

# INTRODUCTION

## INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

This study delineates in clear and unambiguous terms the field within which it operates, that of literary synæsthesia. It was initially conceived as a doctoral thesis in English philology, but personal commitments metamorphosed that project into the present publication. In many ways it represents an updated sequel to Doetsch Kraus' (1992) M. Phil. thesis in Romance philology<sup>1</sup>.

In this research, a comprehensive defence of the defining characteristics of literary synæsthesia is undertaken, and a proposal is made as to how this phenomenon should be analysed, interpreted and classified in order to distinguish it from other figures of speech and phenomena with which it is persistently equated. The aim of this endeavour is best described in the words of Bousoño (1962:87): “Knowing a phenomenon is not simply describing it, it is, above all,

<sup>1</sup> Mentioned, i. a., in the *Actas del XXVI Congreso Internacional de Lingüística y de Filología Románicas*, volume 3, 22 marzo 2013, Valencia [*Proceedings of the 26th International Congress of Romance Linguistics and Philology*, vol. 3, 22Mar2013], as well as, i. a., by Alonso, L.P. (2014), *Avant-garde poetry and the word-image interaction*; Zeuch, Ulrike (2013), *Umkehr der Sinnshierarchie: Herder und die Aufwertung des Tastsinns seit der Frühen Neuzeit*; Marcos, Beatriz (2012), *La comprensión 'sinestésica'*; Pereiro-Otero, J.M. (2008), *La escritura modernista de Valle-Inclán*; Poyates, Fernando (2002), *Nonverbal Communication across Disciplines*; Pereiro-Otero, J.M. (2002), *Los colores del modernismo : "Flor de santidad"*; Weiner, Jack (2001), *El sentido de la vista, del oído y de la intuición*, in *El Poema de mio Cid*; Email from *Academia.edu* (<premium@academia-mail.com > (07Feb2023)): “U. Doetsch Kraus: Congratulations on your 2,860th Mention!”

to interpret it, to explain it.” It is not to clarify the concept of literary synæsthesia, but to make it clear.

If the synæsthetic research of the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s –with a few exceptions– was characterized by a notable lack of in-depth study and analysis and was characterised by vague, imprecise and sometimes very confusing notions of what synæsthesia in general actually involves, it is also true that from the 1990s onwards specific treatises on synæsthesia have proliferated, although there is still no clear agreement on the phenomenon of literary synæsthesia.

The term *synæsthesia* currently raises the vague idea of an expression which involves *the conflation of two or more perceptions derived from different sensory modalities* which, as will be seen in detail, is not enough to determine it. It is therefore common to find cases which are considered synæsthesia or where a sensory amalgamation is assumed, but in which, in fact, there is no synæsthetic incidence at all.

It is common knowledge that synæsthesia has been studied in physiology and psychology. Research in these areas gave rise to the study of literary synæsthesia. However, literary synæsthesia today enjoys less attention than psychological synæsthesia. There is obviously still a great deal which remains to be clarified and it is precisely this need for clarification which has been one of the motivating forces behind this study. The following claim by Cytowic still seems to be very true of current synæsthetic research generally: “Synesthesia seems first to have interested the artist, then the philosopher, then the psychologist, but no one was very successful in making much real sense out of it”<sup>2</sup>.

As seen in §§1.2.2; 1.2.3, however, the phenomenon of synæsthesia was first studied in physiology, then in psychology and finally in literature. The three types of synæsthesia are derived from these areas, namely physiological, psychological and literary synæsthesia. Cytowic is right when claiming “but no one was very successful in making much real sense out of it,” as this failure continues to this day and, thus, clarifying what literary synæsthesia *is* and *is not* has become the main topic of this research. Lynall & Blakemore (2013:859) comment on this lack of clarification: “Synæsthesia eludes not only an agreed explanation but even a clear definition.” Ramachandran & Brang (2013:101) re-

<sup>2</sup> Cytowic, *A Union of the Senses*, p. 128., quoted by Burrows (2012:28). This statement is missing in the 2nd edition of Cytowic (2002).

fer to the reigning confusion about synaesthesia as a neuropsychological or linguistic phenomenon: “The term synaesthesia has been applied liberally throughout the decades, and there is no clear consensus as to where to draw a clear line between the form of synaesthesia which this book is about [neuro-psychological *synaesthesia proper*]<sup>3</sup>, and other similar phenomena and conditions ranging from metaphorical language to vivid drug-induced hallucinations.” It is one of the many tasks of this study to draw a clear line between neuropsychological synaesthesia and literary synaesthesia, as well as between literary synaesthesia and other phenomena. Interestingly, a current online source (cf. fn. II.17) not only clearly refers to the still missing adequate definition of synaesthesia, but also to the inaccurate involvement of various phenomena in order to describe it:

“Difficulties have been recognized in adequately defining synesthesia. Many different phenomena have been included in the term synesthesia (“union of the senses”), and in many cases the terminology seems to be inaccurate.”

