

<https://doi.org/10.21638/2226-5260-2020-9-2-683-702>

ROMAN INGARDEN'S CONCEPT OF THE FILMIC WORK OF ART: STRATA, SOUND, SPECTACLE

ROBERT LUZECKY

PhD Program in Philosophy.
Department of Philosophy, Purdue University.
47907 West Layfayette, IN, USA.

E-mail: rluzecky@purdue.edu

In the present paper, I suggest a modification to some aspects of Ingarden's analyses of the sound-synchronized filmic work of art. The argument progresses through two stages: (1) I clarify Ingarden's claim that the work of art is a stratified formation in which the various aspects present objectivities; (2) I elucidate and critically assess Ingarden's suggestion that the filmic work of art is a borderline case in respect to other types of works of art—paintings and literary works. Here, I identify a problem with Ingarden's claims about the function of sound in the concretized filmic work's presentation of its fictive world. Ingarden identifies the presented universe of the filmic work of art as a *habitus* of reality, but Ingarden seems oddly conflicted with respect to his notion of *habitus*. I argue that this stems from Ingarden's conceptualization of the filmic work of art as primarily composed of the stratum of represented "visible aspects" in both the cases of the silent film and the sound-synchronized film, and his restriction of the role of phonetic content in the latter. I suggest that were we to reconceptualise the role of aurally presented phonetic content in the concretized sound-synchronized film, we could better understand how film has the seeming magical capacity to transfix us.

Key words: Ingarden, film, sound, ontology, silent film, aesthetics.

© ROBERT LUZECKY, 2020

КОНЦЕПТ ПРОИЗВЕДЕНИЯ КИНОИСКУССТВА РОМАНА ИНГАРДЕНА: СТРАТА, ЗВУК, ЗРЕЛИЩЕ

РОБЕРТ ЛУЖЕЦКИ

Докторант.

Департамент философии, Университет Пёрдью.

47907 Уэст-Лафейет, Индиана, США.

E-mail: rluzecky@purdue.edu

В данной статье я осуществляю модификацию некоторых аспектов Ингарденовского анализа кинематографического произведения искусства, синхронизированного со звуком. Аргументация осуществляется в два этапа: (1) я проясняю утверждение Ингардена о том, что произведение искусства — это страгифицированная формация, в которой различные аспекты представляют собой объективности; (2) я разъясняю и критически переосмысляю тезис Ингардена, согласно которому произведение киноискусства является пограничным случаем по отношению к другим видам произведений искусства — картинам и литературным произведениям. Здесь я считаю проблематичными утверждения Ингардена о функции звука в конкретизированной кинематографической презентации вымышленного им мира. Ингарден отождествляет вселенную, представленную кинематографическим произведением искусства, с *габитусом* реальности, но странным образом противоречит своему собственному понятию *габитуса*. Я утверждаю, что это обусловлено концептуализацией кинематографического произведения искусства Ингарденом в качестве феномена, состоящего, в первую очередь из слоя представленных «видимых аспектов», конститутивных как для него, так и для синхронизированного со звуком кино, а также ограничением роли фонетического содержания в озвученных фильмах. Я предполагаю, что, если бы мы переосмыслили роль звукового представления фонетического содержания в конкретизированном звуко-синхронизированном фильме, мы могли бы лучше понять, каким образом в фильме появляется кажущаяся магической способность поражать нас.

Ключевые слова: Ингарден, фильм, звук, онтология, немое кино, эстетика.

1. INTRODUCTION

Roman Ingarden only wrote about the filmic work of art twice during his philosophical career¹. Despite their relative brevity—especially in comparison to Ingarden's exquisitely detailed analysis of literary works—the two sets of remarks (separated by the span of sixteen years) on the filmic work of art have generated substantive critical response². Ingarden's first “analysis” (Ingarden, 1973b, 323) of the filmic work of art

¹ Ingarden discusses the filmic work of art in *The Literary Work of Art* (Ingarden, 1973) and *Ontology of the Work of Art* (Ingarden, 1989).

² While the three volumes of *Analecta Husserliana* (Tymieniecka, 1976; Rudnick, 1990; Tymieniecka, 1991) that are devoted to explorations of Ingarden's ontology and aesthetics, contain little discussion of how these might be applied to the filmic work, volume forty-one rectifies this oversight with the inclusion of a marvelous paper addressing Ingarden's aesthetics in reference to filmic works of

is a mere six paragraphs long; whereas his second set of remarks on the filmic work of art is thirty-nine paragraphs in length. Strangely, Ingarden characterizes the latter as “introductory remarks” (Ingarden, 1989, 320). In both of his sets of writings on the filmic work of art, Ingarden maintains that it is a “borderline case” in relation to other works of art, and it presents a world that is quasi-real (i.e. a *habitus* of reality that is partially removed from the world inhabited by the viewer of a film).

Ingarden’s first set of analyses of the filmic work of art focuses on the silent film, so it is quite understandable that he would exclude the stratum of words and word sounds from the essential ontological structure of the filmic work of art. Ingarden’s later remarks on film address films with synchronized sound (i.e., “talkies”)³. Though Ingarden maintains that (in terms of its ontology) the sound-synchronized filmic art is primarily made up of visual aspects, he suggests that the phonetic elements of a concretized sound-synchronized film—i.e., the sounds; “the words spoken by presented persons (perhaps also the sounds made by animals)” (Ingarden, 1989, 321); as well as the sounds not typically associated with any visually presented narrator, i.e., the voice-overs that have been used to great effect in Francis Ford Coppola’s *Apocalypse Now* (1979), Ridley Scott’s *Blade Runner* (1982), as well as in the opening sequences of Lars von Trier’s *The Element of Crime* (1984) and *Europa* (1991)—only play a marginal role in the concretized filmic “spectacle” (Ingarden, 1989, 317). I observe that there is something a bit off with Ingarden’s account of the limited role of phonetic material in sound-synchronized film. While Ingarden’s insistence sound-synchronized films are primarily composed of represented visual aspects is adequate, in the sense that it does specify something essential about the filmic work of art’s ontological structure, his associated claim that the phonetic content of sound-synchronized films only enjoys a diminished role is an unusual mis-step for such a rigorous thinker⁴. Though I concur with Ingarden’s suggestion that

art (Helman, Osadnik, Plesnar, & Wilk, 1994, 377–397). B. Dziemodok’s and P. McCormick’s *On the Aesthetics of Roman Ingarden: Interpretations and Assessments* (Dziemidok & McCormick, 1989) contains essays which trace out Ingarden’s thought with respect to the literary work of art, the sculpture, and the painting, but the filmic work of art is barely discussed. Recently, Marek Haltof presents a substantive elaboration of Ingarden’s contributions to early phenomenological film theory in Poland and—still more recently—Olivier Malherbe offers a wonderful reconstruction of the Ingarden’s thought that prioritizes its relevance to the French tradition of film theory (Haltof, 1998, 67–78; Malherbe, 2016, 185–214).

