MAIN ELEMENTS OF H.-G. GADAMER'S COMMUNICATION HERMENEUTICS

Ştefan VLĂDUŢESCU[1], Xenia NEGREA[2], Dan Valeriu VOINEA[3]

Department of Communication, Journalism and Education Sciences, Faculty of Letters, University of Craiova, CCSCMOP, 13 A. I. Cuza Street, 200585 Craiova, Romania

E-mails: [1]*vladutescu.stefan@ucv.ro (corresponding author)*; [2]*xenia_karo@yahoo.com;* [3]*me@danvoinea.ro*

This study explores the communication articulations of Hans-Georg Gadamer's hermeneutics. The research method that was used is a mix between the meta-analytic method, comparative method and hermeneutic method. It starts from the assumption that in order to understand the communication universe, this has to be judged in relation with some pre-determined axes. The corpus of analysis is hermeneutical work of Gadamer. We prove that, founder of the philosophical hermeneutics, Gadamer is also one of the founders of communication hermeneutics. The thetic articulation radiography of the Gadamerian work highlights that activities of hermeneutics inevitably occur within communication; communication includes strong interpretive-hermeneutic flows. Gadamer considers the interpretation as an intrinsic process of communication: no communication can exist without interpretation. The work reveals as main elements of Gadamerian hermeneutic conception of communication: universality of interpretation (of reason, language and understanding), hermeneutical situation (addressing, fusion of horizons), the principle and the canon of interpretation.

Keywords: communication hermeneutics, fusion of horizons, Hans-Georg Gadamer, hermeneutical situation, linguality of understanding.

Introduction

Beforehand, Robert T. Craig (1999) proposed a seven traditions matrix that can fit all approaches to communication. In order to overcome the rigidity of the system of traditions, we have proposed a system of axes that help us make a radiography of the universe of communication and organize this universe. What we called communication axes standard-matrix theory was appreciated by professor Craig (2015) as a possible solution for the communication's organization. Secondary, the present study is an application of the axes theory. Among the 16 axes of the radiography system we can also mention the communication hermeneutics, the communication psychology, the communication sociology, etc.

We clarify that communication hermeneutics is the field of researching knowledge

polarized along the axis of hermeneutics. For understanding the "field of communication theory", Craig carried out a matrix made up of "seven major traditions": rhetorical, semiotic, phenomenological, cybernetic, socio-psychological, socio-cultural and critical (1999). We noticed that there is no epistemic tool for revealing the understanding core of communication in professor Craig's standard. To radiography the universe of communication we have identified a network of 16 axes: communication ontology, communication epistemology, communication methodology, communication axiology, communication history, communication psychology, communication sociology, communication anthropology, communication hermeneutics, communication praxeology, communication ethics, communication logics, communication ecology, communication philosophy, communication law, health communication. We found that this axes' network is in continuous development. We have emphasized that the axes of polarization are already imposed as research branches of the fundamental discipline of communication.

In 2015, in the study "The Constitutive Metamodel: A 16-Year Review" Craig analyzes (2015) the reception and the impact of the model proposed in 1999 (1999) and, among other things, he observes that, following our work from 2013 (Vlăduţescu 2013), we developed "an axial model of the field", as Craig specifies (2015).

The communication hermeneutics axis

Taking into account the fact that communication means freedom, it means also interpretation, hermeneutics. With hermeneutics we are situated in an interpretive paradigm. Within communication hermeneutics it is explained how these axes are generated, how they are structured, how they are understood, how they are interpreted and how their meanings and communicative messages generate effects.

By his study "Conceptualizing Human Understanding: Gadamer's Hermeneutics and American Communication Studies", Stanley A. Deetz is among the founders of communication hermeneutics (1978). Fall also here Martin Buber (1970, 2002), Gadamer (1975, 1990, 2001, 2004, 2008), Paul Ricoeur (1976, 2004), Gianni Vattimo (2000), Craig (2009), Ştefan Bratosin (2011), Richard J. Bernstein (1983), Vattimo and Pier Aldo Rovatti (2012), Loren G. Agrey (2014).

