

Irena Chawrińska  
Uniwersytet Gdański

## COGNITIVE VALUE OF THE HYBRID WORK OF ART

*But when he had received from him the evil token of his daughter's husband,  
first he bade him slay the raging Chimaera. She was of divine stock, not of  
men, in the fore part a lion, in the hinder a serpent, and in the midst a goat,  
breathing forth in terrible wise the might of blazing fire. (Iliad 6, 180–182)*

Chimera is probably the most famous hybrid and perhaps that is not owing to its description provided by Homer in the Iliad. Some people may associate the name with a Polish magazine on literature and art, which was published at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, others may relate it to the Notre Dame Cathedral, and others may know chimeras from the modern fantasy literature or computer games, and finally there may be some people who have in mind the image of chimera viewed as a mythological creature. Chimera is sometimes portrayed as a two-headed creature: one of a goat and the other of a lion, with a tail of a serpent or a dragon. The chimera described by Homer, which was defeated by Bellerofont riding on the winged horse called Pegasus, had a lion's head, a goat's body and a serpent's tail. In computer games chimera is a hybrid consisting of elements taken from other animals, and appearing in various configurations. What seems to be the most important is that hybrids are heterogeneous creatures and, due to that fact, they are quite disturbing. The truth is that chimera is a creature which belches out fire, however, not all hybrids are representatives of this type of beings. The term 'hybrid' can be associated with changeability, lack of cohesion, oddness, heterogeneity, and even with anomalies. In ancient times hybridity did not necessarily equal being a monster but, in fact, it meant heterogeneity. Hybrids were known in many ancient cultures – Sumerian, Egyptian or Greek, for example. They are the creatures of Chaos, of the pre-Ocean, not entirely formed before the final emergence of the world, they express the unity which happens before other beings are fully individualized. They consist of the pre-matter, and they exist only as potential beings. Hybrids can be also interpreted as a visual representation of the relation between all the spheres of the universe: earthly, underground and aerial. In this context hybrid nature expresses the relation of all the spheres and the unity of the universe.

The heterogeneity itself and the lack of cohesion seem disturbing in the case of hybrids. They cannot be assigned to classes or species which can be unquestionably included in dichotomic divisions. The reason for their exceptional nature is their individuality and uniqueness which makes people regard them as odd and disturbing creatures. Can one be a lion, a goat and a serpent at the same time? Or is it possible not to be ranked among the representatives of any species or genus?

What I would like to study in the following article are the phenomena found in the borderline between literature and visual arts. It makes one wonder how we should talk about concrete poetry, artistic book, cybernetic poetry or liberatic ventures. Can we assume that there is one, appropriate language to describe the highly varied cultural phenomena which exist in the borderline between literature and visual arts?

Hybrids<sup>1</sup> seem to be individual works which can hardly be classified under a particular field of art. We can distinguish different genological categories whose aim is to put in order the universe of the phenomena, however, these divisions are not necessarily a hint for a recipient. It is enough to consider what conceptual book and the artistic book with a story have in common, in the case of which it is possible to establish a quite coherent and possibly right interpretation. Except for the fact that in both cases we deal with some artistic activities for which widely understood book is a material used in the process of creation. Surely conceptual books have more in common with concrete poetry than any other artistic books. In any case, works of the most recognized Polish concrete poet Stanisław Dróżdż can be frequently found in the studies on the topic of the artistic book. Are concrete poems, written or painted on the walls of the buildings, just like in the case of the street anthology of Blum-Kwiatkowski<sup>2</sup>, still concrete poetry or maybe they are some sort of the artistic book – as written by Piotr Rypson – book beyond book<sup>3</sup>?

<sup>1</sup> Nowadays there are a lot of publications in which authors discuss the category of hybrid in various senses, ex. N. G. Canclini, *Hybrid Cultures. Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*, Minneapolis-London 2005; M. M Kraidy, *Hybridity, or the Cultural Logic of Globalization* Philadelphia 2005; *Global Modernities*, ed. M. Featherstone, S. Lash, R. Robertson, London – Thousand Oaks – New Delhi 1997 and H. K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, London – New York 2004. Such a way of thinking about hybrids is not interesting for me in this article.

