
UNIT 1 INTRODUCTION TO HERMENEUTICS

Contents

- 1.0. Objectives
- 1.1. Introduction
- 1.2. Meaning of hermeneutics
- 1.3. Development of hermeneutics
- 1.4. The Three Components of Hermeneutical Enterprise
- 1.5. Historical Aspect
- 1.6. Philosophical Basis and Contributions towards Hermeneutics
- 1.7. Issues Involved
- 1.8. Hermeneutics and Epistemology
- 1.9. Let us sum up
- 1.10. Key words
- 1.11. Further readings and references

1.0. OBJECTIVES

The aim of this unit is to enable the student to have a general picture of the Western hermeneutical history and the themes built therein. It also aims to familiarize the historical development of the hermeneutical theories and their concerns with the meaning and interpretation. Student also needs to familiarize the philosophical position of different thinkers apart from the exposition here, to get the nuances of the descriptions here.

1.1. INTRODUCTION

Human search for truth and knowledge is an unending enterprise. There are different ways of knowing and arriving at truth. Irrespective of the source and medium through which knowledge has come about, truth being arrived at, it is an undeniable fact that human experience and its analysis do point us in some direction. Since knowledge is mediated, it is in some way an interpretation. There is always a background in which perception takes place. The knowledge and truth are not an exception to these phenomena. Thus, epistemological enterprise extends to those levels of analysis where we interpret while knowing. Thus, hermeneutics becomes the understanding of the complex conditioning of human knowledge. The hermeneutical tendency is not limited to any one continent or nation or language stream. It is found in all peoples. In fact, it is one of the ways through which knowledge grows.

1.2. MEANING OF HERMENEUTICS

The Greek word *Hermeneuin* meant to express, explain, translate or interpret the sacred message. Originally, it was discussed in the Greek philosophy, later was used extensively in the interpretation of the Bible. As science of interpretation it became an important part of Christian theology in the West. This resulted in various schools of interpretations such as literal, allegorical, analogical, and anagogical (spiritual / mystical) etc. Beginning with scriptural interpretation, it was limited to the domain of Sacred Texts only. However, today it has grown into different domains of human life. It has come out of the theological domain and has entered into the spheres such as art, aesthetics, literature, architecture and to all the notions that govern human life. Hermeneutics through its methods and principles sees the text or the object of interpretation in the present context. Traditionally, hermeneutics has been divided into two categories. They are a. General Hermeneutics – concerned with generalities such as context, language, history, and culture; and b. Special Hermeneutics concerned with specifics such as figures of speech, symbols, poetry, prophecy, typology, doctrinal teachings and various literary forms.

1.3. DEVELOPMENT OF HERMENEUTICS

We find that there was a gradual development from the hermeneutics of the letter (historical) to the hermeneutics of the sense (grammatical). Historically, we can trace the growth of the term from classical understanding of the text to the advanced understanding of 'beyond the text'. In other words, hermeneutics has grown from textual analysis to the analysis of experience. To sharpen the distinction we can say that, hermeneutical growth can be divided into theological hermeneutics and Philosophical hermeneutics (methods). However, the recent classifications in

hermeneutics show some different light. As the interpretation leads to understanding and this understanding affects interpretation, interpretation can be understood as an activity that fills the gaps in our understanding. It means that interpretation always requires knowledge of one's own lack of comprehension – knowledge of the fact that one is puzzled about something that one wishes to understand. Another sense of the word interpretation is called elaborative interpretation which does not involve a self-conscious quest for understanding. This comes more in terms of cultural objects.

Limiting the interpretation to the texts only, interpretation can be divided into two kinds, depending on their aim to provide an understanding of the meaning of a text or to provide an understanding of the relation of a text or its meaning to something else. Based on this the hermeneutics can be divided into Meaning interpretation and Relational interpretation. Meaning interpretation mainly focuses on four different aspects. They are, 1) the meaning as understood by the author of the text; 2) the meaning as understood by particular audiences; 3) the meaning as understood independently of what authors or particular audiences understood; 4) the meaning as including both the meaning. The relational interpretation aims not to cause understanding of the meaning of a text in an audience, regardless of what conception of meaning is used, but rather something else that the interpreter selects.

1.4. THE THREE COMPONENTS OF HERMENEUTICAL ENTERPRISE.

The growth of hermeneutics attests that there is a movement from the interpretations of the text to the understanding of 'understanding', existence and life-world. Therefore, the author, the text and the reader are the three basic components of any hermeneutical enterprise. However, language, culture, and other elements cannot be ignored in the hermeneutics.

The Capacity of The Text

The text in the strict sense of hermeneutics is the key component. Text generally understood as that stretch of written language which has a beginning and end. In a metaphorical sense text can be extended even to include messages generated by sign-systems of various religious, economic, social etc. structures, non-verbal body indicators etc. Text is the basis on which the operations of hermeneutics take place. One of the definition states that, "A text is a group of entities, used as signs, selected, arranged, and intended by an author to convey a specific meaning to an audience in a certain context". It can be a written, printed text or the text of mental images too. Text has many uses such as expressing emotions, issuing commands, eliciting answers, making requests, causing actions etc. Texts cause understandings. The meaning of the text is different from the text and the understanding.

The author and the reader both are part of the text but both are eclipsed in some sense for reader is absent in the act of writing and the author is absent in the act of reading. The text therefore assumes greater role in transforming its readers. Hermeneutics therefore, entails a study of the processes and operative conditions of transforming texts. When the necessary conditions for interpretation become operational, an event of communication takes place within the temporal flow of the reader's life and experience. This sort of textual potency, capacity to influence the reader can be seen from three different angles. These angles are from the part of speech – act, narrative world, and interpersonal understanding. Despite the 'horizon of expectation', the text can surprise, contradict or even reverse such horizon of expectation. The text possesses meaning of itself, the meaning of the author and the meaning projected by the reader.

The Capacity of The Reader / Interpreter

Like the text, the reader too has an impact on the text: being influenced by the text and influencing the text. Every reader brings a horizon of expectation to the text. Horizon of expectation is a mind-set, or system of references, which characterizes the reader's finite view-point amidst his or her situatedness in time and history. From the reader's point of view, there is always an attempt to understand the intentions of the author at the same time, and to understand the text in itself. However, the reader cannot undo the situation or background on which he bases his reading. This interplay exists in understanding the text always. There are six different levels where the reader influences the text and its meaning. They are: Inter-textual, situational, horizontal, semiotic, hermeneutical, and theoretical frameworks. The interpreter in four ways changes the object of interpretation be it text or anything that can be interpreted. They are done through idealizing the object of interpretation, re-segmenting the object of interpretation, reconceiving the object of interpretation and through recovering an underlying object.

The Capacity of The Author

The author cannot be ignored in the hermeneutics. It is his worldview, unconsciously comes into the text and affects the text. An author cannot dispassion himself fully from his historical condition. He feeds both the actual meaning and intended meaning into the text. However, the text has traces of his world view and his times, which can be traced through hermeneutics.

1.5. HISTORICAL ASPECT

While analyzing the history of hermeneutics we can divide it into different major phases. They are:

1. Interpretative stage (regional hermeneutics)
2. Stage of Methodological development (general hermeneutics)
3. Ontological hermeneutics
4. Contemporary hermeneutical trends

It is worth noting in this regard that, there was gradual development from the initial stages of interpretation of myths to the interpretation of the texts. Further hermeneutics grew towards the methodological developments, hermeneutics of experience or the ontology.

Interpretative Stage (Regional Hermeneutics)

Act of interpretation is implicit in human consciousness since the very beginning of human history. Gradual development of human consciousness made humans to realize their own self, others and nature and express them with understanding, expression and application. At this stage of hermeneutics, it involved the interpretation of myths, legends, symbols, texts. The time period of this stage we can find in the ancient Greece and Rome. Hermeneutics was not understood as a discipline at this stage. It was deciphering of oracles, omens and divine messages.

Stage Of Methodological Development

Hermeneutics as a discipline developed during the middle ages specially during the renaissance and reformation period. The development in jurisprudence, philology and philosophy brought great impact on hermeneutics during this period. The main contributors during this period are Johannes Von Felde, Chladenius (1710 - 1759), Friedrich August Wolf (1759 - 1824), Friedrich Ast (1778 - 1841), Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Humboldt, and others.

Ontological Hermeneutics

The theoretical framework which was developed earlier up to the 19th century paved way to deeper hermeneutics. Hermeneutics took a leap from the textual analysis to the life experiences or towards the ontology. The growth in phenomenology as a science by Edmund Husserl (1859 – 1938) and later on followed by Martin Heidegger, Gadamer, Habermas, Betti, Paul Ricoeur, Derrida, Richard Rorty paved way to much more analysis of the human existence leading even further to a scientific realm.

Contemporary Trends

In the 20th century, hermeneutics is no longer a methodology or doctrine concerned with decoding the meaning and truth claims of texts, but was a broader methodology and a philosophical approach to experience that was sensitive to the limits of language and history. The contemporary trends show directions in liberation hermeneutics, Feminist hermeneutics, Black hermeneutics etc.

1.6. SCHOOLS OF HERMENEUTICS / THEORETICAL MODELS

1. Hermeneutics of understanding – Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Betti – Focus on flow-of-life as the hermeneutical key.
2. Existentialist hermeneutics – Kierkegaard, Martin Heidegger, Rudolf Bultman – focus on the self-involvement and subjective understanding.
3. Hermeneutics of meta-criticism – Gadamer, Pannenberg – Question the rationality of our beliefs and of our social practices.
4. Hermeneutics of suspicion and retrieval – Paul Ricoeur – Suspicion of explanation and retrieval of understanding / possibility
5. Socio-critical hermeneutics – Habermas, Richard Rorty – Search for a transcendental basis of hermeneutics.

6. Liberation hermeneutics – Latin American theological enterprise, specially concerned with the emancipation and reading of Bible from the liberation perspective from the oppressive structures (economic-poverty and political-powerlessness). Juan Luis Segundo, J. Severino Croatto, Gustavo Gutierrez, and others are important contributors here.
7. Black hermeneutics – focus on the colonial history and apartheid, slavery. James Cone, John S. Mbiti, Desmond Tutu etc.
8. Feminist hermeneutics – focus on the women's emancipation – Elizabeth Schussler Fiorenza, Mary Ann Tolbert, T. Dorah Setel, Simone de Beauvoir, Elaine Marks, Rosemary Radford etc.

Check your Progress I

Use the space provided for your answer

1. What is hermeneutics?
2. Briefly write about reader-text relationship.
3. Mention three contemporary trends in hermeneutics with its contributors and their focus.

1.6. PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS AND CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARDS HERMENEUTICS

Friederich Schleiermacher (1786 -1834)

Friederich Schleiermacher belongs to the Romantic Movement and the Moravian Pietism. For Schleiermacher, the hermeneutics has the complete domain of speaking and language, and not merely the biblical hermeneutics or the interpretation of the classics. His hermeneutics can be divided into major themes such as, a. Understanding consists in re-experiencing the mental processes of the author of a text, b. it is grasping the meaning of the parts through diving the whole, and understanding the whole through grasping of the parts, c. it involves perceiving the individuality of the author as a human user of shared language, d. to go beyond the world of the author. He held the view that hermeneutics is a connection of thoughts from the speaker to the listener. There is an entire living context for every utterance.

After the Kantian *Critiques*, his contribution in hermeneutics can be put into two major themes. They are; a. possibility of Christian theology, b. possibility of the process of understanding. The task of hermeneutics, therefore, for him was finding out, in the first place, how does the 'divine truths' (trans-rational) dimensions interact with the critical, rational patterns? Secondly, how does understanding the elements / components of texts relate to a more intuitive anticipation of the text as a whole? Thirdly, how does understanding links with the 'pre-understanding' to which the subject matter of the text relates?

In this context he divides the hermeneutical enterprise into two major fields such as:

- a. Historical / grammatical hermeneutics
- b. Psychological / technical hermeneutics.

In both the types he recognized certain amount of uncertainty and wanted to develop certainty in both the fields. When there is uncertainty on texts, there needs to be guessing, conjecture, knowing the historical situation of the author etc. needs to be taken into consideration. On certainty he had two views; certainty as a demonstrative, a method for historical / grammatical hermeneutics and the other as the divinatory certainty, a method for psychological / technical hermeneutics. Neither grammatical nor the psychological have hold over each others' domain but are interdependent. In the hermeneutical circle the objectivity and the subjectivity of the person contribute to the fuller understanding of the text. Schleiermacher had the view that the word has to be understood as a part of a whole leading to complete illumination.

Wilhelm Dilthey (1833 – 1911)

Dilthey is famous for his contribution on understanding and interpretation. Dilthey held that interpretation is a process of coming to know. What we come to know through interpreting the products of human spirit is the full scope of psychic and spiritual life. Accordingly, psychic life cannot be abstracted from historical consciousness. It is part of social and cultural systems. Hermeneutics begins from the objective spirit (whole range of objective specifications) and not merely from individual spirit. Objective spirit is the embodiment of human thought and action. This is the framework of communal meaning to which elementary understanding is oriented. Dilthey's focus was to understand the author better and not understanding him as exactly he is. Therefore, the original context of the author and the entire situational nexus had to be taken into consideration.

