



ONTOLOGICAL DIMENSION OF UNDERSTANDING IN GADAMER'S HERMENEUTIC

Anselmus Chartino Ade

Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Katolik Santo Thomas

Email :

ABSTRACT

The focus point of hermeneutic philosophy is “the art of understanding”. Hermeneutic philosophers pay special attention to the interpretation and application of texts. Hans George Gadamer, as one of the figures in hermeneutic philosophy, emphasized that “understanding” has a circular structure. In order for people to understand, there must be pre-understanding. “Understanding” is impossible without language because it is a fundamental human attitude, which also relate with past texts. “Understanding” essentially has ontological relevance. The ontological dimension shows an existential relationship between words and objects. Looking for a word is actually nothing more than looking for a word that seems to be attached to an object. This word is a statement of the complete identity of reality. Words or language come from reality. The formulation “the conversation that we ourselves are” sounds similar with Rene Descartes' “cogito ergo sum”. If Cortesio's *res cogitans* is thought, then for Gadamer it is language and conversation. The reason of Gadamer is actually very classic, that no thought can exist outside of words and language.

Keywords: *Understanding, Hermeneutics, Ontology*

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Background of Research

The prominent characteristic in the development of philosophy in the 20th century was philosophers focused on language. They did it because they realized that many philosophical problems could be explained through language analysis. However, determining the characteristics of philosophical views through the material objects of language is not easy. The directness of language as one of the material objects of language is the result of critical reflections on errors in understanding language as well as the exploratory thinking power of philosophers at that time to discover the nature and nature of language.

Actually, the issue of language has been discussed since the time of Ancient Greek philosophy. At that time there were three language issues being debated, that the issue of what the meaning was; secondly, whether the language is natural (physical) or conventional (based on mutual agreement); and third, whether the

language is regular (analogy) or irregular (anomaly). These three issues are still a matter of contention until modern times. Apart from that, philosophers from the Greek, Roman and medieval times were involved in compiling traditional grammar. For this reason, it is not surprising that until the 20th century, language problems were increasingly discussed and became the material object of philosophy. Because language has become more intensive as an object of philosophy, the philosophy of language has become a branch of philosophy that is involved in many figures (Chaer 154).

In the course of the history of philosophy in the 20th century, many philosophical figures discussed the Philosophy of Language by giving birth to new theories. Broadly speaking, there are two major schools of Language Philosophy, that Analytical Philosophy and Hermeneutic Philosophy. The great figures of analytical philosophy were Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889-1951), John Austin (1872-1970), Bertrand Russell



(1871-1970), August Comte (1289-1857), and other figures. Meanwhile, famous figures in hermeneutic philosophy are Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834), Martin Heidegger (1889-1976), Hans George Gadamer (1900-2002), and other figures (Schmidt 34).

The focal point of hermeneutic philosophy is “the art of understanding”. The characters pay special attention to the interpretation and application of the text. Hans George Gadamer as one of the figures in Hermeneutic Philosophy will be discussed in this paper. The author chooses hermeneutic philosophy as a branch of the philosophy of language, and specifically the figure of Hans George Gadamer. Gadamer has a fundamental view of “understanding”. The method of “understanding” he offers is different from other figures. The author’s interest in choosing this character lies in Gadamer’s view, that “*understanding as co-understanding and language as an appearance of the essence of ‘being’ in humans*” (Hardiman 151). Gadamer's view is very important and relevant to study, because it contains an applicable dimension, especially in terms of text interpretation and the use of language in communication.

1.2 The Scope and Question of Research

Based on the development of science in the 20th century, Gadamer offers a hermeneutic method, especially for the social sciences, culture and humanities field. Indeed, for these sciences it is difficult to apply qualitative methods in a strict, orderly and positivistic manner. To discuss Gadamer's hermeneutic philosophy, we must focus on his great work, *Wahrheit und Methode*. The book contains his thoughts on aesthetics, social and human sciences, hermeneutics and other matters which all of them involve understanding. Schleiermacher, Dilthey and Heidegger are known solely as hermeneutic thinkers, but Gadamer,

because of his magnum opus, is known as a hermeneutic philosopher.