There are infinite variations in the evaluation of literary synaesthesia and its association with all possible areas and disciplines is unlimited, but the misleading association with psychology and metaphor is noteworthy. It is a particular task of this work to clearly define literary synaesthesia and to separate it from these phenomena and from what is wrongly called “synaesthetic metaphor.”

All too often reference to literary synaesthesia occurs without an explanatory corpus of examples to support what is claimed, or contains incomplete and erroneous definitions and case studies. Many examples considered synaesthesia quite often go beyond the typological boundaries of the phenomenon and quite a number of them should not be considered synaesthesia.

All this has led to a very varied, increasingly complex and confusing evaluation of literary synaesthesia. Moreover, almost no attention has been paid to how to determine whether the syntagm or expression under analysis is, or is not, a true instance of literary synaesthesia. This has had a pernicious effect on the study, analysis, interpretation and classification of this unique and often quite complex figure of speech.

<sup>3</sup> Here and hereafter, everything which is added in square brackets throughout this study –usually in-between a quoted text– is a personal explanatory comment. The obligatory “ellipsis” brackets [...] are also usually added. The italicized parts for emphasis are usually –if not indicated otherwise– also inserted. This will be operational throughout this research and will not be mentioned any further.

Thus, faced with a possible synæsthesia such as:

“Whilst the babling Ecchoe mocks the hounds, ....

Let us sit downe and marke theyr *yellowing noyse*”

(cf. OED/OED Online, s.v. yellow v.2) (cf. §2.2),

it is not possible to simply exclaim, “Oh, what a nice synæsthesia!” and then, with no further analysis, add it to a corpus of synæsthetic examples along with a definition of synæsthesia which is ultimately not literary at all. Any such example as this requires a very careful diachronic and synchronic, semantic, lexical-pragmatic parsing of the sensory terms involved.

The difficulty with taking a *single* expression involving a possible cross-sensory<sup>4</sup> intersection as a sufficient condition for a true literary synæsthesia becomes more than obvious when analysing and interpreting expressions such as Mallarmé’s *blue angelus* (cf. §1.1.5), Jack London’s *White Silence* (cf. §1.7), the expression *scream of wood* (cf. §1.5.8), Hughes’ *perfume-footed music* of a grasshopper (cf. §3.2(31)), his *glare cry* of a cock pheasant (cf. §3.2(18)) or a syntagm such as *sweet hold* (cf. §2.5(23)).

In the final analysis, it is only the application of a rigorous lexical-pragmatic analysis which determines whether or not a given expression is an instance of true literary synæsthesia. Therefore, before undertaking a detailed analysis of specific cases of synæsthesia and other non-cross-sensory associations found in Hughes’ poetry, a thoroughly revised and updated theory will demonstrate that literary synæsthesia is both semantic and perceptual in nature and that its particular characteristics are determined in these areas. This may be a controversial claim, but it is fully discussed and defended throughout this research.

The choice of the title, “In Defence of Literary Synæsthesia,” is derived from A. G. Engström’s *In Defense of Synæsthesia in Literature* (1946), since it contains and highlights everything which is being pursued in this research, in particular the fact that, as stated in Doetsch Kraus (1992:29-75), literary synæsthesia encompasses two distinctly different categories, namely *genuine* and *poetic* synæsthesia, the first of which seems to be the great unknown to this day.

<sup>4</sup> The terms “cross-modal” or “cross-sensory” are used arbitrarily in both psychological and literary research on synæsthesia to describe a process of intersensory amalgamation. In this study, “cross-sensory” is preferred. *Cross-sensory association* here refers to the two types of literary synæsthesia and to physiological synæsthesia and *non-cross-sensory association* to the two types of pseudo-synæsthetic metaphor, and abstract and physical associations.

The alchemical symbol for amalgamation on the cover of the book graphically symbolizes the innermost essence, the indispensable requirement for any synæsthesia, literary or not, namely the synæsthetic amalgamation of two or more heterogeneous sensory terms. Without it, there is no synæsthesia, regardless of its ætiology.