His notions of understanding can be traced to his differentiation between natural sciences and social sciences. While natural sciences are descriptive, social sciences need to be understood in the context of human life. Life for him represents the shared flow of human activities and experiences which together constitute human experience both in its social diversity and in its individual particularity. There is an interaction between expressions of the other based on experience and self-understanding. Therefore, hermeneutics goes beyond the natural science methodology. In this process of understanding there is a tracing of universal in the particular and the whole in the part. This type of hermeneutics leads into history, because both the author and the interpreter share a common dimension of the meaning of being human. There is a transcendence of narrow concerns to the horizon of universal history, which gradually becomes the hermeneutic field. There is a merging of the individual with the knowledge of the universal history. This process of hermeneutics leads to the understanding of history as the expression of human life. Diltheyan notion of category of life (human life) was later on transformed by Husserl and Heidegger into an existential category.

Martin Heidegger (1889 – 1976)

To understand the Heideggerian hermeneutics, we must understand his basic positions. In Heideggerian writings, hermeneutics denotes both a process of human interpretation or understanding from within a particular orientation, and also a transcendental or meta-critical discipline which seeks to explore the foundations on which the possibility of understanding is based. His basic assumptions are, firstly, the horizon for the understanding of being is time, Secondly, the distinction between scientific categories and existential categories, and third the givenness of our world. Human is at the root of hermeneutics. It is the human person who is both the subject and the object of interpretation. The complexities of human person demand the diversities of explanations. This fact has been emphasized by hermeneutic phenomenology and existentialism. Heideggerian attempt in this regard is to understand and interpret all human existence in a reciprocal reflection of human nature. Heideggerian attempt is to interpret Dasein in its historicity, concrete situation. The Dasein, being-in-the-world understands itself in its facticity, temporality and horizon. The meaning emerges in Dasein's relationship with everything else in the given world. In this circular process of meaning discovery, Being, human person is understood and interpreted.

Having discovered this ontological analysis of the Dasein in the early writings of Heidegger, we find refined views in the second and third phases of Heidegger, where in, there is a movement from rigorous analysis of being to the gentle unfolding of the Being through poetry and art. In the broader context of Heideggerian analysis of the ontology of Dasein we find that, such understanding of Dasein itself is an interpretation. Departing from the western traditional metaphysics which had imprisoned the Being, Heidegger wanted to give a reorientation of ontology of Being. His approach was existential, as the Being emerges from the fore-ground of other entities and ontological as it is a phenomenon of interpretation. The analytical approach only provides the Dasein's existence structure in its existence in space and time. However, the meaning of Being cannot be arrived through analytics; rather it is through interpretation, which is fundamental concept of ontology, a basis for transcendental enquiry. In this process of meaning and understanding of Dasein, 'Being-in-the-world' is the pre-understanding. This pre-understanding allows for the possibility of making sense of what entities are. Therefore, hermeneutics is a clarification of pre-understanding, which is a structure of our 'Being-in-the-world'. Along with the understanding these existential structures include 'state-of-mind' and 'talk' which provides the conditions for the new knowledge. They also find their total expression in *sorge* (care) as the being of Dasein. The aim of fundamental ontology therefore is the condition of temporality for the possibility of original care and as the ultimate horizon of the interpretation of Being-in-the-world. Therefore, the Heideggerian attempt in the initial phase was to discover the meaning of being. However, there is a movement from this phase to the next phase of existential circle or the ontological circle.

In understanding, Being is considered as existing. Therefore, it is as potentially-for-being. In the very terms of Heidegger it is the 'Projection'. But it is inauthentic if it is considered as the meaning intended by other, in a

methodical interpretation. In this context, being doesn't acquire new knowledge; rather it interprets the world which it has already understood. In this process of disclosing there is the possibility of interpretation. Therefore, the understanding is directed 'in-order-to' which has the structure of something as something. The fore-structure and the as-structure do play an important role in the interpretation. The interpretation of something as something, i.e., the 'as-structure of interpretation' is founded on the 'fore-structure of understanding'. That is to say, that anything we understand is interpreted by either deriving concepts used from fore-sight or fore-conception (world-view), or by forcing it into pre-existing categories which do not correspond to its being. Meaning is the 'upon which' of a projection in terms of which something becomes intelligible as something; it gets its structure from a fore-having, fore-sight and a fore-conception. In this context of emergence of new meaning of the Dasein, the hermeneutical circle or the existential circle cannot be avoided. It can only be understood that by placing the being properly, one can get the new possibility of the meaning of Dasein. There is no objective understanding in the sense of scientific objectivity; rather it is in the fore-structure of the Being in much of its existential sense.

Hans George Gadamer

The hermeneutical ideas of Gadamer are found in his famous book 'Truth and Method' (1975). He was a student of Heidegger. He placed himself in the traditions of western philosophy and raised new questions about the nature of traditions and their transformation. Gadamerian hermeneutics is an attack on the role of method in hermeneutics. Gadamerian hermeneutics can be understood as an integration of the interpreter into the history / tradition. He believed that in the process of interpretation, the interpreter cannot transcend one's own historical setting. The very aspect of experience is integral with cognition which is part of historical nature of man. It is in our language that we express our experiences as humans when we participate in a tradition. This experience in a historical setting cannot be exempted. At the same time, it is through the very expression in language that we participate in a tradition through the interpretations of sign, works, texts etc. In a constant dialogue and language, hermeneutic experience becomes one with one's own existence. He was alert to the riddle of language and was aware of the limits of what can be said. Gadamerian philosophical hermeneutics is not a philosophical method. He held that no method can ever be sufficient for the disclosure of truth and that truth belongs so essentially to history that it can never be disclosed fully.

When the world was growing towards the certainty of science as the mark of judgment, he held that human life needs reflective and practical judgment. For Gadamer, hermeneutics is not limited to aesthetic experience, jurisprudence, and translation only. He held that after the Kantian limits of reason, it has a universal sway. Hermeneutics doesn't deal with the isolated modes of experience but represents the mode of experience itself. Giving importance to history he held that, tradition / history has been preserved and transmitted through the language but is confined to the logic of language itself. Therefore, hermeneutics is the conversation between history and human affairs. The struggle is therefore, of understanding between the participants of that conversation.

Fusion of horizons

Gadamer bases himself on the linguistic constitution of the world, where understanding is language bound. At the same time language also provides positive hermeneutical conditions for understanding because the linguistic world is the inter-subjective world which opens up the possibility of communication and has a universal dimension. In the transmission of tradition through language, the fusion takes place. The human finitude is manifest in the tradition. The task of tradition is to engage the openness of history and to illuminate the way in which traditions form and deform themselves in the infinite process of fusion. Language, the medium of transmission is present in literature. Self-reflexivity of language is found in the poetry, because poetry is always language that is about language. Here the language returns to itself with greatest density, which is similar to the experience of finitude found in the history. Finitude is the concept he derived from Heidegger which is against the background of releasement / meditation than objective or calculative thinking of the being. Language conceals as well as reveals and thus language becomes the medium of hermeneutic experience. Through the limits of language, translation becomes the supreme form of hermeneutic experience of language. For Gadamer, language not only brands experience as finite, but opens its transcendent possibilities. The finitude, the limits of experience through language opens up the possibility of solidarity and true communication. For the present world, Gadamer doesn't find the possibility of a future world through the lenses of science and technology, rather through the art, poetry, where there can be no expertise, no authority and where there is infinite openness of interpretation.

Habermas

Habermas is one of the most important and influential contemporary theorist of socio-critical hermeneutics. Socio-critical hermeneutics may be defined as an approach to texts which seeks to penetrate beneath their surface-function

to expose their role as instruments of power, domination or social manipulation. Hermeneutics for him is a meta-critique of power which aims to achieve the liberation of those over whom this power or social manipulation is exercised. His major contribution can be seen through his theory of communicative action, which deals with the relation between social practice, inter-subjectivity, language and system. Habermas understands language having the function of reaching understanding and coordinating action and socializing actors as well. It is in these two functions of language the communication takes place as through understanding communicative acts serve as the transmission of culturally stored knowledge and through coordinating action, the communicative acts serve the fulfillment of norms appropriate to a given context.

Paul Ricoeur

Ricoeur's hermeneutics too is centered on explanation and understanding. Hermeneutics for him is a meta-critical discipline which embodies the task of unmasking of explanation and the creative function of understanding. He understood that understanding works at a post-critical level when explanation is critical, socio-critical, or meta-critical. Explanation entails the willingness to expose and to abolish idols which are merely projections of the human will; understanding requires a willingness to listen with openness to symbols and to 'indirect' language. Thus, the two major areas of hermeneutics, explanation and understanding, invite respectively meta-critical or socio-critical suspicion which in turn bring about re-valuations, and also post-critical retrieval embodying openness towards new possibility which may entail renewal or change. Since he based his theory on Freudian understanding his hermeneutics is known as hermeneutics of suspicion and retrieval.

Paul Ricoeur held the view that the existence itself is a mode of hermeneutics / interpretation. According to him the social sciences fall outside philosophy, wherein it has to exchange with them, dialogue with them for the meaning to emerge in a broader understanding. The meaning is mediated through an endless process of interpretation - cultural, religious, political, historic, and scientific. Hermeneutics for him is the art of deciphering indirect meaning. Ricoeur opposed the idealist view that the self is transparent to itself. The self is always as another. The self discovers itself through linguistic mediation of signs, symbols stories, ideologies, metaphors, and myths. The self returns to itself through the language of the others enriched and enlarged. His effort was to find a mid-way between rationalism of Kant and transcendental idealism of Husserl. In deciphering the indirect meaning, there is scope for speculative thought, where in we enter into symbolic meaning. Thus, the encounter is with symbols and their meanings. Symbols have expressions of double meaning, wherein a primary meaning refers to beyond itself to a second meaning which is never given directly.

Ricour's hermeneutics is not confined to myths and symbols. It moved from reflective consciousness to the subjective will and later on his hermeneutics was extended to the interpretation of all phenomena of a textual order, narratives and ideologies. It is at this juncture he encountered the social sciences. Moving away from the traditional categories of explanation and understanding, he moved from speech to text; wherein he acknowledged the alterity and distantiation of meaning as essential dimensions of hermeneutic field. In the process of going beyond the text, we encounter the ontological horizon of world-meaning opened up by the text. Thus a world is disclosed by the text, brings us beyond epistemology to ontology where the being is constantly interpreted and never finally completed. The most radical view of Ricoeur is privileging of the text as model of interpretation. Meaning is no longer an intuitive one, nor a transcendental condition. The text breaks the circuit of internal reflection and exposes us to inter-subjective horizons of language and history. Meaning involves someone saying something to someone about something. Interpretation thus, explodes the confines of the timeless reflective subject and discloses us as language - using beings in a world with others. It brings in the complexities of meaning in an inter-subjective situation, in the horizons of history and tradition. The meaning gets extended because the text functions as a mediator between the reader and the author. Hermeneutics produces second order reference even though it enjoys the autonomy of authors meaning. In this context hermeneutics discloses a hermeneutic circle of historical inter-subjectivity. To interpret meaning is to arrive in the middle of an exchange which has already begun in which we seek to orient ourselves in order to make new sense out of it. There is no hermeneutic-subject which intends meaning, rather it responds to the proposal of meaning which the matter of text unfolds. There is a transcendence of subjective consciousness of the possible new worlds of meaning. This self-hood which is open to the unfolding of meaning is at one end of the hermeneutic circle, makes the second order reference beyond the first order reference of the author. Therefore, it is going beyond egology and ideology. Working of the text itself is a process of semantic innovation. In the case of a symbol, this involves a crossing of internationalities at the level of the word. In the case of metaphor it is a production of new meaning at the level of sentence. In the case of narrative it is the form of an emplotment which synthesizes heterogeneous temporal elements at the level of language as a whole.

Derrida

“Deconstruction” is the most famous of Derrida's terms. He seems to have appropriated the term from Heidegger's use of “destruction” in *Being and Time*. Derrida has provided many understandings of deconstruction. Some of them these understandings are classical. The *first* is the early one, making reversal of platonic emphasis of essence over appearance being reversed, and appearance being given predominance. The *second* definition is less metaphysical and more political. Derrida says that deconstruction is practiced in two styles. There is the genealogical style of deconstruction, which recalls the history of a concept or theme. On the other hand, there is the more formalistic or structural style of deconstruction, which examines a-historical paradoxes or aporias. Derrida calls the *first* aporia, “the *epoche* of the rule” (law must be conserved and also destroyed or *suspended*, suspension being the meaning of the word “*epoche*”), the *second* aporia “the ghost of the undecidable” (“deconstructs from the inside every assurance of presence, and thus every criteriology that would assure us of the justice of the decision”), *third* is called “the urgency that obstructs the horizon of knowledge” (a horizon is both the opening and limit that defines an infinite progress or a period of waiting.”). It is a kind of thinking that never finds itself at the end.