As a hermeneutic philosopher, Gadamer talks a lot about the nature of “understanding” and the nature of language as well as the role of language in hermeneutics. The author presents this paper with the title: ***Ontological Dimension Of Understanding In Gadamer’s Hermeneutic***. The writing of this work is limited to a discussion of the character Hans George Gadamer, specifically his thoughts on “understanding” and language. The discussion is sharpened by three deep question, which are; 1) *What is “understanding” according to Gadamer?* 2) *What is language according to Gadamer?* 3) *What is the relation between “understanding in language” with existence (ontological dimensions)?* The author also makes critical analysis and reflection on Gadamer's thinking and the relevance to.

1.3 The Objective of the Research

The objective of this research is to add a systematic, informative, coherent, interesting literature that can be applied for communication and language in life. The author also wants to know in depth Hans George Gadamer's views on “understanding” which is very ontological. Gadamer's theories are quite helpful in the interpretation of writings.

II. GADAMER AND HERMENEUTIC

Hans George Gadamer was born in Marburg in 1900. In 1922 he received the title of “doctor of philosophy.” In general, his thinking is motivated by phenomenology. Many of his books provide interpretations of philosophers from the past, such as Plato, Herder, Goethe, and Hegel. From all his works, the most important one is *Wahrheit und Methode* (Truth and Method). Then, because of this work he became a famous philosopher in the field of hermeneutics. In 1985 a collection of his works was



published. Gadamer was blessed with a long life and his age spanned the entire 20th century. He died on March 13, 2002 at the age of 102 (Davey 123).

2.1 The Essence of Understanding

2.1.1 *Understanding as Co-Understanding*

Gadamer's project is to release hermeneutics from the aesthetic and methodological limitations that still ensnare Schleiermacher and Dilthey, so that hermeneutics is not anymore understood as an art or as a method, but as a universal human ability in understanding. Therefore, Gadamer's hermeneutics can be called "philosophical hermeneutics". He learned a lot from Heidegger's factization hermeneutics which has succeeded in anchoring the concept of understanding in the human existential dimension. However, Gadamer does not stop with this existential dimension, but tries to connect it with the social dimension, so that understanding also means "*understanding each other*" which also means *co-understanding* (Dostal 56).

Schleiermacher's view of understanding is more in the direction of romanticism, that when understanding a text, we can look back to the past in order to reconstruct its meaning. Even though romanticism is related with aesthetics, it secretly assumes objectivism as practiced in the natural sciences. This is the same as Dilthey's thinking about historicity, which emphasizes understanding only by finding meaning based on the past context of the text (Hardiman 160). For them, understanding a text is finding the original meaning or – in other words – showing what the author in question meant, that his thoughts, opinions, his vision: in short, his feelings and intentions. Therefore, an interpreter must have extensive knowledge of history, in addition to having talent as a psychologist. In this sense, the interpretation of a text is a reproductive work. Achieving the correct meaning of a

text is returning to what the author felt and wanted to say. Interpretation is reconstruction. For Gadamer, this view of hermeneutics is called the romantic view, meaning the view that marked the romantic era. The thoughts of these two figures were then reviewed by Gadamer and then confirmed his own different stance.

Gadamer does not close his eyes to the merits of romantic hermeneutics, but he also sees its weaknesses. The first objection concerns their opinion that hermeneutics is tasked with finding the original meaning of a text, then looking for the meaning that the author placed in the text. For Gadamer, interpretation is not the same as taking a text and then looking for the meaning that the author placed in that text (Gadamer 65). For Gadamer, the meaning of a text remains open and is not limited to the author's intention with the text. So, the interpretation is not merely reproductive, but also productive. Interpretation can enrich the meaning of a text.