<sup>2</sup> The aim of this venture is to move the text radically into the space. Gerard Blum Kwiatkowski makes the work called *Das Offene Buch*. The artist puts concrete and visual poems in different languages on the facades of the houses in Hünfeld.

<sup>3</sup> Piotr Rypson derives the division of artistic books from Anne Moeglin Delcroix. Rypson distinguishes conceptual book, book in the form of a novel, book in the form of process and final product, and book beyond book. Cf. *Books and Pages. Polish Avant-Garde and Artistic Book in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*, Warsaw 2000.

Similar problems related to assigning a particular work to a collection of works are obviously numerous. Surely some of them do not cause any controversies. They are thought to be intermedia works. However, I believe that this is not the category which accurately describes the works from the borderline between literature and visual arts. Above all, it concerns other various works which are combinations of different arts. Moreover, it only shows the ontological heterogeneity of the discussed phenomena, it does not, in any way, indicate the cognitive disturbance which is evoked in the recipient by the work. Furthermore, the term *intermedia* does not constitute a category rooted in the history of art or literature. The term has a typological character, and, according to Higgins, it does not, in any way, evaluate these works. Furthermore, the scholar emphasizes that the category of intermedia makes it sometimes easier to assign a work with an unknown background. However, the formal status of the work is not as important for him as its meaning for the recipient<sup>4</sup>. He even believes that the term *intermedia* is characterized by an inner contradiction. This term enables us:

[...] for an ingress to a work which otherwise seems opaque and impenetrable, but once that ingress has been made it is no longer useful to harp upon the intermediality of a work. No reputable artist could be an intermedial artist for long--it would seem like an impediment, holding the artist back from fulfilling the needs of the work at hand, of creating horizons in the new era for the next generation of listeners and readers and beholders to match their own horizons too. What was helpful as a beginning would, if maintained, become an obsession which braked the flow into the work and its needs and potentials<sup>5</sup>.

It seems to me that the category of hybrid work is more suitable. First and foremost, it indicates the individual character of particular works. By reason of mythological references it indicates some cognitive uneasiness which is felt by the recipient after having experienced the work in which a visual sign has integrated with a verbal sign. In the case of the hybrid its heterogeneity is truly disturbing, the fact that it is put together from various elements which, if viewed individually, are hardly surprising, but when they are put together, they form a being which is odd, disturbing, and which Aristotle found impossible to exist<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup> D. Higgins, "Intermedia", *Leonardo*, vol. 34, no. 1, 2001, p. 52.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 53.

<sup>6</sup> The followers of Aristotle did not acknowledge a hybrid as a compound of two different natures. According to Aristotle these beings fail to come into existence because they appear without a purpose. Due to the nature's functionality the only beings which can exist are adequate and in conformity with nature. It is worth emphasizing that we will not find the term "hybrid" in the works by Aristotle. In the works *Generation of Animals* and *Problems* philosopher discusses some anomalies and monsters. A monster is born when

The situation is similar in the case of hybrid works whose perception gets altered, owing to the integration of the verbal and the visual sign. What is fundamental for hybrid works is their ontological heterogeneity because in their case the carrier of sense is not homogeneous. What plays a crucial part is the work's material nature, which performs a semantic function as well. From the perspective of literature studies this situation is disturbing. In art, lingual elements have been present for a long time. We could refer to the cubistic experiments with lingual elements at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The origin of experimenting with two carriers of sense in the modern culture are the works by Stéphane Mallarmé, Filippo Marinetti and Guillaume Apollinaire<sup>7</sup>. Despite the fact that these names are associated with poetry, the poets' works, together with the development of typography, have inspired artists to further experiments with text in art. Needless to say, in this context we should mention conceptualism, on account of which text has for good become present in museums. It needs emphasizing that using text in plastic arts does not necessarily mean that all the works of this kind should be considered hybrid. Text is used in art for various purposes: it can replace objects, ruin the traditional concept of *mimesis*, be used as a record of a *performance*, it can also perform other functions and it does not necessarily get into a complex relation with visibility, to describe this relation I shall be using the term *hybrid work*<sup>8</sup>.