³ The first “talkie” (Alan Crosland’s *The Jazz Singer*) premiered on October 6, 1927 in New York City (Bradley, 2004, 7). In all probability Ingarden, who was living in Lwów (the Ukrainian city of Lviv) at the time, had no access to or knowledge of sound-synchronized films while he was writing *The Literary Work of Art*.

⁴ Ingarden does not use the term “hierarchy” or any of its lexical equivalents in either of his analyses of the filmic work of art. However, Ingarden’s conceptualization of the strata as hierarchically

the phonetic elements in sound-synchronized films do not need their own ontological stratum, I suggest a modification to Ingarden's claims about the function of phonetic elements in concretized sound-synchronized filmic works of art—i.e., I suggest that the that Ingarden is too quick with his suggestion that the phonetic elements of sound-synchronized films only enjoy a diminished status in relation to the presentation of visible aspects. I claim that—in concretized sound-synchronized filmic works—the phonetic elements should be granted a status that is on par that associated with the presentation of objects by visual (i.e., photographic) means.

It is difficult to overstate the importance of Ingarden's analyses of filmic works of art, if for no other reason than they have contributed to a vibrant discussion of the ontological nature and the affective capacities of the filmic work of art. Witold Płotka does an admirable job of elaborating on Ingarden's crucial role in the development of early phenomenology (Płotka, 2017, 86). Elaborating on Ingarden's importance to phenomenological aesthetics, Helman observes that Ingarden "introduces order and rigour into the study of an art which is notoriously resistant to these virtues" (Helman, 1975, 98). Much of this this order is derived from Ingarden's suggestion that works of art (of various types) enjoy an ontological stratification—a concept that was taken up almost immediately by Bolesław Lewicki and Zofia Lissa (Lewicki, 1935, 69–87; Lissa, 1937)—after its identification in *The Literary Work of Art* (Ingarden, 1973b). Elaborating on the number of ontological strata involved with auditory sphere of film Lissa suggests that film music involves two strata—roughly corresponding to noises and the speech of psycho-social entities. In his argument against Hartman's competing theory of ontological stratification, Ingarden explicitly notes that music is an artistic form which enjoys none of ontological stratification (Ingarden, 1989, 28–32). Were one to transpose Ingarden's arguments here, they would amount to a decisive rejection of Lissa's suggestion. Helman, Osadnik, Plesnar, & Wilk offer a detailed account of the limits of Lewicki's similar suggestion that one should multiply the number of strata involved in filmic works of art (Helman, Osadnik, Plesnar, & Wilk, 1994, 379–380). Perhaps motivated by these perceived failures to adequately identify the number function of the various strata involved in filmic works of art, Helman abandoned her plan

arranged is presupposed in his writings on various works of art. Anita Szczepańska highlights this hierarchical arrangement of the strata when she writes: "The work of art is generally composed of several strata arranged in a hierarchic order. The functions of all the strata in relation to the others determine their mutual organic relationship and their structural unity, with successive 'lower' strata forming foundations for the 'higher' ones, conditioning their existence and defining their characteristics" (Szczepańska, 1989, 24). Though he makes no mention of the filmic work of art, Daniel von Wachter elaborates on the nature of Ingarden's utilization of ontological dependency relations (Wachter, 2013, 55–82).

of “exploiting” the strata in service of filmic analysis. (Helman, Osadnik, Plesnar, & Wilk, 1994, 382). Stefan Morawski takes Helman’s critical assessment of Ingarden to its extreme with his suggestion that virtually everything Ingarden ever wrote about works of art in general and filmic works of art in particular is without philosophical merit—i.e., according to Morawski, a “film does not consist of manifestations, represented objects and events; it is not intentional, and it is not unreal” (Morawski, 1985, 28). Morawski’s polemical extravagances should be regarded as dubious, if for no other reason the surfeit of philosophical literature which tacitly (and sometimes quite explicitly) accepts many of the claims that Morawski denies. Illustrative of this point is Osadnik’s and Plesnar’s acceptance of Ingarden’s suggestions that the filmic work of art involves representations which enjoy stratification (Osadnik & Plesnar, 1991, 63).

Though Ingarden suggested much that is essential to our contemporary understanding of the filmic work of art, I suggest a modification to his remarks on the function of sound in concretized sound-synchronized films. The argument progresses through two stages: (1) I clarify Ingarden’s claim that the work of art is a stratified formation in which the various aspects present objectivities; (2) I elucidate Ingarden’s suggestion that the filmic work of art is a borderline case in respect to its relation to other types of works of art—paintings and literary works—. Here, I identify a problem with Ingarden’s claims about the function of sound in the concretized filmic work’s presentation of a quasi-reality. Ingarden identifies the presented universe of the filmic work of art as a *habitus* of reality, but Ingarden seems oddly conflicted with respect to his notion of *habitus*. This stems from Ingarden’s conceptualization of the filmic work of art as primarily composed of the stratum of represented “visible aspects” in both the cases of the silent film and the sound-synchronized film, and his restriction of the role of phonetic content in the latter. I suggest that were we to reconceptualise the role of aurally presented phonetic content in the sound-synchronized film, we could better understand how film has the seeming magical capacity to transfix us—allowing us to participate with the *habitus* of its world. Taken together, these claims yield that suggestions that were we to reconceptualise the role of aurally accessible phonetic content in sound-synchronized films, we could better understand how these draw us into presented *habitus* of their worlds.