Inseparable from the first objection, the following objection concerns the romantic hermeneutic opinion about time. We as interpreters cannot escape the historical situation in which we find ourselves. It is impossible for any attempt to bridge the gap between our time and the author's time. But such efforts are not necessary either. The meaning of a text is not limited to the past (when the text was written), but also has openness to the future. For this reason, interpreting a text is a task that will never be finished. Each era must strive for its own interpretation. A definitive interpretation cannot be expected. According to Gadamer, what the two figures forget is that the author and his readers have always moved in different areas of mutual understanding and they have taken it for granted (Gadamer 67).

Gadamer used a term in Husserl's phenomenology for this area, that is "horizon". Our understanding of each other forms a horizon that beyond our



respective subjectivities, and that horizon – which is a space that has boundaries – both allows and limits us in understanding things. So, according to Gadamer, understanding is not a representation of the meaning of the past, but rather a fusion between the author's past horizon and the reader's present horizon.

From Gadamer's review in *Wahrheit und Method*, we conclude that there are two main characteristics of the horizon. First, a horizon is not isolated, but open. Second, a horizon is not stable but dynamic, that is constantly moving. Because of its nature, the fusion of horizons become possible. Understanding is a process that involves the tension of multiple horizons or – in Gadamer's words – “it always the fusion of horizons that are thought to exist from themselves (Gadamer 68). Interpretation is an encounter of reader with a text which also means the reader's current encounter and the traditions surrounding the text. Gadamer called the concept of horizon fusion as *co-understanding*.

2.1.2 Pre-understanding

Gadamer emphasized that “understanding” has a circular structure. In order for people to understand there must be pre-understanding. To achieve understanding, the only way is to start from previous understanding. For example, to understand a text, you must first have a certain pre-understanding about what is discussed in the text. Otherwise, it will never be possible to gain an understanding of the text. But on the other hand, by reading the text, pre-understanding materializes into real understanding. This process is called by Heidegger and Gadamer the “hermeneutical circle”. Understanding the world is only possible if there is a pre-understanding of the world and of ourselves. But this circle is not a vicious circle, but rather makes our existence possible (Davey 35).

A person who tries to understand is not protected from the distraction of pre-existing meanings that do not originate from the things themselves. If understanding always involves a pre-existing meaning, a pre-understanding, there will be no objective interpretation as pursued by Schleiermacher, Dilthey and positivists in the social and human sciences. There is no other way than to acknowledge the existence of this pre-understanding.

2.1.3 Always in Application

The concept of fusion of horizons has important implications for application problems. Referencing the classic J.J. Rambach, *Institutioner Hermeneuticae Sacre* (1723), Gadamer divided hermeneutics into three parts: understanding, explication (*subtilitas explicandi*) and application (*subtilitas applicandi*). Schleiermacher and Dilthey placed the application in its own place, so that the application was considered as an art of presentation. Gadamer however has a different stance. According to him, application is an integral part of understanding (Dostal 68). This view is consistent with his concept of the fusion of horizons. Application is none other than an integral process in the projection of the meaning of the text within the stretching horizon of the interpreter.

Gadamer believes that understanding interpretation and application is “an integrated process”. Understanding without application has no real meaning. Understanding always requires implementation. Application is not something separate from understanding, but is an integral part of understanding. A reader understands by applying text to a specific context. This happens because understanding is the result of the fusion of horizons (Gadamer 56).

2.2 The Language Ontology

In his book *Warheit und Methode* Gadamer explains that “understanding” is



impossible without language. “Understanding” is a fundamental human attitude, which is also related to past texts. So, “understanding” essentially has ontological relevance. For Gadamer, language is a reality that cannot be separated from life experience, understanding and thoughts. Therefore, language is not only an empirical reality. Language, according to Gadamer, is a principle, language is a medium of hermeneutic experience. However, not only as a tool, but as a horizon of hermeneutic ontology. According to Gadamer, “being” appears to humans, and is manifested in language. In other words, “being” appears as a conversation in a hermeneutical situation (Schmidt 40).

