in order to

minimize the discrepancy between experience and message corresponds to the choice made by the analyticians.

To the phenomenologist, the danger of deforming the content of an experience is the greatest when the results of cognition are conveyed by means of scientific language, which uses abstract notions and definitions explaining their meaning. The danger is the slightest when he uses ordinary language, for it is this kind of language that preserves the undeformed content of man's primaevial contact with the world. The preference for ordinary language is another link between Ingarden's philosophy of literature and analyticism.

However, the main reason why Ingarden chose ordinary language were not the arguments presented by the analyticians, but his fascination with Bergson's thought. In the phenomenologist's opinion, Bergson's criticism of language stemmed from his anxiety about a possible falsification of intuition grasping the thing "*an sich*". Although Bergson's criticism was aimed not only at the language of the exact sciences and the kind of philosophy that followed their example and was biased towards the natural sciences, his writings taught Ingarden to treat this kind of language with extreme caution.

Intellectual language is a paradigm which (...) stabilizes the forms that are paradigms of activities. Language is responsible for the "cinematographic" aspect of our reality - something like separate frames on magnetic tape, still sections of a live picture. Language makes us perceive reality and ourselves in this way (...) Language is partly to blame for our false idea of the world

- he summarized Bergson's theses he referred to in his own studies. He compared Bergson's language, free-wheeling, eloquent, and depictive, with the language used by the phenomenologists and he found out that the only difference between them was that the latter replaced "poeticisms" with everyday expressions, which were even more effective.

Thus, Ingarden's choice of ordinary language and the option the analyticians went for did not have the same origin. One thing they had in common was their mistrust of scientism, of its notional apparatus. In Ingarden's case, however, it was related to the criticism of positivistic science presented by the neo-idealists at the initial stage of the construction of their own concept of knowledge, whereas the philosophers of linguistic analysis were influenced in their decisions by a critical approach to neo-positivism as well as to speculative

idealistic philosophy. Ingarden's attitude towards this latter kind of philosophy was ambivalent, but he rejected neither the method nor the language it used.

Ordinary Consciousness - Hermeneutics - Dialogue

The standpoints taken by Ingarden and the analyticians are different not only because the reasons why they chose ordinary language were different, but also because they had different attitudes towards that language. In this respect, however, Ingarden's stance is also different from the views held by the neo-idealists, who preferred ordinary consciousness immersed in the *Lebenswelt*. What all the three approaches had in common was only their recognition of "ordinaries" as the alternative to scientism.

The Cambridge and Oxford thinkers displayed an unlimited confidence in the infallibility of ordinary language. They believed - perhaps with the exception of Austin - that it was a universal panacea for all the ills of philosophy. They had no doubt at all that this kind of language was economical and obeyed the law of sufficient reason. They accepted uncritically the idea that it was only the language of science, and of the philosophy modelled on science, that had got "suffocated", and they blamed this philosophy as the sole agent responsible for all the diseases affecting the body of human knowledge.

The neo-idealists had a similar attitude towards common consciousness - at least this was the attitude they declared. The glorification of this consciousness, which began with Dilthey's praise of the *Lebenswelt*, continued in the same form until the time of Heidegger, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty and Gadamer. In spite of all the differences between their concepts, what they have in common is confidence in the infallibility of ordinary reason (intuition, day-to-day life, experience of living, carnality), and of ordinary language, which preserves man's pre-theoretical, unspoiled by reflection and therefore "real", intentional attitude towards the world. Husserl also expressed this view in his last studies, which in consequence amounted to questioning the validity and value of discursive thinking, objective analysis and methodical investigations.