Literary synæsthesia and pseudosynæsthetic metaphor still seem to be *terra incognita*, not least because there is no clear dividing line between the two phenomena, but also because there are a multitude of supposed synæsthetic associations in relevant literary works, which are referred to as synæsthesia, but are in fact pseudosynæsthetic metaphors, that is, non-synæsthesias. This has led to great confusion –and continues to do so. Hence, very often this defence of literary synæsthesia will involve defending it from widespread misunderstanding and misinterpretation. Consequently, the present research is exactly what it purports to be, a defence of the figure of speech known as literary synæsthesia and the complete elimination of its comparison with metaphor, neuropsychological *synæsthesia proper* and, in particular, its confusion with the misnamed “synæsthetic metaphor,” pseudosynæsthetic metaphor and abstract association. The extent of this confusion will be copiously illustrated but, in this way, the true nature of this controversial figure of speech is gradually discovered and uncovered and, in the process, it will be shown how to distinguish it from non-synæsthesia.

In order to support the theory and typology of the seven categories of cross-sensory and non-cross-sensory associations presented in this research with a sample corpus and to familiarize the reader/analyst with a special category, corresponding sample corpora are appended at the end of each category presented, together with a résumé of Hughes’ cases of that category which are analysed in Chapter III. A cursory glance at these sample corpora and the cases gathered in Appendix 1 is enough to discover the differences among these categories.

## MOTIVATIONS AND GOALS

“If one considers that synesthesis research has been around for 200 years one might reasonably conclude that we have not come far. However, if one considers that most of our knowledge of synesthesia has been accumulated within only

the last 15 years then the picture becomes much healthier” (Ward 2013:1035). However, from today’s perspective, literary synæsthesia has definitely not come very far, which has prompted the following motivations and goals for this research:

1. Present-day synæsthetic research is still characterized by a number of unresolved issues and requires a clear, precise and complete re-examination of its inherent mechanism and the way in which it should be conceptualised. In pursuit of this re-examination, Nikolić & Jürgens (2012:1) –from a neuropsychological point of view– pose a highly interesting issue: “One of the main problems in understanding synæsthesia is determining whether it is a sensory or a semantic phenomenon.” This research shows that literary synæsthesia should be regarded as a semantic *and* perceptual phenomenon. The intermingling of both phenomena not only turns literary synæsthesia into a rather complex and independent figure of speech, but also foreshadows many of the major misunderstandings and misinterpretations which continue to this day.
2. To this day, there is no clear definition of what a literary synæsthesia is, and above all, there are no precise indications on how to address an accurate analysis and classification of this rhetorical figure of speech.
3. Despite the extensive literature on the subject, the interpretation and classification of literary synæsthesia is often incorrect and confusing. Any attempt to fill this void must of necessity involve a thorough semantic, lexical-pragmatic and category-specific analysis of the expression under examination. Only such an analysis will be able to distinguish between synæsthetic or non-synæsthetic associations.
4. There is –at present– no systematic study of synæsthesia in the poetry of Ted Hughes. Given the frequency and the aesthetic, semantic and syntagmatic impact of the use of this figure of speech in Hughes’ poetry, the study of these cases with their particular ways of presenting reality, requires an analysis of this poet’s sometimes very outstanding use of this rhetorical device.

In parallel with the motivations just described, the following goals are pursued:

1. To update the theory of literary synæsthesia presented in Doetsch Kraus 1992 with a view to revising possible inaccuracies in the current

- literature on literary synæsthesia and also to introduce new perspectives which will point a way forward to prevent the reigning confusion.
2. To draw attention to the fact that the literary synæsthesia presented here includes not one but two categories, called here *genuine* and *poetic* synæsthesias, which are completely different from each other (cf. Appendix 3).
  3. The concept of literary synæsthesia is not properly understood to this day. A *sine qua non* prerequisite for the correct analysis, interpretation and cataloguing of literary synæsthesia is seen in outlining the defining characteristics of this phenomenon and in the inclusion of semantic and lexical-pragmatic dimensions in its evaluation. Such an analysis is essential if a decision is to be made regarding the exact nature of any cross-sensory or non-cross-sensory association under analysis.
  4. To provide appropriate and comprehensive case-based categories, their examples and definitions for a more detailed analysis of literary synæsthesia and other non-sensory associations, which is still lacking in reference books.
  5. To clearly differentiate literary synæsthesia from non-synæsthesia, i.e., non-cross-sensory associations such as pseudosynæsthetic metaphor, abstract association, physical association and especially from metaphor, neuropsychological *synæsthesia proper* and so-called “synæsthetic metaphor.”
  6. To call attention to the frequent presence of literary synæsthesia and other non-cross-sensory associations in the poetry of Ted Hughes.