“Understanding” is the same as being aware of the conversation with “being”, so that wherever the conversation happens. According to him, language is not only a sign system, and not only a means of communication, but ontologically, language is an appearance of the essence of “being” in humans. So, language is perceived by humans not only as an empirical reality, but more as an ontological reality. Gadamer's thinking about language is the most difficult and most questionable part of his philosophy. In relation to language, one of the things that Gadamer often emphasizes is that language does not primarily express thoughts but the objects themselves. In this he reacts against every idealistic view of language. According to him, language speaks about objects in the world; it should not be said that language is a subjective reality that hinders our relationship with things. Of course, no words can express an object completely. But this is not caused by the limitations of language, but rather by the limitations of the human subject (Gadamer 76).

If words are signs, then the function of words is none other than to be applied, as a tool for humans to convey their thoughts. This means that language is only a tool of the subject, so it is separated from

the existence of the reality that is thought about. As a result, the word does not make the reality that is thought into what is said. Therefore, there is a separation between reality and understanding. The separation between form and content, the separation between language and thought, which are fundamentally at odds with true existence. If language is signs and forms of symbols made by humans, then it means that words also come from humans; or humans are the cause of the existence of these words. However, this is actually not the case because in essence the word belongs to reality. There is such a close unity between words and objects, that looking for a word is actually nothing more than looking for a word that seems to be attached to the object. This word is a statement of the complete identity of reality. Words or language originate from reality because they belong to it, a part of it. Language is objective, not subjective. Likewise, language and thought for Gadamer form an inseparable unity. After all, it is humans who are looking for the right words, the real ones, which are expressions of reality. So, it can be concluded that humans do not create words, only listen to them. The theory that humans create words and give them meaning is completely untrue (Gadamer 77).

Through language, the world (all dimensions of human life) is expressed. So, it is language that actually expresses the world through words and not through subjects. Language and the world are transpersonal as well as interpersonal realities; Thus, it is not humans who determine language. Linguistic experience shows that human experience cannot possibly precede language; but experience occurs through language. Thus, humans do not own and do not control language; but learning and adapting to the language. Because of the open nature of language, the human mind adapts to language.

2.3 Language as a Hermeneutic Center



Language is a communication medium in which “me” and “the world” exist together. Language is not final data from reality, but a process that does not stop. Dialogue and interpretation are always needed. Human relationships with the world are linguistic, which can be captured and understood. Human experience occurs through language. This brings the possibility for humans to always dialogue with other humans, and especially with another “being” in language. It is in this connection that Gadamer emphasizes the central position of language in hermeneutics that “being” that can be understood is language. Language introduces reality to humans. This role of language is the basis of Gadamer’s hermeneutics (understanding as understanding). The current situation (reality) is known through language, thus forming the horizon of the interpreter or the reader. Through language, reality becomes a pre-understanding in forming understanding in humans (readers). Meanwhile, in the text itself (the past), language is written and reveals the author’s background reality. Gadamer wrote about the role of language in hermeneutics as follows:

“The true hermeneutic moment is... made possible by the fact that a word comes from the past and that we must listen to it, touches us directly, as if the word were addressed to ourselves.”
(78)

It is necessary to add Heidegger’s view which Gadamer agrees with, that the process of understanding/interpreting must be listening. Only in “voice” can we “hear”, and by “hearing” tradition gives life to innovation, texts become context, past history becomes contemporary. Hearing language brings an understanding of reality to life. This principle of understanding also occurs in understanding texts.

24 Speak, Therefore I Am

The formulation “the conversation that we ourselves are” or speaking and therefore we exist sounds similar to Rene Descartes’ “*cogito ergo sum*”. If Cortesio’s *res cogitans* is thought, then for Gadamer it is language and conversation. The reason put forward by Gadamer is actually very classic, that no thought can exist outside of words and language. Talking requires conversation. However, conversation should not be understood as just a casual chat in any place. He is not talking about “language” but rather about “linguistics”. If language is limited to the way a person speaks (words and manner of speaking), then linguistics refers more to a way of thinking and understanding, a way of expressing the universe of ideas and the breadth of horizons (Davey 50).

