

A hermeneutical Ontology and its Circle according to “Gadamer”

Khaled Ahmed Sebaie

Faculty of Arts, University Misurata, Libya

k.sebaie@art.misuratau.edu.ly

Received: 02.01.2022

Published: 28.03.2022

Abstract:

This research paper aims to study the hermeneutical view of the German philosopher “Gadamer”, and it seeks to reveal the development that occurred in the hermeneutical method after it was attached to an ontological understanding, then, clarifying the role one plays in the hermeneutical process, and the effect of the subjective aspects in the interpretative procedure, in addition to explain the extent to which this effect stands, as well as the effect of this on the interpretation process, and what are the foundations from which “Gadamer” derived this vision, hence, whether “Gadamer” intended to present a general theory of interpretation, based on an ontology of understanding, thus, he gives a meaning that has a special dimension of ontology, which is of a special nature, will he succeed in that, and did he have to say that the ontology of understanding is that there is another ontology on playing, this is in accordance with the importance that “Gadamer” attached to playing and the role of playing in the interpretative process, as well as examining the role of self-awareness and one’s personal experience in creating interpretative understanding, hence, all of this affected his treatment of a text when he played the role of interpreter, and how the element of phenomenology found it’s way in that, including self-dynamic and It’s guarantee in carrying out this role, likewise, the role played by the intellectual tributaries owned by the interpreter in terms of language, history, culture and liberation from any authority in carrying out the interpretative procedure, and what is the element that if it was adhered to, then our judgment on the interpretative procedure will be successful.

Keywords: Hermeneutical, Interpreter, Ontology, Phenomenology, Understanding.

أنطولوجيا الهرمنيوطيقا والدائرة التأويلية عند "غادامير"

د. خالد أحمد السباعي

كلية الآداب - جامعة مصراتة

الملخص:

تهدف هذه الورقة البحثية إلى دراسة وجهة نظر الفيلسوف الألماني "غادامير" التأويلية، وتتوخى الكشف عن التطور الذي جرى في المنهج التأويلي بعد أن ارتبط بالفهم الأنطولوجي "الوجودي"، ومن ثم، توضيح الدور الذي يلعبه المرء في العملية التأويلية وتأثير الجوانب الذاتية في الإجراء التأويلي، بالإضافة إلى توضيح المدى الذي يقف عنده هذا التأثير وكذلك تأثير ذلك على عملية التأويل، وما هي الأسس التي استمد منها "غادامير" هذه النظرة، ثم بحث ما إذا كان "غادامير" ينوي تقديم نظرية عامة للتأويل قائمة على أنطولوجيا الفهم، وبالتالي، فإنه يقدم معنى له بُعدًا خاصًا من الأنطولوجيا له طبيعته الخاصة، فهل سينجح في ذلك؟ وهل كان عليه أن يقول بأن من أنطولوجيا الفهم أن هناك أنطولوجيا أخرى في اللعب، فهذا حقيقة يتماشى مع الأهمية التي يعلقها "غادامير" على اللعب ودوره في العملية التأويلية، فضلاً عن دراسة دور الوعي الذاتي والخبرة الشخصية للفرد في خلق الفهم التأويلي، ومن ثم، أثره في معالجته للنص عندما يقوم بدور المؤول وكيف أن عنصر الظاهراتية "الفيينومينولوجيا" طريقه في ذلك، بما في ذلك الحركية الذاتية وكيفية ضمانها للقيام بهذا الدور، وكذلك الدور الذي تلعبه الروافد الفكرية التي يمتلكها المؤول من حيث اللغة والتاريخ والثقافة والتحرر من أي سلطة في تنفيذ الإجراء التأويلي، وما هو العنصر الذي إذا التزمنا به يمكننا من بعده احراز الإجراء التأويلي الناجح.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الهرمنيوطيقا، المؤول، الوجود، الظواهرية، الفهم.

Introduction:

Every understanding related to the subject matter of a science has a special methodology that is followed until it is properly understood, So does this apply to the idea of the hermeneutic understanding that "Gadamer" aims to, so that it becomes subject to a method such as that of applied sciences, for example. Therefore, was "Gadamer's" intention to achieve an interpretative philosophy?

If the issue is like this, then on what basis does he evaluate it from the point of view of human understanding, is it as a part or all that does not accept separation, And if it is "all" that does not accept separation, what are it's

components? Is it related to time? What about one's own self does it have a role, especially that we find "Gadamer" often distinguish between playing and manipulating and the real role one has to play, that role which requires him to stay away from manipulation and traditional systematic domination, Thus, if a person plays the role of interpreter, what is the procedure that he must follow until he reaches the interpretation for which a judgment is being issued describing him as creative? Often one's experiences, and intellectual and historical tributaries are factors that stimulate and strengthen his creative activity in any field he engages in. Are these all the things that the interpreter needs in order to judge his interpretative activity with success? When can we judge the interpreter with success, does subjectivity or objectivity play a role in that? Every text requires us to consider it as having implications and should be interrogated, Then the effect of the interpreter is highlighted as the author's influence has emerged in the text, so what is the condition of understanding imposed on the interpreter? And it happened a lot that we heard the language game, what is it? What is the right that is granted to the interpreter so that it becomes his right to add a new meaning to the text, does this mean that the text opens new horizons after subjecting it to an interpretative procedure? If so, does the intention of the original author remain evidence of this text?.

Research Problem:

The problem examined in this research is to what extent can hermeneutics be considered as a project to implement the rules of existence theory for Gadamer? What is the role that Gadamer assigns to the self in the hermeneutic process, and what is involved in that subject from the components that enter into it's composition, with it's temporal and special dimensions?. Did he succeed in clarifying what he planned and saying the necessity to adhere to the ontology of understanding?.

Importance of the research:

The research seeks to clarify the most prominent role that Gadamer was able to present in developing the hermeneutical process through his trilogy represented in the ontological view of understanding, the recipient (the interpreter), and the text, and how he was able to push the hermeneutics forward until it became a broad field mainly concerned with methods of interpretation. Gadamer was also able to make it an independent vision of the universe, man and heritage, that would enable the reader to possess the techniques of the text as a historical existence, and it reflects a special philosophy in looking at the self on the one hand and the entities on the other, so that the research is thus another attempt that contributes to clarifying the hermeneutical structure.

Purpose:

There is an interpretive formulation that preceded Gadamer, but was it truly fulfilling the requirements of the interpretive process, or was it sufficient only to meet the necessities of the time stage in which it crystallized, or did Gadamer have another more creative vision that added what we can say is new to the point that the interpretive process has become full-fledged through his introduction, if this is the case, then it is necessary to stand on clarifying those pillars and knowing the elements of creativity that they included, and whether Gadamer succeeded in finding a common denominator between all forms of understanding.