2. THE “WORK OF ART” AS A STRATIFIED FORMATION

When Ingarden uses the term “work of art,” he is not simply referring to the sort of entity that enjoys spatio-temporally localization (e.g., the novel on the table, the painting on the wall, the sculpture in the garden, the building adjacent to the city

square, etc.). For Ingarden, “the work of art” is that which can be actualized, concretized, and therefore functions as an aesthetic object. For example, the filmic work of art is not “the ribbon of celluloid that is covered with a series of pictures” (Ingarden, 1989, 317). Were we to assert that the work of art was reducible to its physical material, this would yield the dubious result that there are as many versions of a film as there exist its instantiations as material entities—a view which has suffered the ignominious distinction of being met with almost universal rejection. As Noël Carroll elaborates:

The film performance is generated from a template—standardly a film print, but it might also be a video tape or a laser disc, or computer program. These templates are tokens, each one of them can be destroyed and each one can be assigned to a special location. But the film—say *Broken Blossoms* by D. W. Griffith—is not destroyed, when any of the prints are destroyed, including the negative or master. Indeed all of the prints can be destroyed and the film will survive if a laser disc does, or if a collection of photos of all the frames does, or if a computer program of it does whether on disk, or on tape, or even on paper or in human memory. (Carroll, 1995, 77)

Were one to attempt to reduce the film to its material components, this would entirely overlook Ingarden’s nuanced ontologies of the film involve substantive discussions of the complex relations that obtain among the processes of concretization, actualization, and the formation of the aesthetic object. As Jeff Mitscherling notes, to properly understand Ingarden’s concept of a work of art, “we have to distinguish between three terms: (1) realization (or actualization), (2) concretization, and (3) the aesthetic object” (Mitscherling, 1997, 160, fn. 13). The first of these terms refers to the activity by which the potential of a given material object is made to obtain. For example, when Alexandros of Antioch sculpts a block of marble into the *Venus de Milo*, it is realized as something which has various schematic—not fully determined—aspects. A material work, once it has achieved realization, has various elements that are held in readiness (i.e., they exist as elements of the “work of art” that are awaiting fulfillment by the intentional acts of psycho-social entities). In other words, the work of art for Ingarden is not the physical object, but that which stands ready for actualization, which is achieved through the separate processes of *a*) the artist’s creation of the work of art and *b*) the process of the audience’s viewing the work of art. The actualization of the potential of the physical work of art is the ongoing concretization of the work of art as an aesthetic object. This concretization is a process distinct from the process of its physical work of art’s realization, but dependent on it. The entity produced by these analytically distinct processes is not yet, complete—fully realized; determined in all of its possible properties—, in the sense that it undergoes a further concretization by the psycho-social entities that particulate with it through acts of viewing or otherwise

interacting with it. Only once this final process of concretization has been initiated, does the entity “achieve [*sic.*] its full incarnation” (Ingarden, 1973b, 372) as an aesthetic object. Taken together, these analyses yield the identification of the work of art as that entity which (unlike utilitarian objects—pencils, film projectors, penknives, etc.) has the potential to be actualized as an aesthetic object through the separate processes of its realization and ongoing concretization.

Ingarden conceives of the work of art as an ontologically stratified formation in which the strata differ from each other in terms of both “their characteristic material”⁵ and “the role each stratum plays in relation to other strata and the structure of the whole work” (Ingarden, 1973b, 29). To understand the work of art as a stratified structure, it is important to distinguish between *a*) the elements of a work of art and *b*) the strata that constitute a work of art. Ingarden points out that, to qualify as a stratified structure, a work of art must satisfy four necessary and sufficient conditions. First, the “work of art is composed of “heterogeneous elements that appear in it” (Ingarden, 1989, 32). I. e., a literary work of art involves words and word combinations, a filmic work of art involves different shots, scenes, and series. Second, the heterogeneous elements of a work of art “unite together into formations of a higher order that ultimately pervades the whole of its structure” (Ingarden, 1989, 32). E. g., the various shots of a filmic work of art combine together to form scenes, etc. Third, these elements do not lose their “relative independence and delimitation in the whole of the work” (Ingarden, 1989, 32). That is, we can discern the various scenes and shots of a film. Finally, Ingarden notes that “an organic union obtains” (Ingarden, 1989, 32) among the constituent elements of the work⁶. The stratified structure of a work of art is what

⁵ Ingarden’s rather odd use of the term “material” in his elaboration of the strata of literary works of art invites misinterpretation and demands clarification. The term “material” does not refer to material in any physical sense (i.e., the material of the various strata does not have physical extension). Rather, the matter of a stratum is its ontological elements. In this sense, the material of the schematized stratum is the particular ways by which meanings are schematized (i.e., the material is schematization itself). Similarly, the material of the stratum of represented objectivities is the particular represented objects in a text, none of which have any particular spatio-temporal location in the physically extended world. This use of the term “material” gets a bit confounded when we try to apply it to the phonetic stratum, which has physical signs (i.e., the inscribed text on the pages of a book) as one of its ontological elements. Ingarden repeatedly points out that the phonetic stratum cannot be reduced to the inscribed text. Though the phonetic stratum involves physical graphic representations, it also involves the non-physical sounds of phonemes. It is the interrelation of these elements that constitutes the characteristic material of the phonetic stratum.

⁶ Ingarden’s claim that artworks are organic structures is left under-developed in *The Literary Work of Art*. As a consequence, the claim is too easily dismissed as a mere metaphorical flourish. It seems, however, that Ingarden was being quite literal. Ingarden elaborates on the nature of an organic structure (taken in its generality) in *The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art* (Ingarden, 1973a).

designates the relations of the various elements to each other, and these relations are necessary to the unity of description of the work of art as a whole. When we speak of the strata of a work of art, we are referring to the relations of the elements (specifically, for instance, the graphically represented objects in a painting). For example, Ingarden maintains that literary works of art are constituted by four strata: (1) the “linguistic stratum” of phonological elements. This stratum is constituted by the inscribed words of a text, their requisite sounds, and the higher linguistic and phonetic formations built on the words and word sounds in a given piece of literature (i.e., the sentences, and paragraphs); (2) the stratum of meaning units; (3) the stratum of represented objects; (4) the stratum of schematized aspects.