This research addresses those interested in this field, but is particularly aimed at academics who specialize in literary synæsthetic research. Its objective is to clearly describe still missing facts and data on literary synæsthesia and other non-cross-sensory associations. It should be understood as a call to all those involved in its research to avoid yet further confusion and misinterpretation in the analysis and classification of this complex figure of speech.

In the majority of the literature available on literary synæsthesia, it is not only the lack of a solid and clearly defined theoretical basis for the analysis and interpretation of this figure of speech, but the pervasive lack of criteria as to what exactly constitutes literary synæsthesia. For this reason, this research focuses on all those phenomena which directly affect the mode of formation and



inner mechanism of literary synæsthesia and so form part of what ultimately determines what constitutes this figure of speech. It goes without saying that I alone am responsible for the views expressed here.

Finally, it should be noted that a certain number of recurring, category-defining examples of synæsthesia and other non-cross-sensory associations will emerge as *Leitmotif* examples throughout the text in the hope of facilitating a better understanding of the ongoing discussion.

#### GUIDELINES DERIVING FROM THIS RESEARCH

This research provides guidelines which involve a possible paradigm shift in the recognition, conceptualisation, treatment and classification of literary synæsthesia, allowing the synæsthetic character (or not) of any cross-sensory or non-cross-sensory syntagm to be determined according to one or other of the seven synæsthetic or non-synæsthetic categories defined in this research. It is emphasized that it is not enough to apply a given definition of synæsthesia to an expression which *prima facie* is deemed to be synæsthesia. Neither is it enough to remain at a purely denotative level, but it is essential to apply a semantic and lexical-pragmatic accommodation process to each syntagm, without underestimating any contextual or even extra-contextual and synchronic data. This claim will become particularly evident in the analyses of Mallarmé's *blue angelus* and Jack London's *White Silence*, as well as in other analyses presented as examples of in-depth analysis in the course of this study. The basic approach of the present research then is to highlight two aspects of the phenomenon of literary synæsthesia which have not yet been rigorously addressed, namely its dual manifestation and the analysis of each supposed synæsthetic syntagm in terms of semantics, lexical pragmatics and perception. The main focus of the latter is on each encoded word meaning underlying this unique figure of speech. This process will show that literary synæsthesia is a clearly defined and fully analysable, autonomous and independent double figure of speech.

This research shows that there is a clear-cut distinction between what is and what is not a literary synæsthesia. In other words, when subjected to rigorous analysis, the distinction between literary synæsthesia and principally pseudosynæsthetic metaphor becomes quite obvious and significant.



## THE STRUCTURE OF THIS RESEARCH

This study is structured as follows: Chapter I deals with literary synaesthesia and, together with Chapter II on non-synaesthesia, constitutes the main theoretical basis of the whole research and establishes an updated version of part of the previous theory of Doetsch Kraus 1992 on literary synaesthesia. Chapter I is divided into nine sections: Section (1.1) deals with the semantic-pragmatic dimension in literary synaesthesia and with a brief and cursory cataloguing of literary synaesthesia and non-synaesthesia. It also deals with the uniqueness of the concept of literary synaesthesia and with the way it should be analysed, which is shown in the analysis of Mallarmé's *blue angelus*. Section (1.2) deals with the confusion which exists regarding the relationship between literary synaesthesia, metaphor, so-called "synaesthetic metaphor" and psychology and, for purposes of clarification, it presents the category of the oldest of all synaesthetics, known as *physiological synaesthesia*. Section (1.3) views literary synaesthesia in the light of perception in relation to Dante's *subject-object* dualism in outer-world perception (modes of perception) and involving either *bottom-up* or *top-down* stimulus processing (perception processing). Section (1.4) presents and analyses the first category of literary synaesthesia presented in this study, namely *genuine synaesthesia*, the inherent mechanism of which has not yet been fully discovered and addressed. This will be followed in (§1.5) by the second category of literary synaesthesia, *poetic synaesthesia*. Section (1.6) presents and analyses three further categories of genuine and poetic synaesthesia in which either a coinciding conceptual blending, hypallage or enallage leads to a synaesthetic merging process. Section (1.7) encompasses the previously established guidelines for a correct analysis and interpretation of synaesthetic syntagmata and establishes an indispensable prerequisite for a reliable analysis based on the analysis of Jack London's *White Silence*. These guidelines for a correct analysis of literary synaesthesia eventually culminate with the presentation of an omnivalent definition of literary synaesthesia. Section (1.8) focuses on Ullmann's *panchronistic tendencies* in literary synaesthesia, discussing the extent to which they should still be upheld. The adequacy of Ullmann's three tendencies is usually confirmed by the vast majority of researchers studying synaesthesia. However, they have recently been criticized and also subjected to new hypotheses. Ullmann's postulates are analysed and discussed on the basis of their interpretation in the works of two authors. Section (1.9) presents Hughes' use