Method:

The research is presented according to the descriptive method due to defining the dimensions and the trends of the problem and trying to find an accurate description of it. In some cases, the historical method was followed with the requirements of the presentation to clarify the dimensions of the problem, as well as the comparative method when necessary.

Gadamer: Life and Thought:

Many European philosophical critics argue that the German philosopher “Hans George Gadamer”, who is best known for his famous book “Wahrheit und Method” as well as his pursuit of a renewed theory of Hermeneutics, is that he is at level no less than his teacher “Martin Heidegger” to the point that they associate his name with him on many occasions. “Gadamer’s” overarching philosophy mainly focuses on the “hermeneutic” in general, It requires shifting attention to the ontology of understanding rather than being preoccupied with methodology, this is because the possibility of achieving purely objective understanding in the process of understanding, is a process that is not easy to be sustained over the long run, but an extremely complicated task. The hermeneutic of “Gadamer” is based on the premise that we can not be in harmony with our phenomena, starting from a purely interpretative, sophisticated view. This happens because we belong to our self, having it’s own singularities, in addition to prejudices, therefore this would cause us to ensnaring in a conflict with it, and there is no doubt that our own self has it’s role in our treatment and dealing with all the surrounding phenomena. Hence, “Gadamer” points out accordingly that there is a divine nature that characterizes the interpretative moment in terms of understanding and interpretation.

Unlike other traditional interpreters, “Gadamer” believes that human understanding is based on a historical, linguistic, and dialectical nature, and that understanding has vital keys based on, which are “manipulation”, “authority”, “knowledge” and “methodology”, all of which are considered to be of the

nature and spirit of participation premised on “openness”, “harmony” and interconnectedness, thus, in the contention of “Gadamer”, the truth does not come from the methodology at all, but understanding the truth of an event is entirely possible at the core of the interlocutions.

This paper reviews “Gadamer’s” interpretative theory by looking at the ontology and understanding, it’s implications and related matters, in an attempt to find out the philosophical convictions of “Gadamer’s” vision, in the light of criticisms leveled against it.

“Hans George Gadamer” was born in 1900 AD in “Marburg”, Germany, His mother died when he was four, His father was a professor of pharmaceutical chemistry, who later became dean of the University of “Marburg”, and with what appeared to be a brilliant early brainchild, he successfully started his studies, where he was awarded a doctorate at the age of twenty-two years, from the university of “Marburg”, under the supervision of the philosopher “Paul Natorp” and “Nicolai Hartmann”, for his thesis titled “Das Wesen der Lust nach den Platonischen Dialogen” or “The Essence of Pleasure in Plato’s Dialogues” in 1922 AD. In order to increase philosophical educational attainment, “Gadamer” then moved to the University of “Freiburg” in a desire to study at the hands of the great philosopher “Martin Heidegger” who had been invited him, whose relationship became close to each other, and he was influenced by him, leaving the influence of his former professors, in favor of the philosopher “Heidegger’s” orientation. He began studying “Aristotle’s thought” under the supervision of “Heidegger” and “Edmund Husserl”, and was promoted in his career until he reached the degree of assistant professor in 1929 AD. As for what was going on in the policy arena, regarding the political movement that is rippling in Germany, represented in the rise of the Nazis to power, “Gadamer”, unlike his teacher remained silent and away from political activities, likewise with regard to the military activity of that period, “Gadamer” published his first work in 1931 AD, and this was represented in his thesis whose title was changed to “Plato’s dialectical ethics”.

After this tour of universities and teaching in some of them, “Gadamer” settled to work at the university of “Heidelberg” until he finally succeeded the philosopher “Karl Jaspers” in the Chair of Philosophy in 1949, then he went through a period of stagnation in authorship and publications, where his main focus was on teaching and curricula until 1960, where he published his most famous work “Wahrheit und Method” or “Truth and Method”, in which he sought to reconsider the western heritage and it’s history, placing them in the trial with a view to producing a new evaluation for them, through it he demonstrated a tremendous ability of the exegetical phenomenon, which witnessed an openness after his analysis and review, and the influence of

“Heidegger” was very evident in his writing, especially when he stripped off the absolute characteristic of methodology, considering that understanding is a substantial substratum, and what makes understanding possible is language, since it is the communicative medium for humans, for understanding in his view does not mean an understanding of the potential behaviors of the self, but rather it is the pattern of being of entity, and it’s experience of the world. After publishing this book, “Gadamer” went into lengthy serious and difficult discussions with many thinkers and philosophers, just by way of example we mention some of them “Habermas” and “Jacques Derrida” and others, then he published other books that are the fruit of these discussions, including, “Heidegger’s Ways”, and “Vernunft im Zeitalter der Wissenschaft” or “Reason in the Age of Science”..etc. It is useful here to mention that his interests that ranged between Greek philosophy and his contemporaries have formed an important tributary of his philosophy, as well being fascinated by the study of Greek history and metaphysics, “Socrates”, “Plato” and “Aristotle”, a scientific and practical journey rich until he retired in 1968, and remained devoted to research and authorship until his death in 2002.

“Gadamer” begins his research in the hermeneutics, a method influenced by the division made by the Greek philosopher” Aristotle” on wisdom, by dividing it into two parts, a theoretical section and a practical one, and the same thing he did in his search for the relationship between knowledge and value, and therefore, we find he has called his effort in researching the hermeneutics as a practical philosophy, for “Gadamer” believes that this does not defect his proposition, especially since there were those who were inspired by “Plato” and influenced by him and took his approach and pattern, such as the philosopher “Hegel”, who was influenced by the theory of “Platonism” dialectic, proceeding after that in his dialectic discourse as included in his philosophy, and this does not mean that “Gadamer” as far as “Hegel’s” approach draws his attention, he agrees then with him on what he ended up, because “Gadamer” does not acknowledge “Hegel’s” assumptions and conclusions, as they concluded that the result of the concept of experience differs from his interpretation from hermeneutical point of view.

Another attempt that caught “Gadamer’s” attention related to understanding was that of the philosopher “Nietzsche”, where “Gadamer” thought that “Nietzsche” presented a new way of interpreting the hermeneutical nature of understanding, due to his wonderful linguistic ability, and it crystallized clearly later by “Heidegger”.

“Gadamer” hermeneutical vision:

It is recognized that since the philosopher “Schleiermacher” (1768-1834) reviewed it until today, the hermeneutic became a stand-alone philosophical

discourse, and the most prominent achievement “Schleiermacher” accomplished was to remove it from the religious cordon, and pushing it to consider secular texts as well, such as legal and historical texts, and others, and gained it’s own principles, consequently, everyone chose to discuss it had a view on it, and among them we mention “Wilhelm Deltay” (1833-1911), “Heidegger” (1889-1976), and “Gadamer”, who many studies see as providing a modern hermeneutical method based on the ontology of language and understanding, what is a hermeneutical firstly in his thought?.