The fundamental hermeneutical situation

In philosophical reflections, as in the development of his philosophical hermeneutics, Gadamer starts what Martin Heidegger set. More than a simple cognition, Gadamer lives the predecessor's opera right next to it, as an experience of cognition. Formative exercise is Heideggerian, his merit standing in caring on some query directions opened by the master and starting new ones. If Heidegger puts the being in time (Vėželis 2016), Gadamer brings the conscious of being on the steps of history. Conceived as a coherent set of situations, the evolution of the world is also, seen as a fusion of horizons of a different hermeneutical situation. Far from being uncomfortable, the concept of "hermeneutical situation" (Gadamer 2004: 301) is part of its hermeneutical conceptual arsenal of reflection. Indeed, the general approach is carried out thanks to his hermeneutical analysis. As cognitive spirits, we're not leaving and not returning, nor come out and not come inmnecessarily we are trapped within our hermeneutical situation. The Gadamerian cogitative subject is aware of his throwing in a hermeneutical situation. He is inevitable in this situation. This is his everyday story: lives and dies in the situation he understands good or bad, right or wrong. Anyway, he understands it somehow. Generally, the world always has a meaning. Heidegger's and Gadamer's common

thesis is that the being "is never totally incomprehensible" (Heidegger 2003: 249), there is not totally incomprehensible.

In Gadamer's opera, hermeneutics is articulated and is defined on the domain of this thesis. As theory of understanding and mutual understanding, it has the duty to explain "the miracle of understanding" (Gadamer 2004: 309). The developing of the thesis is performed under fundamental hermeneutical situation within the main process that takes place is comprehension. To be in the situation, to be in dialogue, it means to-be-beyond-the-oneself, to think with the other and return to self as the other. Depending on its specific situation can be described: teacher's situation – teaching situation, the converse – an authentic conversation situation (negotiation conversation, medical conversation and confidential conversation).

What is hermeneutical situation? What about Gadamer reach this situation? The situation is a process that performs between people who, despite practical dissipation and the potential influence, yet has theoretical own unity and cohesion. It was for us an achievement of an ideal hermeneutical situation something that left us with something. Not that we knew anything new here it made that a discourse to be what it is, but the fact that in the other we met something we have not yet met in our own experience of the world. Where a discourse had success, it remained us something, and remained in us something that has changed us. The discourse situation is in a specific neighborhood to friendship. The discourse has a force that transforms. Only in discourse (and, in fact, to laugh together, that is a kind of tacit agreement overflowing) friends can find each other and can build that kind of community where each other remain the same, because they both find the other and find themselves in the other. One of the fundamental hermeneutical situation characteristic is, therefore, the encounter with the other and experiential finding in him.

The discourse is a process of understanding the other. Thus, through our discourse addressed to the other, we implicitly accept that we can understand what the other would answer to us. What you need to catch is the justice regarding the work and accuracy on his opinion, to be able to agree on the workin question. Therefore, we will not report his opinion to himself, but retrospective in its own sight and presumption. Where we reality view the other as an individual the situation of understanding is not given authentically. Preliminary come off as landmarks within the hermeneutical situation: work, opinion, and consent.

Essentially, Gadamer does not propose his own method. In fact, he let it be understood that the search for truth, his research is above any other method. He claims that he talks about the method only because "the tension between the truth and method has an inescaable currency" (Gadamer 2004: 556). Gadamer tries to think beyond the concept of method. He considers as scientific only the fact to recognize what it is. He wants only to describe what it is. It seems to have a strange resentment towards phenomenology. With all the precautions that he takes to stay outside employment on a direction of dependency of a method, which, in his opinion, would foster truth, Gadamer is forced to admit, when he no longer has a choice, that his innocence of description is a phenomenological one. It is just a concession, not as a method of intakes. This is not a dogmatic assumption, but a phenomenological description. Rather then dogmatic, it is more phenomenological enrolled. Under threat of dogmatism, he defends by phenomenology. In him we have, we should say, with a phenomenologist hiding, one seriously to dogmatic. Heidegger reversed evolutional the phenomenology and applied it to the individual living level (unlike Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel that retains it to the spirit level). The direction of his research was "based on the things themselves" (Heidegger 2003: 210), as opposed to Edmund Husserl's motto, "starting from the things themselves" (*zu den Sachen selbst*) that Gadamer and quotes it (2004: 544). Gadamer is returned incognito to the method devised by Husserl.

People are not always in the middle of events. In fact, we perceive most of the world phenomena from a distance. Only our consciousness intimate distance becomes minimal, and there enter prejudices. Fundamental human hermeneutical situation is deeply marked by distance: distance in space, distance in time (history), biases of perception.