In general, dialogic language is explained by Gadamer in several characteristics. Firstly, dialogue is always a circle of asking and answering. According to Gadamer, the advantage of classical philosophy is that intelligence is not determined by the correctness of the answer but rather by the accuracy of the questions asked. This process makes a dialogue lively and dynamic. Second, dialogue characterizes a listening attitude. Gadamer surprisingly emphasized that hearing is as meaningful as or even more powerful than seeing. With the inspiration of Aristotle, he said that “a person who hears, he hears something more, and something that is invisible and everything that can be thought, because there is language.” When we hear a word, for example table, we can immediately think of table, as if we saw it. We are present at the table. If someone listens, it means being present there: catching the sound, looking at the face and finding the meaning of all self-displays and images in their wholeness. Without the unity between hearing and seeing, it is impossible for us to understand (Gadamer 80).

Third, the nature of speaking itself. For Gadamer, “*language exists only in the*



act of speaking” and this is what shows the natural capacity of humans, even having an energetic dimension. Speaking activity must flow from thoughts that are structured in such a way as to express love for the truth. We can talk to ourselves and to others. This conversation produces awareness of self and others. Such awareness leads to awareness as “being.” Fourth, it relates to “translating” as an effort to dialogue with the text. Like Heidegger, Gadamer also believes that translating is the same as tracking and finding traces of thought through the codification of writing for the reader to interpret. The concept of translating is the same as moving the realm of thought from one language into the realm of thought in another language (81).

By tracing and reuniting Gadamer’s various writings which are scattered everywhere, it can be concluded that dialogue is a hermeneutic center where the skills of asking-answering, listening, speaking-seeing, translating and reasoning become a whole. In dialogue, a person is actually interpreting and understanding what is conveyed by another person and even understanding the person himself. No one chirps or talks delirious, but rather “manifests the truth in dialogue between fellow human beings” with his reasoning power (Dostal 71).

III. CRITICAL REFLECTION

3.1 Thought Analysis

3.1.1 Melting Horizons: Toward a Paradoxical Truth

Gadamer is one of the most influential hermeneutic philosophers. His thoughts were quite revolutionary in the world of philosophy of language. His thoughts about “understanding” came from his criticism of the views of previous figures. If analyzed, his thought about “understanding as co-understanding” contains truth. The fusion of the writer’s past horizon with the reader’s present horizon will produce a perfect understanding. The text is not only

understood based on the author’s past context, but is connected to the reader’s present context. In this way, the message to be conveyed is not old-fashioned, but is able to live in the present. Apart from that, Gadamer also added that application is also part of understanding (Schmidt 92). When readers are able to understand the text and relate it to the present, readers will easily apply it. Application is a practical form of fusion between these two horizons. This thinking suggests that understanding is not just understanding theoretically, but with application.

Gadamer’s view that understanding is the result of the fusion of horizons has philosophical implications. If the horizons of understanding continue to move and understanding is the result of the fusion of horizons, truth is not only historical, that is, moving in space and time, but it is also impossible to achieve a final and absolute truth. Truth is relative, because the results of interpretation vary depending on different contexts. However, if we examine it more deeply, we can discover its absolute nature. Interpretation or interpreting has an orientation towards truth. Truth is the truth of the meaning, message, purpose and background of the text. In epistemology, truth is dynamic and relative, but at the same time absolute. In his book *Man and Truth*, Adelbert Snijder, OFM Cap writes this:

“The relationship between relative and absolute is paradoxical. Truth cannot always be relative (relativism) and it cannot always be absolute (dogmaticism or fundamentalism). Truth is relative, but at the same time absolute. This is what is meant by paradoxical nature. We find two truths that are contradictory, but only true in their unity.” (Snijder 56)