In fact, “Gadamer” looks at the hermeneutic as a project to apply the rules of the theory of existence that Heidegger laid it’s foundations, and therefore it is a science that aims to research human understanding in a historical, linguistic, and dialectical manner, and we can not understand any a discourse or a text without return to what is essence and existence, and what it contains of historical and linguistic mental backgrounds, whereby there is no text or speech without having an effect on terms of time and culture surrounding it, and understanding can not be reasonably and logically sequenced unless it is subject to this process, and what was the opposite of that would put us in ambiguity and perhaps even confusion, and what we can deduce here is that “Res cogitans” or a thinking thing (as the mind or soul) very important in conducting the process of understanding, regardless of the objective conditions established in the methodology, and then it is correct to say that “Gadamer” calls for specific hermeneutic interested in explaining the process of understanding in itself, and does not link it with any science, and the best evidence for this is that the content of what he intended in his book “The Truth and Method” is to present a systematic accountability by looking at an understanding manner, therefore, the discourse by it’s nature includes ambiguity and fuzzy which requires an interpretation, because it is considered in the view of “Schleir Macher” the art of avoiding misunderstanding. The question which forces itself now is: Did “Gadamer” success after he transcended the classic hermeneutic method in providing what qualifies him to make a development for it? Actually, to reply briefly, we say that he succeeded, especially when he made the hermeneutic activity as an activity that would “make understanding for the first time a fundamental problem and general necessarily together”⁽¹⁾. He also stressed that all philosophical interpretations are in no way confined to the application of linguistic methods in the interpretation of texts, and then he did not believe that the idealistic theories and their interpretations were sufficient, because they are based on linguistic methods that seek to decipher and master the objective

1- Saeed Tawfiq, On What is Language and Interpretation Philosophy, The University Foundation for Studies, Publishing, and Distribution, Beirut, Edition 1, 2002, p93.

reality of the text. He discusses that in hermeneutics and interpretation, we do not proceed from a point, but rather proceed from a continuous and eternal basis, therefore, hermeneutics is not a method that we use or enter to master something, but that our life itself appears in interpretation, and we live in interpretation, and through it life goes forward. However, “All correct interpretation must be on guard against arbitrary fancies and the limitations imposed by imperceptible habits of thought, and it must direct it’s gaze “on the things themselves”⁽²⁾.

“Gadamer” also confirms that, the aim of his research is not to present a general theory of interpretation or to recount a different account of his methods, but rather that the purpose is to search for a common denominator among all forms of understanding, he believes that we must always move in within us the desire to acquire knowledge continuously, in order to be free from the limitations and dependencies of the presuppositions that inexorably tugs us towards ourselves, while acknowledging that each understanding includes a prejudice “ the recognition that all understanding inevitably involves some prejudice gives the hermeneutical problem it’s real trust”⁽³⁾, he points out that he did not intend to deny the need for methodological work in the humanities insofar as he intends to assert that we are in the realization of the truth, we must know that this does not necessarily depend on the “method”, and he never ignores the benefit of interpretative theories expressed in order to organize the process of understanding methodologically, but what is reticent for it, is it’s conduciveness and the approach followed in general.

The hermeneutic, according to “Gadamer”, is to approach any matter with research, starting from considering it as a structure that requires to relinquish ourselves [Ek-sistenz] in order to understand it, and if it is shrouded in ambiguity at the beginning, we must know that this ambiguity brings with it a kind of awareness that we will need in understanding it, as soon as present it to thought, what will necessitate is a sorting process of understanding, that understanding in itself is a reproduction of an original process, therefore, it is a structure of thought, so that, in order to understand it, we must take up it as a speech “utterance” or as a text, “Gadamer” puts this point thusly “Isolating understanding in this way, however, means that the structure of thought we are trying to understand as an utterance or as a text is not to be understood in terms of it’s subject matter, but as an aesthetic construct, as a work of art or “artistic

2- H.G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, Eng Trans by: Joel Weinsheimer and G. Marshall, Second Revised Edition, Continuum, London, New York, 2006, p269.

3- *Ibid*, p.272.

thought”⁽⁴⁾. then, and only then, we will realize that any ambiguity that we have inexorably tugs us at misunderstanding with the structure to be interpreted and understood, was not really related to it, but to what extent we were able to make it a separate structure from the subject in which it was produced.

Based on the foregoing, the question that arises now is: Are there elements that would form a philosophical hermeneutics according to the proposition presented by “Gadamer”?

To answer that, we say at the beginning that there are three foundations that play a prominent role in the vision of “Gadamer”, which are the ontological view of understanding, the receiver (the “interpreter”), and the text. These triple are as the fixed triangle of hermeneutical movement for “Gadamer”, and we can not practice interpretation without moving within these prominent triple, therefore here, we see the need to stand at each one separately with some clarification.

Firstly, The ontology of comprehension:

By ontology, we mean that which relates to understand, where “Gadamer” advised that we should pay attention to it in general, and as he does so, he is committed to sincerity for “Heidegger”, where it is known that “Heidegger” had turned his back on the methodology and theory of knowledge, and this is in itself is an achievement that would not have been complete if it had not taken up by “Gadamer” to bring it from the longer term to the farthest extent, therefore, he provided an interpretation that is not subject in any way to any criterion, whether methodical or doctrinal, and completely antagonizes all forms of “dogmatism”, that is “To understand at all is to interpret”⁽⁵⁾. This means that interpretation, which has no place for dogmatism, as well as methodology and philosophical doctrine, hence, this in itself is a work that places the interpreter in the face of himself, because by his nature he tends towards what he loves and desires: “the one-sided preference for what is close to one’s sphere of ideas”⁽⁶⁾, therefore, one must commit to the transcendence of himself, and distance his mind from all that is inherent in it, and adhere to the mind course, which as “Gadamer” says, parroting with admiration of “Schleiermacher’s opinion, ”that methodologically disciplined use of reason can safeguard us from all error”⁽⁷⁾, a mind is not subject to any authority other than it’s own, because it’s subjugation, whether it is religious, customary, social, political, or others, what

4- Ibid, p.187.

5- Zdenko Sirka: Transcendence and Understanding: Gadamer and Modern Orthodox Hermeneutics in Dialogue, Pickwick Publications, 2020, p53.

6- Gadamer, 2006, p.280.

7- Ibid, p.279.

results from an interpretation will naturally be a product of this authority to which the “interpreter” mind was subject to, and any judgement issued on him is a judgement of that authority and for the mind of the interpreter. “Gadamer” cites the reforms of the enlightenment to “Martin Luther” (1483-1546), who is well-known “the prejudice of human prestige, especially that of the philosophical [he means Aristotle] and the Roman pope, was greatly weakened”⁽⁸⁾, in other words, weakening the authority of religion based on Aristotle’s logic, from which it derives its certainty and survival from it.