of synæsthesia and non-synæsthesia, their principal syntagmatic moulds, their settings and natural surroundings and eventually analyses whether the synæsthesias found in Hughes' poetry give evidence of Ullmann's proclivities.

Chapter II is dedicated to non-synæsthesia or "false synæsthesia." It is vital and complementary to the theory of literary synæsthesia presented in Chapter I and consists of five sections which present two types of *pseudosynæsthetic metaphors*, namely *analogy* (§2.1) and *value-based* (§2.2) *pseudosynæsthetic metaphor*. Section (2.3) deals with *abstract association* and compares it with ideasthesia. Section (2.4) deals with the last non-synæsthesia to be discussed here, with *physical association*. Section (2.5) is a compulsory complement to Chapters I and II, namely 103 cases considered to be synæsthesia with no synæsthetic incidence, which more than corroborate the prevailing confusion on the topic mentioned throughout this research.

Chapter III is the *Experimental Section* of this research and contains the complete lexical-pragmatic analyses of synæsthesia and non-synæsthesia found in Ted Hughes' poetry.

There are eight *Appendices* for quick reference-checks and consultation which gather the most important aspects of this intricate figure of speech called *literary synæsthesia*. They are meant to show the complexity of its inner mechanism more or less at a glance. Appendix 1 is a *Résumé of all cross-sensory and non-cross-sensory associations in Ted Hughes' poetry*; Appendix 2 establishes the *Difference between literary synæsthesia and non-synæsthesia*, i.e. pseudosynæsthetic metaphor; Appendix 3 shows the *Difference between genuine and poetic synæsthesia*; Appendix 4 presents a *Summary of genuine and poetic synæsthesia in the light of Dante's subject-object dualism and bottom-up and top-down perception processing*; Appendix 5 illustrates the *Difference between analogy and value-based pseudosynæsthetic metaphor*; Appendix 6 presents a *Summary of the semantic-pragmatic difference between literary synæsthesia and pseudosynæsthetic metaphor*; Appendix 7 compares *three five-step interpretative processes in the uncovering of literary synæsthesia and pseudosynæsthetic metaphor* and Appendix 8 gathers the *Classification of cases considered synæsthesia according to their corresponding categories*.

Finally, the work ends with a series of general *Conclusions* and suggestions for possible working hypotheses. The *Bibliography* covers works cited and consulted on synæsthesia and related topics as well as references to consulted dictionaries and other lexicographic sources.

This research will often rely on the ideas and analyses which were first set out in Doetsch Kraus' Master's thesis in Romance Philology (1992), especially when dealing with the question of the classification of literary synæsthesia, pseudosynæsthetic metaphor and abstract association and with the ways in which they can be recognized and analysed. The category of physical association was discovered in Hughes' poetry. However, this theory, which was published in 1992, has been substantially updated, re-elaborated and expanded, in particular taking into account aspects which will highlight the important role of pragmatics and RT<sup>5</sup> principles in the formation of literary synæsthesia.

## METHOD

If the method followed in Doetsch Kraus (1992) was completely inductive, i.e., rigorously sequenced, gradually evolving in a progressive development of various steps and eventually leading to a fully developed theory of literary synæsthesia, the method followed here is entirely deductive. It is based on the theory worked out in the abovementioned work, but the data coverage has been further elaborated and developed and significantly amplified on the basis of semantic-pragmatic principles, which turned into a number of different working hypotheses, all of which eventually culminated in an updated version of the theory itself. This development is reflected in the order in which the different chapters and sections are presented.

