Roman Ingarden's Stratified Ontology of the Literary Work as a Linguistic Model of Textual Layering and Meaning Formation

Miroslaw A. Michalski – Dariusz H. Pater

DOI: 10.18355/XL.2026.19.03.16

Abstract
The article reinterprets Roman Ingarden's layered ontology as a model of text analysis. It shows how phonic, semantic, objectual and aspectual layers can ground linguistic description without reducing the literary work to signs, discourse use or readerly construction.
Key words: Roman Ingarden, layered ontology, text linguistics, intentional object, textual meaning, phenomenology

Introduction

The problem of the layered nature of literary works, formulated by Roman Ingarden in his classic study Das literarische Kunstwerk (1931), is one of the most influential proposals for the ontology of works of art in the 20th century. However, its reception in the field of linguistics - especially text linguistics, discourse semantics and the theory of layered meaning structure - remains disproportionately modest in relation to the potential of this concept. Ingarden's analysis of layers: sound, meaning, object, and schematic appearance, was originally developed within the horizon of realistic phenomenology, in dialogue with Edmund Husserl, and then in polemics with transcendental idealism (Ingarden 1931; 1960).

The fundamental question that justifies this study is: can Ingarden's layered ontology be reinterpreted as a model of text structure in the linguistic sense, without reducing its metaphysical dimension to a purely formal theory of language levels? The answer requires a hermeneutic return to the sources - both to the German edition of 1931 and to the Polish edition O dziele literackim (Ingarden 1960) and later systematic developments (Ingarden 1964-1965) - and a confrontation with the achievements of contemporary text theory (de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981; Petofi and Rieser 1973), semiotics (Eco 1979) and reception phenomenology (Iser 1978).

In the context of current research on multi-layered semantics and the relationship between linguistic structure and the ontology of the represented object, the return to Ingarden is not purely historical. It is an attempt to reintroduce his ontology into the discussion on the nature of text as a dynamic, complex and not fully determined structure.

The reception of Ingarden proceeded in several distinct phases.

The first phase includes interpretations directly related to realistic phenomenology and the polemic with Husserl. Of key importance here is Der Streit um die Existenz der Welt, in which the author systematises the ontology of the work in the broader context of the dispute over transcendental idealism. Fundamental to the literature on the subject are the studies by Danuta Gierulanka and Andrzej Połtawski (1964) and Roman Ingarden (critical editions), as well as analyses by Polish commentators such as Władysław Strozewski (1981).

The second phase is reception in literary theory and reception aesthetics. Wolfgang Iser (1978) and Roman Ingarden were sometimes read as precursors of the theory of "gaps" and indeterminacy (Unbestimmtheitsstellen). However, this trend often reduced the ontological dimension of layers to a functional model of the reader. Today, this line of thought is critically discussed by Peter McCormick (1990), who points to the tension between ontology and the pragmatics of reception.