1.7. ISSUES INVOLVED

After analyzing the hermeneutics in its theories and practice, we can cluster the few questions which can still be discussed. They are,

1. What is the objective meaning of the text and how can we determine it? Is it only literal or more than literal?
2. What is objectivity when there is vagueness around neutrality of the text?
3. What is objective in the way of fixing meaning and how this objectivity is related to cultures?
4. What is the structure of those ‘things / texts / ’ which can be interpreted?
5. How does the logic of interpretation differ from that of natural sciences?
6. How does paradigm shifts in understanding and social experience affect the ‘objective’ interpretation?
7. Is every hermeneutic process relativises text and how can we justify it?

It is worth noting in the modern world the problem of pluralism, one of the basis of pluralism is hermeneutics. The authenticity and fixing of meaning more than one way comes in terms with the metaphysics of interpretation. The separation between the objects of interpretation and the interpretation itself is a crucial question in this connection.

Secondly, the question of representation at the background of language, culture, belief system etc. arises in the context of interpretation. When we look from the realistic and idealistic viewpoints, it becomes difficult to fix the meaning than falling into the relativistic trap.

1.8. LET US SUM UP

After understanding the basics of hermeneutics, we can say that, hermeneutics as a discipline has given rise to varied meanings based on the interpreter. The insights read into the text and the response of the text to its reader points out the fact that the understanding changes according to the times. It is through deeper reflection, we are able to determine to some extent the meaning at the time of the text and to our times. We cannot limit to the world of text alone for it involves the world of reader too.

Check your Progress II

Note: Use the space provided for your answer

Give the meaning of deconstruction?

Highlight the contribution of Heidegger to the hermeneutics.

What are the issues involved in the hermeneutics?

1.9. KEY WORDS

Hermeneutics: The art of interpretation, based on some principles or canons of interpretation which help us in interpreting the text or event or an action. It can also refer to the act of interpretation

Pre-Understanding: The condition that the interpreter already has some understanding, irrespective of its vagueness and marginality. It is assumed to be present in any interpretation.

Hermeneutical Circle: A notion which shows the circularity involved in the process of understanding. The circularity between pre-understanding and emergent understanding is known as hermeneutical circle.

1.10. FURTHER READING AND REFERENCES

Daniel J., Adams. *Biblical Hermeneutics: An Introduction*. Madras: The Christian Literature Society, 1987.

Margolis, Joseph and Tom Rockmore. Ed. *The Philosophy of Interpretation*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

Putti, Joseph. Et.al. *Hermeneutics: Truth or / and Meaning*, Andhra Pradesh: St. John's Regional Seminary, 1993 – 94.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *New Horizons in Hermeneutics*. Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992.

Wachterhauseer, Brice R. Ed. *Hermeneutics and Modern Philosophy*, New York: State University Press, 1986.

UNIT 2 LANGUAGE GAMES AND PARADIGMS

Contents

- 2.0. Objectives
- 2.1. Introduction
- 2.2. Wittgenstein before Language Games
- 2.3. Picture Theory as the Preliminary for Language Game Theory
- 2.4. Language Game: A Shift from Picture Theory
- 2.5. Meaning as Use and Hermeneutics
- 2.6. The Analysis and Understanding of Paradigm
- 2.7. Language Game as New Paradigm
- 2.8. Epistemological issues
- 2.9. Let us sum up
- 2.10. Key words
- 2.11. Further readings and references
- 2.12. Answers to check your progress

2.0. OBJECTIVES

The objective of this unit is to familiarize the student with the theory of language game and why it brought about revolutionary change in the philosophical thinking. The unit also aims at familiarizing the student with the notion of paradigm as how a concept of the philosophy of science helps in understanding the traditional philosophical thinking.

2.1. INTRODUCTION

The revolutionary idea in the history of philosophy came at the strategic time when the whole of philosophy was moving in one direction. The turns which were intended and were brought were anyway not in a day but came out of the constant struggle to debug the complexities of problems as understood by the philosophers of the time. A constant search and reflection has paved way towards novel understanding, resulting in the new direction of human understanding and newer heights of comprehending the reality. One such turn we find at the end of 19th century and reached its fuller manifestation in the person and works of Wittgenstein. The pure speculative thinking, which was considered as the subject matter of philosophy got blurred as the advancement in science took place. Science became part of human existence and secondary reflection was needed on science itself. A unique analysis of the growth of science with its history paved way to the novel insight into the notion of Paradigm. In fact, later on the term paradigm-shift became so popular, that it was a reflection on science and its growth. Paradigm became the substratum of any theory, through which phases of development were differentiated and newer understandings were reached. In this unit we are going to see these two notions of language games and paradigm, their implications to philosophy, particularly to epistemological issues.

2.2. WITTGENSTEIN BEFORE LANGUAGE GAMES

The term 'language game' is unique to the 20 century linguistic philosophy. After the drastic turn in philosophical approach, where in the language became the focus of philosophy, the analytical mode of philosophizing gained its importance. The century old philosophical problems

were looked from the language perspective and hence, language became the focal point of philosophical analysis. From the time of Brentano, Meinong and Husserl, we find a slow movement towards the focusing of language. However, the movement became intense at the end of the 19th century with the emergence of the ordinary language philosophy of Moore, Logical atomism of Russell and culminated in the Picture theory of Wittgenstein. The mathematical application towards language in the form of symbolic logic by Frege and analysis through the analytical school of Vienna too contributed towards this movement. All through this history Wittgenstein stands out as a unique philosopher, philosopher of language who contributed intensely to the language philosophy and the philosophy that followed after.

2.3. PICTURE THEORY AS THE PRELIMINARY FOR LANGUAGE GAME THEORY

Before entering into the language game theory, the picture theory of language plays an important role in understanding Wittgenstein. It was his earlier work, the *Tractatus*, which contains the main idea of picture theory.

Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus is one of the original works of Wittgenstein in its content and style. It is arranged as a series of remarks numbered in decimal notation. Altogether it contains seven propositions and rests are the explanations of these propositions. They are:

1. The world is everything that is the case.
2. What is the case, the fact, is the existence of states of affairs.
3. A logical picture of facts is a thought.
4. A thought is a sentence with a sense.
5. A sentence is a truth-function of elementary sentences.
6. The general form of a truth-function is $[p, \xi, N(\xi)]$.
7. Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent.

In analyzing the history of philosophy, Wittgenstein found that the philosophical problems arose due to the misunderstanding in the language itself. Therefore, a clarification of language would result in answering the questions which were considered as philosophical. Through *Tractatus*, Wittgenstein wanted to dissect language as to make it an answer for the philosophical problems. The result of such an enterprise is the picture theory, apart from which there are also other important themes in the *Tractatus*. Picture theory aims at explaining the nature of sentences / propositions. Wittgenstein wanted to find out what makes it possible for a combination of words to represent a fact in the world? How is it that by producing a sentence I can say something – can tell someone that so-and-so is the case?

He held that a sentence is a picture / model of reality. His understanding was that, when we put a sentence together we construct a model of reality. As picture represents for Wittgenstein a sentence represents the reality. It does it so by showing its sense. It shows how things are if it is true. A sentence composed of old words is able to communicate a new state of affairs by virtue of being a picture of it. The pictorial elements have one-to-one correspondence with the things in the state of affairs it represents. Picture theory held that a picture must have something in common with what it pictures. A sentence as a picture has something in common with the reality. It was a two fold answer to the philosophical problem. At one hand he analysed language as the one which as a propositional structure at the basis upon which ordinary language is built up. On the other hand there is reality at the root of which there is thought as the basis. As the ordinary language represents the surface structure, the deep structure of language / propositions

represents the thought. This representation is done in the way of picture. However, he understood the limitation of the picture, that it cannot represent itself, for which it needs some other form of representation. Applying it to the language and thought, Wittgenstein felt that that which cannot be thought cannot be said. Whatever can be thought can be expressed. Thus, the analysis of language shows the limits of our thinking. The function of philosophy therefore, is to indicate what cannot be said by presenting clearly what can be said. The conception of propositions / language rests on the notion of 'name'. Name being the simple sign, not composed of other signs. Name stands for objects but doesn't picture the reality for it can do so only in a combination of names. This combination of names portrays a combination of objects – i.e., a state of affairs.

Another important contribution of *Tractatus* is the notion of elementary propositions, which consist of names. Elementary propositions cannot be analysed further. The names in elementary propositions exist as a logical necessity. This logical necessity arises out of the requirement that propositions have a definite sense. An indefinite sense therefore is no sense at all. The analysis of elementary propositions showed that that either they are true or false, in representing the reality. Wittgenstein held that our ordinary language is in perfect logical order. The work of a philosopher is to analyse the propositions into elementary propositions and show what evidently lies there and not bringing an order where it is not. Wittgenstein employed a technique of truth tables to analyse the truth and falsity of propositions. His understanding was elementary propositions either fall under the tautologies or contradictions. A tautology shows a certain combination of propositions and the structure of the constituent propositions. In this whole scheme of things, there was no place for will and action, ethics, metaphysics: all that falls outside of logic. He conceived anything outside of logic as accidental.

Check your Progress 1

Note: Use the space provided for your answer

1. What are the Wittgenstein's important contributions?
2. What is picture theory?
3. What is the world-view we get out of picture theory?

LANGUAGE GAMES A FRAMEWORK FOR MEANING

The picture that emerges of the *Tractatus* is that of a static, clear cut, and a binary world. The realities which at times defy the logic or the logic of which is not yet identified become accidental to the world of our living. The picture theory accords a sidelined status with regard to their role, for they fall outside the realm of logic. Yet these are the facts which make much sense and living possible along with human constructs and perception. Therefore, the static picture of

the world through the clarification of language failed to have a holistic account. The realization from the part of Wittgenstein that his earlier philosophy failed to attempt at a holistic picture of human world, gave way of understanding philosophical problems in a new light. We find a drastic shift in his views, in the *Philosophical Investigations*. It is not an overthrowing of the *Tractatus* rather; it is in the background of *Tractatus* his *Investigations* make sense. Therefore, in the history of philosophy it is unique to Wittgenstein; he produced two different original systems at different periods of his life.

2.4. LANGUAGE GAME: A SHIFT FROM PICTURE THEORY

The important elements of picture theory in the *Tractatus* were names, elementary propositions, states of affairs, logical space etc. The purpose was to understand the logical world, the possible world which could be expressed in language. The path taken was logical analysis of propositions. In the *Investigations* the move was from the foundations of logic to the nature of the world. The shift therefore is from the limited understanding of language, language of the natural sciences to the language of wider forms of life. It is no longer one view of language rather languages within the language. Given the totality of names and the totality of elementary propositions, the language will not give the essence of language and the essence of the world. This is the very idea which presupposed that the proposition carries with it the whole of language. *Investigations* rejects this idea. A sentence / proposition does presuppose a 'language game', but a language game will be only a small segment of the whole of language. The example for such notion appears in the example of the mason and his helper. It is not the mere words, but the totality of signs and symbols within the framework of construction of building gives meaning to the language. In comparison with the higher, complex languages, this language may appear as lower. But it has its own language game in which the elements of language make sense.

Another important shift is from the limited understanding of the language to the forms of life. The *Tractatus* anticipated the newer combination of objects in the logical space. The *Tractatus* held that what is given can be arranged differently provided the new arrangement confirms to the laws of logic. *Investigations* differed from this understanding. A new language game would embody a new 'form of life' which is not merely a rearrangement of what already exists. It is a form of life because the new language game carries with it not merely words but behaviours, reactions etc.

In the third place, the *Investigations* rejects the claim of *Tractatus*, the universal form of language. There is nothing common to the various forms of language that makes them language. There is not something common to all language games just as there is something common to all the games. The commonality that which makes them the game rather it is the multitude of relationships 'overlapping and crisscrossing'. The language game therefore can be better understood in the light of the concept of family resemblance. Therefore, it is not the unity of essence which makes the world rather it is the difference which is at the root of reality.

Another important shift is from names as absolute to names as relative. The names stood for objects in the *Tractatus*, whereas *Investigations* held the view that the words, names are neither simple nor complex. The simplicity and the complexity are brought in when they are viewed against the background of a language game. Two other objections that were brought against the notion of names based on the understanding of *Tractatus*. They are, firstly, *Tractatus* equated the meaning of the name as the object it stands for; and the names are a priori for meaning.

Investigations goes further and says that the meaning of the word is never a thing and secondly, before one can find out what a name stands for one must already have mastered the language game to which the name belongs.

Investigations also considers the logical necessity of the simple objects not as absolute. Their sense is not definite in relation to the particular language games. Therefore, the language analysis need not be propositional only, rather it differs according to the language games. Therefore, precision, exactness are relative to particular language games, where in we find the actual language as imperfect based on these ideals. Therefore, the philosophical ideal and the actual language comes into conflict because the analysis doesn't lead to what is there. In this context of bewitched by the language, we are called to see what is really there. There needs to be a shift from the analysis to description. It is through description we come realize that there is no hidden structure beneath language and reality rather in description we come to see what is really there.

LANGUAGE GAMES AND MEANING

It is worth noting the central notion of Investigation i.e., meaning as use. While *Tractatus* maintained that sentence / proposition has meaning or sense because it is a picture, *Investigations* turns it upside down and says it is the 'use', employment, application that gives meaning. Therefore, it is not the analysis of the elementary proposition which made sense, rather the situation in which a word, a sentence / proposition that is used gives meaning. A significant sentence therefore is a tool with which a certain job is done. The use here is understood not as correct use of the word / sentence, but use stands for meaning. Thus, there is particular behavior and circumstances go along with the sentence in its meaning. Ultimately it is the use in the context makes meaning.