<sup>5</sup> The acronym RT is used throughout when referring to *Relevance Theory* or *relevance theoretical* principles.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

The bibliography covers:

1. *Works cited and consulted on synæsthesia and related topics.*

Dictionaries<sup>6</sup> and Handbooks, i.e., lexicographic sources used for the semantic and lexical-pragmatic analysis of possible cases of synæsthesia. In the analysis of possible instances of synæsthesia the OED<sup>7</sup> was primarily consulted, and for more detailed accuracy, the ODEE, *Etymology online*, as well as the OALD, SOED, LDCE or the OD & T. In cases of further doubt, more extensive research was carried out in online lexicographic sources. Online access to the *OED online* was released in mid-February 2020 after the update of the 2009 version of the OED CD-ROM was interrupted.

2. *References to dictionaries, handbooks, consulted online dictionaries, books and articles.*

The presentation of Hughes' works and the cross-sensory and non-cross-sensory associations are indicated as follows:

1. *The provenance of Hughes' analysed cases is indicated as follows:*

e.g., *Puma*, in *The Iron Wolf*, 1995:68 (1-12):

<i>Title of poem</i>	<i>Title of book</i>	<i>year</i>	<i>page</i>	<i>page number</i>	<i>line(s)</i>
<i>Puma</i> ,	in <i>The Iron Wolf</i> ,	1995	:	68	(1-12)

<sup>6</sup> The acronyms of which are listed before the *Bibliography*. Footnotes are indicated according to the chapter in which they appear.

<sup>7</sup> The 2nd edition of *The Oxford English Dictionary* 2009 CD ROM (Version 4.0). Any reference to the OED in this research refers to this 2009 edition. The 2009 OED CD ROM Dictionary and the current OED Online Dictionary are treated here as one and the same entity (OED/OED Online) when their references are the same and otherwise noted in the opposite case.

2. *The numerical reference or section in which a particular case is presented or analysed is, i.a., outlined as follows:*

<i>Reference</i>	<i>Section</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Case number</i>
§3.2 (53)	3.2		(53)
§3.3 (18)	3.3		(18)
§3.5(13)	3.5		(10)
§3.7.1 (I)(27)	3.7.1	(I)	(27)
§3.7.2 (V)(2)	3.7.2	(V)	(2)

3. *Presentation of Hughes' works and cross-sensory and non-cross-sensory associations*

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In addition to the people to whom this research is dedicated, I would like to take this opportunity to especially thank Prof. Prof. Dr. Fernando González Ollé of the University of Navarra (Professor of The History of the Spanish Language and Professor of General Linguistics and Literary Criticism), linguist and member of the *Real Academia Española*, for his invaluable help and guidance in the previous research on literary synæsthesia (Doetsch Kraus 1992) in terms of constant contribution of data, comments and research indications; for his guidelines towards a rigorous investigation and for his great interest in the present research, which, however, is only now coming to light for personal reasons. I am particularly indebted to him for forwarding the manuscript of the present work to the Director of *Anejos de Rilce* (cf. *infra*).

I would especially like to thank the late Dr. class. phil. Gloria Toranzo from the University of Navarra, who in 1973 entrusted me with the task of researching synæsthesia and to whom I am deeply grateful for her invaluable help in all areas and for monitoring my B. Rom. Phil. thesis (1974 unpublished) on *Synæsthesia in the poetic language of Federico García Lorca*.

I am especially grateful to Prof. Dr. class. phil. Carmen Castillo of the University of Navarra (Professor of Classical Philology and the second woman to obtain a Latin Philology Chair in Spain) for supervising my M. Phil. thesis (1983) on *Synæsthesia in Spanish poetry from the Middle Ages to the mid-nineteenth century: A semantic approach*, which was published in 1992.

Special thanks are due to the late Prof. Dr. Jesús Cañedo, Professor of the History of Spanish Literature (Golden Age) and director of the Department of Literature at the University of Navarra, who arranged for the publication of Doetsch Kraus 1992.

I am particularly grateful to Prof. Dr. Luis Galván, Professor of Theory of Literature at the Universidad de Navarra and Director of *Anejos de Rilce* of the publishing house EUNSA (*Ediciones Universidad de Navarra S.A.*) for accepting and publishing this book.

I would like to express my special appreciation and deep gratitude to the editors and layouters of *Anejos de Rilce* for their support and help, their full dedication in editing this book, their careful and meticulous presentation of the text and, above all, for their admirable patience, tolerance and painstaking toil with regard to the successive galley proofs.

A huge amount of gratitude goes to the authors of the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED/OED Online). The results and conclusions in the analysis and interpretation of literary synæsthesia and non-synæsthesia would not have been possible without the constant recourse to this invaluable source; the whole analytical and *Experimental Section* of this research is based on this enormous and unique lexicographic treasure trove. Without the OED, it would not have been possible to defend literary synæsthesia.