If Gadamer’s theory of understanding is analyzed more deeply, the nature of relative truth also contains



absolute truth. According to Gadamer, interpretation is not merely reproductive, but also productive. For him, interpretation is nothing more than “projecting a historical horizon that is different from the present horizon”. The truth in the text as the author's perception (horizon of the past) has absolute nature. The author of the text has a permanent and complete truth which is the result of his own thoughts. What the author of the text in question means, that the person's thoughts, opinions, vision, feelings and intentions, is fixed and absolute. It could be said to be absolute based on his perspective. According to Dilthey, achieving the correct meaning of a text is returning to what the author felt and wanted to say. Interpretation is reconstruction. So, the truth in the text is absolute and permanent (Hardiman 234). The true intent and message – which the author conveys within his horizon – are fixed and absolute. Reconstruction seeks the absolute truth. Meanwhile, the relative nature is found in the contemporary reader or interpreter. The context of the reader or interpreter is always different. The truth resulting from the fusion of horizons is relative because of the different contexts of readers and absolute because the truth of the text is the author's opinion. Therefore, the truth obtained from Gadamer's hermeneutic principles fulfills the nature of truth, that is paradoxical between relative and absolute.

3.1.2 Identification of Reality Through Language

Gadamer's view of language as an ontological reality is a view that contains epistemological truth. According to Gadamer, “being” appears to humans and is manifested in language. In essence, the word belongs to reality. Self-statement of reality is revealed through language. This is very consistent with sources of knowledge that involve humans as subjects and reality as objects. In order for there to be knowledge, the subject must be directed

towards the object and conversely the object must be directed towards the subject. This means that in order for knowledge to occur, the subject must be open and directed or directed towards the object to recognize and to know it as it is, and conversely the object must be open and directed towards the subject to be known as it is. Humans as subjects try to know reality (objects) by looking for the right words and reality as an object is open and directed to the subject. For Gadamer, language is an appearance of the essence of “being” in humans. With language – which belongs to reality – reality opens and directs itself completely to the subject (human). So, recognition of the nature of “being” becomes possible, because of complete direction and openness.

Language is a communication medium in which “I” and “the world” exist together. Language is not final data from reality, but a process that does not stop. This brings the possibility for humans to always dialogue with other humans, and especially with those in language. Humans are a reality for other humans. In human philosophy, personality is viewed from three points of view: ontological, psychological and dialogical views. Language communication is discussed in a dialogic view. The dialogical view relates the human person to the relationship between one human being and another human being. Personality is formed through communication with others. Togetherness is a forum for expressing personal existence (Snijder 72). Through communication, humans express themselves, their desires and their uniqueness. Eating life according to the dialogic perspective lies in efforts to build unique communication. With “I-Thou” communication, humans discover experiences. Gadamer's view shows the importance of speaking as “being” to know reality and have experience. Language as a recognition to reality, that other humans, helps humans to achieve awareness as “being” and find experiences



with other humans to form their personalities, because experiences occur through language.

3.1.3 Ontological Dimension: Understanding and Language

Gadamer's view of understanding as understanding and language as the essence of "being", have a dialectical or mutually continuous relationship. Gadamer stated that understanding essentially has ontological relevance. For Gadamer, understanding does not only apply to the interpretation of texts, but also applies to the interpretation of reality. The reality around humans, which is also called the world (all dimensions of human life), must be understood by humans themselves. The purpose of this understanding is to achieve an existential awareness. In human philosophy, it is said that reflection on "I" says that "I" is always "I" who through my body is present in the world. The me who was detached from the world I could not find. I am who I am because to an encounter with others and the world. By reflecting on humans as existence, one becomes increasingly aware of the close relationship between the world and humans. Meetings and relationships between the world and humans imply an understanding attitude. Understanding occurs because of language. Humans understand language as belonging to reality. Understanding as understanding between people occurs in dialogue. In dialogue, a person is actually writing and understanding what is conveyed by another person and even understanding the person himself. Thus, it appears that the principle of understanding is needed to understand reality (other humans or other objects) through language.

Rather, language is necessary for understanding itself. As Gadamer said that no thought can exist outside of words and language. Understanding always involves human thinking power. Therefore, understanding always requires language. For Gadamer, language is a reality that

cannot be separated from life experience, understanding and thoughts. So, language is not only an empirical reality. Language, according to Gadamer, is a principle, language is a medium of hermeneutic experience. So, it becomes clear that Gadamer's view of understanding as understanding (fusion of horizons) and language as the essence of "being" are dialectically related and mutually supportive.