Nonetheless, in Anglo-Saxon analytical philosophy and in Franco-Germanic neo-idealistic philosophy the enclaves of "truth" in the world of daily life were practically illusory. Heidegger was distancing himself from them when he contrasted *Rede* with *Gerede*. The same is true of Sartre, who introduced a categorically evaluative contrast between *être en soi* and *être pour soi*, and of Moore, whose analytical procedure required an answer to the third question,

that about the “real” meaning of the term discussed. As a matter of fact, in all of the above cases it was the philosophers’ theoretical consciousness that had superior authority and offered arbitrary predetermined solutions to apparently undetermined dilemmas.

There are three thinkers, however, whose ideas stand out from all the others. On the one hand, neither Austin, nor Ricoeur, nor Ingarden have an uncritical faith in ordinary language and consciousness immersed in daily life. On the other hand, despite their skeptical attitude, they do not belittle their significance. They seem to have found a third option in preference to the alternatives: “commonly held view” - “theoretical reflection”, “to know how” - “to know what”, “life” - “science”, “practice” - “theory”.

The reasons why Ingarden, Heidegger and Sartre turned to ordinary consciousness were the same. They resulted from their critical attitude towards Husserl’s transcendental idealism, which, in their opinion, had failed to take advantage of the slogan “*zurück zu den Sachen selbst*”. Husserl’s transcendental *Ego*, described in his *Ideas*, and regarded as the absolute beginning of philosophical thinking, its “unfounded foundation”, was contrasted with ordinary, “naïve” consciousness immersed in the elements of daily life. This consciousness was supposed to be the “absolute zero” of philosophical reflection Husserl had been looking for, but it was treated not as Husserl’s *fundamentum inconcussum* but as the point where *Zirkel in Verstehen* breaks up.

Unlike Husserl’s other opponents, Ingarden, who agreed that ordinary consciousness should be the starting point of philosophical thinking (as a philosopher “has to begin somewhere”, according to the words he used while describing the phenomenologists’ aims), had the same critical attitude towards it as towards any other consciousness. Even though he assumed that it suffered fewer of the usual afflictions than other ready-made beliefs, he thought that it should be treated with suspicion until it was verified by direct experience, with which its content was to be confronted later on.

Ingarden also thought that the language of this consciousness did not deserve confidence without “an insight into the thing itself”:

When we finally come into contact with objects, the role of terms used in ordinary language is over. What is more, we must try to break away from all the suggestions offered by this language. There is no doubt that the habit of using certain words, or terms, rather than others, brings about, or is capable of bringing about, some changes in the way we see the object (*idola fori!*) (...)

Breaking away from the ready-made language, or ready-made notional apparatus, can be achieved - with the aid of experience - only if we consciously suspend the validity of the terms we have used so far and of the opinions we hold

- he wrote. In Ingarden's opinion, ordinary language, which enables us to begin our philosophical thinking, has to be later on "bracketed" and subjected to a critical dispassionate analysis. As Austin put it, it is the first, not the last, word in the linguistic phenomenologist's reflections:

Certainly ordinary language has no claim to be the last word, if there is such a thing. (...) And it must be added too, that superstition and error and fantasy of all kinds do become incorporated in ordinary language and even sometimes stand up to the survival text. (...) Certainly, then, ordinary language is not the last word (...)

It is not only the method of reflection Ingarden demonstrates in his treatises, e.g. on truth in art or on the form and content of the work of art, which reveals the real function and significance ordinary language and consciousness had for him, but also their arrangement in the authorized book *Studia z estetyki* (Studies in Aesthetics). It is probably no coincidence that they were not printed in chronological order. The article "O tzw. 'prawdzie' w literaturze" (On So-Called "Truth" in Literature), written in 1937, in which Ingarden gives his opinion on the question, is preceded by the semantic treatise on "various understandings" of truth in the work of art, written nearly ten years later. The change in order seems to indicate that, in the phenomenologist's opinion, before one develops one's own concept, one should analyze the existing concepts that have entered into the ordinary, "practical" and scientific consciousness. One arrives at the truth through a critical analysis of other people's truths. The arrangement of the studies of form and content leads us to similar conclusions. The problem absorbed Ingarden's attention for nearly a quarter of a century. His first article on the subject was written in 1937. The philosopher's purpose was to establish the general meanings of the two terms mentioned in the title. However, the article was not included in his *Dziela* (Works). Ingarden continued with this type of "quite general" analysis in his 1939 review of Łempicki's *Forma i norma* (Form and Norm), which was not included either in Volume Two of his *Studia z estetyki*, even though it contained a block of treatises on form and content (Ingarden published it in Volume Three, in the polemic and discussion