The third phase includes attempts to include Ingarden in semiotic and structural discussions. Umberto Eco (1979) in The Role of the Reader addresses the problem of the openness of the text, which can be juxtaposed with the category of indeterminacy. However, Eco operates within the paradigm of interpretative semiotics, which leads to a shift in emphasis from the ontology of the work to the process of semiosis.
In the field of text linguistics, the concepts of Robert-Alain de Beaugrande and Wolfgang Dressler (1981) and Janos S. Petofi and Rieser (1973) develop models of multilevel text organisation, but without direct reference to Ingarden's ontology. The research gap therefore lies in the lack of a systematic study that would reconstruct Ingarden's layering as a theoretical model applicable to text linguistics and discourse semantics.
Recent research on the phenomenology of language (Zahavi 2003) and the ontology of works of art (Thomasson 1999) points to a return to realistic models of objectivity. However, the integration of this research with the tradition of Polish phenomenology remains fragmentary. This article therefore enters into dialogue with both classical studies on Ingarden and the contemporary debate on the ontological status of text.
The aim of this article is to show that Ingarden's layered ontology can be read as a linguistic model of text structure, provided that its realistic ontological foundation is preserved.
The main hypothesis is that the layering of a literary work in Ingarden is not merely a metaphysical classification of levels of aesthetic being, but implies a formal model of meaning organisation that can be transformed into a tool for linguistic analysis.
Specific questions:
What are the ontological relations between the sound, meaning and object layers?
How can the concept of indeterminacy (Unbestimmtheit) be translated into the category of semantic openness of a text?
Is the layered structure hierarchical or rather relational and dynamic?
How does Ingarden's concept of intentionality differ from Eco's semiotic models and structural theories of text?
Methodologically, the article is based on:
- hermeneutics of sources in the Gadamerian sense (Gadamer 1960), assuming the dialogical nature of interpretation and the historicity of understanding;
- a phenomenological analysis of Ingarden's texts, taking into account their German and Polish versions;
- theoretical comparative studies, comparing Ingarden with text theory (de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981) and semiotics (Eco 1979);
- analysis of philosophical discourse, allowing us to capture conceptual shifts between ontology and linguistics.
This method is appropriate because the subject of the study is not only linguistic structure, but also the relationship between linguistic structure and the ontology of the subject presented. The research perspective remains realistic-phenomenological, while taking into account contemporary theories of text.

Reconstruction of the ontology of the layers of a literary work. Analysis of German and Polish terminology

Roman Ingarden's layered ontology was formulated in the first edition of Das literarische Kunstwerk (1931), and then developed and partially reformulated in the dispute over the existence of the world (Ingarden 1964-1965) and in the Polish version O dziele literackim (Ingarden 1960). The foundation of this concept is the thesis that a literary work is neither a real physical object (such as a book as a copy) nor a purely mental experience of the author or reader, but a "purely intentional object" (rein intentionaler Gegenstand) with a specific ontological structure (Ingarden 1931: 52-58).

The term "rein intentionaler Gegenstand" has a technical meaning and refers to the phenomenological distinction between an intentional act (Akt) and its object (Gegenstand). Unlike Husserl, for whom the intentional object remains within the horizon of transcendental constitution (Husserl 1913/1982), Ingarden emphasises the ontological distinctness of the work as a structure which, although dependent on acts of consciousness in an existential sense (heteronomy), is not reducible to them in an ontological sense (Ingarden 1964-1965, vol. I: 181-205). This realistic correction of phenomenology is of fundamental importance for the further analysis of layers.

A literary work is therefore not identical with its material carrier (Druckexemplar) or with the experience of reading (Erlebnis), but constitutes a structure of meaning that is actualised in acts of concretisation (Konkretisation), but is not exhausted by them (Ingarden 1931: 239-250; Iser 1978: 274-294). Already at this level, it is clear that Ingarden's ontology implies a relational model: structure - act - concretisation.

The first of the distinguished layers is the sound layer, referred to in the German edition as Lautgebilde, and in the Polish version as "sound creations" (Ingarden 1931: 32-41; 1960: 29-36). The term Lautgebilde does not refer to physical sound (Schall), but to a structural phonic arrangement that conveys meaning.

Ingarden thus distinguishes the sound layer of a work from the material act of articulation or graphic notation. In an ontological sense, Lautgebilde is an ideal structure that can be realised in various copies and performances, but retains its formal identity. This distinction anticipates the later linguistic distinction between type and token (type/token distinction), although Ingarden does not formulate it in analytical terminology.

The sound layer is not yet the meaning layer; however, it is a condition of its possibility. In this sense, the relationship between Lautgebilde and Bedeutungseinheiten (meaning units) is fundamental (Fundierungsverhaltnis) rather than purely associative. The phonic structure establishes the possibility of meaning, but does not fully determine it (Ingarden 1931: 60-71).

From a linguistic perspective, this layer can be reinterpreted as the phonological-graphical level of the text, but its ontological status remains different from that in purely structural models of language (cf. de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981: 3-15). Ingarden does not analyse it as a linguistic system (langue), but as a component of a specific work (Werk), which shifts the emphasis from the system to the individual structure.