IV. CONCLUSION

As mentioned previously, according to Gadamer, understanding is mutual understanding which also means co-understanding. In the interpreter's encounter with tradition, understanding occurs when the interpreter's horizon and the tradition's horizon merge. This fusion is a form of understanding in which the subjective point of view simply recedes, so that a new understanding is built. In understanding writing or text, readers anywhere and anytime can understand the writing. This means that the meaning and message of the writing that someone reads can be easily understood if he connects the original message of the text with the real conditions he is facing. By looking at the context, readers can easily understand and put it into practice.

Gadamer does not stop with the existential dimension of understanding, but tries to connect it with the social dimension, so that understanding also means "understanding each other" which also means co-understanding. The social dimension here is related to the application. In the next study, Gadamer talks about language and dialogue. Mutual understanding is needed in dialogue. The view that "talking therefore being", is a theory that is very relevant to the current state of communication. The development of communication media today is very rapid. Many communication media help people to talk to each other. The communication media is in the form of oral communication media or through



writing. Through writing, for example on cellphones, while writing is more varied, such as social networks (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc.), SMS, letters, etc. Apart from that, through the internet we can get a lot of information in the form of writing. We don't need to bother looking for books or newspapers. This condition often causes misunderstandings. So Gadamer's theory of understanding is very relevant to this situation. Readers must understand the writing and see the context, so as not to misinterpret the information (Gustamao 2006). Gadamer's five characteristics of dialogical communication will also help to create good communication through these media. The use of media as a means of dialogue (talking) must be used well to increase basic human qualities ("being").

Gadamer's theory has deeper relevance in the world of jurisprudence, interpretation of historical books and interpretation of holy books. Although it still has relevance for interpretation or efforts to understand texts in general. In his book, Gadamer wrote an example of the relevance of his teachings, that about a judge. A judge does not judge according to his personal opinion in the field of law; he judges according to the laws applicable in his territory and he must strictly adhere to those laws. So, his job is to apply general laws to various concrete cases. Gadamer believes that the law can only be understood in and by applying it to concrete cases. It cannot be said that a judge first fully understands and realizes the meaning of the provisions in the law, then applies them to concrete cases. But only by applying these decrees does he see and understand their meaning, especially when he sees and understands their meaning, especially when the application involves new situations. Likewise for the interpretation of history books and the Holy Bible.

Gadamer's theory also has relevance to the field of science in writings or books. As time goes by, more and more writings

or books will be left behind and new theories or books will also appear. The creation of new writings will never be separated from old theories or books. Scientists give birth to new theories based on old theories. So, to produce a new theory, a scientist must study the old theory well. In this case, understanding Gadamer's principles is very helpful. Interpretation of old theories and adaptation to the current context can help create new theories that can answer contemporary problems as well. Apart from that, old theories from old texts are still held, understood and lived. With this, science can continue to develop according to the present.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Chaer, Abdul. Filsafat Bahasa. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta. 2015.
- Davey, Nicholas. Unquiet Understanding. Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics. New York: State University of New York Press. 2006.
- Dostal, Robert J. The Cambridge Companion to Gadamer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2008.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. Philosophical Hermeneutics. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1976.
- Gusmao, Martinho G. Da Silva. Hans George Gadamer: Penggagas Filsafat Hermeneutik Modern yang Mengagungkan Tradisi. Yogyakarta: Kanisius. 2013.
- Hardiman, F. Budi. Seni Memahami: Hermeneutik dari Schleiermacher sampai Derrida. Yogyakarta: Kanisius. 2015.
- Schmidt, Lawrence L. Understanding Hermeneutics. Durham: Acumen. 2006.
- Snijders, Adelbert. Antropologi Filsafat: Manusia Paradoks dan Seruan. Yogyakarta: Kanisius. 2004.