2.5. MEANING AS USE AND HERMENEUTICS

In the background from *Tractatus* to *Investigations*, some insights can be derived in understanding hermeneutics in the Language game theory. Basically, how a word, sentence or the *Tractarian* Picture is interpreted determines what use is made of it. What is deduced out of the proposition is entirely dependent on the understanding of the proposition. Therefore, the meaning being identical with use comes before use. The use is based on the understanding of the proposition. Therefore, the use presupposes the meaning known. We can thus, say that, understanding carries with it the compulsion. In this prior knowledge of meaning, comes in relation to the logical compulsion / necessity which was discussed in the *Tractatus*. Going beyond in the *Investigations*, Wittgenstein puts-in the notion of mental act between the act and the state of understanding. The mental states can be deduced from the action resulted or are known by the conclusions drawn in a particular language game. However, Wittgenstein calls them the general disease of thinking, because the newer situations are dealt in the mental act confirming to a rule. Therefore, it appears that the mental acts do confine the newer situations to particular way of rule application. *Investigation* differs here in saying that there is a difference in our understanding of a rule and application of rule in a particular way. The emergence of meaning is determined in the way a particular rule is applied and not by the deductions of mental acts. Thus, the meaning emerges not merely by the way rule is formulated in a sentence but by what we say and do in actual cases. It is the agreement that determines whether a particular action is in accordance with a rule. Therefore, it is our agreement fixes the meaning of the rules and defines their content. There is proximity between the growth of meaning and increase in the

practice. It is in this practice, the rules get their meaning. Therefore, the emergence of meaning is in actual practice and in the application of rule in particular situations. Going beyond the 'private rules' of a language, Wittgenstein asserted that such a thing is not possible because meaning arises only in the context of circumstances or situations. The notion of private language seems to be obscure because the rule applications of such language cannot be known / made known to others. Therefore, the meaning in exclusion, without forms of life is not possible. For the hermeneutical enterprise, this understanding of meaning and understanding has great impact. The hermeneutical enterprise becomes meaningful when we look at the meanings emerging from the life world.

Check your Progress II

Note: Use the space provided for your answer

1. What is language game theory?
2. What is the picture of the world derived through language game theory?
3. What is meaning as use?

2.6. THE ANALYSIS AND UNDERSTANDING OF PARADIGM

The term paradigm became famous with Thomas S. Kuhn, a philosopher of science in his '*The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*'. In his attempt to analyze the history of science, he found that science has grown in a systematic way. However, the new insights into science which brought revolutions in science were altogether different way of looking at things happened than the traditional way of looking at things. Identifying this as the basis for understanding what a paradigm is, Kuhn was able to go to the conceptual understanding of the paradigm.

Science, when it works within an established framework, a framework supported by theories and empirical data, still faces complicated questions. The answer to these questions is challenging and at times the answer can never be found in the given framework. A certain amount of arbitrariness is present in such enterprise of searching for the answers. The science at this stage is called as normal science for it is based upon certain foundations which are well established.

Paradigm is therefore, an established framework within which many unsolved problems are answered. It need not be science only, for that matter any scientific discipline. Paradigm is not a complete thing in itself, it emerges as one finds it out, as the research advances, thinking advances, and it becomes more refined. Paradigm, in this sense, gives meaning to the larger body of facts and establishes their relation within the paradigm. Secondly, it helps in prediction to the given data. Thirdly, a paradigm resolves some of the ambiguities and problems within the given paradigm. It is worth noting in the analysis of Kuhn that long gap of time elapses before the signs of new paradigm emerge. Certain notions are important to note in the Kuhnian analysis of science, which could be applied to other sciences as well.

The term paradigm has been used by Kuhn in two senses. First of all it stands for 'the entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques and so on shared by the members of a given

community'. On the other hand, paradigm denotes one sort of element in that constellation, the concrete puzzle-solutions which, employed as models or examples, can replace explicit rules as a basis for the solution of the remaining puzzles of normal science. Since, Kuhn was within the framework of normal science, he has applied this understanding of paradigm to the natural science. Kuhn emphasizes on the second understanding of paradigm as deeper for it gives a place for new framework.

The second important aspect to notice in the understanding of a paradigm is the notion of the community structure, who share a particular paradigm. It is circular in its relation to a community, because, paradigm is shared by a scientific community and scientific community consists of individuals who share a paradigm. Community here refers to the persons who hold on to / share a paradigm. Science is not freed from the community structure because science is essentially a shared enterprise. Therefore, paradigm in the philosophical sense (the second understanding) is the collection of community commitments. The proper term can be used in the Kuhnian sense is the 'disciplinary matrix'. It is disciplinary because it refers to a discipline as a common possession of the practitioners, and secondly matrix because it is composed of ordered elements of various sorts, which need further specification. This disciplinary matrix is characterized by symbolic generalizations, beliefs in particular models, values inherently held and shared, and shared examples (exemplars).

In this sense, as the new paradigm emerges, the diverse scientific communities are merged into and are reduced to a fewer groups. This is the function of foundation because it unites diversities of problems and reduces them, unites them around a central problem around which other problems are centered. The nature of paradigm is such that, it has the unique function of uniting pre-paradigm period and the new paradigm. The older problems are understood in the new light. In this light when we analyze a paradigm, a paradigm governs not the subject matter but the group of practitioners.

A few insights can be gained from the analysis of paradigm by Kuhn. They can be classified as following and can be applied to linguistic turn as a paradigm shift.

1. In an established paradigm, all problems are looked from a particular framework, which in turn determines the nature and solution to the problems.
2. The period of such status quo, the normal science, has problems with those empirical data which defy the existing paradigmatic frameworks
3. The attempt to newer solutions to the problems comes as the paradigm shift where in the older problems are understood in a new light.
4. This results in the revolution in science where in stray phenomena of established framework become the examples / models of new framework.
5. New paradigm rules the science for a period of time until the anomalies are found to be answered with a shift in the paradigm.

2.7. LANGUAGE GAME AS NEW PARADIGM

Within the school of language philosophy it is worth noting that it has progressed through different directions. From the rigorous analysis of language to the ideal conception of it, to the building of artificial languages the language philosophy has influenced. However, name of

Wittgenstein mainly for his contributions to this particular field cannot be ignored. From the point of view of static view of language, he progressed towards the dynamic view of language. In his hands the language analysis has become a novelty and in fact a paradigm. It is paradigm because it has shifted the issue of static view to the dynamic view of language. The focus on the 'forms of life' throws light on the variety of language rules. The notions of logical space and logic-rule-governed determinate language is understood in different light. There is no single rule governing language rather; each 'form of life' has its own logic which determines the type of language. Therefore, the language is never a fixed static thing, rather it acquires meaning and structure as it emerges from the life world.

This is a new paradigm shift because the philosophical problems had been understood as absolute in all realms. They are problems within the form of life of philosophy. Hence, the answers to these problems need to be found within the framework of philosophical discussions. This understanding also presupposes a paradigmatic shift in the Investigations with regard to the notion of family resemblance. A problem in one form-of-life may have similarity in other forms-of-life. This is a grand insight because, though language as a language game, rule governed is not an isolated entity rather, it shares some similarities with other life –worlds, forms-of-life. The rules of one form of life govern one particular type of language at the same time that is not absolute to other forms of life, rather, it has similarities and dissimilarities in its logic in relation to other languages.

2.8. EPISTEMOLOGICAL ISSUES

Looking at language from a paradigm shift of 'language game', certain problems surface in the epistemological realm. The problems can be categorized as realistic problems, logical problems and epistemological problems etc. In the epistemological realm, in the first place, how does a language incorporates the structure of realistic framework? Basing on the empirical content of the sense data, what logic of language connects it to the reference of all that is outside our mental realm. What is the logical structure of those forms of language which refer to the empirical content, a realistic picture of the world.

In the second place the question is concerned about the languages which are based on the logic of idealism. What actually is the logical structure of those languages which have a structure of idealistic form-of-life. The form of life concerned with imaginations, ideal states, etc. too need to have a structure within the given form of life. In relation to the understanding of family resemblance, how do these different languages resemble each other? The sharing between different forms-of-life, how does it take place? Is the rule governing of language is our reading into a particular language or it is inbuilt into it? These are the questions which need to be tackled in the epistemological aspect of language game theory of Wittgenstein.

As epistemology is concerned with knowledge, can we stratify the contents of our knowledge according to different language games, then which is that language which unifies all different forms-of-life, and what is its rule as a game?

Check your Progress III

Note: Use the space provided for your answer

What is a paradigm?

How language game is a paradigm?

What are some of the epistemological problems of language-game paradigm?

2.9. LET US SUM UP

Language game theory unfolds the creative genius of Wittgenstein. In fact it became a paradigm because many contemporary schools of philosophy found a basis of synthesis in this view of language where in they could go deeper into plurality and meaning within the contexts. Deeper analysis of philosophical problems within the given realm took place. The philosophical problems were understood in new light. Creatively, the clarification of language as its structure was exposed to rigorous analysis in finding out the rule governedness, led to the better understanding of natural language. The enterprise of artificial language construction owes deeply to the language game theory. The epistemological realm has its gratefulness to language theory for it shed new light on perception, language and linguistic structure.

2.10. KEY WORDS

Picture Theory: Picture theory is the earlier position of Wittgenstein. According to this theory, the ontological structure of the world which is logical has its parallel in the structure of the language. The names being basic constituents of the propositions which are either true or false as expressed in the logic of language have a correspondence to the structure of the world. That which can be logically represented in the language is a possible state of affairs in the world. The logical necessity of propositions determines the states of affairs in the world.

Language Game: Language game theory is expressed in the *Investigations*. The language game theory moves from the foundations of logic to the nature of the world. The shift therefore is from the limited understanding of language, language of the natural sciences to the language of wider forms of life. It is no longer one view of language rather languages within the language. A sentence / proposition does presuppose a 'language game', but a language game will be only a small segment of the whole of language. It is the use, employment of particular word in the given language game gives rise to meaning. The language game theory therefore, is the understanding that the language is determined by rules which are particular to the form-of-life.

Paradigm: It has been used by Kuhn in two senses. First of all it stands for 'the entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques and so on shared by the members of a given community'. On the other hand, paradigm denotes one sort of element in that constellation, the concrete puzzle-solutions which, employed as models or examples, can replace explicit rules as a basis for the solution of the remaining puzzles of normal science.

2.11. FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Fann, K T. *Wittgenstein's Conception of Philosophy*. California: University of California Press, 1969.

Finch, Henry LeRoy. *Wittgenstein - The Early Philosophy: An Exposition of "Tractatus."* New York: Humanities Press, 1971.

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, The University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Pitcher, George. *The Philosophy of Wittgenstein*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India Private Ltd., 1964.

Stern, David G. *Wittgenstein on Mind and Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961.

UNIT 3 THE LINGUISTIC TURN AND EPISTEMIC JUSTIFICATION

Contents

- 3.0. Objectives
- 3.1. Introduction
- 3.2. Major Factors of Linguistic Turn
- 3.3. Historical Survey/ Important Contributions
- 3.4. Reconstruction of Metaphysics
- 3.5. Two Schools
- 3.6. Impact on Philosophy / Epistemology
- 3.7. Epistemic Justification
- 3.8. Linguistic Turn and Epistemic Justification
- 3.9. Let us sum up
- 3.10. Key words
- 3.11. Further readings and references
- 3.12. Answers to check your progress

3.0. OBJECTIVES

The aim of this unit is to familiarize the student with the trends in the language philosophy, specially after the great linguistic turn, which shifted the focus of philosophy to the language. The unit also familiarizes the student with the epistemological justification with regard to the propositions which is the main contribution to the understanding which comes as a unique contribution after the linguistic turn.

3.1. INTRODUCTION

In the philosophical attempt to understand the world, man and the transcendent, there are various attempts to answer the fundamental questions. The history of philosophy shows the evidence that there are shifts in understanding the reality from various perspectives. It was from speculation through reason, to analysis of knowledge that the philosophy has grown into. On the way, it has accommodated various insights from various sciences in its attempt to understand the world. However, one of the drastic shifts in understanding the reality is through the focus on language. It can be traced to the long history but evidently, it became prominent during the 19th and 20th centuries. This major shift we are going to discuss is the linguistic turn in understanding the reality.

Every philosophy, metaphysics has its own epistemological outlook and a world view. It is based on this the philosophical body of knowledge has grown. The laying bare of the presuppositions behind a particular philosophical way of looking makes philosophical problems clear and helps in searching for the better answers. In this process the older answers seem to be opinions and newer answers are sought to replace the opinions. One of the shifts in finding a new answer to the ever new problems of philosophy is recourse to the language in which any philosophical problems are formulated. Therefore, the linguistic turn in philosophy refers to the analysis of language as the potential for providing answers to the philosophical problems. Generally, this turn has parted into two different ways in answering philosophical problems. One of the ways is the ideal language philosophy and the other as the ordinary language philosophy.