section). Moreover, neither of the relevant chapters of Volume One of *Spór o istnienie świata* (Controversy over the Existence of the World), published in 1948 but written during World War II, which established the essence of form and content by the eidetic method, was included in the block of articles published in *Studia z estetyki*. Instead, the block begins with a purely semantic study, written a year later, in 1949, which draws on the findings of the analytical school. The study is called “Ze studiów nad zagadnieniem treści i formy dzieła sztuki” and deals with the meanings of both categories in the concepts presented by various thinkers. Ingarden first carries out his semantic analysis on the basis of “ordinary” language and “ordinary” scientific consciousness. Then he presents his own point of view in his 1958 article “O formie i treści dzieła sztuki literackiej”. Thus, he makes it quite clear that phenomenological eidetic analysis has to be preceded by linguistic analysis in which the object in question is examined in terms of the natural attitude of everyday life.

Ingarden, however, does not treat ordinary consciousness as an aid whose role is over once the area of phenomenological research is delimited, nor does he confine its function to clearing that area prior to direct experience. In other words, direct experience does not invalidate or eliminate this consciousness. This consciousness cannot be downgraded the way it happened in the case of Moore’s third question, Sartre’s *être en soi* or Heidegger’s *Dasein*.

In his analyses of other people’s concepts, which have entered into the “ordinary” scientific consciousness, Ingarden does not distort the authors’ intentions, even though his method neutralizes the original context in which those concepts appeared. Even the most arbitrary of his interpretations, e.g. of Aristotle’s *catharsis* and *mimesis*, fall within the confines set by the theory in question. No one can say that the philosopher forced on *Poetics* or *Laocoön* the theses for which there is no evidence in those books.

Probably in all of his studies, Ingarden adheres to the principle of co-ordinating his own, gradually developing, opinions with the content of ordinary consciousness. The above is true of his *Spór*, where he analyses the existing views on the relations between consciousness and the world, and then singles out those which are noncontradictory in terms of rules of formal ontology. It is true of his minor philosophical treatises, where he rejects all the proposed ideas about how we should understand subjectivity and objectivity, and formulates his own theory, which, nevertheless, respects the well-established meanings with which these terms are likely to be used (either in the objective, ontological sense, or in the subjective, epistemological sense). It is true of his

aesthetic studies, where he examines the terms “form” and “content” as used by scholars, and specifies the ordinary uses of these terms in aesthetics, and leaves some of them, namely the ones which are the least ambiguous and the most functional. It is true of his book *O dziele literackim*, where ordinary consciousness is not only the basic criterion for his choice of the material he is going to subject to an eidetic analysis, but it is also actively involved in formulating and answering further questions raised by the phenomenologist. If the results of his pure, assumption-free, essential analysis turn out to be incompatible with common experience, Ingarden either rejects them or at least tones his interpretation down.