The most difficult empathy is being's empathy over time, being on the steps of history. We bring with us the whole history of the world, a historical being who comes to us, that makes up the genealogy of us. Every man is the successor of a continuous historical chain of beings. Even understanding our direct ancestors is not a simple thing. Understanding occurs necessarily in a hermeneutical situation, a situation description-understanding-explanation-interpretation: "If we are trying to understand a historical phenomenon from the historical distance that is characteristic of our hermeneutical situation, we are always affected by history" (Gadamer 2004: 300).

Hermeneutical situation rests on three pillars: reason, language, and understanding. They make in Gadamer's vision a unity that might be called the horizon of the universalities: "universality of reason" (2004: 402), "language universality" (2001: 420), "understanding universality" (2001: 679) that "the universality of the hermeneutical dimension" (2001: 533). The reason "is common to all and is able to capture what is common to all" (Gadamer 2001: 512). The requirement of reason, Gadamer shows, is to understand and to give you adhesion based on the understanding. Ideas, thoughts, opinions, experiences are brought to communicational life, are communicated through language and as language: "Our thought is transmitted through language" and is "linguistically mediated" (Gadamer 2004: 546).

The language acquires such proximity besides reason, things that it calls, that becomes incomprehensible even the fact of the existence of different languages, since all appear to be characterized by the same proximity besides

reason and things. The universality of language is in the fact that it is not a closed area of expressibility, beside which would sit other areas of inexpressibility, but it is all-encompassing (Corradi Fiumara 2006; Costache 2016). There is nothing that should be avoided in principle of being told, in as far as only that fact of having significance means something: "We can express everything in words and can try to come to agreement about everything" (Gadamer 2004: 548).

There is not an emplacement situated outside of lingual experience of the world, in terms of which it may become an object itself. Linguality is "determination of the hermeneutic object" and of hermeneutic conducting (Gadamer 2004: 391). The essential relationship between lingual and understanding is manifested itself in the first instance by the fact that the essence of tradition is to exist in the language environment, so that the privileged object of the interpretation is of lingual nature. Any knowledge of the world by human is mediated linguistic. A first orientation in the world is performed by learning the speech. But not only that. The linguisticity of our fact be in the world articulates, ultimately, the entire field of experience. It exists everywhere is known the world, where unfamiliarly is canceled, where is performed the highlighting, perception, proximity, and ultimately the noblest task of hermeneutics as philosophical theory lies in the fact to show that only the integration of all knowledge of science in personal knowledge of the individual can be called "hermeneutical experience" (Gadamer 2004: 370). The one who lives in a language is full of unsurpassed suitability feeling of the words he uses beside of things to which he refers. It seems to be almost impossible that other words in other languages to be able to name the same things as well and properly. The appropriate word seems to be always the right and always unique, as pointed thing. Even the toil translation rests ultimately on the fact that the original terms seem to be inseparable from pointed contents. Despite any

differences of how to say something, Gadamer retains the indissoluble unity of thought and language that sees translating within the hermeneutic phenomenon as unit of understanding and interpretation (Grondin 2011).

The universality of language keeps up with the universality of reason. Gadamer underlines that "language is the fundamental mode of operation of our being-in-the-world and the all-embracing form of the constitution of the world" (1990: 147). The consciousness of hermeneutical participates in the universal relationship between language and reason. There is a crucial linkage between understanding and linguality. Linguistic can support any understanding. The understanding effort and interpretation always remains meaningful. In this superior universality proves that intellect rises above barriers of any constitution of language. Hermeneutic experience is the corrective by which thinking reason avoids the lingual magic and gets itself a lingual constitution. The understanding must create the hermeneutical situation and to integrate into it. If any understanding is placed in an appropriate equivalence relation besideit possible interpretation and if the understanding it is not in principle limited, then the lingual surprise of this understanding within interpreting must bear in its turn in itself an endlessly exceeding any barriers (Schmidt 2000). Understanding is lingual, even reasoning about all language is also lingual: "The linguisticality of our understanding is really one about language. In fact, language is the single word, whose virtuality opens for us the infinity of discourse, of speaking with one another" (Gadamer 2004: 553).