The ontology of understanding then, is a vision characterized by its distinctive and special nature, which includes an unrelenting attempt to liberate from every form of authority imposed by people and those that impede the work of the interpreter at the self-level, and decide only the authority of the mind alone, subsequently, there is no meaning or significance to the text except what the mind lends it or takes away from it, this is if we want to reach an understanding described as creative, and we do not avoid right if we say that “Gadamer” has succeeded in many ways in an ontological debate in his search for the concept of truth, and true understanding in order to reach an ontological level of understanding, we may discern its impact on the vision of the “world shown in understanding”, but there are some critics who believed that “Gadamer” in his mission did not succeed completely, because he did not fully adhere to what was called by “Heidegger” represented in “the search for the credibility of an understanding with “Trans-historical dimensions”⁽⁹⁾, in terms of its interpretative practices.

On the ontology and play:

“Gadamer” attaches the concept of play a special importance, because play has a pivotal role in the ontology of aesthetic, and the “primitive” human before he knew anything about identity, image and symbol, he did not know the distinction between existence and play, therefore, the play was seen as a form of the first forms of understanding, this is because the essence of the “being inside” “Innesein” is “tension” in particular, hence the issue of being present is a matter of bearing the burden of taking the initiative, this initiative, according to “Gadamer”, represents the actual tension of existence, and when anyone plays, this person is contained within the structure of play, which has the nature of its very essence as “Gadamer” said: “the structure of play absorbs the

8- Ibid, p.279.

9- Qais Madi Ferro, Historical Knowledge in the West, Philosophical, Scientific and Literary Approaches, The Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies, First Edition, Beirut, June, 2013, p62.

player into itself, and thus frees him from the burden of taking the initiative”⁽¹⁰⁾, consequently, the player is described as adept when he mastered the role of playing assigned to him, and if the opposite happens, he is judged to spoil the game, that the criterion for success in playing is his commitment to seriousness; “Someone who does not take the game seriously a spoilsport”⁽¹¹⁾, this despite the fact that there is a general characteristic that helps him to be a successful player, because every game has a special attraction and a fascination through which it can seduce the players, because of the risk element it contains “there is a risk that they will not “work”, “succeed”, or “succeed again”, which is the attraction of the game”⁽¹²⁾. This is in itself an element that guarantees that the impulse of one to be “experienced”, and accordingly, it is correct to say that each game has its essential role in attracting the player, so that it becomes the real tried and tested self “What holds the player in its spell, draws him into play, and keeps him there is the game itself”⁽¹³⁾, not the player himself.

On the basis of the above, we can say that play leads to an interpretation of ontology and has to do with the process of completing interpretation, since it includes a role for subjectivity and active existence, in terms of the interpretation of existence, this can be understood when we realize that it is “a possibility” and that it is “given” “Vorgege”, that the human being may be acquired by practicing existence in some way, moreover, “Aristotle” used to say that “playing has a goal that aims to do when we do it, and that it is “for the sake of enjoyment”. However, “Gadamer” makes another importance on the other hand behind playing, saying: “More importance, play itself contains its own, even sacred, seriousness. Yet, in playing, all those purposive relations that determine active and caring existence have not simply disappeared, but are curiously suspended”⁽¹⁴⁾, hence, this makes us look at the role of play and its relationship to interpretation.

We know that “Gadamer” from the beginning made playing a key to ontological interpretation, and the principle of play in his view is one of the most important concepts that he had to apply as a basic pillar in constructing experience with the truth as “Jasper”* said: The player is the one who plays a role in relation to a situation in daily life, therefore, every action depends on highlighting his presence on the player himself, and the relationship of play to interpretation lies in the extent of fusion of the player in the game which he is

10- Gadamer, 2006, p.105.

11- Ibid, p.103.

12- Ibid, p.106.

13- Ibid, p.106.

14- Ibid, p.102.

about, therefore, in order for the purpose of interpretation to be completed, the player must melt / integrate to the point of fusing “Schmelze” in the whole game, at which time the player has accomplished his desired mission of playing “Play fulfills its purpose only if the player loses himself in play”⁽¹⁵⁾, thus, in order for the player to lose himself in the game, he must fully identify with it, so that he and the play become one thing, and this is undoubtedly possible after he plays the game very seriously, otherwise he will spoil the game and deprive others of pleasure, as we have already indicated before.

We said that every action stops showing its existence to the player’s role, but how is that? Since every player possesses that initiative that involves the desire to experiment, therefore, the player can subject every role to play to experience, the experience of playing which is an artistic work in itself, and it is known that the artwork includes the emergence of the truth, and the truth is unconcealment and not obscure “Unverborgenheit”, this is what made “Gadamer” not attach importance to the aesthetic awareness per se, but rather to the experience of art that exists and is a work of art in exchange for what “Gadamer” confirms as the monotonous process of aesthetic awareness, and it is not described as a subject that stands in front of the self-dealing with it except when was a work of art “the work of art has its true being in the fact that it becomes an experience that changes the person who experience”⁽¹⁶⁾, because the experience bridges the gap between the subject and object, and until it is done appropriately, the limitations and restrictions of the traditional methodology that conduct research through abstraction and generalization should be excluded. Here “Gadamer” proposes, accordingly to his vision, what is in line with what he wants to reach, as it allows us-as in history, for example – awareness of “our heritage, which is the determinants of awareness prior to consciousness”⁽¹⁷⁾.

Secondly: The recipient (Interpreter).

Perhaps one of the most important and most prominent effects of phenomenology on hermeneutics, is that it brought about kind of self-dynamic process that take place at the level of the recipient of work, where the recipient has the interaction with what is presented to him consciously and tinged it with his own experience, after reading it or watching it, then becomes entitled to form something on the work “every encounter with the work has the rank and rights of a new produce”⁽¹⁸⁾, what makes this right for the recipient is that open

15- Ibid, p.103.

16- Ibid, p.103.

17- Gadamer, 1997, p.14.