All types of works of art except for the musical work of art present visible aspects. In order to understand the role of visible aspects in the filmic work of art, it is necessary to clarify Ingarden’s use of the term “aspect” (*Ansicht*). The aspects of a work of art are the various modes of appearance of the objectivities—i.e., the objects and states of affairs presented in the literary work of art, the painting, the sculpture, the architectural work, and filmic work of art⁷. Perhaps it is helpful to understanding the nature of this stratum through reference to Ingarden’s elucidation of its function in the ontology of literary works of art. The aspects of a literary work of art are presented by means of words and word formations. For example, Yukio Mishima’s *The Temple of Dawn* presents particular objects like “a small design of scattered cherry petals” (Mishima, 1990, 196) and states of affairs like “the faint ringing of a distant bell” (Mishima, 1990, 196) as aspects that are present in the novel’s reality. Ingarden notes that, in literary works of art, the aspects are schematic because they are not

In order to be considered “organic” an entity must fulfill three conditions: (1) the entity should “perform a particular main function, to which various other functions, performed by its individual organs, are subordinated” (Ingarden, 1973a, 74); (2) this system of functions is “closely related to the structure of the organism, which is adapted to them” (Ingarden, 1973a); (3) the entity has “a certain typical course of life [that] is manifested in all organisms” (Ingarden, 1973a, 76). The strata of a literary work of art each have certain aesthetic value qualities, and these coalesce to form a “polyphonic harmony” of values which define the literary work of art as an aesthetic object (Mitscherling, 1997, 139). In this sense, the literary work of art fulfills the first of the conditions of being organic. The function of the literary work of art is to obtain its realization as an aesthetic object, and the particular value it has as an aesthetic object is dependent on the ontological structure of the literary work of art. The literary work of art meets the second of these conditions, in the sense that it fulfills a function that is identical to that of other literary works of art. This point is amplified when we recognize that the literary work of art’s function is derived from an ontological structure that is identical with the ontological structure of other literary works of art. Finally, the literary work of art meets the third condition, in the sense that it enjoys a peculiar form of “life” as an aesthetic object.

⁷ Mitscherling is one of the few who have elaborated on Ingarden’s (often overlooked) discussion of the architectural work of art (Mitscherling, 2004).

generated by the experience of any psychic individual but instead have the basis of their determination, and in a certain sense, their potential existence in the states of affairs projected by the sentences or in the objects represented by means of states of affairs. (Ingarden, 1973b, 264).

The aspects are not a product of reader's psychic operations, though the aspects guide these operations when the reader is experiencing the literary work of art. Thus, the work of art's aspects "portray determinate real objectivities" (Ingarden, 1973b, 264) that are real within the context of the work, and which are actualized by the person who experiences the work of art. Because the aspects of works of art present the particularities of things and states of affairs which the reader has not experienced in his own reality, their actualization "never succeeds in such a way that the contents of the aspects actualized by him could be similar in detail to the aspects he would have experienced" (Ingarden, 1973b, 264) had these aspects been presented in their particularity in the person's non-fictional reality.

The filmic work of art presents its reality through the "polyphonic" inter-relation of its strata. Ingarden claims that both silent and the sound-synchronized filmic works of art possess only two strata: the stratum of represented objects (i.e., the objects and states of affairs that are presented on the screen) and the stratum of schematized aspects, by which the presented objectivities become manifest. Works of art are schematized, in the sense that their presented aspects are not fully determined—i.e., they are presented as lacking complete, specification of their predicates or properties. Ingarden refers to the aspects of the latter stratum as schematized, because no object or state of affairs is presented by a work of art in a fully determinate manner. With respect to the concretized filmic work, these elements are presented as schematic aspects, because they are presented to the viewer as part of a schematized whole, and they achieve their realization through their presentation to the viewer. This ongoing act of participation with a work of art is one of the ways a work of art can be concretized. For example, when a film is projected to the audience, the audience concretizes the schematic aspects of the film that have been realized in the presented images, but which have not yet been concretized until the film is viewed; these images are given meaning through the viewer's perception of them. This act of attentively viewing a film yields the ongoing concretization of the film as an aesthetic object. The objectivities presented by a work of art are schematized, insofar as they exist potentially in the states of affairs and things presented by the work of art. These are fulfilled by the intentional processes of the person who experiences the work of art as a potential aesthetic object. Ingarden carefully identifies the difference among real objects and schematized objects through reference to their formal characteristics. Ingarden observes: (1) real objects tend to enjoy complete determination—i.e., "every

real object is *unequivocally, universally* (... in every respect) *determined*"; (2) real objects enjoy a primary ontological unity, which serves as the ontic base of intentional acts of constitution; (3) each real object is "absolutely individual," in the sense that any general property or quality predicated of it—such as a particular colour—is predicated of it as an individuated entity (Ingarden, 1973b, 246–247). Schematized entities enjoy only diminished determinations, in the sense that some of their properties are unfulfilled. I. e., schematized entities involve what Ingarden characterizes as "spots of indeterminacy" (Ingarden, 1973b, 246)⁸. These under-determined properties are the entity's schema. To the extent that objects and states of affairs are not fully determined in a work of art, they are "schematized." For example, not all details of a character's appearance are given by the author of a literary work, so the reader is required to fulfil these aspects to constitute the entity as an intentional object. Similarly, in filmic works of art, the objects and states of affairs in a film are not given in a fully determinate manner. (E. g., the weight the statuette in John Huston's *The Maltese Falcon* is not specified in the film, so the viewer is required to fulfil these aspects to make the objects or fully manifest to his consciousness.)

⁸ In his elaboration of the nature of schematized aspects and their fulfilment, Ingarden makes explicit reference to Husserl's complex elaboration of intentional fulfilment. Spiegelberg observes that Husserlian intentional directedness at an object involves four discrete characteristics: (1) objectivation; (2) identification; (3) connection; (4) constitution. The intentional act of fulfilling schematized aspects occurs in the intuitive fulfilment of an entity which appears as an incomplete—not yet fully determined—form. This tends to be associated with the intentional process of connection (Spiegelberg, 1965, 108–111). Mitscherling presents an excellent elaboration of Ingarden's concept of schematized aspects (and their fulfilment), while these remarks are about the stratum of schematized aspects in a literary work of art, the identification of the nature of schematized aspects is transposable to filmic works of art, in the sense that these involve the presentation of schematized aspects—albeit in a different way. Mitscherling writes: "Some basic phenomenology is necessary for the clarification of the nature of this stratum. When consciousness attends to (or 'intends') a particular object, it is usually the case that only some of the 'aspects' of that object are presented immediately to consciousness, and these aspects are said to be either fulfilled or unfulfilled. For example, when we look to a table from above, the table presents us with the aspect of 'table-top' and 'table-bottom', and the former is fulfilled while the latter remains unfulfilled. When we look at the table from beneath, the former (table-top) aspect is unfulfilled and the latter (table-bottom) is fulfilled. A similar situation obtains in the case of the literary work of art, but here the reader is often forced to fulfil for herself many of those aspects that are presented by the author as unfulfilled, and she does so with regard to those aspects that are presented more fully, i. e., as fulfilled. The latter provide the reader with a direction to follow in her intentional activity of fulfilling these unfulfilled aspects, which are said to have been presented as 'schematized'. This intentional activity of the fulfilment of schematized aspects is a central component of the general activity of 'concretization'. As no character, for example, can ever be exhaustively presented by an author—no character, that is to say, can ever be portrayed as fully and completely determined—the manner in which this concretization is to proceed can only be schematically determined by the literary work through its stratum of these schematized aspects" (Mitscherling, 2010, 143–144, fn.10).