What is essential in the hybrid work is that we can find there a union of two ontological orders, that is to say, of the work's material sphere and its intentionality, in terms of Ingarden's writings. I am referring here to the Ingarden's theory because it particularly clearly shows how the role of the matter is reduced to recording, and that it does not play any important role. The material sphere of a literary work enables only, according to Ingarden, to reach the intentionality contained in the work in the process of specification. In the case of hybrids their

---

“[...] the movements (originating from the male) cease and the material (provided by the female) is not under their control, then what remains is the most general in being, and that is «animal». The new born, as we used to say, has a head of a ram or an ox” (Aristotle 1979: 181). Similar anomalies can be observed among animals. The representative of one genus can have the head of another one. According to Aristotle monsters are scarcely similar to creatures they are said to be similar to. Therefore, philosopher believes that they do not exist. Moreover, he claims that the being which is born must be the same as the being which provides the semen. From the horse's semen only a horse can be born, from a man only a man, in other case we cannot call the being which is born an offspring. “For that reason our offspring is not something which comes from a different part of our body, or something that is corrupted or distorted” (Aristotle 1980: 62).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. W. Hill, *The Schwitters Legacy: Language And Art In The Early Twentieth Century w: Art and Text*, London 2009, p. 10–19.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. D. Beech, *Turning Yhe Whole Thing Aroung: Text Art Today w: Art and...*, op. cit., p. 26–35.

material nature does not deprecate their intentional layer, if we wanted to use Ingarden's terms, and the process of specification comprises also 'non-lingual' aspects. What plays a crucial part is the work's physical space, because the matter itself performs a semantic function as well.

By denying that there are both the inside and the outside of the work of art, we make it seem to be an organic whole – the form. Such works, in which the meaningful aspects are the semantics of a language and the semantics of material's structure working together, should be referred to as the form. The starting point of my deliberations is Luigi Pareyson's theory of formativity. Pareyson's idea is interesting from the perspective of this article, because he regards the work of art to be the form in which there is no division into the form and the content. It does not mean that the content is unimportant in the case of such works. Even Russian formalists, in the second decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, considered the literary work to be the 'content form'<sup>9</sup>, and it could seem that they, as formalists, should appreciate only the formal aspects of works of art. They do not dissociate themselves from their other aspects. According to Pareyson, the process of forming the work of art comprises all its elements, including the matter, which becomes significant. If we follow the philosopher's line of thought, we could say the same about the meaning in the case of works of art that have no meaning.

If I do not acknowledge the works ranked among *Text Art* to be hybrid, what kind of works do I recognize as hybrids? I analyze such phenomena in art in which the semiosis of the verbal sign and the semiosis of the visual sign seem equally significant: concrete poetry, artistic book, liberature and, so called, new media literature. I attempt to investigate in what way the works of such kind fulfill the cognitive value. What I find interesting is the question whether the theory of Pareyson is sufficient to describe the modern hybrid works.

Concrete poetry pays attention to the language, to its ostensible transparency, materiality and physical form. The recipient's task gets more difficult, reading requires more concentration because it is impossible to determine the sense which could be conclusive for a group of recipients or on any kind of a plane, from the perspective of the given methodology. It depends primarily on the recipient what meaning the work in question can receive. He or she is not able to reach the *signifié*. It does not mean that the content gives way to the form. The semiotic model, which brings a concrete poem down to the content and the form, that is to the *signifiant* and the *signifié*, does not work in the case of the poetry of this current. Concrete poets do not aim to create one artistic code, one perspective

---

<sup>9</sup> Cf. B. Eichenbaum, *The Theory of Formal Method*, in: *The Theory of Literary Studies Abroad*.

*Anthology*, edit. S. Skwarczyńska, t. 2: *From the Time of Antipositivist Turn to 1945*, part 3: *From Formalism to Structuralism*, Cracow 1986, p. 174.,

which would combine the varied formal solutions. The reading of the concrete poem takes as much time as it takes the recipient to study the poem, it is impossible to find the same starting point of reading over and over again which the readers of linear literature are accustomed to.