The second layer is the semantic layer, referred to as Bedeutungsschicht or Schicht der Bedeutungseinheiten (Ingarden 1931: 73-109; 1960: 64-96). It includes sentences (Satze), their meaning (Sinn) and the logical relationships between them.

Ingarden assumes that the meaning of a sentence is not a simple sum of the meanings of words, but a structure of meaning that has a specific organisation. He distinguishes between meaning (Sinn) and the object represented (Gegenstand), which refers to Frege's distinction between Sinn and Bedeutung, although Ingarden does not adopt it directly (cf. Frege 1892/1984). Meaning is an intentional structure that points to an object but is not identical with it.

At the level of meaning, there is the category of "places of indeterminacy" (Unbestimmtheitsstellen), which are an essential element of the structure of a work. Indeterminacy is not a lack or a defect, but a constitutive feature of a literary text (Ingarden 1931: 254-270; Iser 1978: 182-206). It is thanks to them that the work retains the potential for concretisation.

Unlike structuralism, which treats the text as a closed structure of sign relations, Ingarden's layer of meaning is open and dynamic. However, this openness does not mean interpretative freedom. The structure of meaning sets the limits of possible concretisation, which distinguishes Ingarden's ontology from radical interpretative semiotics (Eco 1979: 7-11).

The third layer is the layer of represented objects (Schicht der dargestellten Gegenstandlichkeiten), comprising characters, events, spatial and temporal relations - in other words, the represented world (Ingarden 1931: 109-150; 1960: 97-142).
The key here is the distinction between the real object and the represented object. A literary character does not exist in reality, but has a specific form of existence as a purely intentional object. It is neither fiction in the psychological sense nor a real entity - but a structure defined by the layer of meaning.
Ingarden emphasises that the object layer is not autonomous: it is founded on the layer of meaning, which determines its scope and structure. At the same time, it has relative structural independence, as the presented world exhibits ontological coherence (ontologische Geschlossenheit), which can be analysed independently of the act of reading (Ingarden 1964-1965, vol. II: 61-89).
From a linguistic perspective, this layer corresponds to the referential level of the text - the structure of world models or mental representations. However, Ingarden gives it a clear ontological status, not just a cognitive one. It is here that the difference between phenomenological ontology and discourse theory in a purely pragmatic sense becomes apparent.
The fourth layer, often overlooked in brief reconstructions, is the layer of "schematised appearances" (Schicht der schematisierten Ansichten) (Ingarden 1931: 270-308; 1960: 285-325). It concerns the way in which the objects presented appear in the perceptual perspective - their aspectuality (Abschattungen).
The term Ansicht refers to Husserl's theory of appearances (Abschattungen), but Ingarden modifies it by transferring it to the field of literary works. In a literary text, appearances are not perceptual data, but schematically determined possibilities of making an object present in the reader's imagination.
This layer combines ontology with reception theory, but does not reduce it to the psychology of reading. Schematicity here means structural indeterminacy, which demands concretisation but does not determine it.
The reconstruction of layered ontology requires emphasising that the relationships between layers are foundational (Fundierung) rather than causal. The higher layer is founded by the lower one, but is not reducible to it. This relationship resembles the phenomenological structure of ontological dependence (ontologische Abhangigkeit), analysed in more detail in the dispute over the existence of the world.
A literary work as a whole is a heteronomous entity: dependent on acts of consciousness in an existential sense, but possessing structural autonomy (Ingarden 1931: 367-381). It is precisely this duality - dependence and autonomy - that is the key to reinterpreting the ontology of layers as a model of text.
From the point of view of text linguistics, Ingarden's layering can be read as a model of multi-level organisation: phonic, semantic, referential and phenomenal. However, reducing it to a purely formal scheme would be a hermeneutic error. Layering is an ontological category, not just a descriptive one.
In this sense, Ingarden's ontology transcends both structuralism and pure semiotics. It allows us to think of text as a structure of meaning that has its own mode of existence, different from both real being and mental experience.