On the one hand, language is the language of reason itself. On the other hand, the connection between language and understanding is similar to connection between language and reason: we can say that understanding is the understanding of language itself. Gadamer states that "understanding is language-bound" (1990: 156). He asserts that "All understanding is interpretation, and all interpretation takes place

in the medium of a language that allows the object to come into words and yet is at the same time the interpreter's own language" (Gadamer 2004: 390) and that "Every interpretation has to adapt itself to the hermeneutical situation to which it belongs" (Gadamer 2004: 398). With this the hermeneutic phenomenon proves to be a particular case of the universal relation between thought and speech, whose enigmatic depth determines the suppression of the language in thought. Interpretation is, also as dialogue, a close circle through the dialectic question and answer. It is a report of authentic history that is used in the language environment and that we can call a dialogue even in texts interpreting. Linguality of understanding is the materialization of historical effectiveness consciousness.

The task of interpretation always imposes when the content of the meaning of fixed fact is controversial and should be gained the proper understanding of the news. The news is not however what the speaker said originally, that the writer, but what he wanted to say if I were his original partner for dialogue. Specifically, within interpreting are functioning axiomatic two mechanisms: principle of any interpretation, consisting of that "a text must be understood in its own terms" (Gadamer 2004: 292) and "reasonable hermeneutic canon" that states that "in a text should not be introduced anything that the author and the reader could not have in mind" (Gadamer 2001: 295). Reason, language and understanding are limitless. Being everywhere and of all, they belong, therefore, also being. In these circumstances, as Gianni Vattimo believes that Gadamer's basic thesis, that being that can be understood as language, announces a development of Heideggerianism' (Vattimo 1997) is a projection of the future in the past and an unprofitable breakof the system, coming even from a Gadamerian. Thesis "Being that can be understood is language" (Gadamer 2004: 470) is only a part of the Gadamerian tricuspid axiomatic. Being is only the starting point, shows Gadamer that starts from the fundamental ontological constitution that is being

is language, the representation of itself. Added that reason, language and understanding as forms of universality creates solidarity.

The elements of hermeneutical situation

There are three elements in a situation of mutual understanding, as also Gadamer calls the hermeneutical situation: partners (of which the most important is the recipient), hermeneutical relationship and hermeneutical problem.

1. Partners are mutually controlled. "We are always guided by the recipient provisions, from which we want to achieve an adequate understanding of the meaning" (Gadamer 2001: 605). In the discourse which he addressed, the producer opens a horizon of interpretation and of communication that the recipient must complete it. All that is said, is also, always already oriented towards communication and involve the other. It involves providing of the other, with whom he shares, some assumptions and whose understanding relies upon. The other takes what is said as it is thought, that he actually meant by that complements and specifies what is said and does not take anything literally, in abstract semantic content.

2. The relationship that is based on and the development of prior relationships of partners and "do absolutely intelligible" (Gadamer 2001: 354) the hermeneutical situation is a hermeneutical relationship. The situation produces relationship equally that relationship produces the situation.

3. Between partners is created a fundamental hermeneutic report of the "common mutual preunderstanding" (Gadamer 2001: 608) and "communicative mutual preunderstanding", the basic agreement that strengthens then in comprehension and consensus (agreement). Hermeneutical problem to solved within hermeneutic report is not that of the correct mastery of the language, but the real understanding of something that is happening in the language environment. Hermeneutical problem

is essentially the same in oral and written endeavor.

Preliminary conditions

Taking into consideration that mutually communicative understanding represents even the essential feature of the hermeneutics situation, Gadamer gives the impression that it "depends on conditions that can not be themselves created" (2001: 520) by itself hermeneutical situation. In reality, the situation is put into play just by the fact that it is already in the game. It never starts from scratch. Every situation requires so, preliminaries: the ability to judge, the common language, pre-understanding, pre-concepts, pre-accord, goodwill.

1 . The ability to judge also the common language. Within the situation it is assumed from hypothesis that speakers speak the same language. Mastering the language is a "preliminary condition" of the understanding (Gadamer 2004: 181). This is a preliminary of the hermeneutical situation. Language preforms and directs anticipatory any experience, representing both a condition and a positive guidance of this (Vallée 2013; Simms 2015).

2. Preunderstanding and preconception. A fundamental structure of the hermeneutic situation as a general rule is the fact that in their performance, the partners are "so directed of preconception and preunderstanding" (Gadamer 2001: 493), that they constantly remain hidden and it takes an own fracturing of what is in intentional direction of the speech, to awake to prejudices as such.

3. The preliminary goodwill. Thus, "everywhere is trying to communicate, goodwill is preliminary" (Gadamer 2001: 605).

4. Agreement, preliminary solidarity. Hermeneutical situation consciousness generates a preliminary solidarity. Gadamer underlying this section of the debate on "the thesis that wherever is possible mutual understanding, solidarity is assumed" (Gadamer 2001: 605).