3. THE “BORDERLINE” QUALITIES OF FILMIC WORK OF ARTS AND ITS PRESENTATIONS OF HABITUS

Given the ontological similarities that seems exist among the ontologies of various works of art—that, for the most part, they enjoy ontological stratification—one might be led to the erroneous claim that various types of works of art enjoy identity with one another. Ingarden cautiously observes that works of art are non-identical to one another in terms of both their ontological structure and their modes of presentation as entities undergoing concretization. One might observe that works of art bear a similarity in terms of their capacities to express (or from the viewer’s perspective, produce) affects. Andrey Tarkovsky once characterized his films as attempts to fulfil the “fervent wish... to speak out...to say everything with total sincerity and without imposing my own point of view on others” (Tarkovsky, 1986, 12). This sentiment has perhaps been echoed by other artists—painters, poets, sculptors, musicians, novelists, architects—throughout the ages. One possible implication of this claim is the suggestion that art of various types is similar, in the sense that it fulfills a similar human need to express something essential about the human condition. Tarkovsky’s allusion to the profound beauties of various works of art brings to mind Witkiewicz’s suggestion that works of art express the metaphysical feelings of the artist’s “experiencing of the secret of existence as unity in variety” (Ingarden, 1973b, 294, fn. 9). Ingarden identifies these as any of “the sublime, the tragic, the dreadful, the shocking, the inexplicable, the demonic, the holy, the sinful, the sorrowful, the indescribable brightness of good fortune, as well as the grotesque, the charming, the light, the peaceful, etc.” (Ingarden, 1973b, 290–291). Roland Barthes further elucidates on the nature of these in his elaboration of *punctum* of still photographs—i.e., those visual elements “which rise [*sic.*] from the scene, shoots out of it like an arrow, and pierces” the viewer (Barthes, 1981, 26). Though we can recognize the capacity of art to express these sorts of qualities, Tarkovsky cautions against the attempt to establish an identity relation among various types of art on the basis of their capacity to express these qualities, when he notes that there is something unique to cinema—something “distinctively cinematic”—, which is lost when one attempts to translate one type of art into another⁹. Perhaps here one may draw reference to the breath-taking penultimate shot of Tarkovsky’s

⁹ Tarkovsky makes this point explicitly through reference to making a filmic work of art out of a literary work of art: “Trying to adapt the features of other art forms to the screen will always deprive the film of what is distinctively cinematic, and make it harder to handle the material in a way that makes use of the powerful resources of cinema as an art in its own right. But above all such a procedure sets up a barrier between the author of the film and life” (Tarkovsky, 1986, 22).

Nostalghia (1983): the camera follows the character of Andrei Gorchakov as he laboriously trudges across the drained pool of a mineral spring, desperately trying to preserve the flickering light of a candle during his journey to the other side of the fetid ruin. The agonizing frustration conveyed in these nine minutes and seven seconds (the temporal duration of the uninterrupted shot), could scarcely be conveyed in literature, or a painting's presentation static images. Ingarden carefully notes that any metaphysical qualities that may be evoked by a particular work of art subsist from its particular concretizations. (Ingarden, 1973b, 294-295). Due to the particularity of these concretizations, these qualities, are not directly involved with the generality implied by work's ontological stratification. The suggestion here is that while works of art of various types may bear a relation to one another, to characterize them as having identical ontologies is as much a disservice to the particular beauty and meaning of any given work art work of art as it is an assault on any notion of rigorous ontology. Throughout his numerous intricate ontologies of various types of art, Ingarden always carefully identifies what is the ontological makes each type of work ontologically unique. Ingarden specifies the ontology of the filmic work of art through comparison to both the painting and the literary work of art.

Ingarden notes that the primary stratum of the filmic work of art is that of "visual aspects"¹⁰. In this respect, the filmic work of art has an ontological structure which is analogous to that of a painting. The difference between these two types of works of art is that, in the painting, the stratum of represented visible aspects presents a single isolated moment in the temporal continuum, whereas in the filmic work of art, the stratum of visible aspects presents a temporal flow. In the painting, the stratum of represented visible aspects shows "single moments of a process, but also intimates certain earlier and maybe also certain future phases of the process, which may be guessed by the viewer" (Ingarden, 1989, 325). Here Ingarden's point seems to echo André Bazin's claim that photographic images of cinema function to liberate temporal progression from the limits implied by a painting's isolation of temporal progression to the static presentation of a stationary entities. Bazin writes:

¹⁰ The filmic work of art presents the viewer with "a discontinuous manifold of 'images' that conceals its discontinuity, each image being a reconstitution by photographic means of a visual aspect of a determinate object or objective situation" (Ingarden, 1973b, 323). This claim is repeated in *Ontology of the Work of Art*, where we are told that the filmic work of art is composed primarily of "visual aspects which are reconstructed on the screen with the help of patches of colour or of light and shadow [to] make possible the quasi-perceptual presentation of Objects that have been made visible, of things, of people, and of events." (Ingarden, 1989, 324)

Viewed in this perspective, the cinema is objectivity in time. The film is no longer content to preserve the object, enshrouded as it were in an instant, as the bodies of insects are preserved intact, out of the distant past, in amber. The film delivers baroque art from catalepsy. Now, for the first time, the image of things is likewise the image of their duration, change mummified, as it were. Those categories of *resemblance*, which determine the species of *photographic* image likewise, then, determine its aesthetic as distinct from that painting. (Bazin, 2005, 14–15)