Translation of layered ontology into a linguistic model of text

The reconstruction of the layered ontology of a literary work, carried out in the previous chapter on the basis of the German edition of Das literarische Kunstwerk(Ingarden 1931) and later systematic approaches (Ingarden 1964-1965), now requires a move that is methodologically more risky, but at the same time necessary from the perspective of text linguistics. It is not enough to demonstrate the internal consistency of Ingarden's concept; it is also necessary to demonstrate its operability within contemporary models of text analysis. However, the translation of ontology into a linguistic model cannot

mean reducing ontological categories to purely functional levels of description. What is at stake is preserving the difference between ontological foundation and analytical hierarchy.

Ingarden's concept of foundation (Fundierung) describes the ontological relationship between the layers of a work: the higher layer is founded on the lower one, but cannot be reduced to it (Ingarden 1931: 60-71; 1960, vol. I: 196-214). In text linguistics, on the other hand, the levels of analysis - phonological, lexicogrammatical, semantic, pragmatic - are organised according to functional and methodological criteria, not ontological ones. In the classical model of de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), text is a communicative structure based on the principles of cohesion and coherence, and its layering is descriptive in nature. In Halliday (1994), the layering of language takes the form of a systemic-functional architecture of realisation, in which semantics is realised in lexicogrammar, which in turn is realised in phonology. It is a dynamic and operational model, but its order is one of function, not of being.

The translation of Ingarden's ontology must therefore consist in distinguishing between two planes: the plane of being, in which the text as a literary work has a specific mode of existence as a purely intentional object, and the analytical plane, in which the text becomes the object of linguistic segmentation and description. The relationship between these planes is not one of identity, but of theoretical translation.

The sound layer (Lautgebilde), which Ingarden understands as the phonic structure of a work, is not the phonological system of language, but an ideal arrangement of sounds that establishes the possibility of meaning (Ingarden 1931: 32-41). In text linguistics, the phonological level is treated as a component of the language system or as the realisation of discourse. However, in the proposed translation, the sound layer must be read as the formal-expressive dimension of the text, in which the sound, rhythmic and graphic organisation is not only a carrier of meaning, but also co-creates its semantic field. Thus, the phonological level is not merely a technical layer of realisation, but a structure that has a foundational meaning for the sense of the text as a whole.

The meaning layer (Bedeutungsschicht) constitutes the second level of translation. For Ingarden, the meaning of a sentence is not a simple sum of the meanings of expressions, but an organised intentional structure that determines the field of possible concretisations (Ingarden 1931: 73-109). In text linguistics, semantic coherence is analysed as the effect of the relationship between text segments and their anchoring in the encyclopaedic knowledge of the recipient (de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981). Petofi and Rieser (1973) argue that the structure of a text comprises a complex system of textual-semantic relations, integrating the logical and referential levels. However, Ingarden's concept of meaning goes beyond a purely relational model of coherence. Meaning has the status of an element of the structure of the work, and indeterminacies (Unbestimmtheitsstellen) are not merely pragmatic gaps, but ontological moments of openness that constitute the text as a dynamic structure. The translation of this layer into a linguistic model therefore requires the recognition that the semantic level is not solely a function of usage, but a structure that determines the scope of interpretative actualisation.

The object layer (Schicht der dargestellten Gegenstandlichkeiten) introduces the problem of reference and representation of the world. In text linguistics, we speak of models of the world or mental representations (van Dijk 1980), which enable the interpretation of text in the context of knowledge about reality. Ingarden, however, does not reduce the represented world to the reader's cognitive construct. Literary objects have a specific ontological status as elements of the structure of a work, although their existence is heteronomous (Ingarden 1931: 109-150). The translation of this layer requires a distinction between the referential level, analysed in linguistic terms, and the ontological level, which concerns the mode of existence of the depicted world. In the proposed model, the world of the text is both a representative structure and an

ontological structure: it is neither a real world nor an arbitrary interpretative construct, but a system of objectivity founded by the layer of meaning.

