

EXPLORING THE DYNAMICS OF UNDERSTANDING IN WESTERN HERMENEUTICS: FROM REPRODUCING MEANING TO REJECTING METANARRATIVES

M. Ied Al Munir

Universitas Islam Negeri Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin, Jambi

Email: m.iedalmunir@uinjambi.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to provide an overview of the dynamics of emerging understanding regarding Western hermeneutics. Two main questions are addressed: (1) What is meant by hermeneutics? and (2) How has thinking about understanding evolved in Western hermeneutics? The research employs historical and *verstehen* methods. Two key findings emerge. First, hermeneutics represents an effort or approach to comprehend and interpret various objects of study, ranging from sacred texts, historical writings, scientific literature, culture, to human existence itself. Second, Western hermeneutics encompasses diverse perspectives on understanding. Modern hermeneutics, exemplified by figures like Schleiermacher and Dilthey, tends toward reproductive understanding, aligning with the author's intent. In contrast, contemporary hermeneutics, associated with Heidegger, Gadamer, and Ricoeur, exhibits a productive tendency, generating new insights through reader engagement. Critical hermeneutics, as articulated by Habermas, views interpretation as a liberating endeavor. Deconstructionist hermeneutics, influenced by Derrida, leans toward radical understanding. Finally, postmodern hermeneutics, championed by thinkers such as Lyotard and Vattimo, rejects metanarratives in interpretation.

Keywords: Western Hermeneutics, Reproduction, Production, Meaning, Metanarratives

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk memberikan gambaran tentang dinamika pemahaman yang muncul terkait hermeneutika Barat. Dua pertanyaan utama yang dibahas dalam penelitian ini adalah: (1) Apa yang dimaksud dengan hermeneutika? dan (2) Bagaimana pemikiran tentang pemahaman dalam hermeneutika Barat berkembang? Penelitian ini menggunakan metode sejarah dan *verstehen*. Dua temuan utama muncul. Pertama, hermeneutika mewakili upaya atau pendekatan untuk memahami dan menafsirkan berbagai objek kajian, mulai dari teks-teks suci, tulisan-tulisan historis, literatur ilmiah, kebudayaan, hingga eksistensi manusia itu sendiri. Kedua, hermeneutika Barat mencakup berbagai perspektif tentang pemahaman. Hermeneutika modern, yang dicontohkan oleh tokoh-tokoh seperti Schleiermacher dan Dilthey, cenderung pada pemahaman reproduktif, selaras dengan maksud penulis. Sebaliknya, hermeneutika kontemporer, yang dikaitkan dengan Heidegger, Gadamer, dan Ricoeur, menunjukkan kecenderungan produktif, menghasilkan wawasan baru melalui keterlibatan pembaca. Hermeneutika kritis, seperti yang diartikulasikan oleh Habermas, memandang interpretasi sebagai usaha pembebasan. Hermeneutika dekonstruksionis, yang dipengaruhi oleh Derrida, condong ke pemahaman radikal. Akhirnya, hermeneutika postmodern, yang didukung oleh pemikir seperti Lyotard dan Vattimo, menolak metanarasi dalam interpretasi.

Kata Kunci: Hermeneutika Barat, Reproduksi, Produksi, Makna, Metanarasi.

A. Introduction

Hermeneutics initially referred to the study of the general principles of scriptural interpretation. For Jewish and Christian communities, the primary goal of hermeneutics was to uncover the truths and values contained within their sacred texts. Hermeneutics was later applied to the interpretation of other sacred texts, including the Qur'an. As it evolved, hermeneutics became associated with the study of interpretation itself (Britannica 2024). Although its origins are not definitively clear, the term hermeneutics is often linked to Hermes in Greek mythology. In ancient Greece, Plato viewed hermeneutic knowledge as something revealed and intuitive, distinguishing it from discursively-based, truth-oriented theory (Gjesdal 2022). The term hermeneutics formally began to be used in the 17th and 18th centuries to denote the study of rules that should be followed in interpreting and understanding texts from the past, especially sacred texts and classical works (Bertens 2002).