18- Gadamer, 2006, p.82.

door as long as there is a saying that has an apparent meaning and the other is internal or hidden, so the interpreter accordingly is responsive since he is a recipient of a speech. It is well known that every discourse carries many interpretations, which leads us to consider it, and doubts about its meaning, that is, doubts about “how to respond, it becomes clear that doubt is the true condition for interpretation”⁽¹⁹⁾, then this speech or text becomes a game for the recipient in which he is entitled to interpretation in a way that he can understand from its contents, provided that the linguistic capacity that is within his ability is the mediator between him and the text that was received, because the language is the pantry of the interpreter and by which he practices the process of understanding, especially since language, as well known, is the bowl of thought and comprehension is its inextricably interlinked, and when it happens that language fused with understanding, then the interpreter will be able to produce new meanings as a result of this, and a new life will be emitted in the text that is to be interpreted to give way to the element of creativity, and creativity here is “In a certain interpretation probably is recreation, but this is a recreation not of the creative act but of the created work, which has to be brought to representation in accord with the meaning the interpreter finds in it”⁽²⁰⁾, therefore, indeed, every interpretation in its details includes the simplest linguistic processes as every human being needs to explain his intentions in order to be able to understand with others, so that the interpreter finds himself before a text, which implies that he is in front of the will of another person, and until he understands what the text wants to pass, it means identify with other’s self “To understand oneself is to do so in front of the text, and to accept from it the conditions of the self that is different from the ego that comes to reading”⁽²¹⁾. In addition to the language, then there will be the formative aspect of the interpreter, from experience that have formed and become accumulated, and then become the bridge between him and the truth intended by the text, thus, the interpretative process is related to the structural condition and the subjective side of the interpreter, this prompted “Gadamer” to insist on saying: “the present participation of the subject of the interpreter”, where the subjectivity of the interpreter is characterized by the “I-ness” that has precedence of presence in the interpretation process, which is the ontological condition for any successful interpretation process, given the role it plays in

19- K.M. Newton, *Twentieth Century Literary*, trans by: D. Issa Ali Al-Akoub, Ein For Human and Social Studies, First Edition, 1996, p195.

20- Gadamer, 2006, p.118.

21- Ricœur (Paul), *De texte a l'action, essais d'herméneutique*, II, édition seuil, Paris,1986, p31.

terms of linking the interpreter visions between the present and the past, and this role can not be likened to bias or attachment to social, religious, authoritarian and legal issues, and all that hinders the process of interpretation, but rather the exact opposite where it should be seen as data of successful understanding, and “Gadamer” as he goes on this course, based on this insistence, he has avoided the confusion in which his predecessors such as “Schleiermacher” and “Deltay”, who missed this matter, fell from their account, the role of the experiment in conducting the interpretation process, however, this role that “Gadamer” attached to subjective experience, is in line with what was aspired to complete the journey of his teacher, Heidegger, who was seeking to undermine the concept of objectivity in interpretation.

In order to complete his project, “Gadamer” proposed the idea of “prejudgment”, an idea that consistent with the role of self-experience in practice of interpretation, as it works to enrich the text and send a new spirit in it, to interrogate the past and present in the interpretative procedure of the text to be interpreted, thus, the interest of interpretation is focused on it’s historical than anything else, of course this should be done away from the psychological aspects that marred the view of “Schleiermacher”, as “Gadamer” said, which concerned the psychological mystery of the other, this has occupied him with the ambiguity of the past and the present, that is, the historical text “He was occupied by the mystery of the “other”, as he was occupied by the psychological aspect of dialogue and diverted him away from the historicity of the interpretation”⁽²²⁾, In fact, what the idea of prejudgment goes to is the interpreter begins to open up to the text to be interpreted, so that it is not judged by provisions other than the era in which it was produced, because it is unfair and prejudice to apply criterion, values and provisions other than it’s era, while adhering to the present and not leaving it with what it contains of criterion, values and provisions, where, the awareness of the individual plays an important role, as it’s prejudgments are not just provisions of his own, but rather are related to his existence, including the understanding and interpretation “The self-awareness of the individual is only a flickering in the closed circuits of historical life. That is why the prejudices of the individual, far more than his judgments, constitute the historical reality of his being”⁽²³⁾, we are not surprised if we know that presupposition is primarily based on what we include in the knowledge of the historical legacy that we gained over time through our

22- Adil Mustafa, *Understanding; The Entrance to Hermeneutics, The Theory of Interpretation of Plato to Gadamer*, Publisher The Hindawi Foundation, C.I.C.2018, p.63.

23- Gadamer, 2006, p.278.

awareness and our perception of what happened that we understood, which contains a set of conceptions that include “art”, “history”, “the creative”, “Welt-An-Schauung” “worldview” “, “experience”, “genius”. “external world”, “expression”, “style”, “symbol”, which we take to be self-evident, contains a wealth of history”⁽²⁴⁾, and all of them have a role in shaping our self-understanding.

For a person to have a self- awareness, it means that implicitly that this person has strived towards a reasonable historical self- understanding, as for how that self- understanding occurs, it occurs as soon as the reader’s self-encounters a text or topic that accepts interpretation, that has been produced from others, “Self-understanding always occurs through understanding something other than the self”⁽²⁵⁾. So having some object in front of the subject is enough to stimulate its self- understanding, that understanding in which language plays a pivotal role in it, so the language was “the medium in which substantive understanding and agreement take place between two people”⁽²⁶⁾, they are the subjectivity of the “interpreter” coming over the text as a first party, and the production that it received as a second party, and this confirms the validity of what “Schleiermacher” once said that: “language is the only presupposition in hermeneutics”.

The interpreter means behind the practice of interpretation, understanding the mind that is in the past and transferring all strangeness in it to familiarity, in order to reach the truth that increases knowledge, thus, when he puts a text to study it then to interpret it, he will have the freedom to research it in terms of the results he seeks to reach, and every time he should take into account that the improvised and arbitrary results are absolutely rejected, because any interpretation that includes them is doomed to failure, therefore, in order to avoid this failure, he must seek correct ways conducive to the truth and avoid doing all the ways that will not “do justice to the true binding nature of the work, which imposes itself on every interpreter immediately in it’s own way and does not allow him to make things easy for himself by simply imitating a model”⁽²⁷⁾, in order for him to understand the mind belonging to the past, he has to search for his linguistic richness and develop it, so that he can search the meanings and their origin in a way that connects to their roots, hence this makes him eligible to deal with the text to be interpreted “Thus it is quite right for the interpreter not to approach the text directly, relying solely on the fore-meaning

24- Ibid, p.9.

25- Ibid, p.83.

26- Ibid, p.386.