This is how the concept of so-called borderline cases verified the theory of the literary work of art worked out by the eidetic approach, the remarks on the phases of such a work introduced major corrections in the description of its multilayer structure, and the theses on the history of concretization ruled out the substantial criterion of literariness in favour of the operational one. It is quite reasonable to suppose that those corrections were made because the essential theses put forward by the phenomenologist were incompatible with the realities of literature and the way its “ordinary consumers” came into contact with it. What is more, the readers’ experience makes Ingarden withdraw a few questions put forward from the standpoint of theoretical consciousness. Thus, on considering “the difficulties (...) which make it hard to understand how it is possible for us to read a literary work in the first place, or listen to it and comprehend it”, and in view of the obvious fact that such works *are* read and understood, he is forced to admit that “such difficulties theoretically arise from the fact that a concrete process of reading and listening is grossly inaccurately treated as abstract”, and to dismiss this apparent dilemma. Similarly, Ingarden’s recognition of the real communication practice interferes in his philosophy of language: the theory of meaning as a usage competes successfully with the concept of meaning as a reference to the intentional object. Even if Ingarden questions the existing “common” solutions, he agrees that they may give a good explanation of certain issues, which are of little interest to the phenomenological philosophy of literature, but which are important to other branches of literary studies. This is why on criticizing the neo-Kantian interpretation of form and content he speaks favourably of Kleiner’s treatise *Treść i forma w poezji* (Content and Form in Poetry), which explains creative processes on the basis of this interpretation.

Thus, ordinary language and everyday consciousness are ever-present in Ingarden's writings. He is guided by them in his reflections, where they are both the starting point and the horizon of reference. What is more, in time their role and involvement seem to have grown as the philosopher was moving away from the first stage of radically eidetic phenomenology. Initially, in the twenties (when he wrote his *Dążenia Fenomenologów* (The Aims of the Phenomenologists, a treatise often mentioned here) Ingarden's approach was dictated by necessity rather than choice when he had the option : silence or the language of science (or, historically speaking: Bergsonism or positivistic scienticism), and he decided to adopt a third, intermediate approach. His later choice, however, was not limited in any way. In the sixties, when Ingarden was chiefly concerned with axiological problems, his recognition of the validity of ordinary consciousness began to equal his recognition of the validity of direct experience. Theoretical consciousness and ordinary consciousness became treated on an equal basis. As a matter of fact, the origins of that approach can be traced back to his earlier writings. There, theoretical consciousness is to the pre-reflexive content of common experience as form is to content in Kant's concept: ordinary consciousness and the language in which it is expressed are the data, whereas theoretical consciousness is to be deduced.

In his thinking, Ingarden moves continually to and fro. When he is to answer the eidetic phenomenological question, he turns to everyday know-how: "the moment we start our analysis we have to be practically able to select works of value from among all the works of art so as to concentrate our attention chiefly (...) on them while carrying out our analysis of their structure and characteristics", as he defines the order he established in his *O dziele literackim*. However, he treats ordinary consciousness as self-unconscious, so to speak, as something that does not "know that": "it is one thing to be able to distinguish between works of value and works of no value in one's practical experience of analysis; quite another to explain theoretically what the value of a work of art is and what it depends on".

Theoretical consciousness, superstructured on it, stimulates its self-understanding, sheds light on it and illuminates its content. As a matter of fact, this is the sole purpose of it:

My contribution, Ingarden says, summing up the role he played in the analysis of various meanings of truth in a work of art, consists in the fact that I have made clear differentiations and have given definitions of those meanings using

the notional apparatus I have devised for the philosophical theory of art, and in the fact that I have classified the terms thus differentiated in a systematic and orderly way.

In Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz's words, theoretical consciousness only sublimates ordinary consciousness.

Thus, Ingarden's method of thinking is quite close to Ricoeur's hermeneutics with its absence, as was mentioned before, of the dilemma as to whether to choose pre-epistemological or theoretical consciousness. There, objectifiable knowledge by analysis does not invalidate common experiential understanding. According to Ricoeur, rejecting reflection would amount to rejecting language, an attitude as naive as it is incompatible with the anthropological functions which he, just like Ingarden, assigned to his own philosophical reflection. To Ricoeur, the language of the "knowledge that" is no problem, whereas in Ingarden's philosophy of art it is a very serious dilemma. By solving it, the philosopher transforms his hermeneutics into the art of dialogue.