The most subtle translation requires the layer of schematic appearances (Schicht der schematisierten Ansichten). Referring to Husserl's theory of aspects (Abschattungen), Ingarden points out that literary objects appear in perspectives that are structurally determined but not fully determined (Ingarden 1931: 270-308). In linguistics, this corresponds to the analysis of point of view, deixis or focalisation (Lyons 1977), but these models deal with discursive functions, not with the ontological structure of appearance. The translation of this layer therefore requires recognition that the pragmatic-perceptual level of the text - comprising the narrative perspective and the structure of actualisation - has a dual status: it is both a category of discourse analysis and an element of the structure of the work as an intentional object.

As a result, the proposed ontological-linguistic model is not a simple map of correspondence between Ingarden's layers and the levels of language. Rather, it is a matrix in which each component of the text has a descriptive and ontological dimension. The formal-expressive dimension of the text corresponds to the sound layer; the semantic-structural dimension - to the meaning layer; the representational dimension - to the object layer; the pragmatic-perceptual dimension - to the layer of schematic appearances. Each of these dimensions can be analysed using linguistic methods, but their description is not exhaustive.

The difference between the ontological foundation and the linguistic hierarchy remains fundamental. While in systemic-functional models the layers of language are levels of realisation, in Ingarden's view the layers of a work are moments of its mode of existence. The translation of ontology into a linguistic model does not, therefore, mean the ontologisation of linguistics or the linguistic reduction of ontology, but rather the introduction into text theory of a dimension that allows us to think of text as a structure of meaning with its own ontological status.

Understood in this way, the ontological-linguistic matrix makes it possible to overcome two extremes present in text theory: the formalistic reduction of text to a system of sign relations and radical constructivism, which makes text solely the effect of an interpretative game. In the light of Ingarden's ontology, text is a structure of meaning that exists heteronomously but has structural autonomy. It is this duality - dependence on acts of reading and structural independence - that makes layered ontology not only an aesthetic project but also a potentially fundamental linguistic model.

Application study: ontological and linguistic analysis of Czesław Miłosz's poem "Campo di Fiori"

The choice of Czesław Miłosz's poem "Campo di Fiori" (1943) as analytical material is not accidental. This text combines a distinctive formal organisation, a complex structure of meaning, an elaborate world presented, and a clearly marked pragmatic perspective. It therefore allows us to test the operability of the proposed ontological-linguistic matrix, while maintaining the ontological depth of Ingarden's concept of layers (Ingarden 1931; 1960). The analysis is not a thematic or historical-literary interpretation, but an attempt to show that the four components of the model - formal-expressive, semantic-structural, representational, and pragmatic-perceptual - form a coherent structure for describing the text as an intentional object.

On a formal-expressive level, Miłosz's text reveals a clear rhythmic and versification organisation, which is not only a carrier of content, but also constitutes a field of meaning. The regularity of phrases, syntactic parallelism and recurring enumerative structures generate tension between formal order and catastrophic content. In this sense, the sound layer is not a neutral substrate, but an active element organising meaning. Ingarden's Lautgebilde should be understood here as an ideal phonic structure that is actualised in a specific performance but retains its formal identity (Ingarden 1931: 32-41). Rhythm and repetition have a semantic function, contributing to the effect of

contrast between the indifference of the crowd and the historical tragedy. Thus, the formal-expressive component reveals its foundational character in relation to the further layers, although it does not determine them mechanically.

At the semantic-structural level, parallel construction plays a key role: the juxtaposition of Rome's Campo de' Fiori with the Warsaw ghetto. The structure of meaning does not consist solely of historical reference, but of an organised relationship of analogy. The meaning of the poem is constituted as a dynamic relationship between two temporal orders, which corresponds to Ingarden's layer of meaning (Bedeutungsschicht). Indeterminacies - for example, the lack of direct moral commentary in some parts of the text - are not gaps in information, but places of potential concretisation (Ingarden 1931: 254-270). In the linguistic model, they can be analysed as a space of pragmatic implicatures, but their ontological status is deeper: they define a field of interpretative actualisation that is not arbitrary but structurally limited by the organisation of meaning.