Following extensive debates in the modern era, particularly methodological debates on whether the social sciences should adopt methods similar to the natural sciences or different methods, hermeneutics in recent decades has evolved into an important and widely-used method for interpreting research objects in various fields, especially in the social sciences (Al Munir 2021). From this background, the researcher is interested in and considers it important to conduct scientific research on the development of thought on understanding in Western hermeneutics, particularly from the modern era to the postmodern era, encompassing understanding as meaning reproduction to the rejection of metanarratives.

Numerous studies have been conducted on Western hermeneutics with various tendencies. First, there are studies that discuss Western hermeneutics in general (Hardiman 2015; Najib et al. 2021). Second, there are studies that discuss the thinkers of Western hermeneutics and their thoughts (Asmolov 2016; Hansen 2019; Hovey et al. 2020; James et al. 2024; Martono 2019; Mrugalski 2021; Rahman 2016). Third, there are studies that discuss the implementation of Western hermeneutics in various fields (Al Munir 2021; Arias Schreiber et al. 2022; Elbanna & Newman 2022; Fancourt et al. 2022; Hurley et al. 2022; Morán-Reyes 2022; Wagemans 2023; Watson & Minns Lowe 2023). This research aims to enrich these studies by historically and thematically unraveling Western hermeneutics.

This article aims to elucidate the dynamics of understanding in Western hermeneutics from the modern era to the postmodern era. To this end, two main questions will be addressed: (1) what is meant by hermeneutics? and (2) how has the understanding in Western hermeneutics developed from the modern era to the postmodern era? This aim will provide an understanding of the various tendencies within Western hermeneutic tradition. Therefore, this article argues that there are diverse tendencies in understanding Western hermeneutics, such as meaning reproduction, meaning production, meaning liberation, meaning radicalization, and the rejection of metanarratives for the creation of new meanings.

B. Method

This article employs qualitative research in the form of a literature review. The primary sources of this research include various references, both printed and online, such as the book “Seni Memahami: Hermeneutika dari Schleiermacher sampai Derrida” by F. Budi Hardiman and the article “Hermeneutics” by T. George in The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Data were collected using reading and note-taking techniques on the mentioned references. The collected data were then analyzed using historical analysis methods and *verstehen* as previously articulated by Kaelan (Kaelan 2005). The historical method is used to determine the historical periodization of the figures, while the *verstehen* method is employed to understand symbolic meanings. In this research, the historical method is utilized to trace the historical periodization of hermeneutic thinkers from the modern, contemporary, critical, deconstruction, to the postmodern periods. The *verstehen* method, on the other hand, is employed to understand the thoughts of hermeneutic thinkers and the tendencies of each of these figures.

C. Result and Discussion

1. Definition of Hermeneutics

The term hermeneutics is derived from the Greek verb “*hermēneuein*,” meaning to interpret, and the noun “*hermēneia*,” meaning interpretation. This Greek term refers to the figure in Greek mythology, Hermes. Hermes was a messenger tasked with conveying the messages of the god Jupiter to humans. Hermes is personified as having winged feet. He was assigned to translate messages from the gods on Mount Olympus into a language

that humans could understand. Thus, Hermes played a crucial role, as any misunderstanding of the gods' messages could have fatal consequences for all humankind. Hermes had to interpret or adapt a message into the language used by his audience. Since then, Hermes has become a symbol of an ambassador with a specific mission. The success or failure of this mission entirely depended on how the message was conveyed (Sumaryono 1999).

The verb “hermēneuein” in the process of conveying messages has three forms: (1) to express in words; (2) to explain, such as describing a situation; and (3) to translate, such as transliterating a foreign language. These three meanings of “hermēneuein” are represented by the English verb “to interpret,” but each of these meanings forms an independent and significant part of interpretation. Thus, literally, interpretation can refer to three different things: oral expression, reasonable explanation, and transliteration from another language (Palmer 2005).