27- Ibid, p.118.

already available to him, but rather explicitly to examine the legitimacy i.e., the origin and validity of the fore- meaning dwelling within him”⁽²⁸⁾, hence, in order to ensure integration events between the past and the present in which the interpretative practice takes place, the interpreter must always keep raising the question after question about what he is interpreting, and each time with every question looking for what raised the question “For it is necessary to keep one’s gaze fixed on the thing throughout all the constant distractions that originate in the interpreter himself”⁽²⁹⁾, by this he can move strangeness to familiarity, the strangeness of that which belongs to the past in terms of language, culture, meaning, and value to what suits it in the present, so that it becomes alive with the life of what is today means culturally, meaning, and value, to a degree in which the interpreter appears as if he is contemporaneous with the author “The interpreter is absolutely contemporaneous with his author”⁽³⁰⁾, this contemporaneous, of course, is neither by relying on the prior meanings of the interpreter alone, nor by stubborn disregard for the meanings of the text, but rather by preparing the interpreter himself for the text as it includes a content that he is preparing to receive, so he leaves no room for his imagination to accept any image other than what the text depicts alone, then his consciousness becomes identical with the images and meanings provided by the text and the fact that the interpreter seeks to achieve “That is why a hermeneutically trained consciousness must be from the start, sensitive to the text’s alterity. But this kind of sensitivity involves neither “neutrality” with respect to content nor the extinction of one’s self, but the foregrounding and appropriation of one’s own fore-meanings and prejudices. The important thing is to be aware of one’s own bias, so that the text can present itself in all its otherness and thus assert its own truth against one’s own fore-meaning”⁽³¹⁾, accordingly, it is permissible for the interpreter to read the text that allows him to present new creativity, and is different from other interpreters, whereby every text is inevitably subject to an interpretative procedure that has exceeded its author, so it is subject to a new production process that includes elements that bear connotations that were not clear enough to see them in a regular way. There may be implications for the present that do not allow their appearance to be clear, but through the effort of the interpreter who links this present to that of that past, therefore, it manifests itself and becomes readable as the reading is done nowadays “Not just occasionally but always, the meaning of a text goes beyond its author. That

28- Ibid, p.270.

29- Ibid, p.269.

30- Ibid, p.223.

31- Ibid, p.p.2-271.

way of understanding is not merely a reproductive but always a productive activity as well”⁽³²⁾, here, we should point out that what the interpreter makes of the connection between the past and the present, despite the positive ones it holds, but it carries a negative side on the opposite side, however, it portends a more valuable positive role “ along with the negative side of the filtering process brought about by temporal distance there is also the positive side, namely the value it has for understanding. It does not only lets local and limited prejudices die away, but allows those that bring about genuine understanding to emerge clearly as such”⁽³³⁾, then the time distance is an open horizon for all interpretative potential.

Since, interpretations differ according to different cultures, religions and even groups and individuals, this difference does not preclude their legitimacy from being derived from two principles: the “first, the strangeness of meaning from the prevailing values, cultural, political and intellectual values. The second is to emit new values with a new interpretation, that is, to return strangeness to familiarity and to put strangeness in familiarity”⁽³⁴⁾, we can say that this is due to the difference in grasping, because there is an understanding that differs from one person to another, and this grasping is better than that, this is in view of the background from which the interpreter starts and the extent of his awareness and self-understanding, and the subject of understanding remains the text to be interpreted in isolation from the author, thus, there is a better interpreter than another, and a better interpretation than another one, because of the preference for understanding, while that “ the better understanding that distinguishes the interpreter from the writer does not refer to the understanding of the text’s subject matter, but simply to the understanding of the text –i.e. of what the author meant and expressed. This understanding can be called “better” insofar as the explicit thematized understanding of an opinion as opposed to actualizing it’s contents implies an increased knowledge⁽³⁵⁾. The essence of the difference is the similarity and vice versa, while there was a difference in the interpretations according to the difference in understandings on a subject, the interpreters are similar even if the topics of their interpretations differ, for example: “The interpreter who reads works of literature in terms of their biographical or historical sources is sometimes no better than the art historian

32- Ibid, p.296.

33- Ibid, p.298.

34- Muhammad Moftah, Receiving and Interpretion, A systematic Approach, The Arab Cultural Center, First Edition, 1994, p.218.

35- Gadamer, 2006, p.191.

who examines the works of a painter in terms of his models”⁽³⁶⁾, this is because each interpreter is involved in a participatory relationship with the topic he is researching.

As for the method followed by the interpreter, of course, it will not be a traditional one, because the traditional methods are conducted in an abstract, generalized manner, the interpreter is concerned with a hermeneutic interpretation, with purely human details, concerned with the human experience of the “producer of the material to be interpreted” in terms of his anxiety, despair, and the emotional affairs, tendencies, and other intrinsic within him, which makes it difficult for traditional methods to deal with, matters that the human experience alone can comprehend and interpret, therefore, “Gadamer” viewed human existence as a human phenomenon with its human experience lie outside the limits of the traditional methodology, including the scientific ones, consequently, understanding the texts lies within the interpretative phenomenon that is “The hermeneutic phenomenon basically not a problem of method at all”⁽³⁷⁾, it is no less important than the natural phenomenon, thus, “Gadamer” relied on the apparent “phenomenology” method concerned with “Describing phenomena as they appear in our experience, and the subject of his interest is the meaning of the phenomenon as given to our consciousness and our lived human experience”⁽³⁸⁾. The phenomenological method alone is capable of bridging the gap between the subject and object on the one hand, and exploring familiarity within the strangeness on the other hand, thus providing the opportunity to reach the desired truth behind the interpretative procedure.

Thirdly: The text.

The text is considered the third element in the hermeneutics according to “Gadamer”, the text that is a sum of words, and every word that acquires its meaning from the sentence or the text that contains it, because the nature of the word is to give birth to another one, and its meaning is not achieved except with what preceded it and what is attached to it “The word alone within any system has no meaning in itself, but rather its meaning is derived from the units or words adjacent to it in the position in which it appears”⁽³⁹⁾, in fact. Each text is a production process for a creator who can provide an interpretation of his

36- Ibid, p.139.

37- Ibid, p.Int-xx.

38- H.G. Gadamer, The Relevance of the Beautiful and other essays, Trans by: D.Saeed Tawfiq, Supreme Council of Culture, Egypt, 1997, p12.

39- Paul Ricoeur, Interpretation Theory, Discourse and the surplus of meaning, Arabic trans by: Saeed Al-Ghanimi, Arabic Cultural Center, Beirut, Lebanon, Casablanca, Morocco, 1st ed, 2003, P.26.

text, and is similar to an art board product that also can provide an interpretation of his work, but the necessity of presenting production at each of them is to stop that task, and to be satisfied with the role of the creator only towards their work, and if they try to do so, their efforts remain restricted and are not considered a criterion that is taken into consideration on what they have presented, therefore, "Gadamer" believed that even if he did so, then he "as interpreter he has no automatic authority over the person who is simply receiving his work"⁽⁴⁰⁾, just as the creator of the artistic painting in front of his work only mere viewer, so too, for the one who creates a text that remains in front of what he produced as a reader for it only, that "the only standard of interpretation sense of his creation"⁽⁴¹⁾, and this meaning belongs to the reader who will act as the interpreter of the text.