The representational layer, corresponding to Ingarden's layer of represented objects (Gegenstandlichkeiten), encompasses two worlds: historical Rome and occupied Warsaw. Both worlds are constructed as object structures with internal coherence. They are neither a historical document nor a purely subjective vision, but a representative structure founded on the layer of meaning. In text linguistics, one can speak of a model of the world (van Dijk 1980), but Ingarden's perspective allows us to emphasise that the represented world has a specific ontological status as an element of the structure of the work. Literary objects - characters, events, places - exist as objects of pure intention, whose ontological dependence on the act of reading does not negate their structural autonomy (Ingarden 1964-1965).

The most subtle level of analysis concerns the pragmatic-perceptual component. Miłosz's poem employs a variable perspective in which the narrator takes the position of both witness and commentator. Schematic views (schematisierteAnsichten) manifest themselves in the way scenes are evoked: fragmentarily, aspectually, with distance. The reader does not receive a complete, panoramic view, but a series of shots that demand to be completed in the act of reading. The narrative perspective is not merely a stylistic category, but a moment of the ontological structure of the text, determining the way in which the depicted world is made present. In this sense, the pragmatic level is not reduced to an analysis of the function of speech or point of view, but constitutes an element of the work's existence as a structure of meaning.

The application of the ontological-linguistic matrix to Campo di Fiori shows that the four components are not isolated from each other. The formal-expressive dimension of rhythm and parallelism underpins the semantic structure; this, in turn, constitutes the world presented; the narrative perspective actualises it in a schematic and dynamic way. Linguistic analysis can operate at each of these levels, but their relationships remain rooted in the ontological foundation. In this sense, Ingarden's model is not merely a historical aesthetic theory, but a tool that allows us to transcend the reduction of text to a system of signs or to pure interpretative pragmatics.

This study shows that layered ontology can be translated into an operational model without losing its philosophical integrity. Literary text appears as a structure of meaning with four interrelated dimensions that can be analysed linguistically, but whose relations are foundational, not merely functional. In this way, the ontological-linguistic model allows us to think of text as an intentional being, the analysis of which requires both formal precision and ontological reflection.

Methodological consequences for text linguistics

The reconstruction of Roman Ingarden's layered ontology and its translation into an ontological-linguistic model lead to a fundamental question about the methodological status of text theory. If a literary text - and more broadly, text as such - is a structure of meaning with a specific mode of existence, then its analysis cannot be limited to the description of formal relations or the reconstruction of communicative functions. It

requires the recognition that the levels of linguistic analysis refer to a structure that has its own ontological order.

Contemporary text linguistics, starting with the classical model of de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), has developed within a communicative paradigm in which text is primarily a linguistic event that performs specific functions in interaction. The criteria of textuality - cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativeness, situationality and intertextuality - are operational and descriptive in nature. However, this paradigm does not resolve the question of the ontological status of text as a structure of meaning. Text is sometimes understood as a product of discourse, as an interpretative construct or as a system of signs. Less often, it is analysed as an object with a specific mode of existence.

Ingarden's layered ontology introduces an element into text theory that can be described as the ontological dimension of analysis. This does not mean the ontologisation of linguistics in the sense of metaphysical speculation, but rather the recognition that the phonological, semantic, referential and pragmatic levels are not merely modules of description, but correspond to real moments of the structure of text as an intentional object (Ingarden 1931; 1960). The relationship between them is not purely functional, as in Halliday's (1994) realisation models, but is fundamental in nature: the formal layer establishes meaning, meaning establishes the represented world, and the way in which this world is made present determines the field of actualisation.

The first methodological consequence is the need to distinguish between the level of description and the level of structure. In linguistic analysis, we use methodological categories that are instrumental in nature. However, if we adopt Ingarden's perspective, we must recognise that these categories refer to real moments in the structure of the text. The analysis is therefore not purely constructive; it is a reconstruction of a structure that has its own autonomy from the act of interpretation. This perspective counteracts radical semiotic constructivism, in which the text becomes solely the effect of an interpretative game (cf. Eco 1979).