According to Richard E. Palmer (Palmer 2005), hermeneutics can be defined in at least six forms. First, hermeneutics as the theory of biblical exegesis. Second, hermeneutics as the methodology of general philology. Third, hermeneutics as the science of linguistic understanding. Fourth, hermeneutics as the methodological foundation of the *Geisteswissenschaften*. Fifth, hermeneutics as the phenomenology of existence and existential understanding. Sixth, hermeneutics as a system of interpretation, both recollective and iconoclastic, used by humans to uncover the meaning behind myths and symbols. Each of these definitions represents a historical stage, referring to important events or approaches to the problem of interpretation. Each can be referred to as biblical, philological, scientific, *Geisteswissenschaften*, existential, and cultural approaches. Essentially, each definition represents a different viewpoint from which hermeneutics is seen, giving rise to different perspectives but legitimizing the framework of interpretive action, especially text interpretation. The content of hermeneutics itself tends to be reshaped through these changing perspectives. Simply put, the author sees hermeneutics as an effort or method to understand or interpret a particular object of study, ranging from sacred texts, past texts, scientific texts, culture, and even human existence itself.

Hermeneutics has evolved significantly from ancient times to the present day. Specifically, in its development from the modern to postmodern periods, according to Theodore George (George 2021), hermeneutics has undergone various dynamic thoughts

with many thinkers. Modern hermeneutics was advocated by 19th and early 20th-century German thinkers, particularly Schleiermacher and Dilthey. Contemporary hermeneutics took diverse forms with contributions from Heidegger, Gadamer, and Ricoeur. Beyond these, there are also critical hermeneutics with its proponent Habermas and deconstructive hermeneutics with its figure Derrida, as well as postmodern hermeneutics with figures like Lyotard and Vattimo. These developments will be further elaborated in the following discussion.

2. Reproduction of Meaning in Modern Hermeneutics

In the modern hermeneutics section, there are two key figures whose thoughts the author outlines: Schleiermacher and Dilthey. Friederich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher (1768-1834) is the first figure in modern hermeneutics, contributing significantly to the foundation of universal hermeneutics. With a background in German Romanticism, Schleiermacher developed hermeneutics with a reproductive model. He believed that hermeneutics is a discipline focused on the elaboration and interpretation of texts concerning traditional concepts contained in sacred scriptures and dogma. In this way, he considered understanding to be a direct process of empathy. Schleiermacher focused his hermeneutic studies on sacred scriptures, legal texts, and philology. He used philological methods to study writings in sacred scriptures and hermeneutic methods for texts not related to sacred scriptures. His goal was to gain a good understanding of the meaning of texts (Hardiman 2015; Sumaryono 1999).

To understand a speaker's statement, one must be able to understand the language and the speaker's psyche. The more complete one's understanding of the author's language and psychology, the more complete the interpretation. Linguistic competence and the ability to understand a person will determine one's success in interpretation. This aligns with the task of hermeneutics, which is to understand texts as well or better than their authors themselves, and to understand the authors of the texts better than understanding oneself (Sumaryono 1999). These are the two main tasks of hermeneutics according to Schleiermacher: grammatical interpretation and psychological interpretation. Grammatical interpretation is a prerequisite for everyone's thinking, while psychological interpretation allows one to grasp the author's personality.

The next figure in modern hermeneutics is Wilhelm Christian Ludwig Dilthey (1833-1911). Dilthey was a follower of Hegel and a member of the Historical School. His

hermeneutic model was also reproductive. According to him, understanding in hermeneutics is a scientific method. The main concept of his hermeneutics is reliving (*nach-erleben*). The object of his hermeneutic study was the social sciences. Dilthey made a significant contribution by integrating *verstehen* into the methods of social sciences (Hardiman 2015). He sharply distinguished between natural sciences (*Naturwissenschaften*) and social sciences (*Geisteswissenschaften*). All natural sciences, such as biology, chemistry, physics, and all scientific disciplines using inductive and experimental scientific methods, fall under *Naturwissenschaften*. Meanwhile, all sciences related to human social life, such as history, psychology, philosophy, social sciences, arts, religion, literature, and similar sciences, fall under *Geisteswissenschaften*. Natural physical sciences use scientific methods and are exact sciences whose discoveries can be proven with very strict methods (Sumaryono 1999). On the other hand, social sciences cannot be applied with scientific methods because these sciences are related to human life. Here, hermeneutics is needed as a method in social sciences.