3.2. MAJOR FACTORS OF LINGUISTIC TURN

The linguistic turn in philosophy aims at arriving at truth through the analysis of language. Initially, the language philosophy school was anti-metaphysical in its outlook. It is influenced by the Logical Positivism of the Vienna Circle and their scientific bent on verification. Another important presupposition in linguistic philosophy is the shift of discussion from reality to that which describes the reality, namely the language. Language philosophy assumes that the language reflects the reality. Hence, the language is the efficient tool to know, to understand the reality through its description and through the analysis of its logical syntax. Hence, the linguistic turn aims at describing the world by describing a suitable language. Language is a method according to this school of philosophy.

3.3. HISTORICAL SURVEY/ IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTIONS

Linguistic turn in philosophy did not occur within one day. It was a longer reflection and growth in fields such as phenomenology, existentialism, logic etc. gave rise to linguistic turn. The growth of science and the scientific world view in some way helped in developing a turn towards language analysis. While science claimed that it claimed particular truths, philosophy was trying to give the most general truths about the world and reality, a universal picture of the world, a general world view, a synopsis wherein all other truths could be held together. However, previously the philosophers who were arriving at this kind of truth were distinct from each other and hence there was not one view of the world but several. How to account for such variety and multiplicity of views where in there are contradicting views from one another? In the history of the development of ideas, the linguistic turn is a profound one. However, two major trends have contributed in arriving at this turn. They can be categorized as development from Frege and Meinong who were belonging to the philosophical traditions in Germany and the other is from the English speaking traditions specially of Moore and Russell and Wittgenstein.

The contributions of the philosophers from the German speaking philosophers specially of Frege are important here. First of all, Frege held that the notion that the structure of a thought must be reflected in the structure of sentence expressing it and not mere encoding it. It meant that without reference to the linguistic expression, thought structure cannot be studied because every thought is mediated by language. Therefore, the understanding came about as the thought is grasped in grasping the semantic properties of the sentence: to speak of the structure of the thought is to speak of the semantic interrelation of the parts of the sentence. Secondly, the notion of sense and reference played a significant role in determining the truth value of a sentence and the thought. Thirdly, Frege held that an expression simply has a sense which is objective and therefore human beings have access to thoughts only as expressed in language or symbolism. At one strand of philosophy of language, these thoughts of Frege contribute to the linguistic turn.

At the other side, the Moorean emphasis on the common sense, Russell's search of logical atoms and Wittgenstein's emphasis on language game gave altogether twisted the philosophical direction and the philosophical questions. It is from here the emphasis falls on the language. The language philosophy turns to the analysis of language as the philosophical truth is expressed in language. The analysis of language here is the arriving at the meaning of the expression, the sense of it. Therefore, linguistic turn essentially presupposes a secondary reflection on language in which the world is expressed either truly or falsely. The expression therefore can represent the world through propositions which are either true or false.

In this sense, language philosophy looks at philosophy as an activity of finding meaning. Through analysis, when the meanings are found, the problems of philosophy are dissolved. When a problem is understood it no longer remains a problem. Hence, the explication of the philosophical problem through language will lead to the disappearance misunderstandings which we usually call philosophical problems. Secondly, some problems will reappear as the problems of ordinary science and not philosophical ones.

Analytics being one of the chief methods of philosophical enquiry we find that the history of the development of language analysis can be understood in four different phases. They are: Traditional analysis, analysis which leads to the construction of artificial languages, later Wittgensteinian analysis and Analysis of the Oxford school of language philosophers. Some of the important contributors to the linguistic turn and the philosophers of this school: Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, G. E. Moore, Bertrand Russell, Rudolf Carnap, Gilbert Ryle, Gustav Bergmann, Norman Malcolm, Max Black, WVO Quine, Wittgenstein, Peter Geach, Donald Davidson, P F Strawson etc.

Check your progress I

Use the space provided for your answer

What is linguistic turn?

What are the main streams which helped in development of the linguistic turn?

Name a few contributors of the linguistic philosophy?

3.4. RECONSTRUCTION OF METAPHYSICS

One important point to note here is that mutual sharing has taken place between language schools of philosophy and the logical positivist school. At some points they agree and take inspiration from one another. However, there are essential differences. Language as such has been studied by philologists, aestheticians, psychologists, sociologists etc. but the type of study undertaken by the language school is unique because it tried to bring together the insights as general truths under the banner of the analysis of language. Certain presuppositions of the language school are necessary to understand the metaphysics they construct. The language school of philosophy considers that philosophical problems are not pseudo-problems but cannot be polarized into either phenomenology alone or formalism only. These problems are essentially linguistic. Secondly, the philosophical propositions are used, in the first place in the ordinary sense and secondly in their complexity in the technical sense. Therefore, in one sense, it uses common sense of the language and the other the complex ideal sense, with fixed meanings. Thirdly, language philosophy assumes that grammatical form may mislead in understanding the philosophical problems and therefore, technical symbolization can be used in the form of ideal language. Fourthly, language philosophy considers the syntax of language specially of ideal / formal language as the object of analysis which will lead to the proper meaning of expressions. (Syntax here deals with some properties of the signs and of the patterns in which these signs are arranged). Here, the syntax stands underneath the expressions and words of natural language. The elements of syntax language (can be called signs) need interpretations and they are defined in order to be arranged. Hence, the defining of the signs in the syntactic language in turn defines the undefined signs of the same language. When the words and expressions stand for such signs they give rise to meaning.

On these notions we can understand how the language school reconstructs the metaphysics. First of all, the differences of views on philosophical problems are no longer are considered incompatible but are considered to have a commonsense core. This solves the problem of understanding the reality as diverse, unified etc. by the analysis of language. The second reconstruction is regarding the notion of truth. The language school analyses the certainty, synthetic and analytic truths. The notion of certainty can be applied to the synthetic truths wherein the certainty becomes absolute regarding the objects in the world, with regard to its content. However, the notion of certainty with regard to analytic truths may not give any certainty about the contents of the world. It only works within the framework of logical language. Understanding these independently of each other blurs the understanding of certainty.

Abstract entities like relations, properties, classes, numbers, propositions etc. are problematic issues in the language when they are looked from the empirical point of view. However, language philosophy discusses them within the linguistic framework by dividing them into two categories such as internal questions within the framework and entities as whole as external questions. Based upon the language framework such as logical framework and factual framework, the questions of these abstract entities can be dealt with. Factual framework depends much on the empirical standpoint while the former stands for the logical analysis of a language. The reality of the internal questions stands out as empirical reality, having a framework of 'thing-language'. While the external question are answered from different points of view such as realism, idealism etc. because they are raised from the point of view of theoretical framework.

3.5. TWO SCHOOLS:

Ordinary Language Philosophy Of G. E. Moore

G. E. Moore is the chief proponent of ordinary language philosophy. Moore's philosophy bases itself on the commonsense view and ordinary language. Common sense view of the world and the ordinary language are closely connected in the ordinary language philosophy of Moore. The epistemology based on the empiricism is hall mark of ordinary language philosophy. Therefore, empirical statements do have a certainty of themselves. Moorean concept of certainty, knowledge and language emerge from his understanding of the sense-data theory. Idealism had emphasised on the role of mind to such a great extent that, what mind perceives, namely the

material object / reality, was reduced to mental phenomena, a thought or idea. Moore held that in any case it is through sensation and perception that we form the ideas in our minds; it is not our ideas which form the objects. Thus, there exists some sort of reality outside, beyond our mind. This reality is the content of our experience. It is through the senses that we know the material objects, and on this all other means of knowledge are based. Thus, in our experience of objects we apprehend something which is there and not an idea. This content of our experience is known as sense-data.

Moore succeeds in establishing the existence of material objects. However, he encounters the problem, that “in our direct apprehension, we directly apprehend certain sense-data and at the same time something other than sense data.” This something ‘other than sense data’ is known through the propositions, which are new class of facts in the universe. Moore classifies material entities into two. His classification is based on the knowledge of the material entities. Knowledge of material entities is derived through the propositions. What he means by proposition is, ‘a proposition is the sort of thing which is commonly expressed by a whole sentence.’

For Moore, proposition doesn’t mean collection of words, rather a sort of thing which these collections of words express, ... ‘mean’. Analysing the example of twice two are four and twice four are eight, in both cases, what is apprehended (Four, eight) or the ‘meaning’ is proposition. Moore concludes that a proposition has an act of apprehension and what is apprehended is proposition. The notion of logical certainty doesn’t apply to the empirical statements. According to this school, the falsity comes to surface when expressions contradict the empirical facts or when wrong language is used to describe the empirical facts. However, an ordinary expression is an expression which would be used to describe non-contradictory situation, a certain sort of situation. At the same time an ordinary expression also can construct a contradictory situation.

Ideal Language Philosophy Of Bertrand Russell

Focus being different to different thinkers in this school, ideal language assumes that the properties of language may help in understanding the structure of the world. The linguistic approach to metaphysics being an enquiry, it understands the relation between the language and world. Each of the facts of which the world is composed has a certain ontological structure. In order for a given sentence to assert a particular fact, the sentence must have a logical structure which has something in common with the ontological structure of the fact. Hence, on the not unreasonable presumption that sentences are easier to investigate than the facts they assert, the royal road to metaphysical knowledge consists of investigating the structures of the sentences. For a study of grammar will yield us knowledge of that part of the ontological structure of the world, which is common to facts, on the one hand, and sentences asserting those facts, on the other. However, natural language and its grammar have many accidental features and it can assert by several sentences and in diverse structures. Therefore, the natural language leads to ambiguity of perplexity in its expression, and hence, to gain metaphysical knowledge through investigating language one must first construct an ‘ideal’ or ‘logically perfect’ language to investigate. Logical syntax is the requirement of the ideal language in order to represent the world. In some sense, therefore, we can say that an imperfect language will have a misleading structure which will render unsound any inferences drawn from its structure to the structure of the world.

Russell’s theory of descriptions and his search for the ultimate constituents of the world need a mention here. The theory of descriptions ascribes a shadowy mode of participation and existence of the abstract and imaginative entities. Not adhering to any disputable epistemology, this theory of descriptions stands as a method of logical translation. In some sense it can be interpreted as a contribution to the reform of common syntax, improvement of the vocabulary of ordinary language is provided through theory of descriptions rather than a doctrine of logical construction theory of language.

The relationship between the logical constructions of language (ideal) and the non-logicality of the material words are based on the epistemological principle of the reducibility of knowledge to acquaintance. Therefore, the sentences of natural language are already a translation when it consists entirely of ‘logically proper names’ for they are the ultimate constituents of the world. The sentences therefore are in some sense are pictorial sentences. The logically proper names, the ultimate constituents of the world are those with which we can be acquainted. Though this view has its own defects, the theory of descriptions through the recognition of ultimate constituents of the world (sense-data) with which we are acquainted sheds its light on ideal language in which the defects of the ordinary language are removed. The ideal language therefore is a construction which removes the defects of the ordinary language using the symbols which are logically proper names denoting objects of acquaintance.

(The contributions of Wittgenstein cannot be ignored here. He has been dealt in the previous unit we don't have a detailed discussion here.)

Check Your Progress II

Use the space provided for your answer

What is the metaphysics of linguistic philosophy?

Which are the two schools of linguistic analysis?

Mention Russell's' contributions.

3.6. IMPACT ON PHILOSOPHY / EPISTEMOLOGY

The linguistic turn through its analysis has brought out some solution to the metaphysical problems, epistemological problems, and also has blurred some other problems too. In the first place, the impact can be noticed that the ordinary language is taken seriously to find out do our scientific, philosophical problems stated in them are really the problems of language or the problems of reality. Secondly, the language is understood not merely as a grammatical construct rather having a logical structure. Language therefore falls under the domain of logic. The epistemological plane too has been influenced by the linguistic turn. The epistemology of linguistic school has its basis on two fundamental views of empiricism and idealism. While the ordinary language philosophy has the foundation of empiricism, the later developments from Russell to Wittgenstein have their foundations in idealism to a very great extent. It is the later school which became prominent in its analysis of language strongly being influenced by the logical positivism of Vienna Circle. The usually considered ontology and the picture of reality is perceived through the linguistic lenses after the linguistic turn. The language itself is considered as a category and has commonality with the structure of the world. And therefore, there is a direct relationship with the world and language. The inner structure of language through the notion of proposition gets more attention as the propositional structure can be analysed through the logical tools and symbols, forming an ideal language.

3.7. EPISTEMIC JUSTIFICATION

Epistemology in the recent times has shifted its focus from discussing the traditional questions of knowledge to the deeper areas of perception in relation to beliefs. Epistemology is the study of knowledge and the justification of belief. It tries to answer the questions such as 'which beliefs are justified and which are not? What is the difference between knowing and having a true belief? What is the relation between seeing and knowing?' etc. In this regard positions are taken as realism, idealism and others towards knowledge and the stands points of different schools pose further problems in the field of epistemology.