The second consequence is a redefinition of the concept of coherence. In the classical view, coherence is the effect of semantic and pragmatic relations that the reader reconstructs on the basis of their knowledge of the world (de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981). In the ontological-linguistic model, coherence is rooted in the structure of meaning as an ontological layer. Indeterminacies are not information gaps, but moments of structural openness that constitute the text as a field of possible concretisations. Thus, the analysis of coherence requires not only a description of the relations between sentences, but also the recognition of the structural limits of interpretation.

The third consequence is a new approach to the relationship between text and world. In pragmatics and discourse theory, reference is sometimes treated as a function of language use in context (Lyons 1977; van Dijk 1980). Ingarden's object layer, on the other hand, allows us to think of the world of the text as a representative structure with its own ontological coherence. This means that the analysis of reference cannot be limited to the relationship between expressions and empirical reality, but should include the structure of the world presented as an element of the work.

The fourth consequence is the reinterpretation of the pragmatic level. In many models, pragmatics is the highest level of analysis, encompassing the sender's intentions and the communicative context. In the ontological-linguistic model, the pragmatic-perceptual level corresponds to the layer of schematic appearances and therefore concerns the way in which the world presented in the act of reading is made present. Pragmatics is therefore not only the external context of the text, but also a moment of its structure. This opens up the possibility of integrating text linguistics with the phenomenology of reception, without reducing one to the other.

Finally, the adoption of the ontological dimension of the text leads to a redefinition of the concept of textuality. A text is not merely a communicative event or a material artefact. It is a structure of meaning that exists heteronomously - dependent on acts of reading - but has structural autonomy. In this view, linguistic analysis becomes a reconstruction of this structure, rather than merely a description of communicative functions.

These consequences are programmatic in nature. They introduce a dimension to text linguistics that allows us to transcend the opposition between formalism and constructivism. On the one hand, they recognise the autonomy of the text structure; on the other, they preserve the dynamic nature of actualisation in the act of reading. Ingarden's layered ontology does not replace existing linguistic models, but provides them with a deeper theoretical justification.

In this way, the article concludes with a proposal for a model that combines phenomenological ontology with operational text analysis. Text appears as a multidimensional structure, the study of which requires both linguistic precision and ontological awareness. Text linguistics understood in this way does not abandon methodological rigour, but extends it to include reflection on the mode of existence of its subject matter.

Conclusion

The aim of this article was to show that Roman Ingarden's layered ontology can be translated into an operational linguistic model without losing its phenomenological and ontological integrity. The starting point was the reconstruction of the structure of a literary work as a purely intentional object, whose layered structure - phonetic, semantic, objectual and aspectual - is not merely an analytical scheme, but an expression of a specific mode of existence. Next, an attempt was made to translate this ontology into a model of text analysis, clearly distinguishing the ontological foundation from the linguistic hierarchy. The application study showed that the proposed ontological-linguistic matrix is truly operational, and the methodological chapter indicated its consequences for text theory.

The main thesis of the article can be formulated as follows: literary text - and more broadly, text as a structure of meaning - is neither exclusively a system of sign relations nor merely the effect of pragmatic actualisation in discourse, but a multidimensional structure with its own ontological status, which can and should be taken into account in linguistic analysis. The ontological-linguistic matrix of layers does not replace existing textual models, but provides them with a deeper theoretical justification, allowing the formal, semantic, representational and pragmatic levels to be integrated into a single coherent descriptive architecture.

This proposal does not claim to fully systematise all aspects of textuality. It requires further development in the direction of comparative research, especially with regard to cognitive and discursive models, as well as testing on a broader empirical basis. Its fundamental value, however, lies in restoring to text linguistics the question of the mode of existence of its object. Text analysis is not merely a methodological operation; it is also - albeit often unconscious - a reconstruction of the ontological structure of meaning.

If text linguistics is to maintain a balance between formal precision and theoretical adequacy, it must recognise that text as an object of study is not a neutral set of data, but a structure with a specific ontological order. Ingarden's layered ontology, read from an ontological-linguistic perspective, offers a tool that allows this structure to be grasped without falling into either formalistic reductionism or constructivist relativisation of meaning.