If Schleiermacher was closely associated with German Romanticism, Dilthey's thoughts can be understood in relation to the Historical School, referring to the intellectual movement of the 19th and early 20th centuries that no longer treated human nature, morality, and reason as absolute, eternal, and universal but instead sought to understand them as relative, changing, and specific, shaped by historical context. According to George (George 2021), Dilthey's overall project was to establish a critique of historical reason that would secure an independent epistemological foundation for research in the social sciences, i.e., sciences distinguished by their focus on historical experience. Dilthey linked the goals of social sciences not with the explanation of external experiences but rather with the understanding of lived experiences (*Erlebnis*). Dilthey asserted that the understanding achieved in social sciences involves interpretation. However, this means that hermeneutics, understood as a universal theory of interpretation validity, is no more than establishing rules for successful interpretive practice. Hermeneutics explains the validity of research conducted in social sciences. Dilthey asserted that the main goal of hermeneutics is to preserve the general validity of interpretation against the breakthroughs of Romanticism and skeptical subjectivity and to provide a theoretical justification for such validity upon which all certainty of historical knowledge is built.

3. Production of Meaning in Contemporary Hermeneutics

In the contemporary hermeneutics section, the author outlines the thoughts of three hermeneutic figures: Heidegger, Gadamer, and Ricoeur. As previously stated by George (George 2021), the separation of contemporary hermeneutics from modern hermeneutics is marked by Heidegger's use of hermeneutics in the phenomenological investigation of human existence. Contemporary hermeneutics was then shaped in various forms by Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics, which further developed and expanded Heidegger's efforts. Additionally, contemporary hermeneutics also received contours from Ricoeur's contributions.

The first thinker discussed in this study is Martin Heidegger (1889-1976). He was a proponent of phenomenology. His hermeneutic model is characterized by facticity. According to him, understanding in hermeneutics is a way of being. The main concept of his hermeneutics is the pre-structure of understanding. The object of his hermeneutic study is human existence. He made significant contributions to revealing the importance of presuppositions in understanding texts (Hardiman 2015). Heidegger shifted the understanding of hermeneutics from the traditional method of interpreting authoritative texts, such as religious and legal texts, to a way of understanding human existence itself (Lafont 2016). This shift can be described as a breakthrough in the historical hermeneutic movement. Heidegger demonstrated the role played by hermeneutics in understanding the way of being of humans through a critical reevaluation of Husserl's phenomenology, particularly a critical reevaluation of aspects of Husserl's phenomenology that relied on transcendental and eidetic methods. In this regard, Heidegger contrasted his hermeneutic phenomenology with Husserl's transcendental approach (George 2021). Simply put, Heidegger's hermeneutics is interpretative because it allows reality to reveal itself. The interpreter does not impose their mental conditions on what appears. In this respect, Heidegger's hermeneutics is not cognitive but reflective.

The next thinker, Hans-Georg Gadamer (1900-2002), was a follower of Heidegger's ontology. His hermeneutic model is philosophical or productive. According to him, understanding in hermeneutics is agreement. The main concept of his hermeneutics is the fusion of horizons and effective history (*Wirkungsgeschichte*). The object of his hermeneutic study is the interpretation of texts in general. He made significant contributions to positioning hermeneutics as a universal phenomenon

(Hardiman 2015). Gadamer argued that hermeneutics is an art, not a mechanical process. If understanding is the soul of hermeneutics, then understanding cannot be treated as a complement to a mechanical process. Understanding and hermeneutics can only be treated as an art form. If in an artwork there is some kind of intuition and speculation, a circular movement, a form of anticipation of previous considerations, then it is indeed expected. Gadamer referred to hermeneutics as an art, and such hermeneutics cannot be prepared beforehand, predicted, or stated beforehand. Hermeneutics must produce an essence in the inner realm, which is the highest and true reality. This inner essence must be understood and expressed. Hermeneutics must be conducted beyond reconstruction. This means that the original author or artist who created a work is not necessarily the ideal interpreter. However, it is also a fact that those who investigate history can also be called history makers because history has its own meaning and has endless productivity in its research results that are always changing and evolving (Sumaryono 1999).