Knowledge And Its Relation To Justified True Belief

Knowledge arises in experience, reflection, and develops through inference. It has a distinctive structure and content. Knowledge can be knowledge of the objects which are external to us. Much of the sense-data theories and realistic theories deal with this view of epistemology. However, the knowledge is not merely of the external objects. Knowledge also can be of different kinds. It also includes the mental states, imaginations, mathematics etc. The content of knowledge becomes beliefs, propositions, which are believed to be true. Such knowledge certainly depends on the perception but is beyond perception like knowledge through memory, reflection on abstract matters etc. Therefore, the justification of belief as content of the knowledge is must. It needs some footing to hold it to be true. In this sense, a justified true belief needs to be grounded on some source which is considered as true. It usually finds itself grounded on causal, justificational and epistemic grounds. A belief is grounded on causal ground because

an experience underlies the belief, it is grounded on justification because some elements of our beliefs are related to such experience and epistemically justified because the knowledge constitutes the belief we hold in virtue of our experience.

What Is Justification?

Not all knowledge is justified true belief but all knowledge is at least justified true belief. The natural knowledge which strongly has its foundation on the sense experience doesn't need to be justified by any other kind. However, the propositional knowledge does need justification. The knowledge about the world, in its relation to truth has its basis in the world. However, the justification is related to the process inside the mind. Therefore, that which is not visible, the propositional knowledge needs to be justified for the sake of communication of knowledge.

Justification is essentially connected with the truth. Whether it is a propositional belief or empirical belief, both are connected with truth. Knowledge arises from the same sources as justification: the internal states and processes that justify our beliefs also connect our beliefs with external facts in virtue of which those beliefs are true.

The relationship between the knowledge and belief is closely connected. When the belief is not based on direct knowledge and is dependent upon indirect knowledge, the foundation of such belief needs to be closely looked into. In the long epistemic chain, the belief that constitutes knowledge might have been derived from some knowledge. In this sense, the epistemic chain may lead to infinite regress without anchoring anywhere giving any strong foundation for knowledge or it might turn out to be circular. Sometimes such epistemic chain might end in no knowledge while at times it may end with a belief that constitutes the direct knowledge.

In this connection, the epistemic justification is concerned about reaching to the direct knowledge which justifies the belief without being circular. It reaches to one of the direct or non-inferential source of knowledge like perception, memory, introspection or reason. When we say reason, it can be valid inferences. The last resort where the directly justified belief appears, that belief can be called as the foundational belief from which there is no further regress.

Theories Of Epistemic Justification

Epistemic justification is a normative notion. It is regarding the belief which leads to knowledge. The norms which govern the beliefs: rules describing the circumstances under which it is epistemically permissible to hold beliefs are called epistemic norms. Epistemic condition is necessary condition for knowledge. In other words, epistemic justification in some way hits at the foundations of knowledge or source of knowledge. In this regard, epistemic theories can be categorized as, 1. Doxastic theories which include foundation theories and coherence theories and 2. Non-doxastic theories which include internalism and externalism, which also have its subcategories like reliabilism and probabilism.

3.8. LINGUISTIC TURN AND EPISTEMIC JUSTIFICATION

At this juncture, we can deduce and bring in the unique contribution upon which the language philosophy was built; namely the proposition. It is worth noting, how do we justify the proposition, which is according to the language philosophy is the irreducible thing. Views may differ here based on the schools of thought; however, it is worth noting that all the schools are unanimous on propositions. Going a step further we can say that, the proposition too is the possible object of belief. In this sense, the justification of proposition will lead to the understanding that epistemic justification of proposition will yield to the clarity of the knowledge of the world. According to the language philosophy, the language depicts the structure of the world through the propositions. Hence, if the propositions are epistemically justified then the belief which leads to knowledge is justified.

The Problematic

Epistemic justification of propositions leads us to the basic issue of any justification namely, how the components of the proposition are justified. Names in Wittgensteinian analysis, logical atoms in Russell, and sense-data in Moore are the objects which are the fundamental components of any proposition. In this regard, how do we justify them? Epistemically it goes directly to perception as a source of knowledge. However, perception has its own limitation and has its basis in empiricism, which has its own inbuilt drawbacks. Therefore, it is worth noting the difficulty in justifying the propositions which have been the bedrock of linguistic philosophy.

This also throws light on the epistemology they hold, namely, logical empiricism, idealism etc., for which the justification often turns out to be circular.

Check your Progress III

Use the space provided for your answer

What is epistemic justification?

Why epistemic justification is important in the language philosophy?

What is the problematic of language philosophy?

3.9. LET US SUM UP

Epistemic justification of propositions will help us to determine the aspect of philosophical truth present in the linguistic analysis. The claims after the linguistic turn through the language philosophy will enable us to understand them in their relation to epistemology. We can ascertain their validity and the claim of knowing the world better can be critically looked at.

3.10. KEY WORDS

Epistemic justification: It is concerned about reaching to the direct knowledge which justifies the belief without being circular. It reaches to one of the direct or non-inferential source of knowledge like perception, memory, introspection or reason.

linguistic turn: In the history of the development of ideas, the linguistic turn is a profound one. However, two major trends have contributed in arriving at this turn. They can be categorized as development from Frege and Meiningong who were belonging to the philosophical traditions in Germany and the other is from the English speaking traditions specially of Moore and Russell and Wittgenstein.

3.11. FURTHER READING AND REFERENCES

Dummett, Michael. *Origins of Analytic Philosophy*. Harvard University Press, 1996.

Audi, Robert. *Epistemology*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Rorty, Richard, Ed. *The Linguistic Turn*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Pollock, John, L. *Contemporary theories of Knowledge*. London: Century Hutchinson Ltd., 1986.

Moore, George Edward *Philosophical Papers*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1959.

Moore, George Edward *Philosophical Studies*, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1922.

Moore, George Edward. *Some Main Problems of Philosophy*, London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1953.

Russell, Bertrand. *The Problems of Philosophy*. London: Oxford University Press, 1912.

Russell, Bertrand. *An Inquiry Into Meaning and Truth*. England: Penguin Books, 1973.

Russell, Bertrand. *Logic and Knowledge: Essays 1901-1950*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1956.

Russell, Bertrand. *Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1948.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961.

UNIT 4 INDIAN HERMENEUTICS

Contents

- 4.0. Objectives
- 4.1. Introduction
- 4.2. Vedic Interpretation
- 4.3. Indian theories of Meaning
- 4.4. Analysis of Rhetoric Language
- 4.5. Hermeneutics in Heterodox Schools
- 4.6. Hermeneutics in Orthodox schools
- 4.7. Let us sum up
- 4.8. Key words
- 4.9. Further readings and references

4.0. OBJECTIVES

The objective of this unit is to familiarize the student regarding the hermeneutical growth in the Indian tradition. It is not a detailed exposition, however, the student is required to familiarize with the various schools of Indian thought who adapt different ways of interpreting their philosophies and world views. The student is required to have general framework of Indian philosophy that the notions presented become familiar to him.

4.1. INTRODUCTION

The diversity of Indian continent is not only limited to languages, religions, cultures but also to the philosophies too. Diversity in philosophic heritage can be attributed to the creative interpretations and re-interpretations of the classical Indian texts. A basic understanding of the various philosophical schools, both heterodox and orthodox, the literary genre of each tradition, religious outlook and spirit of Indian culture as a whole with its complexity will enable us to have some glimpse of the depth of Indian understanding of interpretation. An important point to note is that, there is an exchange of the wealth of knowledge between different schools, the basis of which is found in the use of different grammatical tools, rules of interpretation, made use by different authors to expose their own philosophical views. Therefore, the Vedangas which are the ancillary sciences which help for Vedic interpretations do play an important role in the hermeneutic trend in India. Starting from the Vedas, we can trace the hermeneutic development during different periods. They can be classified as, Vedic Period, Epic / Purana Period, Sutra period.

4.2. VEDIC INTERPRETATION

Vedas are at the basis of the Vedic culture which has its own tradition. Along the way, the Rg, Yajur, Sama and Atharva Vedas had influence on overall culture and society of India. Containing the divine revelation and are called *Apaurusheya*, they have been the chief texts of interpretation. Reaching its climax, the Vedic period, had developed a system of ritualism, acute sensitiveness for language and grammar, resulting in a very complex world-view. Since the Vedic texts contained in them the fundamental questions and orientation of human life, they have been interpreted differently based on different approaches to life. This had led to the emergence of *Darshanas*, specially *Astika* systems, who owe their allegiance to the Vedic authority.

After the Vedic period, we find the Epic period, where two important epics were compiled; Ramayana and Mahabharata. They are alive till today as they have been reassessed and reviewed to the changing contexts. At the end of this period we find the compilations in the form of *Sutras* / Aphorisms. It is through the *Sutras* all the traditional knowledge has been handed down till the present day. Hence, there arose a methodology which interpreted the *Sutras*. For the *Sutras* literally meant thread, yarn or string, that runs through and holds together different ideas and links up diverse interpretations within one tradition. They are the cues, the seminal ideas, often expressed in concise and cryptic ways. *Sutras* thus are characterized by,

- a. framed as to contain the least number of letters,
- b. to be constructed in such a way as to avoid ambiguity and doubt,
- c. are impregnated with the meanings,

- d. have widest applications,
- e. are free from all defects and are reasonable at the same time.

Sutras needed deeper explanations, which gradually led to the development of *Vedangas*. They helped in the Vedic interpretation. They are, *Nirukta* (etymology), *Vyakarana* (grammar), *Siksha* (phonetics), *Chandas* (metrical science), *Jyotisa* (astronomy) and *Kalpa* (science / art of rituals). The commentaries which were developed using these Vedangas are known as *Bhasyas*. *Bhasyas* are commentaries on *Sutras*. However, the further commentaries were developed on the *Bhasyas* too. They are known as *Vartika*, followed by *Vyakhyanas*, *Tikas* and *Vrtti* or *Tippani*, which can be considered as short notes. For a beginner to enter into any school of thought there are manuals which are known as *prakarana grantha*.

Schools Of Vedic Interpretation

Over the centuries the Vedas have been interpreted differently by different schools that focused on one aspect of Vedas. Some of the traditional schools of Vedic interpretation are:

1. Yajnika School / Ritualistic interpretation. The chief propounder of this school is Sayanacharya.
2. Aitihasikas / Historical interpretation. This school looks at the Vedic texts as historical happenings.
3. Vaiyakaranas / Grammarians. This school interprets Vedic text as authoritative texts for Grammar.
4. Nirukta / Etymology school. This school is propounded by Yaska, which uses root meanings to find the meaning of Vedic texts.
5. Parivrajakas / Mystical interpretation. This school interprets Vedas as mystical expressions.

Some of the traditional Indian interpreters are Sayanacharya, Skandaswamy, Bhattabhaskara, Mahidhara, Madhva, and in the modern times Dayananda Saraswati, R.M.Roy, Bala Gangadhar Tilak, Radhakrishnan, Aurobindo, Coomaraswamy etc. Even Western scholars have contributed immensely to the interpretation of Vedas. They are Roth, H.H. Wilson, Max Muller, R.T.H. Griffith, Maurice Bloomfield, Able Bergaigne, Raymundo Pannikar etc.

Principles Of Vedic Interpretation

Vedic interpretation requires the resourcefulness of the interpreter because the Vedic Sanskrit is different than the classical Sanskrit. An awareness of metaphors, similes, world view, mythology, knowledge of rituals is needed to interpret vedas. The knowledge of Metre, Padapatha and Samhitapatha too is needed to interpret Vedas.

The focus on Articulation / Sikska (accent, time factor and nasalisation of sounds) needed to be taken into consideration. The etymologies in Vedas have their own rules to derive the meanings. They are such as, regular words should be derived in a regular way, comparison can be made use and through meaning-considerations etymologies can be derived. The knowledge of various phonetic phenomena such as metathesis, syncope, haplology, and anaptyxis too is needed for Vedic interpretation.

4.3. INDIAN THEORIES OF MEANING

Language is not merely what is articulated, rather it has an inner nature which is the word-essence, known as the *Sabda-Brahman*, which is beginningless and endless. This *Sabda-Brahman* is conscious in all living beings through vibration in two ways: *Nama* (Name) and *Rupa* (form). In this regard the *Vak* / speech is understood at four levels in relation to the understanding of the centers of energy. The four levels are,

1. *Para vak* (Transcendent speech) at the *Muladhara Cakra*
2. *Pasyanti Vak* (Subtle speech) at the *Svadhista Cakra*
3. *Madhyama Vak* (Inner Speech) at the *Anahata Cakra*
4. *Vaikhari Vak* (Manifest Speech) at the *Visuddha Cakra*

Sphota Theory

Sphota theory is propounded mainly by the Grammarians (*Vyakarana Darsana*). The origin of this theory is attributed to Spotayana Rsi by different authors. The word *Sphota* etymologically derived from the root *Sphut* which means to open, to unfurl, to develop. The same *Vyakarana Darsana* describes *Sphota* as the eternal word-symbol which is different from letters, manifested by letters, and indicative of meaning. The *Sphota* is different from *Dhvani* (sound). Bhartrhari, Nagesa Bhatta and Vedantins etc. have discussed on *Sphota* elaborately. *Sphota* theory holds detailed analysis of letter, word and sentence.

Basic Unit Of Language: Analysis Of Letter, Word And Sentence

There are different views on the basic unit of language. While Mimamsakas hold that it is the letter (*varna*), Naiyayikas hold it as word (*pada*), Vaiyakaranas hold it as sentence (*Vakya*).