AI Use Statement

The authors declare that AI-based language tools were used only for linguistic proofreading and stylistic refinement. The conceptual structure, argumentation and interpretation remain the authors' own work. All references and in-text citations have been checked manually during revision; AI tools were not used as an autonomous source of bibliographic data.

Bibliographic references

de Beaugrande, R.-A., & Dressler, W. U. (1981). Introduction to Text Linguistics. London – New York: Longman. ISBN 978-0-582-55485-6.

Eco, U. (1979). The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. ISBN 0-253-20318-0.

Frege, G. (1892/1984). On Sense and Reference. In Collected Papers on Mathematics, Logic, and Philosophy (McGuinness, B. ed.). Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 157–177. ISBN 0-631-12735-9.

Gadamer, H.-G. (1960). Wahrheit und Methode. Grundzuge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik. Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

Gierulanka, D., & Poltawski, A. (1964). Kierunki badan filozoficznych Romana Ingardena [Directions of Roman Ingarden's Philosophical Research]. In Szkice filozoficzne. Romanowi Ingardenowi w darze [Philosophical Sketches. A Gift to Roman Ingarden] (Zarnecka, Z. ed.). Warszawa – Krakow: Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe (PWN), pp. 473–481.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). An Introduction to Functional Grammar. 2nd ed. London: Edward Arnold. ISBN 978-0-340-57491-1.

Husserl, E. (1913/1982). Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy: First Book: General Introduction to a Pure Phenomenology. Translated by F. Kersten. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers. ISBN 978-90-247-2342-3.

Ingarden, R. (1931). Das literarische Kunstwerk. Eine Untersuchung aus dem Grenzgebiet der Ontologie, Logik und Literaturwissenschaft. Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer.

Ingarden, R. (1960). O dziele literackim: Badania z pogranicza ontologii, teorii jezyka i filozofii literatury [The Literary Work of Art: An Investigation on the Borderlines of Ontology, Theory of Language, and Philosophy of Literature]. Translated by M. Turowicz. Warszawa: Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Ingarden, R. (1964–1965). Der Streit um die Existenz der Welt. Bd. I–II. Tubingen: Max Niemeyer.

Ingarden, R. (1973). The Literary Work of Art: An Investigation on the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Literature. Translated by G. G. Grabowicz. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press. ISBN 0-8101-0418-0; 978-0-8101-0418-1.

Iser, W. (1978). The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. ISBN 978-0-8018-2101-1.

Lyons, J. (1977). Semantics. Vols. I–II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0-521-29165-8; 0-521-29186-0.

McCormick, P. J. (1990). Modernity, Aesthetics, and the Bounds of Art. Ithaca – London: Cornell University Press. ISBN 978-0-8014-2452-6.

Petofi, J. S., & Rieser, H. (eds.) (1973). Studies in Text Grammar. Foundations of Language Supplementary Series, vol. 19. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company. ISBN 978-90-277-0368-2; 902770368X.

Strozewski, W. (1981). Istnienie i wartosc [Existence and Value]. Krakow: Wydawnictwo Znak. ISBN 83-7006-017-2.

Thomasson, A. L. (1999). Fiction and Metaphysics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0-521-64080-6; 978-0-521-64080-0.

van Dijk, T. A. (1980). Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. ISBN 0-89859-039-6; 978-0-89859-039-5.
Zahavi, D. (2003). Husserl's Phenomenology. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. ISBN 978-0804745468.
Words: 5943
Characters: 40 158 (22 standard pages)

Mirosław A. Michalski
Christian Theological Academy in Warsaw
ul. Broniewskiego 48, 01-771 Warszawa
Poland
m.michalski@chat.edu.pl
ORCID: 0000-0001-7769-722X

Dariusz H. Pater
Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw
ul. Dewajtis 5, 01-815 Warsaw
Poland
d.pater@uksw.edu.pl
ORCID: 0000-0002-4915-3695