Many thanks to *Oxford University Press* Customer Service Executive, Ms. Jane Gardner, for several online consultations referring to the 2009 CD-ROM version of the OED and also to Ms. Ursula Roberts (OED Technician) and Ms. Rachel Rains (OED CD-ROM customer support) for their technical support. My special thanks to Ms. Rachel Rains, currently (2020) a member of the OED Online Sales Processing Team and formerly involved in customer support for the OED CD-ROMs for twenty years, in particular for facilitating free access to the *OED Online Dictionary* for one year (February 17<sup>th</sup> 2020) as compensation for the interruption of the update of the 2009 OED CD ROM version.

My sincere thanks to Frau Heidrun Beckers, *Universitäts- und Stadtbibliothek Köln* (eBook Department) for her help *in situ* and for emailing electronic books and documents.

Many thanks to my twin, Ingeborg Eugenia Doetsch, for localizing, digitizing, emailing and photocopying some of the works consulted at the *Universitäts- und Stadtbibliothek Köln*.

A very special and personal thanks to Frau Irene Strobl<sup>8</sup>, who, while a student of Romance Philology, copied the myriad cases of possible synæsthesias found in Presymbolist Spanish literature (approximately 5000 cases) onto index cards during one of her summer breaks and in between two following semesters.

A very personal thank you to Ursula Dedek (Sherborne International School, Sherborne, UK) for sending newspaper articles and epilogues about Ted Hughes after his demise.

There are many considerable intellectual debts towards those authors who with their works and commentaries on synæsthesia or related matters have – some of them quite significantly – confirmed, corroborated, inspired, completed and consolidated the theory, working hypotheses and findings presented in this research. Citing them directly is a way of acknowledging their work and giving them the opportunity to contribute to this research, while at the same time thanking them sincerely. To all of them, whether I agreed or disagreed, whether I applauded or criticised, I owe a debt of gratitude.

Many thanks go to *Research Gate*, *JSTOR*, *Dialnet*, *Scribd*, <https://books.google.com/co.uk>, *Kindle* and *Academia.edu* for the fact that a considerable part of the material consulted for this research has been available thanks to their electronic text corpora.

Finally, this research is dedicated to the recognition of the outstanding contributions to the study of literary synæsthesia –so difficult to grasp, analyse, interpret and classify– by the four great pioneers of a rigorous study of this figure of speech:

<sup>8</sup> Founder and director of *Centro Linden*, Language School, Pamplona, the official examination site for the *Goethe Institute* exams in northern Spain.





Bernhard Engelen<sup>9</sup>  
(cf.§1.4.2)



Erika von Siebold<sup>10</sup>  
(cf.§1.4.2.2)



Albert Wellek<sup>11</sup>



Ludwig Schrader<sup>12</sup>

Given their extraordinary contributions to literary synæsthetic research in general (Engelen and von Siebold) and to its history and evolution (Wellek and Schrader), their extensive works form the basis for all synæsthetic research. Ward (2013:1023) makes a relevant observation regarding the so often evident oblivion of antecedent phenomena: “As such, the modern rediscovery of synæsthesia has proceeded almost entirely without an awareness of historical precedents,” which is the case with these four researchers of literary synæsthesia who should by no means be buried in oblivion.

The ideas and contributions of Engelen and von Siebold have supported, underpinned and consolidated the present theory. Bernhard Engelen should be regarded as the “Father of literary synæsthesia and non-synæsthesia.” His monumental and outstanding contribution<sup>13</sup> to all literary synæsthetic research so far has been a real revelation, not only because of his ground-breaking comments on perception, but above all because his literary synæsthetic theory wholly encompasses what literary synæsthesia is and is not. Engelen, without actually classifying the two categories of literary synæsthesia and pseudosyn-

<sup>9</sup> (1937-2016) Professor of German Language, Language Didactics and Literary Studies (University of Dortmund). My gratitude to Mrs. Hildegard Engelen (1944-2017) for this photograph from 1967.

<sup>10</sup> Prof. Jkvr. Dr. Erika Helene Henriette Wanda (Freiin) von Siebold (1890-1964), Professor of English language and literature. Cf. <[http://www.gf.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Erika-von-Erhardt-Siebold-Medieval-Literature-1931\\_250x250.jpg](http://www.gf.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Erika-von-Erhardt-Siebold-Medieval-Literature-1931_250x250.jpg)>.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. <<http://gutenberg-biographics.ub.uni-mainz.de/personen/register/eintrag/albert-wellek.html>>.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. <<https://www.romanistik.hhu.de/personal/emeriti/nachruf-schrader.html>>.