Mimamsakas hold that the letters are the ultimate units of language. It is the combination of letters that constitutes a word and it is a combination of words that constitutes a sentence. Word or sentences have no independent entity apart from letters. They hold that individual letters are partless and indivisible; there is no potency of generating *Sphota* without letters. It is the letters who bear the meaning. Kumarila Bhatta expanded this view.

The Naiyayikas hold view that it is the word which is the real unit of language. They refute Varnavadins arguing that letters taken separately do not convey any meaning and all combination of letters are not meaningful. The potency of generating a sense lies in the terms as like when a word is made of some root, affix, case etc. The denotative capacity lies in the words alone.

The Vaiyakaranas hold that the real unit of language is a sentence. This view has been expounded chiefly by Bhartrhari in his *Vakyapadiyam*. The sentence is the fundamental unit of language because dividing it into letters and words is only an artificial approach for as a judgment, sentence is one integral whole which is really indivisible.

Analysis Of Word: Conditions For Words

In a wider sense *Sabda* is understood as sound (*Dhvani*) which is perceived by the auditory sense organ, in a restricted sense it is understood as a spoken word signifying something, and still more refined sense refers to testimony. Words are divided further into two types, *Varnatmaka* (articulate; further divided into *Sarthaka* or meaningful and *Nirarthaka* or meaningless) and *Dhvanyatmaka* (inarticulate). A word is that which is capable of meaning. The potency of a word to denote something is called *vr̥tti* i.e., the relation between word and meaning which gives rise to verbal cognition. This potency of a word is of two kinds namely, *Sakti* (abhidha) and *Laksana*. The *Rasa* schools add another kind namely *Vyanjana* as *vr̥tti*.

With regard to the meaning of the word and reference, it is generally held that word refers to *Vyakti*, *akṛti*, and *Jati*, with the grammatical nuances. With regard to the derivation of the meaning of words, four kinds of *Saktis* are recognised. Classification of word is done based on this *Sakti*.

Analysis Of A Sentence A sentence is a combination of words with a mutual relation among the concepts. Therefore, any collection of words doesn't become a sentence. There are certain conditions which have to be fulfilled in order that it becomes a meaningful sentence. These conditions are

1. *Akanksa* (Expectancy): a word by itself may not convey the full meaning in a sentence. It needs other words in-order to convey the meaning. This mutual expectancy of one word to another is known as *akanksa*.
2. *Asatti* or *Sannidhi* (justaposition): the meaning of words in a sentence can be understood only if they are co-uttered (*sahoccarita*). The co-utterance of words is known by the name of *asatti* or *sannidhi*.
3. *Yogyata* (fitness / concord of words): the words in a sentence should be mutually compatible. They should be fit enough to be combined together.
4. *Tatparya* (intention of the speaker): the knowledge of the speakers' intention becomes more particularly necessary in the case of an equivocal expression and can be determinant with the help of various factors which determine the meaning of the words.

In the Indian hermeneutical tradition it is also discussed as how does the different words put together give rise to meaning. There is a synthesis of concepts. To answer this as how does the synthesis takes place, two theories have been put forward and are discussed in the wider circles. They are :

Abhitanvaya Theory

This theory is propounded by the Mimamsa School, Kumarilla Bhatta, Bhatta School. According to this theory, all words convey their meaning separately. The different words become related together by a synthetic construction (*samsarga maryada*). This takes place in accordance with the *akanksa*, *asatti*, *yogyata*, and *tatparya*. Thus meaning of the sentence arises from a synthesis (*anvaya*) of the words. Meaning is the concatenation of the individual items expressed by words. The individual words have in themselves meanings which can be comprehended separately. On hearing a sentence, we have first an understanding of the separate meanings of the words one after the other; then we put together these meanings according to the *akanksa*, *yogyata*, and *sannidhi*, and we arrive at the meaning of the sentence. Unlike the words, the sentence does not have its own independent meaning. Based on the psychological analysis of the process of learning a language, the meaning of a word is learnt by observing the use of words in actual contexts of situations. The meaning is recollected in similar situations. This view was held by Prabhakara and

Cidananda. But some others like, Parthasarathimisra, hold that the meaning of a word is conveyed by the primary significative potency of the word. The meaning is conveyed directly and not by reminder of former experiences.

Anvitabhidhana Theory

According to the *Anvitabhidanavada*, propounded by Prabhakara (Guru School), words in a sentence are synthesis of concepts. According to this theory, the words expressed are already related together and they collectively generate the meaning in an automatic way. It is not the case that the words are said first and the synthesis is made later on. Words are real and actual constituents of language and have definite meaning of their own, but the purpose of the words is to serve as part of the sentence. Unrelated words are only abstraction. Thus, both the individual word-meanings and their mutual relation are conveyed by the words themselves. The *anvitabhidhana* theory of sentence states that the sentence has a unitary meaning of its own; the constituent words possess meaning only as they are related to this unitary sentence meaning. In the language learning of the children, the Guru School holds that a sentence and behaviour produced out of it makes the children to learn the meanings of the sentences and act accordingly. Different schools of philosophy have responded differently to the question of the meaning of a sentence, largely depending on the metaphysical outlook they had and the aim they wanted to achieve against the rival schools. This theory of sentence meaning has been strongly criticized by the Bhatta School. Later on the views on both these theories are synthesized by Mukulabhatta into a combination called theory of *Samuccaya* for both these theories contain only the partial truth.

Check your Progress I

Note: Use the space provided for your answer

What are the principles of Vedic interpretation?

What are the conditions of a sentence?

What is *Anvitabhidhana* Theory?

4.4. ANALYSIS OF RHETORIC LANGUAGE

Rhetoricians identify threefold *vr̥ttis* in words. They are *Abhidha* (Primary potency of a word), *Laksana* (Secondary potency), and *Vyanjana* (Tertiary potency). These three *vr̥ttis* produce three types of meanings. They are *Vacyartha* (Literary meaning), *Lakseyartha* (Figurative meaning) and *Vyangyārtha* (implied meaning).

Abhidha / *Vacyartha* (Literary meaning):

Vacyartha is the chief meaning or the fixed dictionary meaning. It is also known as *mukyārtha*, *abhidārtha*, *sakyārtha* etc.

Lakseyartha / *Laksana* (Figurative meaning):

When the chief meaning is hampered or obstructed in some way, it gives rise to the *Laksana* or the secondary meaning. It is some syntactical incompatibility or a hindrance to the intended meaning that necessitates *Laksana*. *Lakseyartha* can take place when there is any obstruction to the primary meaning and also when substitution of another meaning is associated with the primary meaning. Sometimes convention or purpose necessitates *Laksana*. Differences are found in the classification of *Laksana*. But popularly accepted one is the threefold classification: *Jahat Laksana*, *Ajahat Laksana* and *Jahatajahat Laksana*.

Vyangyārtha / *Vyanjana* (Implied meaning):

Vyanjana is that capacity of suggestiveness of implication which differs both from *abidha* and *Laksana*. The rhetoric school recognises two types of *Vyanjanas*, namely *Sabdi vyanjana* and *Arthi vyanjana*. The *vyanjana* is called *sabdi vyanjana* if the implication arises from some specific word. However, it can mean so if it depends on the primary meaning of the word (*abhidamula*) or it can also depend on the secondary meaning (*Laksanamula*). *Vyanjana* is called *arthi vyanjana* if the implication arises from the meaning of the sentence as a whole and not from any

specific word. For E.g.: the sun has set. It also depends on the nature of the speaker, nature of the bearer, the proximity of some other sentence, the place, time, intonations, gesticulations of the speaker etc.

Some Views on Poetic language

The poetic language too has been identified in the field of hermeneutics. Understanding them gives much wider light on the interpretation of text and the plays, their metaphysical outlook and how they have been employed in various ways. Some of the important questions that are dealt in these schools are: what constitutes the essence of poetry, what are its main elements, what are the characteristics of poetic language etc. These questions are discussed under the 6 schools of poetics.

1. The *Rasa* School : According to this school of thought the essence of poetry lies in *Rasa*. Bharata muni analyses three factors involved in the *Rasa* as *Vibhava*, *anubhava*, and *vyabhicari bhava*. Of the nine *Rasas*, the *Sringara Rasa* which pervades the most of the poetical literature.

2. The *Riti* School: According to this school of thought the soul of poetry is *riti*. Vamana Acarya is the chief propounder of this school. *Riti* means a specialised form of composition.

3. The *Vakrokti* School: According to this school, the essential feature of poetic expression is *vakrokti*. Kuntaka Acarya is the chief exponent of this school. *Vakrokti*, according to him is that kind of artistic expression which suggests something in an ingenious way. E.g.: Can a leopard change its spots?

4. The *Dhvani* School: This school of poetry considers *Dhvani* as the soul of poetry. Ananda Vardhana, the author of *Dhvanyaloka* is the chief propounder of this school. *Dhvani* according to this school is that in which the *vyngyārtha* (implied meaning) far excels the *vacyārtha* (literal meaning). The school propounds the idea that it is the aesthetic sensibility of the person, who enjoys the pleasures generated by the *Dhvani*.

Classification of *Dhvani* is done under various heads. However, the threefold classification is considered as common. They are: a. *Dhvani* arising from the force of the word (*sabda saktyuktha*), b. *Dhvani* arising from the force of meaning (*arthasaktyuktha*) and c. *Dhvani* arising from the force of word and meaning (*ubhayasaktyuktha*).

The Dhvani Theory

Dhvani theory occupies a unique place in the rhetoric schools of Indian aesthetics. Grammarian school used this understanding of *Dhvani* in relation to phonemes, the uttered syllables. It was used by Bhartrhari to explain the language phenomenon where the literal meaning of the sentence is different from the intended sense. *Dhvani* literally means sound, tone, echo etc. but in the poetic schools it means evocation. Anandavardhana defines *Dhvani* as a specific arrangement of language wherein the primary meaning remains subordinate in order that the evoked significance shines prominently. The nature of *Dhvani* is explained in the metaphorical way like the charm of young woman (*lavanya*) which is much more than the sum of limbs, like soul to the body etc. Anandavardhamana, based on the nature of *Dhvani* divides it into three types, namely, *Vastu Dhvani*, *Alamkara Dhvani*, and *Rasa Dhvani*.

It is important to note that *Dhvani* does differ from individual word meanings, *Abhidha*, or *Laksana*. It is much more than that. The evocativeness takes place not merely with the conditions of the word but is conditioned by factors such as the context, the relation between the speaker and the listener, the time, the place, the intonation etc. More than the author it is the reader who plays important role in the evocative meaning. The evocative meaning falls outside the realm of logical knowledge and therefore, it is *Alaukika* in the sense of appreciative realm. *Dhvani* in this sense brings together the experienced world of the author which lies beneath the text through the *Dhvani* to the experiencing world of the reader. Anandavardhamana further states that the *Dhvani* is not limited to the language and its functions but goes beyond them to wider reality of gestures, music, etc. *Dhvani* theory therefore aims at bringing richer meaning to the text, delight to the reader (*camatkara*) and enables a process of discovery through sensitivity in perception by interpreting finer aspects of reality leading to newer perspectives.

5. The *Aucitya* School: This school considers the *aucitya* (propriety or fitness) as the life of the poetry. Acarya Ksemendra is the chief exponent of this school. The *Anaucitya* or the impropriety or discord of one thing with another gives rise to the *Rasabhanga* or the breach of aesthetic joy. This school considers *aucitya* as the sustaining life force of poetry.

6. The *Alankara* School: The *alankara* school of thought focuses on the decoration of language with the help of *alankaras*. Accordingly, poetry is ornamentation of expression. *Alankaras* embellish *Rasa*. There are two types of *alankaras*. They are, *Sabdalankara* (ornamental word) and *arthalankara* (ornamental meaning).

4.5. HERMENEUTICS IN HETERODOX SCHOOLS

Buddhist understanding of the language and its components differs from other orthodox schools of Indian thought. Keeping in mind the general framework of Buddhist metaphysics, specially the four noble truths, theory of

dependent origination, eightfold path, meditation and the community / *sangha*, *Ksanikavada*, *anatmavada* etc. the Buddhist hermeneuticians argue along the line of their metaphysics in order to establish their proposed views. Therefore, their analysis of word, meaning, sentence, in general the language differs from other schools. In the first place, Buddhist exegesis / interpretation is derived from *Abhidhamma*, one of the *Pitakas*. Buddhist hermeneutics lists matrices / *matrika*; the digests or exegetical guides, which maintain orthodoxy and also provide patterns for exegetical coherence. Nirvana or enlightenment being the ultimate aim of Buddhism, interpretation and the practical application of Buddhist scriptures needs to be taken into consideration.

Principles Of Buddhist Hermeneutics

1. The four reliance or strategies for understanding a text (*Pratisarana*)

According to *Pratisarana sutra*, there are four criteria of interpretations. They are:

- a. Relying on the teaching and not on the teacher
- b. Rely on the meaning and not the letter
- c. Rely on the definitive meaning and not the interpretable meaning
- d. Rely on (non-conceptual) wisdom and not on the (dualistic) cognition.