For example, Paul Cézanne's *Rideau, Cruchon et Comptoir* presents the viewer with a manifold of aspects arrested in their temporal progress (e.g., the painting shows an apple poised to slide off the table). The viewer of the painting can intimate a past event where the apple slid to its position at the table's edge, and he can imagine a future event in which the apple will slide off the table, yet neither of these events is directly presented in the painting. Were one to attribute any movement to any of the images within a painting, this would only be through the attribution of a unrepresented movement. A filmic work of art, by way of contrast, presents objects "just as paintings do, yet in a manner essentially expanded and altered, since in their succession and fusion they permit the appearance of temporally extended *events in their total concrete development*" (Ingarden, 1973b, 324). (E.g., in Louis Lumière's *Workers Leaving the Lumière Factory* [1895], the represented objectivities of the workers bustling about and the dog sauntering across the frame depict time's progress as something realized in the film, and not requiring the psychic processes of the perceiver.) For Ingarden, the filmic work of art "does not confine itself to presenting merely a single situation that is taken out of the whole story and is thus made static" (Ingarden, 1989, 325). Thus, though the stratum of represented visible aspects is present in both the painting and the filmic work of art, the function of the visual stratum is qualitatively different in each case. Though both the painting and the filmic work of art have the same primary stratum of represented visible aspects, the function of this stratum in each type of work of art presents aspects in fundamentally different modalities (i.e., as that which is presented to the viewer in temporal progression, or as that which is frozen in time).

Ingarden observes that the filmic work of art differs from the literary work of art to the extent that the latter possesses strata which are wholly absent from the former. The primary two strata of the literary work of art are the phonetic stratum of words and word sounds, and the stratum of meaning units. The silent filmic work of art lacks one of these and only has access to the other in a modified sense¹¹. The implication

¹¹ Ingarden writes: "In the cinematographic drama, however, there is neither the stratum of phonetic formations nor that of units of meaning, both of which appear in a literary work. Therefore, roughly

of observation that there are no spoken words in a silent film suggests that the represented objectivities of a silent film enjoy a diminished reality. This can be demonstrated through a comparison of the silent filmic work of art and the literary work of art when it is read aloud. In the case of the literary work of art, Ingarden observes that the meaning of the represented objectivities (i.e., the actions of the characters, the setting, etc.) involves a dependency relation of among the vocalized aspects of the phonetic stratum and the stratum of meaning units—the manifold of words and associated word sounds suggest the meaning of what is represented in the vocalized aspects of a literary work of art. This is clearly not the case with silent films, for the simple reason that the phonetic content only obtains in a very diminished sense (i.e., as the non-auditory dialogue which interrupts camera shots, sequences, and series of images). The dependency relation of phonetic content to meaning fails to obtain in a silent film because one of the terms of the relation (the phonetic content) is lacking one of its means of its realization. This can be illustrated by the sense of near preternatural dread that a viewer of F. W. Murnau's *Nosferatu, eine Symphonie des Grauens* (1922) may experience when she witnesses the shadowy form of Count Olaf slowly sulking up the stairs. In absence of any spoken words, gasping breaths, and terrified cries words (which would—perhaps—specify the meaning of Olaf's furtive actions) the viewer is left painfully unaware of what motivates the monster. The claim is that the lack of the phonetic stratum in silent film diminishes the clarity of the meaning which associated with the rendering of representative objectivities in a literary work of art. This diminishment is particularly obvious when one attempts to discern the interiority of a character—something not always revealed by an entity's physical actions. Ingarden suggests that the schematized aspects of a silent film are presented through strictly visual means. The suggestion here is that meaning of the silent film has its ontic base in presented visual images. This essentially diminishes the precision and vivacity of possible meanings we can derive from the silent filmic work. The silent film presents a series of representations whose meaning is emaciated, in the sense that the discontinuous series of images presents only a diminished means by which to apprehend a given character's psychic attributes (i.e., thoughts, motivations, and emotional states). This is not to say these lack existential character, but it does have the effect of producing "a certain shift in the center of gravity of psychic existence" (Ingarden,

speaking, only half the strata that are essential for the literary work remain. Consequently, it is not a literary work in a true sense... [T]he ultimate constituent stratum in a cinematographic drama is exclusively the stratum of visual aspects and not the stratum of meaning units. In other words, here, the sole constituting "material" is the reconstituted visual aspects, and they perform their constituting function by effecting the appearance of corresponding objectivities" (Ingarden, 1973b, 324).

1973b, 325), wherein the psychic operations of the character have the quality of a certain “roughness,” (Ingarden, 1973b, 325) and the mental life of the presented objectivities is “pushed to the background, if not altogether removed” (Ingarden, 1973b, 325) from the silent filmic work.

Oddly, Ingarden seems to suggest that the diminished role of sound is not much different in the case of the sound-synchronized films. While word sounds are obviously part of the concretized sound-synchronized film, Ingarden implies that these are restricted to the role “of an ancillary means of presentation” (Ingarden, 1989, 331). Ingarden explicitly notes that in concretized sound-synchronized films, role of words and word sounds is only of marginal importance¹². While language is present in the sound-synchronized filmic work of art, Ingarden claims that it is an inessential component that is not fundamentally part of the ontological structure of the filmic work of art. To the extent that words and word sounds are present in the modern filmic work of art, it bears some similarity to the literary work of art, but insofar as the words do not constitute the primary means of the sound-synchronized filmic work of art’s presentation, the sound-synchronized filmic work of art is distinct from the literary work of art. The filmic work of art and the literary work of art are related to the extent that both utilize the same material (i.e., words and word sounds), but the function is radically different in each case. This is particularly evident in their respective modes of presentation—the reading aloud of a literary work (which has been the aim of literature from at least the time of the lyric poems of Ancient Greece); the viewing of a film.