The sense of concrete poetry lies in the process, in the creation. New meanings are constituted so intensively that in this poetry the *designatum* of words becomes insignificant. Concrete poems break the sign, they separate the *signifiant* from the *signifié*. Even though concrete poetry uses the elements of sign communication, it does not try to describe any elements of the reality. Concrete poems use the fragments of sentences to reveal to the recipient the significant role of the context. It is the context which shows how changeable and wavering the sign is. The word's sense depends on the potential relations of words with other signs, because the word is the moment when many semantic paths cross<sup>10</sup>, and every one of them can create its own context. The word in concrete poetry ruins the context to get involved in the subsequent context, the word which denotes one object cannot carry out all the possible meanings contained. Concrete works are fulfilled in the moments of explosions of uncontrolled meanings, and when they are being perceived the recipient suspends all the systems of meanings which precede the moment of perception.

In this context we should consider whether Pareyson's theory of formativity is a suitable theoretical tool used in the interpretation of concrete poetry. At first glance it seems that Pareyson's theory and concrete poetry are completely incompatible. After all, Pareyson's postulate was that the interpretation's aim is to deeply penetrate the work of art. Reading a concrete poem depends on the previously described attempts to determine a meaning by the recipient on the basis of the appearance, which reveals itself, only the *signifiants*. At the same time, Pareyson emphasizes in his writings that interpretation is an encounter of two infinities: the person's and the form's. Furthermore, he indicates that spirituality deprived of physical aspect simply does not exist. Nonetheless, according to the scholar, the appropriate interpretation relies on congeniality which is viewed as the synchronization of the recipient with the work of art, in such a way that the recipient becomes the most suitable tool to comment on the work, without losing his or her subjectivity. Concrete work is a sign of numerous potential meanings, and the sigh has been used by the artist but the possibilities of meanings of the work considerably exceed the intentions of the creator.

Such work displays a considerable surplus of meanings if compared with the artist's intentions. The meaning of the concrete poem, understood in such way, is that there is a maximum opening of the context of interpretation, which prevents

---

<sup>10</sup> Cf. T. Sławek, *The Philosophy of Conjunction and the Poetry of Negativity*, in: *Between Letters. Essays on Concrete Poetry*, Wrocław 1989, p. 27.

us from determining the unambiguous sense. As stated by Pareyson, the process of interpretation is also infinite, but he does not assume in advance that the right interpretation of the work of art is impossible. Also U. Eco, while writing about the aesthetic message existing on the verge of communication noise, assumes that some significant information is conveyed to the recipient. The concrete poem only *sows* meanings in the subsequent interpretation processes which never explain the thing in question completely. In the case of concrete poems being the constellation of the *signifiants*, the *signifié* will always be inaccessible to the recipient<sup>11</sup>.

If the sense of a particular utterance is impossible to determine, there may be other ways of perceiving the work of art of that kind. Is it possible to experience concrete poetry outside of the discourse?

The recipient of concrete poetry never in his or her process of interpretation reaches the moment when the meaning is being constituted, because he or she operates within the sphere of the *signifiants*. However, the potential of meanings, embedded in particular poems, can be activated and intensified in such a way that on the principle of explosion the sense will be revealed for a moment. Surely that will not be a comfort and *katharsis* preceded by numerous attempts of interpretation in Pareyson's terms, but a momentary experience outside of the discourse, the disclosure of the truth (*aletheia*), some kind of participation in creating a new thing. In the case of traditional literature, which undoubtedly realizes the cognitive value, the interpreters in the subsequent processes of interpretation find new elements of meaning, but many interpretations turn out to be wrong. Frequently the essence of a traditional literary work reveals itself also in the sudden and outside-of-the-discourse experience of a particular recipient and has little in common with the interpretation provided by an expert on literature.

Surely concrete poetry and other hybrids show the reality and the permeation of iconicity to the everyday life. The significant feature of the hybrid is the fact that it catches up with the changing reality. These works result, in simple terms, from the encounter of people with the world, from experiencing the reality and opposing it, because mass media and the common embellishment of everyday life have dominated the perception of the reality by people – “posters and advertisements, comics and magazines’ illustrations surround us, they draw our attention, they attack us<sup>12</sup>.”