Ingarden questions the validity of using either scientific or ordinary language as the only instrument for communicating with the reader - a potential phenomenologist. The reasons why he questions the former have already been presented. As to the latter, his unfavourable opinion derives from the fact that this kind of language is not an adequate instrument for transmitting to ordinary consciousness its purified and elucidated content. He doubts its efficiency, just like Austin, to whom ordinary language is something better than the metaphysics of the Stone Age, namely, as we said, the inherited experience, and acumen of many generations of men. (...) If a distinction works well for practical purposes in ordinary life (...), then there is sure to be something in it; it will not mark nothing: yet this is likely enough to be not the best way of arranging things if our interests are more extensive or intellectual than the ordinary.

This kind of language, the analytician says, holds what is necessary for a "natural" pre-epistemological contact with the world, i.e. somewhat less than necessary in terms of theoretical knowledge focused on it. Similarly, Ingarden says that this language has not coined terms appropriate for verbalizing direct experience which may, or may not, agree with the content of ordinary consciousness. Thus, the phenomenologist has to reject it:

To have words as intersubjectively intelligible formations (...) is absolutely necessary the moment the individually-obtained results of our experience (...)

are to be presented to other subjects. (...) it is a special question, namely a question of going beyond ordinary language, so to speak, in order to gain experience and process the suppositions which are altogether absent from ordinary language. Can these new meanings (suppositions) enter our language in such a way that they will be intelligible to those people who have not had such experience (...)? It is impossible to use the existing words.

Other kinds of language do not fulfill Ingarden's requirements either. For example, one should not introduce poetic language into philosophy lest this should result in hermetism. Much as this kind of language has no equal in terms of evocativeness, it discourages the "ordinary" reader rather than encourages him to reflect together with the phenomenologist. This is why Ingarden rejects Bergson's and Heidegger's attempts.

Ingarden's solution to the problem of theoretical language is unprecedented in comparison with those offered by the analyticians and neo-idealists. The philosopher suggests communicating through dialogue, talking to one another, which means thinking together:

We should enable other people to gain the same experience as we have, which has enabled us to form a new appropriate supposition. This is a question of the art or technique of conversation whose purpose is to suggest the right experience to the interlocutor.

What makes Ingarden's views different from Ricoeur's is his idea of the language in which the hermeneutic philosopher's thought, swinging like a pendulum, should be expressed.

This dialogue should be conducted in the language the reader is most familiar with, but this language should also be depictive and evocative. Instead of naming things, it should evoke their forms recognized by the phenomenological "consciousness that":

we started with ordinary language (...) and we have to use ordinary words with the same reservations. Thus we choose words which are commonly used and therefore understood, at least to a certain extent, by the majority of people (...) we choose words which are as "intuitive" as possible, i.e. which are capable of calling up images of the appropriate objects.

According to Ingarden, this kind of dialogue not only ensures “intellectual cooperation” but also saves us from dogmatism. It does not force us to accept ready-made formulas nor is it meant to be a lecture. It shows the reader the way to the authentic knowledge of the world and to self-knowledge. In his polemic against Jerzy Pelc and the “family” Kotarbiński’s disciple is a member of, Ingarden refuses to recognize authoritarian systems of thinking:

The family I am a member of, he says, try to share their experience - by means of communication - with other people and (...) to awaken other people’s experience.

In the philosopher’s opinion, it takes a special talent, a natural ability, to conduct a conversation like that. This is a thing one cannot learn. According to him, dialogue is the essence of phenomenology. Where it ends, phenomenology ends, too.

As to the objectives of phenomenological analysis, it is significant that it was carried out in those centres where phenomenological research was conducted, where many scholars worked together and where debates over the same issues continued for months on end. This is the way things looked at Göttingen for a number of years, and in some other centres as well, wherever the phenomenologists managed to create a proper atmosphere of teamwork. Where, on the other hand, phenomenological work took the form of individual research, it soon degenerated into various trends whose names may have suggested some links with phenomenology, but, in fact, they had little in common with it.