In both of his writings on the filmic work of art, Ingarden describes the filmic work as presenting a quasi-real world which involves the viewer, but which is of a fundamentally different order than that of the real world. The represented objectivities on the screen are projected images that are not “real,” because they lack ontic autonomy in two senses. Their existence as objects is dependent on the fact that they are filmed (i.e., they are representations), and their reality is established through the psychic operations of the spectator. For Ingarden, “[t]he objects which are photographed, are so to speak, not simply real objects. They perform here a function of reproduction and representation; they play a ‘role’” (Ingarden, 1973b, 327). Insofar as they are playing a role, the objects presented on the screen have existential characterization as real

¹² Ingarden writes: “The mediating role of language, is not indispensable in the [sound-synchronized] film... Not language, but a multiplicity of flowing visual aspects, reconstructed photographically or graphically, constitutes the proper... means of presentation which gives the spectator access to the phenomenally appearing presented world not indispensable in the [sound-synchronized] film... Not language, but a multiplicity of flowing visual aspects, reconstructed photographically or graphically, constitutes the proper... means of presentation which gives the spectator access to the phenomenally appearing presented world” (Ingarden, 1989, 326.)

objects within the presented world of the filmic work, but their position as existential objects is that of representations within a fictive universe, which gains reality as a fiction through the psychic operations of the viewer¹³. This presented world is a *habitus* of the viewer's reality, insofar as its ontic existence is derived from—at minimum—the process filming of the actor and other objects that the actor interacts with, and the intentional acts of the viewer who fills in the schematic aspects presented in the filmic work.

In his discussion of the *habitus* of the sound-synchronized filmic work, Ingarden seems to conflate the presented world of the filmic work with the film viewer's reality. In Ingarden's discussion of silent filmic works of art, the objectivities presented in the filmic work are removed from our own world by virtue of the very fact that they are representations of an entity that is non-identifiable with our own reality. The images on the screen are just images, presented as flickers on the distant screen in the darkened room. But Ingarden's conceptualization of the filmic *habitus* undergoes some rather drastic modification in his discussion of the sound-synchronized filmic work of art. Here, Ingarden writes:

In his mental experiencing of these aspects [the objectivities presented by the sound-synchronized filmic work], the spectator ceases to see the screen, and in its place sees in an almost perceptual manner things and people which conduct themselves in a certain way in the presented space (Ingarden, 1989, 326).

The language of partialities is still present here. Ingarden's use of the term "almost" suggests that the filmic *habitus* is still removed from the reality inhabited by the film viewer. But it is difficult to grasp what constitutes the difference between the presented objectivities of the filmic reality and the viewer's reality, because the viewer

¹³ Ingarden draws this distinction in reference to the function of nominal words (i.e., nouns and noun phrases) in the literary work of art. The presentation of nominal words denotes the existence of an object. This is the existential characterization of an object. Borrowing one of Ingarden's examples, when the reader is presented with the noun phrase "the capital of Poland," the city in question is intended not simply as a 'city,' but also as something which according to its mode of existence, is real" (Ingarden, 1973b, 70). Existential characterization designates that an object is characterized such as it would be were it to exist. Existential position, by way of contrast, determines the type of reality enjoyed by the object designated by the nominal word or word phrase. The name of a fictional character, for example, denotes an "object that never existed or will exist but one which if it were to exist, would belong among objects to which the existential mode of 'reality' applies" (Ingarden, 1973b, 70). In terms of the filmic work, the represented objectivities (i.e., the things and people the viewer sees on the screen), are existentially characterized as real and existentially positioned within the filmic world, which is rendered as a series of schematic aspects that are concretized by the psychic operations of the person who views the filmic work.

no longer sees the screen. The presented space and the space occupied by the viewer seem to merge into one, insofar as the thing mediating the division between the two modes of reality (i.e., the screen) disappears from the viewer's experience of reality.

The separation of the sound-synchronized filmic *habitus* from the viewer's reality gets a bit more difficult to determine when Ingarden specifies that:

The individual presented things and persons [of the sound-synchronized filmic work] move in a way that is independent of the spectator and apparently autonomous, and they comport themselves like real beings. This conduct comprehends not only what one can see, but also...all that can be heard, such as tones, noises, spoken words, etc. In particular, the presented people in general behave physically in a way completely similar to that of real people. (Ingarden, 1989, 326–327)

The presented objectivities of the filmic universe now seem to comport themselves in a way which is no longer simply representational, insofar as their conduct “comprehends” (*begreift*)—i.e., contains within itself—the experiential reality inhabited by the viewer of the film. This seeming conflation of the filmic world and the world inhabited by the viewer is amplified when Ingarden notes that the behaviour of the represented objectivities behave in a way which is “completely similar” (i.e., identical) to how the viewers of the filmic world behave. In other words, the filmic universe appears to be something which is no longer simply a *habitus* that is only quasi-real. Ingarden is indicating that the viewer enters into the presented world of the filmic universe to such an extent that he is no longer present merely as voyeur, but as someone who is participating with the film's presented objectivities, existing with the “fictive figures and their fortunes, almost as in daily life” (Ingarden, 1989, 327).

This entry into the presented reality of the film, and the seeming conflation of the viewer's reality with the reality of filmic universe, is facilitated by the existence of sound (i.e., the aurally represented phonetic content of word sounds, noises, and other aural phenomena). The suspension of disbelief which occurs when the viewer apprehends sound-synchronized films is a consequence of the presence of sound. Thus, the role of sound in modern filmic works greatly augments the reality of the filmic universe (increasing it to the point that the existential position of the presented objectivities seems to be the same as the viewer's). This augmentation of the *habitus* of the reality of concretized sound-synchronized films indicates that Ingarden unfairly restricted the role of aural content in these. Sound functions to draw the viewer into the presented world to such a degree that the distinction between the quasi-real of the presented universe borders on conflation with the viewer's universe. While the distinction still remains between the two (the presented world and the world of the view-