If we consider liberature, then to name the specific union of the text and the picture in one work – liberature – K. Bazarnik and Z. Fajfer use the term the architecture of word. They add at once that comparing literature with architecture

<sup>11</sup> Cf. T. Ślawek, *Concrete and Difference*, op. cit. p. 47.

<sup>12</sup> E. Gombrich, *Art and Illusion. A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation*, translated into Polish by J. Zdrański, Warsaw 1981, p. 19.

is a simplification because, in the case of liberature, the aspect of time still plays a significant role. Therefore, despite the division into the spatial arts and the temporal arts suggested by Lessing, liberature should be thought to be the space-time literature. In the simplest way Bazarnik and Fajfer explain the space-time nature of literature by saying that this is the literature which incorporates to its territory the physical space of the book. If we think of liberature, the category of the carrier of meaning is no longer significant because the book, its physical structure and form are the integral parts of the work.

The question remains what significant role, in the case of liberature, is attributed to the material aspects of a liberatic work. What is the purpose of the material in liberature?

For the liberatic authors the term of the literary work's material refers not only to the language but also to a sheet of paper or a block of marble. When they think of the form, what they have in mind is not only the text but also the matters of typography and editing. To the term of literary work the liberatic authors add the category of books, however, their understanding of the book goes beyond a volume consisting of some sheets of paper<sup>13</sup>.

W. Kalaga describes those seemingly outer elements of the literary work by introducing a term *layout* which is used by liberatic authors to *produce a meaning*<sup>14</sup>. For them language, or more precisely, its visual embodiment – writing, becomes a material which can be seen or even touched. The material becomes tangible and it seems to be an integral element of the literary work. When we think of those works, we cannot talk about their layout anymore because all the outer elements of the work are invalidated, they are incorporated into the work.

For that reason we can acknowledge that liberatic work is a form. Formal and beyond-formal elements are united in an organic whole in this kind of writings. According to Pareyson, also formativity, which reveals itself through art, must adopt some physical matter which puts up resistance against the author<sup>15</sup>. The artistic output could not be pure formativity if it did not mean the formation of physical matter. As stated by the scholar, the physical aspects of the work of art are fundamental for the art because that is the only way to distinguish the artistic work from other activities meant to produce some contents, such as thinking, reasoning, acting. The sensual element (*aithesis*) is essential for the work of art to become the work of art that is the form.

<sup>13</sup> Zob. Z. Fajfer, *Lyric Poetry, Epic Poetry, Drama, Liberature*, in: *From Joyce to Liberature*, red., op. cit. p. 234.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. W. Kalaga, *Hybrid Text. Poliphonies and Aporias of Visual Experience*, in: *Cultural Visualisations of Experience*, edit. W. Bolecki, A. Dziadek, Warsaw 2010, p. 9.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. L. Pareyson, *Aesthetics and Theory of Formativity*, translated into Polish by K. Kasia, Cracow 2009, p. 54.

The total nature of a liberatic work means that we can find there the union of textual semiosis and the semiosis of a material carrier which together constitute a semiotic whole. The work's sense is structured by both the language and the book's matter. What is significant is that the book's space, its shape and material structure become a part of the message related to the outer reality, as written by R. Nowakowski in his *Treatise on Pageography*: 'A liberatic author's aim is to turn the world into a book. He or she must place and fit the multidimensional and simultaneously happening world in a book. Not in the text (because it is flat and too narrow by nature) but in the book – in the multidimensional and simultaneously happening object-item-thing where the text is one of planes of the action'<sup>16</sup>. The liberatic work, viewed as some sort of transfiguration of the subject's experiences, definitely fits into Pareyson's theory who believes that the work of art is a reflection of the artist's spirituality expressed by the work's style that is in the formation method. By using the book's space artists are able to convey their experiences.

The liberatic work in which visuality is equally important as words requires from the recipient the non-sequential and non-linear reading. The recipients takes over some of the functions of the author who is no longer an absolute creator, his or her role is now restricted to being a *designer of the perception experience* and he or she is demoted into being one of many co-authors of the work<sup>17</sup>. The recipient of the liberatic work can be called an interactive reader because in the liberatic text we can find many possibilities of experiencing what we read.