The starting point of Gadamer's hermeneutics is the concern that the success of scientific methods has alienated us from the validity of truth questioned in interpretive experiences. Therefore, philosophical hermeneutics begins with an effort to restore the sense of truth questioned in interpretive experiences by focusing our attention on the motives of the humanistic tradition and the ontology of art. Gadamer's considerations of the motives of the humanistic tradition are oriented by Weimar classicism and its legacy in the intellectual life of 19th-century Germany. His notes help us to restore the validity of truth experiences not measured by scientific methods but instead depend on our education, grasped as formation (*Bildung*) through formal education and experience, as well as the cultivation of appropriate capacities such as common sense, judgment, and taste (George 2021). Simply put, Gadamer viewed hermeneutics as human capacity to discover truth through historical research. That truth is continuously discovered and does not stop at one truth. Ultimately, truth will reach the true truth.

Next, Jean Paul Gustave Ricoeur (1913-2005) was a follower of Descartes' philosophy, Husserl's phenomenology, existentialism, and psychoanalysis. His hermeneutic model is critical. According to him, understanding in hermeneutics is reflecting on meaning. The main concept of his hermeneutics is the correlation between understanding and explanation. The object of his hermeneutic study is the interpretation

of myths, sacred texts, ideology criticism, and critical social sciences. He made significant contributions to integrating interpretation and reflection (Hardiman 2015).

Ricoeur took orientation from Heidegger's hermeneutic phenomenology's claim that self-understanding must be understood in ontological terms, that self-understanding is self-interpretation of human existence understood as the occurrence of the distinctive possibilities of such existence. According to Ricoeur, one of the goals pursued by various kinds of hermeneutics is the struggle against cultural distance, i.e., the interpreter must maintain a distance to carry out a good interpretation. We can only critique if we distance ourselves from the object being critiqued. However, the critique we conduct will also produce a pre-formed structure, and our ideas, as well as the language expressed in that structure, also have colors. Therefore, everyone conducting a critique actually brings assumptions. Because when an interpreter distances themselves from historical and cultural events, they do not work with empty hands. This shows that we cannot completely avoid prejudices. Ricoeur stated that the main task of hermeneutics is on one side to search for the internal dynamics governing structural work within a text, and on the other side, to search for the power possessed by the work to project itself outward and allow the meaning of the text to emerge. Ricoeur understood hermeneutics as a theory of the operation of understanding in relation to the interpretation of a text. What we say or write has more than one meaning when we relate it to different contexts. Ricoeur referred to this feature as polysemy, a feature that causes a word to have more than one meaning when used in a relevant context (Sumaryono 1999). Simply put, for Ricoeur, hermeneutics is a theory about how to interpret texts, signs, or symbols.

4. Liberation of Meaning in Critical Hermeneutics

Hermeneutics is also constructed through critical theory, one of which is from Jürgen Habermas (1929-2019). He was a follower of the critical philosophies of Kant, Hegel, and Marx. His hermeneutic model is critical. According to him, understanding in hermeneutics is liberation. The main concept of his hermeneutics is emancipatory interest. The object of his hermeneutic study is ideology critique, psychoanalysis, and critical social sciences. He made significant contributions by integrating interpretation and critique (Hardiman 2015). Understanding in Habermas's explanation essentially requires dialogue because the process of understanding is a collaborative process where participants are simultaneously connected in the lifeworld (Lebenswelt). The lifeworld

has three aspects: the objective world, the social world, and the subjective world. The objective world is the totality of all entities or truths that enable the formation of true statements. So the totality that allows us to think correctly about everything, including humans and animals. The social world is the totality of all interpersonal relationships considered legitimate and orderly. The subjective world is the totality of the experiences of the speaker or often referred to as my world, my experiences, and so on. When we talk about understanding in a social context, the hermeneutic approach presupposes the existence of a transcendental linguistic rule in communicative action because reason or reasoning is beyond language (Sumaryono 1999).