er), this distinction becomes all the more difficult to specify. (I. e., the existential position of the presented realities gets called into question due to the presence of sound in the sound-synchronized filmic work.) This indicates that, if we are to maintain the fineness of the distinction between the *habitus* of the filmic world and the world of the viewer, it is necessary to modify Ingarden's conceptualization of the function of sound in concretized sound-synchronized films to recognize that it plays more than an ancillary role. Because phonetic content (identified as involving any of vocalized word or animal sounds, noises, music either used as part of the diegetic narrative or as an aspect of the film's soundtrack) in the concretization of sound-synchronized films functions to diminish the existential gap between the filmic work's presented universe and the lived universe of the spectator (between the real and the quasi-real), we have to alter Ingarden's claim that sound merely plays an inessential role in the concretized sound-synchronized filmic work of art.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Ingarden's conceptualization of the filmic work of art needs revision. For Ingarden, the work of art is not simply the physical work of art. Rather, the work of art is that which undergoes ongoing processes of concretization. These process of concretization of a work of art involve either of the two distinct processes of the artist's realization of the physical work of art or the viewer's beholding of the realized work of art. In concretizing the work of art, we recognize it as an organic unity. The filmic work of art is constituted by strata which are similar to those of the painting and the literary work of art, though these strata function differently in the painting, the literary work of art, and both types of filmic work of art —i.e., silent and sound-synchronized films. Like paintings, the filmic works of art presents things and states of affairs primarily through the stratum of represented visual aspects, yet the visual aspects presented in the painting show things and states of affairs arrested in their temporal progression, and filmic works of art shows entities and states of affairs in temporal progression. Like the literary work of art, the sound-synchronized filmic work of art involves phonetic material, but the role of the phonetic material is radically different in these two types of works of art. Ingarden carefully observes that phonetic content does not enjoy a role of ontological primacy in filmic works of art — represented visible aspects are more fundamental in both silent and sound-synchronized filmic works. Oddly, Ingarden seems to suggest that this ontological primacy of the visible implies a prioritization of the visible in reference the importance of the sound-synchronized filmic presentation. Ingarden's restriction of the role of sound in the sound-synchronized

filmic works of art is odd, since the presence of sound in these serves to blur the distinction between the reality inhabited by the viewer of the filmic work of art and the universe presented by the filmic work of art. That is, in the sound-synchronized filmic work of art, sound functions to obscure the existential position of the presented objects and states of affairs. If we are to accurately describe the role of sound in the sound-synchronized filmic work of art, then it is necessary to modify the role of sound in the modern film.

REFERENCES

- Barthes, R. (1981). *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography* (R. Howard, Trans.). New York: Hill & Wang.
- Bazin, A. (2005). *What is Cinema?* (H. Gray, Trans.). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bradley, E. (2004). *The First Hollywood Musicals: A Critical Filmography of 171 Features, 1927 Through 1932*. New York City: McFarland and Company.
- Carroll, N. (1995). Towards an Ontology of the Moving Image. In C. A. Freeland, & T. E. Wartenberg (Eds.), *Philosophy and Film* (68–85). New York & London: Routledge.
- Dziemidok, B., & McCormick, P. J. (Eds.). (1989). *On the Aesthetics of Roman Ingarden: Interpretations and Assessments*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Haltof, M. (1998). Film Theory in Poland Before World War II. *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne*, 40 (1/2), 67–78.
- Helman, A. (1975). The Influence of Ingarden's Aesthetics on the Theory of Film. In P. Graf, & S. Krzemień-Ojak (Eds.), *Ingarden and Contemporary Polish Aesthetics* (97–107). Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Helman, A., Osadnik, W. M., Plesnar, Ł., & Wilk, E. (1994). Some Remarks on the Application of Ingarden's Theory to Film Studies. In A.-T. Tymieniecka (Ed.), *Allegory Revisited; Ideals of Man-kind, Analecta Husserliana, Vol. 41* (377–397). London: Kluwer Academic Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-0898-0_28
- Ingarden, R. (1973a). *The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art* (R. A. Crowley, & K. R. Olson, Trans.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Ingarden, R. (1973b). *The Literary Work of Art. An Investigation on the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Literature* (G. G. Grabowicz, Trans.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Ingarden, R. (1989). *Ontology of the Work of Art* (R. Meyer, & J. T. Goldwait, Trans.). Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Lewicki, B. (1935). Budowa utworu filmowego. *Życie Sztuki*, 2, 69–87.
- Lissa, L. (1937). *Muzyka i film. Studium z pogranicza ontologii, estetyki i psychologii muzyki filmowej*. Lwow: Księgarnia Lwowska.
- Malherbe, O. (2016). Roman Ingarden et le Cinéma: entre visibilité et musicalité. *Studia Phaenomenologica*, 16, 185–214.
- Mitscherling, J. (1997). *Roman Ingarden's Ontology and Aesthetics*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Mitscherling, J. (2004). The Identity of the Architectural Work of Art. *Contemporary Issues in Aesthetics* (Supplemental volume of *Symposium*, 8 [3]), 491–518.
- Mitscherling, J. (2010). *Aesthetic Genesis: The Origin of Consciousness in the Intentional Being of Nature*. Toronto: University of America Press.

- Mishima, Y. (1990). *The Temple at Dawn* (E. D. Saunders, & C. S. Seigle, Trans.). New York: Random House.
- Morawski, M. (1985). Ingardenowska koncepcja sztuki filmowej. *Kwartalnik Filmowy*, 8 (4), 17–32.
- Osadnik, W. M., & Plesnar, Ł. A. (1991). On the Sign Character of the Representing Stratum in a Film as a Work of Art. In A.-T. Tymieniecka (Ed.), *Ingardeniana III: Roman Ingarden's Aesthetics in a New Key and the Independent Approaches of Others. Analecta Husserliana, Vol. 33* (63–78). London: Kluwer Academic Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-3762-1_2
- Plotka, W. (2017). Early Phenomenology in Poland (1895–1945): Origins, Development, and Break-down. *Studies in East European Thought*, 69 (1), 79–91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11212-017-9274-0>
- Rudnick, H. H. (Ed.). (1990). *Ingardeniana II: New Studies in the Philosophy of Roman Ingarden. Analecta Husserliana, Vol. 30*. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Spiegelberg, H. (1965). *The Phenomenological Movement: A Historical Introduction I*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Szczepańska, A. (1989). The Structure of Artworks. In B. Dziemidok, & P. J. McCormick (Eds.), *On the Aesthetics of Roman Ingarden: Interpretations and Assessments* (21–54). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Tarkovsky, A. (1986). *Sculpting in Time: Reflections on the Cinema* (K. Hunter-Blair, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Tymieniecka, A.-T. (Ed.). (1976). *Ingardeniana: A Spectrum of Specialized Studies Establishing the Field of Research. Analecta Husserliana, Vol. 4*. Boston: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Tymieniecka, A.-T. (Ed.). (1991). *Ingardeniana III: Roman Ingarden's Aesthetics in a New Key and the Independent Approaches of Others. Analecta Husserliana, Vol. 33*. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Wachter, D. von. (2013). Roman Ingarden's Ontology: Existential Dependence, Substances, Ideas, and Other Things Empiricists Do Not Like. In A. Chrudzinski (Ed.), *Existence, Culture, and Person. The Ontology of Roman Ingarden* (55–82). Frankfurt: Ontos Verlag.