2. The four types of intentional and metaphoric language

There are several methods to understand the intentions of the texts. *Abhipraya* or contextual meanings are used for decoding the passage, while *Abhisamdhi* also is used in decoding the sacred text. The four kinds of intentions mentioned are

1. Introductory hidden intention - where the meaning is relevant only for the beginner
2. Metaphysical hidden intention – where the meaning is a statement on the nature of reality
3. Therapeutic hidden meaning – where the meaning is realized by following the instructions in combating unhealthy actions or states of mind
4. Metaphorical intention – where the meaning is not the literal meaning and often is paradoxical in character.

There are other two principles followed in the Buddhist hermeneutics. They are,

3. Four modes of reasoning
4. Use of analogies like dried ginger placed in medicinal powder, the canvas for painting, etc.

Apohavada

In the first place, the Buddhist logicians, hermeneutics consider that the essence of meaning is negative in character and that words have no direct reference to objective realities. They say it because for them words deal directly with the conceptual images, which are purely subjective constructions of the mind (*vikalpas*) and the connection is between the words and the mental images. Therefore, meaning of a word is a conceptual image (*vikalpa*). The essence of *vikalpa* is the negation of all its counter-correlates (*anyapoha*); which means the exclusion of all objects that are not the concepts.

The Buddhists on this line deny the existence of a positive entity called the universal (*samanya* or *jati*). Ultimately only the *svalaksana* or a particular at a point of time is the real. The existence of objective world is made up of succession of momentary particulars. These momentary particulars produce mutually different results, but since they produce same sensation they all appear as identical. Since the sameness is given importance and the relative differences are excluded, it gives rise to the same perception. The *pratyaksa pramana* for Buddhist logicians gives the unerring knowledge of the unique particular that is given directly to the senses. However, the name and the form is supplied by the mind which are cannot be included in the perception. Therefore, the perception is indeterminate for Buddhist hermeneutics.

The conceptual image of a thing has no direct correspondence with the real external things which are mutually different. The apparent identity of the image is produced by the identical efficiency of things. However, these conceptual images bring about purposeful action in daily life. A word cannot signify a 'unique particular' since the 'particulars' are momentary entities do not continue up to the time that conventional relation is apprehended. The universal is only an intellectual fiction without any reality. A word cannot denote a real positive thing because only the momentary particular (*Svalaksana*) is ultimately real. The meaning therefore, is a conceptual construction and not an objective fact. The word produces the purely subjective concept, which is negative in nature; excludes other concepts to make it distinct. Therefore, meaning of a word is the exclusion of everything other than the concept (*anyapoha*). This theory of *Apohavada* has been criticized by different schools on different grounds. The modified

version of the same theory is found in the works of Ratnakirti. He has attributed that the word consists of both the positive and negative meanings. It is important to note that, through this theory the Buddhist metaphysics of the unreality of universals is achieved. Later on Nyiyayikas have adopted the insights through their understanding on *Vyapti*. This is one of the contributions of defining meaning through negation.

Jaina Interpretation

Jainism is another significant school of heterodox system. It arose as a protest movement against Hinduism. It differs from the other systems in its religiosity, metaphysics and epistemology. Its metaphysical view holds that reality is pluralistic, expresses itself in multiple forms. All assertions of this pluralistic reality cannot be one view rather are relative and probable. Reality for the Jainas is complex web of many-ness (*Aneka*) and manifoldness (*anekanta*). Therefore, there are different points of view. The Jaina view of reality depends on the two main pillars, namely, *syadvada* and *anekantavada*. The contribution of Jainas to the field of interpretation is significant one because they admitted the possibility of multiple interpretations. To the language and methods of interpretation their contribution is very less. However, it is important to note their understanding of language as expressive (*vacaka*) or suggestive (*Jnapaka*). They hold that meaning is primarily rooted in the nature of reality and becomes conveyed through this expressive / suggestive capacity of words. It is important to note that, Jaina view altogether corresponds with the modern hermeneutical developments. The appreciation for variety and emergence of meaning and interpretations is what stands out in the Jaina view. Secondly, it is significant to note that interpretation is not merely limited to language, epistemology but also to ontology. Through this there is a relativistic view which is more consistent with their ontological commitment in pluralism.

Check your Progress II

Note: Use the space provided for your answer

1. What is *Dhvani* ?
2. Explain *Vyanjana*.
3. Explain Buddhist principles of hermeneutics.

4.6. INTERPRETATION IN ORTHODOX SCHOOLS

Two important schools which stand out in the Indian hermeneutic tradition are the *Vaiyakaranas* and the *Mimamsakas*. The analysis of words, sentences etc. belong to mainly the Grammarian school, however, it is not exclusively its right. Always contributions from other systems of thought in the form of criticism, correction, and innovation have contributed to the growth and refinement of their views.

The second important school in this regard is the *Mimamsa School*. The *Mimamsakas* are considered as a science of judicial interpretation of the sacrificial portion of Veda. *Mimamsa School* came in the context of Vedic texts, which were found to be contradictory. However, proper interpretations cleared the contradictions. *Mimamsa* in this regard is a science of interpretation or exegesis. It essentially differs from *Kalpasutra* and *Nirukta*, but has the characteristics of both.

Mimamsa Procedure of Understanding

Mimamsakas identify the five step procedure of understanding which is called *Adhikarana*. These are not absolute categories; there are differences of opinion regarding this. The five steps of *adhikarana* are the following:

1. *Visaya*: the text or the passage is the subject of interpretation which is being capable of having two or meanings.
2. *Samsaya* (Doubt): when there is doubt regarding the correct meaning of the text, it is known as *samsaya*.

3. *Purva-paksa*: is stand taken with one of the meanings and testing how far it stands reasonable.
4. *Uttara-paksa*: is the refutation of the *purva-paksa* or the suggested meaning.
5. *Nirnaya*: is the establishment of the true meaning.

Some of the conditions of understanding are found even in Uttara mimamsa. The conditions are: 1. The Beginning (*upakrama*), 2. The Conclusion (*upasamhara*), 3. The Repetition (*Abhyasa*), 4. Peculiarity (*Apurvata*), 5. The Object (*Phalam*), 6. The expectation or purpose (*arthavada*), 7. Suitableness (*upapatti*).

The further discussion on the Adhikaranas and the principles of textual interpretation are known as Nyayas. These are primarily linguistic and grammatical tools which contribute to the enrichment of the meaning of the textual exegesis. In order to understand the rituals prescribed in the Vedas Mimamsas developed a systematic theory of *Vakyabhodha*. This helps in the clarification and correct understanding of the various rituals. It is to be noted that the social, religious of context of the time, specially sacrifice based social and religious milieu is taken into consideration. It is also worth noting that Mimamsakas make use of the Nyayas in their hermeneutical strategy like that of *Kaka-taliya nyaya*, *kaka-dant-pariksa nyaya* etc.

The Mimamsa interpretation theory is based on some of the basic principles which will give the proper meaning of the Vedic sentences. These principles are of two types: a. principles that are primarily related to the interpretation of words and sentences; b. principles regarding the interpretation and application of sacrificial acts.

In understanding the meaning of the word, the following rules need to be taken into consideration. They are:

1. Meaning of words by current usage
2. Aryan usage of a word need to be taken into consideration against the foreign usage of the same word
3. Meaning of foreign words should be taken in their own sense
4. A word is to be understood in the sense suitable for the act concerned
5. If the literal interpretation of a word would make another word meaningless, the former should be interpreted in a qualified sense
6. One word must not have several senses
7. The peculiar feature of one leading object belonging to a class may give name to the whole class
8. If the meaning of the word is vague, it must be identified and made definite by the following passages
9. When a verb has more than one adjective used in the text, all these adjectives must be taken to refer to the same acting and nor to separate implied actions
10. When a word is used in a text having the nature of general clause, the singular number of a word includes the plural and the masculine the other two genders
11. A word occurring in an injunctive text / *vidhi vakyas* should be understood in the number and gender which it grammatically bears in that text

There are other rules too, which are grammatical in nature in understanding the text. Proceeding from this, Mimamsakas discuss the Rules for the sentences. They are broadly divided into four classes of rules as,

- a. Rules relating to determine syntactical units so far as the interpretation of injunctive text is concerned.
- b. Rules that relate to the construction of injunctive texts *Vidhi vakyas* and *arthavada* texts
- c. Those relating to the different clauses
- d. Those regarding the negation and conflicting texts.

Elaboration of each of these principles is a tedious task. Therefore, the three general principles governing the construction of sentences can be mentioned here: the principle of 'syntactical connection' or *Ekavakyatadhyakarana*, the principle of syntactical split or *vakysbhedadhyakarana* and the principle of elliptical extension or *anusangadhyakarana*.

There are also general axioms of interpretation. They are:

1. *Sarthakya* : Every word and sentence must have some meaning and purpose
2. *Laghava*: when one rule or proposition would suffice, more must not be assumed
3. *Arthaikata* : to a word or sentence occurring at one and the same place a double meaning should not be attached
4. *Gunapradhana* : if a word or sentence which, on the face of it, purports or expresses a subordinate idea clashes with the principle of idea, the former must be adjusted to the latter or altogether disregarded
5. *Samanjasy* : contradiction between words and sentences is not to be presumed if it is possible to reconcile them

6. *Vikalapa*: when there is a real contradiction, any of the contradictory matters may be adopted as option.

Nyaya Interpretation

Nyaya School agrees to most of its content to the grammarian school. However, *Visayatavada* and theory of abhava are its unique contributions to the field of hermeneutics.

Visayatavada has its basic premise that knowledge is not empty but has content. It is not empty knowledge. The analysis of this knowledge through the universalisation leads to the understanding. The relation between the object and the knowledge possessor in its entirety with the universalisation is known as the *visayatavada*.

Avacchedaka and *avacchinna* also need to be considered in this context.

The theory of abhava (non-existence) is important in the Navya-nyaya analysis. It forms as an independent category in their metaphysics. Abhava is that cognition which depends on the cognition of its counter-positive. This theory has much similarity with the Buddhist apohavada. The three main components of the abhava are; a. Prati-yoga – that which is absent or the counter positive, b. Anuyogi – the locus or the substratum where the abhava is, c. Pratiyogisambandha – the relation of counter positive to the thing.

Check your Progress 3

- a. Use the space provided for your answer
- b. Check your answer with those provided at the end of the unit.

1. What is the role of Mimamsa in Indian hermeneutics?

2. What are the three Mimamsa rules of sentence construction?

3. What is *Visayatavada*?

4.7. LET US SUM UP

Sufficient attention was given to the classical texts and proper methods were developed and to that matter one of the schools of Philosophy namely Mimamsa laboured extremely to develop a proper methodology of exegesis of Vedas. Contributions of grammarians, the Logic school namely Nyaya etc are note worthy. The general metaphysical approach towards language and its role in human life, leading to action brings out the truth that Indian hermeneutics based themselves on a sonic theology which governed different aspects of their lives. Ultimately, the analysis and interpretation of text is the interpretation of life itself, for text and sound are the un-detachable parts of human life.

4.8. KEY WORDS

Akanksa (Expectancy): a word by itself may not convey the full meaning in a sentence. It needs other words in-order to convey the meaning. This mutual expectancy of one word to another is known as *akanksa*.

Asatti or **Sannidhi** (juxtaposition): the meaning of words in a sentence can be understood only if they are co-uttered (*sahoccarita*). The co-utterance of words is known by the name of *asatti* or *sannidhi*.

Yogyata (fitness / concord of words): the words in a sentence should be mutually compatible. They should be fit enough to be combined together.

Tatparya (intention of the speaker): the knowledge of the speakers' intention becomes more particularly necessary in the case of an equivocal expression and can be determinant with the help of various factors which determine the meaning of the words.

Dhvani : *Dhavni* literally means sound, tone, echo etc. but in the poetic schools it means evocation. Anandavardhana defines *Dhvani* as a specific arrangement of language wherein the primary meaning remains subordinate in order that the evoked significance shines prominently.

Vyanjana: *Vyanjana* is that capacity of suggestiveness of implication which differs both from *abidha* and *Laksana*.

Visayatavada: The relation between the object and the knowledge possessor in its entirety with the universalisation is known as the *visayatavada*.

4.9. FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Muraleemadhavan, PC. Ed. *Indian theories of Hermeneutics*. Bharatiya Book Corporation, 2002.

Roy, Krishna. *Hermeneutics: East and West*. Allied Publishers Limited, 1993.

Jha, Hari Mohan. *Trends of Linguistic Analysis in Indian Philosophy*. Varanasi: Chaukhambh Orientalia, Varanasi, 1981.

Raja, K. Kunjunni. *Indian Theories of Meaning*. Madras: The Adyar Library And Research Centre, 1963.

Subrahmanyam, Korada. *Theories of Language: Oriental and Occidental*. New Delhi: D.K.Printworld (P) Ltd., 2008.

Singh, Jai. *Verbal Testimony in Indian Philosophy*, Jai Singh, Delhi: Parimal Publications, 1990.

Amaladass, A. *Indian Exegesis: Hindu-Buddhist Hermeneutics*. Chennai: Satya Nilayam Publications, 2003.