So the text goes beyond it's author and becomes deliberative when it reaches to the reader, and the issue of it's continuity as it is, is no longer concerns the author, but has become a matter that belongs to those who try to subject it to understand, and according to what he can receive the text with self-awareness and accumulated knowledge, he can understand the text to a degree that exceeds the producer's understanding of the text, as we indicated before "Understanding the text is related to realize the laws of interaction between accumulated experience and the truth disclosed by the text ."Gadamer" likened this process that begins with the player's author, and ends with the spectator recipient, through a neutral medium is the form that enables the reaction process, making the receptivity process possible and connected through the laxity of the ages, therefore, this potentiality lays the foundation for saying that the text does not imply a fixed reality, because it changes from era to another according to the recipient's horizon, the experience reading, and the different perceptions of recipients in every time and place"⁽⁴²⁾, therefore, every text includes the content of what it aims to communicate, and this content remains inherent in it and depends on who seeks to understand and interpret it, and this one who strives for that will only deal with the text that is related to his specialization and interests, and thus the secrets of the text are revealed to him by virtue of his relationship with his field of knowledge, hence it is truthful to say that each text is subject to "many different variables. The first of these variables is the nature of the science that deals with the text, that is, the special knowledge field that

40- Gadamer, 2006, p.192.

41- Ibid, p.192.

42- Qutb Al-Resiouni, The Qur'anic text from the Incoherence of reading to the horizon of contemplation, Publications of the Ministry of Awqaf and Islamic Affairs, Morocco, 1st ed, 2010, p.260.

defines the goals and methods of interpretation. The second of these variables is the cognitive horizon in which the specialized scholar deals with the text, so he tries to understand the text through it, or tries to make the text reveal itself⁽⁴³⁾, in a manner in which all ambiguity becomes evident.

Since the hermeneutic is in its most distant sense “the theory of interpretation”, which deals with the study of comprehension processes in particular that searches for the interpretation of texts, therefore, every reader who tries to understand some text, is always in a state of “projecting” “he projects a meaning for the text as a whole as soon as some initial meaning emerges in the text. Again, the initial meaning emerges only because he is reading the text with particular expectations in regard to a certain meaning. Working out this fore-projection, which is constantly revised in terms of what emerges as he penetrates into the meaning, is understanding what is there”⁽⁴⁴⁾. However, this reader is exposed to multiple projects on his way that has what supports them and others lacking that support, so he sheds the last aside and “begins with fore-conceptions that are replaced by more suitable ones. This process of new projection constitutes the movement of understanding and interpretation. A person who is trying to understand is exposed to distraction from fore-meanings that are not borne out by the things themselves. Working out appropriate projections, anticipatory in nature, to be confirmed “by the things” themselves, is the constant task of understanding. The only “objectivity” here is the confirmation of a fore-meaning in its being worked out”⁽⁴⁵⁾. Accordingly, the movement distinguishes the interpretative process, so the interpretation of any text includes a movement of association between the interpreter and the subject that he seeks to interpret, so that a relationship will be formed between him and the heritage in which the text is spoken, and then the interpretative awareness becomes “aware that its bond to this subject matter does not consist in some self-evident unquestioned unanimity as is the case with the unbroken stream of tradition”⁽⁴⁶⁾, this is because, as we have already indicated, any hermeneutical work is essentially based on “a polarity of familiarity and strangeness”⁽⁴⁷⁾, therefore, understanding any text necessarily requires the reader to take into account “The ideal precondition” which means “identification” with the original reader who is the author of the text, Indeed,

43- Nasr Hamed Abuzayd, *The Concept of the Qur’anic Text: A study in the Sciences of the Qur’an*, The Arab Cultural Center, 5th ed, 2000, p.9.

44- Gadamer, 2006, p.269.

45- Ibid, p.p.70-269.

46- Ibid, 2006, p.295.

47- Ibid, p.295.

this task is inevitably important that is not achieved before understanding, and this procedure is of course not only related to the text that is within the contexts of the past and carries a heritage, but also includes the contemporary text of the reader written in a language that he does not understand, where we find that it's meaning is only exposed through the "oscillating movement between whole and part", through this "it is always in this movement that we learn to understand an unfamiliar meaning, a foreign language or a strange"⁽⁴⁸⁾, actually, everything that intercepts us, and we need to interpret it, we find that we have no choice to resort to "the circular movement" to understand and interpret it "the circular movement necessary because "nothing that needs interpretation can be understood once". For even within one's own language it is still true that the reader must completely assimilate both the author's vocabulary and even more the uniqueness of what he says"⁽⁴⁹⁾, this is of course, that the more the reader understands the author's lexicon, the more in depth the interpretation of his texts will be.

It established that every textual production is the appearance and manifestation "Scheinen", which reveals the possibility of a mystical side, therefore, the interpretation that deals with everything that is deeper in it's mysteries requires the need to understand it. Indeed, every problem of interpretation was a problem of understanding, and the text itself represented an outward image in relation to what was implicitly implicated in the author, thus, "Gadamer" considered this a direct manifestation of the thought intended by the "communication" approach that takes place with the "Presupposed reflection", this is of course true for every writing or text and "hence of all texts they are always presentation through art. But where speaking is an art so is understanding. Thus all speech and all texts are basically related to art of understanding"⁽⁵⁰⁾, of course, the art at it's core is a movement.

So, interpreting every "communication" "Verstandigen" requires a dynamic understanding? But what is the nature of this movement? How does it work?

Since each text is a grouping of words that are aligned in a linear row consistently, it is natural that they form a combined, extended, and widening, therefore the process of understanding or interpreting it does not take place at once, for if it were so, we would have obtained a relative concept that does not fully satisfy what the text aspires to reveal, and therefore it required a movement in the way of understanding, this movement is of a circular nature, namely, this circular movement as "Gadamer" explains is from the nature of

48- Ibid, p.190.

49- Ibid, p.p.1-190.

50- Ibid, p.p.8-187.

understanding, that is always in a circular movement, and the shape of this movement lies in “fundamentally, understanding is always a movement in this kind of circle which is why the repeated return from the whole to the parts, and versa, is essential. Moreover, this circle is constantly expanding, since the concept of the whole is relative, and being integrated in ever larger context always affects the understanding of the individual part”⁽⁵¹⁾, but how can this hermeneutic circle be explained? Indeed, “Gadamer’s” interpretative circle can be understood as the relationship between the reader and the text that is often formulated in the expression “part and all”, and therefore it is neither something that lies in the reader itself nor is it in the text “the circle, then, is not formal in nature, it is neither subjective nor objective, but describes understanding as the interplay of the movement of tradition and the movement of the interpreter. The anticipation of meaning that governs our understanding of a text is not an act of subjectivity, but proceeds from the commonality that binds us to the tradition. But this commonality is constantly being formed in our relation to tradition. Tradition is not simply a permanent precondition; rather, we produce it ourselves inasmuch as we understand, participate in the evolution of tradition, and hence further determine it ourselves. Thus the circle of understanding is not a “methodological” circle, but describes an element of the ontological structure of understanding”⁽⁵²⁾, where the text is dealt with at the beginning as a whole, as a sentence or an issue and being considered taking into account that there are parts that are on the waiting list for reading, then what has been read is only part, and then we form an opinion related to it, which is only possible by bringing the rest of the parts one by one until we have the whole, and what supports us in that is the element of understanding that has a “circular movement of understanding runs backward and forward along the text”⁽⁵³⁾, then we proceed based on what we have formed from it to visualize the rest of those parts, and continue reading it indefinitely, then we make an attempt to link them all together until we have a certain knowledge about them, what supports us in that is the believe that an interpretative circle is not a “vicious circle”, but rather it contains an interpretative context, that “Gadamer” says is “fore-conception of completeness”, which is a formality for every understanding, and it states that what can be clearly understood would constitute the unity of meaning, and then we should assume the completion of the text when we read it and remove from our path any possibility of doubting it, unless it becomes clear to us the error of our assumption, of course, it is as soon as there is difficulty in understanding it,

51- Ibid, p.189.