<sup>13</sup> PhD thesis (1966, University of Cologne), of which I received a digitized version in September 2017.

æsthetic metaphor discussed here and in Doetsch Kraus 1992, came to intuit them clearly. Without going into precise descriptions, he clearly differentiates between *genuine* and *poetic* synæsthesia and -fleetingly and without explicitly distinguishing them, either— hints at what is presented here as *analogy* and *value-based pseudosynæsthetic metaphors*, interestingly linking them—as von Siebold—to “some kind of *tertium comparationis*.” And again, without explicitly referring to them, he clearly intuits and relates *bottom-up* and *top-down* processing of perception and Dante’s *subject-object* dualism to literary synæsthesia, elaborating both phenomena to perfection. Engelen establishes the very first linguistically rigorous theory of literary synæsthesia.

Erika von Siebold not only provides the most extensive sample corpus ever presented in literary criticism of examples of neuropsychological synæsthesia, genuine synæsthesia, a myriad of poetic synæsthesias, countless physical associations, analogy-based and also some value-based pseudosynæsthetic metaphors from English, French and German 19<sup>th</sup> century poets—a real treasure trove—but she also—already in 1919—with no more than a simple reference, a simple stroke of pen and without further commentary, intersperses throughout her work some of the most salient and immovable characteristics of cross-sensory and non-cross-sensory associations—where and whenever pertinent—namely the absence of a *tertium comparationis* in a literary synæsthesia, the amalgamation process of source>TARGET in a literary synæsthesia, the predominance of the oldest synæsthetic amalgamation of sight>SOUND in a literary synæsthesia, the conflation of two (or more) heterogeneous perceptual experiences in a literary synæsthetic syntagm, the non-imaginative creation of a genuine synæsthesia, a real double perception in a what is here considered *genuine synæsthesia*, the “indiscriminate use” of non-sensory cliché adjectivation in what is here called *analogy-based pseudosynæsthetic metaphor*, a reference to abstract association, the arbitrary hierarchy of PRIMARY and secondary sensory perception in a genuine synæsthesia, the usually bipartite nature of synæsthetic syntagmata, the predominant function of the modifying, attributive source-domain term (secondary stimulus) to trigger a synæsthetic conflation and, without directly referring to so-called “synæsthetic metaphor,” she adds examples of this category and refers to the cross-cultural character of such expressions, and finally, to the most important aspect of literary synæsthesia, namely “the juxtaposition of several sensory impressions,” of “setting two senses in parallel” and to “a true through-lived [perceptual] experience” of genuine synæsthe-

sia. Moreover, von Siebold provides –albeit fragmentarily– a more than precise definition of what is presented here as genuine synæsthesia (cf. §1.4.2.2). With her unparalleled work, von Siebold laid the foundation for a conscious study of literary synæsthesia.

The frequent references to Engelen and von Siebold are intended to support the theory presented in this research and to rekindle these investigators' contributions to the recognition and analysis of literary synæsthesia and its distinction from non-synæsthesia, and to place both authors and their works where they still deserve to be today. This also applies to Wellek and Schrader.

The aim of this research is to present and defend a new and fully elaborated theory of literary synæsthesia. An important part of this work consists of a critical analysis of numerous prevailing misinterpretations of this phenomenon, an analysis which inevitably involves countless citations of misidentified synæsthesia or related phenomena. The object of this analysis is not so much to expose false arguments which abound in the literature as to define once and for all the nature and underlying mechanisms of literary synæsthesia and, thus, protect it from further misinterpretation.

This updated theory of literary synæsthesia is shared with academics researching literary synæsthesia in the hope and belief that it will contribute to the eventual eradication of possible future misinterpretations of literary synæsthesia, and this, regardless of the categorization of literary synæsthesia as presented in this research, which will most likely result in a new evaluation and conceptualization of literary synæsthesia and non– synæsthesia. Future exchange of ideas, new clarifications and valuable criticism will always be regarded as a fruitful benefit and collaboration.

Literary synæsthesia has struggled for recognition in vain in recent decades; it is time to fully acknowledge it for what it is. Erika von Siebold (1919:304) wanted to “fully study the nature of synæsthesia;” this research has attempted to adhere precisely to this goal and hopes, *Deo volente*, to have clearly and convincingly expressed theories and conclusions which should spark the discovery and eventual recognition of this complex figure of speech.