One important controversy of Gadamer's hermeneutics relates to the basis of ideology critique. This issue was then continued by Habermas. For Habermas, ideology is the relationship between doctrine, belief, and political attitudes that distort the political reality they aim to describe. Thus, ideology reinforces distorted power relations, which in turn prevent the openness of discussion needed for the consideration and decision-making of legitimate democratic politics. Considering this, one of the goals of critical theory is to build a foundation for criticizing ideology. Habermas and other critical theorists seek a basis for critique with the ability to reveal even some of our most cherished doctrines, beliefs, and political attitudes as ideological distortions resulting from forms of domination derived from tradition. Habermas raised objections to Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics that the hermeneutic experience of truth offers too little basis for such critique. Habermas objected that philosophical hermeneutics, with its adherence to the authority of tradition, does not provide room for critique of ideology embedded in historically transmitted prejudices that underpin our experience of truth. Moreover, as we might worry, what Gadamer describes as the hermeneutic experience of truth might not be an experience of truth at all but rather a distorted communication involved in ideology because the so-called truth is the result of conversations that might not be open but oriented towards prejudices that reinforce domination relations (George 2021). Habermas's critical hermeneutic theory represents a new breakthrough that bridges the tension between objectivity and subjectivity, ideality and reality, theoretical and practical.

5. Radicalization of Meaning in Deconstructive Hermeneutics

Derrida's deconstruction theory also adds a distinctive color to hermeneutics. Jacques Derrida (1930-2004) was a follower of Heidegger's ontology, French post-

structuralism phenomenology. His hermeneutic model is radical. According to him, understanding in hermeneutics is suspending meaning. The main concept of his hermeneutics is *différance*. The object of his hermeneutic study is the interpretation of texts in general, such as literature, law, philosophy, theology, and so on. He made significant contributions by opening up the intertextual interpretative space from multiple perspectives (Hardiman 2015). Hermeneutics is understanding in works. Its goal is to reveal the secret worldview of the author and enable us to adjust that the phenomenological essence of understanding is none other than the ability of someone to hear what they say. The sign-giver is the person who can feel the author's breath and the meaning of the sign or the meaning attached to the author. The hermeneut then tries to release the meaning from the spoken or written words at the moment those words are uttered; this can happen because the voice heard is identical to consciousness. Interpretation theory is essentially a theory of reading, which ultimately is also a theory of texts. A person's understanding depends on how they read the text. Based on this, the reading theory will also depend on understanding (Sumaryono 1999).

Further important controversy regarding Gadamer's hermeneutics emerged in the context of Derrida's deconstruction project. While the relationship between hermeneutics and deconstruction is complex, an important controversy is whether the success of understanding truly reaches the determined meaning. Gadamer states that the success of understanding is understanding something in its existence as it is or what it is. Moreover, we experience truth as a claim we can agree on and is meant to be justified by the interpretive experience that first brings it forth. However, as we can observe, Gadamer's idea of the success of understanding thus relies on the authenticity of our experience that we truly have understood something determinate or at least something quite definite to make a truth claim. Derrida's deconstruction raises a challenge to this idea because Derrida argues that discursive experience is governed by the operation or perhaps more accurately the structure of inoperativity that would impede the possibility of understanding something with such determination. Derrida explains the character of the structure of inoperativity in terms of several concepts throughout his career, but perhaps none more influential than *différance*. Derrida describes *différance* as the dual structure of difference and deferral. According to Saussurean linguistics, difference thus indicates that in discursive experience, determining the meaning of something remains beyond our

reach because linguistic signs present what they should signify not per se but always heterogeneously through other signs. Différance further indicates that because of this heterogeneity that cannot be replaced, our efforts to determine the meaning of something remain in suspension. Because discursive experience is thus imbued with heterogeneity, our attempts to determine the meaning of something are not entirely under our control but instead remain subject to the free play of signs (George 2021). Hermeneutics in the perspective of deconstruction provides an important space for constructing meaning for the reader and their context. The differences in meaning and understanding are considered as unavoidable prerequisites in the process of reading a text. Through Derrida's lens, deconstruction becomes a reflective means to open up new perceptions and possibilities that may have been overlooked in efforts to understand.