52- Ibid, p.p4-293.

53- Ibid, p.293.

in this regard, “Gadamer” says “the rules of such textual criticism can be left aside, for the important thing to note is that applying them properly depends on understanding the content”⁽⁵⁴⁾, then, every time I move to a sentence in the text and return to its predecessor so that the meaning is complete for me, because the meaning during this process is being changed every time during the sequence of reading, in this way we go, and every time we find that we are moving between texts and we have certain perceptions about the whole, that is, we are moving in the corpus of the text forward and backward as if we were moving back and forth, so that what was before us becomes previous, and what follows later, and each time it is formed in our minds perceptions followed by other perceptions where the first becomes a precedent and the next is subsequent, in this way we continue to approach the next in a circular way, and this transition between the previous and the subsequent is what we can call the past and the present. During this process, what can hinder the activity of the mind and understanding occurs while they are in the process of movement and linkage required by the hermeneutic circle between the part and the whole, in the face of such a problem, “Gadamer” says that “It is to be overcome by feeling an immediate, sympathetic, and congenial understanding. Hermeneutics is an art and not a mechanical process, thus it brings its work, understanding to completion like a work of art”⁽⁵⁵⁾, consequently, its completion means that we were able during this process to link the horizons together in various fields of knowledge that serve our understanding of the text, as well as bring about the desired change that reveals what the text hides.

In fact, an understanding in this way can be described as creativity, creativity which is the fruit of good thinking “ someone who is better able to think his way through what an author is talking about will be able to see what the author says in the light of a truth hidden from the author”⁽⁵⁶⁾, it is very logical that the interpretation that is the product of this understanding leads us to creativity, and then it becomes very correct to say that every interpretation is an attempt on the path of creativity.

In accordance with the above, it is correct to say that the process of following the text with the review that we presented, through each of its parts, and then linking it in a row, is a process that takes place as a dialogue with the text, and a characteristic of the dialogue is that it occurs cross-fertile intellectual exchange, so, if we consider the further meaning that it includes, we will find it only the mutual stimulation of thought (“and has no other natural end than the

54- Ibid, p.294.

55- Ibid, p.190.

56- Ibid, p.194.

gradual exhaustion of the process described”) a kind of artistic creation in the reciprocation of communication”⁽⁵⁷⁾, hence, in every dialogue with any text, the interpreter must keep on the goal that he seeks to reach.

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing, we can conclude our research with the following results:

A hermeneutic understanding can not be subject to a methodology, because it is of a subjective dialogue nature.

The interpretation philosophy that “Gadamer” aims to attain, is a science that can only be achieved by looking at the human understanding as an inseparable whole consisting of history, language, culture and dialectical “dialogue”, and it can only be understood by researching this whole, which is based on the time (past and present), in terms of language, culture, and dialectical dialogue.

Hermeneutics, according to “Gadamer” vision, is a science of existence and phenomena of understanding based on true representation of one’s own self, as he is the official player who opens up to others, participates and practices his argument with them, in complete liberation from manipulation, domination and traditional methodology.

Hermeneutics takes place according to a closed circle that rotates in the form of a question and answer, and thus it is similar to conducting a conversation, and it is at the farthest level in terms of its roots “the original position of life” possessing the characteristic of historical wading mixed with the world of language, therefore, we can call it “conversation” regardless of the circle of its interest, in other words even if it concerns interpreting texts.

What has been deduced from the text after its interrogation, necessarily reflects the understanding of the interpreter, and this understanding should not be viewed as a final and absolute understanding, despite the necessity of putting one’s prejudices aside when the interpretative procedure being conducive to relative results, but they constitute a space that affects understanding, therefore it is, however, a condition of understanding.

Understanding is a situation or event occurring, in other words it is a linguistic game for the interpreter has the right to be involved and to address it.

The text that has been subjected to an interpretative procedure opens new horizons for it, and moves it away from its original author’s intent.

57- Ibid, p.187.

References

- 1- Adil Mustafa, *Understanding; The Entrance to Hermeneutics, The Theory of Interpretation of Plato to Gadamer*, Publisher The Hindawi Foundation, C.I.C.2018.
- 2- H.G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, Eng Trans by: Joel Weinsheimer and G. Marshall, Second Revised Edition, Continuum, London, New York, 2006.
- 3- H.G. Gadamer, *The Relevance of the Beautiful and other essays*, Trans by: D. Saeed Tawfiq, Supreme Council of Culture, Egypt, 1997.
- 4- K.M. Newton, *Twentieth Century Literary*, trans by: D. Issa Ali Al-Akoub, Ein For Human and Social Studies, First Edition, 1996.
- 5- Muhammad Moftah, *Receiving and Interpretion, A systematic Approach*, The Arab Cultural Center, First Edition, 1994.
- 6- Nasr Hamed Abuzayd, *The Concept of the Qur'anic Text: A study in the Sciences of the Qur'an*, The Arab Cultural Center, 5th ed, 2000.
- 7- Paul Ricoeur, *Interpretation Theory, Discourse and the surplus of meaning*, Arabic trans by: Saeed Al-Ghanimi, Arabic Cultural Center, Beirut, Lebanon, Casablanca, Morocco, 1st ed, 2003.
- 8- Qais Madi Ferro, *Historical Knowledge in the West, Philosophical, Scientific and Literary Approaches*, The Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies, First Edition, Beirut, June, 2013.
- 9- Qutb Al-Resiouni, *The Qur'anic text from the Incoherence of reading to the horizon of contemplation*, Publications of the Ministry of Awqaf and Islamic Affairs, Morocco, 1st ed, 2010.
- 10- Ricœur (Paul), *De texte a l'action, essais d'herméneutique*, II, édition seuil, Paris, 1986.
- 11- Saeed Tawfiq, *On What is Language and Interpretation Philosophy*, The University Foundation for Studies, Publishing, and Distribution, Beirut, Edition 1, 2002.
- 12- Zdenko Sirka: *Transcendence and Understanding: Gadamer and Modern Orthodox Hermeneutics in Dialogue*, Pickwick Publications, 2020.