Thanks to the simultaneity, the integrity of the components of the hybrid work is possible. It is typical not only of the works in which we deal with material, verbal and iconic messages at the same time. Quite the opposite, it is also applied as an organizing method for works in which the iconic element is absent or is highly reduced, for example to the size of fonts. The simultaneity of two ontological orders, intentional and material-visual, does not need to result in aporeticity of the recipient's experience<sup>18</sup>. This order can compete, but they can also cooperate in the process of perception. In the case of one work they can create a semiotic whole, and in the case of another they can lead to the dispersion of sense in the process of reading, and in some other case they can cause that the sense will be completely undefinable.

To conclude, we should admit that in all the *hybrids* I have enumerated form the borderline between literature and visual arts, the most significant is the union

---

<sup>16</sup> Quoted after: A. Przybyszewska, *To Destroy in order to Build. On New Qualities of Liberature and Hypertext*, in: *Tekst-tura. On New Forms of Literary Text and Text as a Work of Art*, edit. M. Dawidek-Gryglicka, Cracow 2005, p. 47.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. L. Bieszczad, *Art in the Cybernetic Age; between Embellishment of Reality and Ontologisation of Art*, in: *Beauty in the Net. Aesthetics and New Media*, edit. K. Wilkoszewska, Cracow 1999, p. 95.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. W. Kalaga, *op. cit.* p. 19.

of the semiosis of text and the semiosis of material carrier which together enrich the *meaning*. In this context it is little important that in case of many works it is difficult or impossible to find or determine their sense. The most essential is the strategy of double encoding which intensifies the feeling of oddness we encounter when we perceive a hybrid. Just like in the case of the mythological creatures which would dismay people with their heterogeneity and the fact that particular elements are not congruent. The most recent works, for which the matter, physicality, structure and the shape of the work are constitutive features, express the experiences of artists who live in the contemporary world and, due to their unique structure, the recent works make the recipient's perception less automatized, which was once suggested by Russian formalists. They are made in such a way that they attract attention of the recipient *saturated* with the modern world, they intensify the moment of perceiving and experiencing it. They use the right tricks – not only literary – to influence the perception of the world of the readers. The artist who functions in the world, who experiences it, even if through the odd form, he still imitates the reality around them. Hybrids are one of many pieces of evidence that the classical concept of mimesis is in crisis. However, it does not mean that hybrids are not mimetic at all. In a unique way they try to render the specificity of the modern world.

In these works we find that the temporal and causal orders of the presented world are ruined by the introduced simultaneity<sup>19</sup>. We should realize that these works in a way imitate “the multilayered complexity of the simultaneity, hybridity, and the vagueness of the (post)modern reality<sup>20</sup>”. They are structured in such a way that the recipient's every experience is aporetic, as a rule the recipient cannot reach one unambiguous sense, or even a couple of coexisting senses. After analyzing many works, which in that way program the recipient's experience, we can draw a conclusion that these works inform us that what we deal with is aporia and indeterminateness on a higher level, that is on the level of the reality in which it is impossible to grasp the unambiguous sense of a particular phenomenon. Precisely that aporeticity of the real reveals itself through the visual integrated with the word, and that visuality is not able to express the complexity of the world, like the simple words have been describing the various elements of the world in the traditional literature. That speechlessness, contradictory to sense, which literature is struggling with, speaks to the contemporary recipient, sometimes to the rationality of mind, but as often it is an extra-rational experience which, as believed by Russian formalists, intensifies the recipient's perception and makes it less automatized. As a result of experiencing a hybrid work the recipient has got an opportunity to

<sup>19</sup> Cf. W.Kalaga, *Hybrid Text...*, op. cit. p. 103.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid..

reflect on the modern world because these works are not only experiments of the artists who are searching for new means of expression.

The mimesis is designed here to let us experience aporia, lingually-visually-tangibly, as a metaphysical quality present in the word which is surrounding us; to let us experience an inherent impossibility to grasp the unambiguous or ambiguous sense, and to face the fact that these senses are not inherently congruent<sup>21</sup>. Ironically, in the world in which the category of the *truth* has been devalued, the recipient of a hybrid work has got an opportunity to experience deeply the metaphysical truth through literature in which we can find its materiality coming to the fore. If we want to put it in a slightly provocative way, we can say that the today's truth, which will be efficiently deconstructed after using the category of text, can return to us from the materiality or maybe from the textuality and materiality related with each other<sup>22</sup>.