6. Rejection of Metanarratives and Creation of New Meanings in Postmodern Hermeneutics

Hermeneutics is also specifically shaped by the emergence of postmodernism. The rise of postmodernism proved to be a significant driver for the development of hermeneutics. Jean-François Lyotard (1924-1998) harbored distrust towards metanarratives. For him, metanarratives are foundational stories of modern Western philosophy that function to legitimize discourse in science. Examples include the narrative of scientific objectivity and the contribution of science to societal progress (George 2021).

Lyotard saw the danger of metanarratives, which have resulted in our judgment of knowledge being reduced to a single total standard, namely the commodity of information produced and exchanged for the accumulation of wealth and power. Distrust of metanarratives yields new possibilities, namely freedom in the creation of new meanings. Hermeneutics will emphasize the possibility of interpretive experiences to generate new meanings. The most influential conception of postmodern hermeneutics lies in Gianterasio (Gianni) Vattimo's (1936-) notion of weak thought (*pensiero debole*). Vattimo considered interpretive practices that gradually reduce the dominance of the narratives from Western metaphysical tradition. Vattimo believed in the postmodern possibility of liberating the creation of new meanings. Vattimo argued that interpretive practices could loosen the grip of metanarratives. Vattimo understood interpretive experiences as practices of recovery, i.e., recovery capable of weakening Western

metaphysical interpretation. Vattimo linked the possibility of meaning liberation through weak thought because through it, every metanarrative can be unmasked (George 2021). Simply put, postmodern hermeneutics refers to the ideology that people can transcend old theories and assumptions in interpreting general assumptions.

D. Conclusion

This article yields two main conclusions. First, hermeneutics is an effort or method to understand or interpret a particular object of study, ranging from sacred texts, past texts, scientific texts, culture, to human existence itself. Second, the development of thought in Western hermeneutics from the modern to the postmodern era stretches across various tendencies. In modern hermeneutics, with figures like Schleiermacher and Dilthey, the tendency is reproductive, i.e., understanding according to the author's understanding. In contemporary hermeneutics, with figures like Heidegger, Gadamer, and Ricoeur, the tendency is productive, i.e., generating new understanding from the reader. Critical hermeneutics, with its figure Habermas, tends to make interpretation an effort of liberation. Deconstructive hermeneutics, with its figure Derrida, has a tendency towards radical understanding. Lastly, postmodern hermeneutics, with figures like Lyotard and Vattimo, tends to reject metanarratives in interpretation. These conclusions can theoretically enrich the discourse on hermeneutics, often seen as a single interpretive model with a unified tendency, whereas there are various tendencies within it. Practically, the existence of these diverse tendencies will open opportunities for their application in various fields such as religion, science, and culture. This research, of course, still holds weaknesses as it is in the form of a literature review, thus requiring further research related to its application in the form of field studies.

References

- Al Munir, M. I. (2021). Hermeneutika sebagai Metode dalam Kajian Kebudayaan. *Titian: Jurnal Ilmu Humaniora*, 5(1), 101–116. <https://doi.org/10.22437/titian.v5i1.12508>
- Arias Schreiber, M., Chuenpagdee, R., & Jentoft, S. (2022). Blue Justice and the co-production of hermeneutical resources for small-scale fisheries. *Marine Policy*, 137(April 2021), 104959. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2022.104959>
- Asmolov, A. G. (2016). Psychology of Modernity as a Social Situation of Development:

- Challenges of Uncertainty, Complexity and Diversity. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 233(May), 27–34.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.122>
- Bertens, K. (2002). *Filsafat Barat Kontemporer: Inggris-Jerman*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Britannica, T. E. of E. (2024). Hermeneutics. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*.
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/hermeneutics-principles-of-biblical-interpretation>
- Elbanna, A., & Newman, M. (2022). The bright side and the dark side of top management support in Digital Transformaion –A hermeneutical reading. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 175, 121411.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121411>
- Fancourt, N., Foreman-Peck, L., & Oancea, A. (2022). Addressing ethical quandaries in practitioner research: A philosophical and exploratory study of responsible improvisation through hermeneutical conversation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 116, 103760. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103760>
- George, T. (2021). Hermeneutics. In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2021/entries/hermeneutics/>
- Gjesdal, K. (2022). Hermeneutics. In *Oxford Bibliographies*.
<https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/display/document/obo-9780195396577/obo-9780195396577-0054.xml>
- Hansen, A. V. (2019). Value co-creation in service marketing: A critical (re)view. *International Journal of Innovation Studies*, 3(4), 73–83.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijis.2019.12.001>
- Hardiman, F. B. (2015). *Seni Memahami: Hermeneutika Dari Schleiermacher Sampai Derrida*. Kanisius.
- Hovey, R. B., Rodríguez, C., & Jordan, S. (2020). Beyond Lecturing: An Introduction to Gadamer’s Dialogical Hermeneutics With Insights Into Health Professions Education. *Health Professions Education*, 6(4), 465–471.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hpe.2020.08.004>
- Hurley, G., Curtis, K., & Hammond, J. A. (2022). Hermeneutic phenomenological research on how nurse educators make meaning of compassion and understand its role in their professional practice. *Nurse Education Today*, 119(October), 105588.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2022.105588>
- James, S., Cronin, J., & Patterson, A. (2024). “If you like your history horrible”: The obscene supplementarity of thanatourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 106, 103749. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2024.103749>
- Kaelan. (2005). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Bidang Filsafat*. Paradigma.
- Lafont, C. (2016). Martin Heidegger. In *The Blackwell Companion to Hermeneutics* (First). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Martono, M. (2019). *Kajian Kritis Hermeneutika Friederich Scheiermacher VS Paul*

- Ricoeur. *Jurnal Edukasi Khatulistiwa: Pembelajaran Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 2(1), 42. <https://doi.org/10.26418/ekha.v1i1.31713>
- Morán-Reyes, A. A. (2022). Towards an ethical framework about Big Data era: metaethical, normative ethical and hermeneutical approaches. *Heliyon*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e08926>
- Mrugalski, M. (2021). Teoria/Literatura as a Mise en Abyme of Digital Research on Literary Studies. The Corpus of Polish Literary Theory Between Mathematical Intuitionism and Formalism. *Russian Literature*, 122–123, 85–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ruslit.2021.07.005>
- Najib, M. M., Hamzawi, M. A., & Rohmawan, D. (2021). *Hermeneutika Klasik dan Hermeneutika Modern (Dari Merebutkan Objektivitas hingga Objektivitas Absurd)*. 7(2), 131–155.
- Palmer, R. E. (2005). *Hermeneutika: Teori Baru Mengenai Interpretasi*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Rahman, D. R. (2016). Kritik Nalar Hermeneutika Paul Ricoeur. *Kalimah*, 14(1), 37. <https://doi.org/10.21111/klm.v14i1.360>
- Sumaryono, E. (1999). *Hermeneutika: Sebuah Metode Filsafat*. Kanisius.
- Wagemans, J. H. M. (2023). How to identify an argument type? On the hermeneutics of persuasive discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 203, 117–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.11.015>
- Watson, E. E., & Minns Lowe, C. J. (2023). Exploring the business skills, experiences and preparedness of UK-based private physiotherapists when establishing and developing a physiotherapy business: A hermeneutic phenomenological study. *Musculoskeletal Science and Practice*, 63(September 2022), 102694. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.msksp.2022.102694>