## References

- Aristotle, *Generation of Animals*, Warsaw 1979.
- Aristotle, *Problems*, Warsaw 1980.
- Beech D., *Turning The Whole Thing Aroung: Text Art Today w: Art and Text*, London 2009.
- Bieszczad L., *Art in the Cybernetic Age; between Embellishment of Reality and Ontologisation of Art*, in: *Beauty in the Net. Aesthetics and New Media*, edit. K. Wilkoszewska, Cracow 1999.
- Eichenbaum B., *The Theory of Formal Method*, in: *The Theory of Literary Studies Abroad*.
- Anthology*, edit. S. Skwarczyńska, t. 2: *From the Time of Antipositivist Turn to 1945*, part 3: *From Formalism to Structuralism*, Cracow 1986.
- Fajfer Z., *Liberature*, in: *From Joyce to Liberature*, edit. K. Bazarnik, Cracow 2002.
- Gombrich E., *Art and Illusion. A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation*, translated into Polish by J. Zarański, Warsaw 1981.
- Higgins D. "Intermedia", *Leonardo*, vol. 34, no. 1, 2001
- Hill W., *The Schwitters Legacy: Language And Art In The Early Twentieth Century*, in: *Art and Text*, London 2009.
- Kalaga W., *Hybrid Text. Poliphonies and Aporias of Visual Experience*, in: *Cultural Visualisations of Experience*, edit. W. Boleckiego, A. Dziadka, Warsaw 2010.

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid, s. 104.

<sup>22</sup> P. Rodak, *The Truth in the Personal Journal*, in: *The Truth in Literature*, edit. A. Tyszczyk, J. Borowski, I. Piekarski, Lublin 2009, p. 398.

Pareyson L., *Aesthetics. Theory of Formativity*, translated into Polish by K. Kasia, Cracow 2009.

Przybyszewska A., *To Destroy in order to Build. On New Qualities of Literature and Hypertext*, in: *Tekst-tura. On New Forms of Literary Text and Text as a Work of Art*, edit. M. Dawidek-Gryglicka, Cracow 2005.

Rodak P., *The Truth in the Personal Journal*, in: *The Truth in Literature*, edit. A. Tyszczyk, J. Borowski, I. Piekarski, Lublin 2009.

Rypson P., *Books and Pages. Polish Avant-Garde and Artistic Book in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*, Warsaw 2000.

Sławek T., *The Philosophy of Conjunction and the Poetry of Negativity*, in: *Between Letters. Essays on Concrete Poetry*, Wrocław 1989.

Sławek T., *Concrete and Difference*, in: *Between Letters. Essays on Concrete Poetry*, Wrocław 1989.

#### Streszczenie

### **Wartość poznawcza dzieła hybrydycznego**

W niniejszym artykule koncentruję się na próbie opisu wartości poznawczej dzieł artystycznych, w których nastąpiła integracja znaku werbalnego i wizualnego, co w efekcie zmienia sposób percepcji tego rodzaju dzieł. Język w tego typu dziełach (pozostających na granicy między literaturą a sztukami wizualnymi), a właściwie pismo z jego wizualnymi aspektami stanowi materiał, który służy za fundament procesu formowania dzieła sztuki. U podstaw dzieł hybrydycznych leży heterogeniczność ontologiczna, ponieważ nośnik sensu nie jest w ich przypadku jednorodny. Istotną rolę odgrywa tu materialność dzieła, która również pełni funkcję semantyczną.

#### Abstract

### **Cognitive Value of the Hybrid Work of Art**

I will focus on the attempt to describe cognitive value of the works in which the integration of visual and verbal signs occurred, which in effect changes the perception of such works. Language in this type of works (located on the border between literature and visual arts), and in fact the writing with its visual aspects, is the material that serves as the foundation of the process of forming an artwork. At the core of hybrid works lies the ontological heterogeneity, because the carrier of sense is not homogeneous in their case. An important role is played by the materiality of the work, which also fulfills the semantic role.