Anticipation of accomplishment

Understanding is directed permanently by transcendental anticipations of meaning that come from reporting to the truth of what is pointed: "The circle, which is fundamental to all understanding, has a further hermeneutic implication which I call the fore-conception of completeness" (Gadamer 2004: 294). Such anticipation represents "an axiom of all hermeneutics" (Gadamer 2004: 364), Gadamer calls it the anticipation of accomplishment. This is a presupposition that guides any understanding and consists of that becomes intelligible only what presents a perfect unity of meaning. Only when this assumption proves to be unaccomplishable, that the work and opinion do not become intelligible, we doubt it, we call it in question, eventual, process of transmission and try to fix it. The preliminary conception of perfection, that guides whole our understanding and gives to comprehensive subject orientation, thus proves itself as each time one determined in terms of content. Any anticipation of this kind extends until the limit that work refuses to become intelligible.

Supplying of the horizons

The fusing of the horizons of what is happening in comprehension constitutes the true performance of the language (Grondin 2005). Of genuine understanding takes a recovery of the concepts of a historical past, so that to contain also our own understanding. Gadamer calls this hermeneutics phenomenon "fusion of horizons" (2004: 305).

1. Prejudices

Prejudices and interests are reflected in the hermeneutical situation. They burn visible influences, even determine them. The prejudices and interests "mark out our hermeneutical situation" (Gadamer 2008: XVII). Of the two prejudices have a most prominent role. Interests influence, but prejudices determine. Interests

are a specific kind of judgments. Gadamer's memorable thesis is that "The prejudices of the individual, far more than his judgments, constitute the historical reality of his being" (2004: 278). Being as being is permeated by prejudices and the hermeneutical situation is determined by them: "A hermeneutical situation is determined by prejudices that we bring with us" (Gadamer 2004: 304). Prejudices form the horizon of any present. The real meaning of communication is that prejudices are put mutual through a test. The German philosopher enunciates a positive concept of prejudice in the sense of judgment rendered before the final examination of all objective determinant factors (Kovacs, Kot 2016). His opinion is that there is no free deal of prejudice. Understanding itself has a structure of prejudices. Even with our experience of the mediated world through language we obey some prejudices. Moreover, prejudices constitute a condition of understanding. Therefore, individual prejudices are the historical reality of his being a far greater extent than his judgments: "the prejudices of the individual, far more than his judgments, constitute the historical reality of his being" (Gadamer 2004: 278).

They are pre-adhesions of our openness to the world, are precisely the conditions for us to know something, for what we find to tell us something. Prejudices constitute, in the true sense of the word, the preliminary orientation of our whole possibility to know. The claim of total lack of prejudice is naive. The problem really critical of hermeneutic analysis is not the annihilation of prejudices, but prejudice distinguishes of true prejudices through that we understand, of the false prejudices, that lead to misunderstanding (Dumitru *et al.* 2016: 56). The great risk in the hermeneutical situation must be limited by awareness the risk that, refusing to accept prejudices, to become under the domination of hidden prejudices deaf to work that speaks us.

2. Autotelism and unpredictability

The way in which a word leads to another, the way the hermeneutic situation that deploys

as that dialogue takes a turn, it follows its course and it finds its end, all of this can constitute, of course, a type of leadership, but in this leadership the dialogue partners are less those who lead than those are led. Nobody knows from the beginning what will come out. "We define the concept of situation by saying that it represents a standpoint that limits the possibility of vision", asserts Gadamer (2004: 304). Being in hermeneutical situation, although we say we bring a dialogue, as it is more productive, as its leadership takes less than the will of one or other of dialogue partners. Thus, the dialogue itself is never that something that we want to wear. It is more accurate, in general, to say that we find ourselves in a dialogue, if not we find ourselves involved in one. Understanding or its failure is like an event occurred on our account. We could say then that something was a good dialogue or was not under favorable auspices. All of these attests that hermeneutical situation has its own spirit and the language is which is worn has itself its own truth, in other words "reveal" and make it come out that are to come. The hermeneutical situation is, as a result, outside of the will of partners. It is an autotelic event and unpredictable.

Conclusions

Gadamer's communication hermeneutics starts from the assumption that understanding is already interpretation, understanding always contains a kind of interpretation. Lingual interpretation is interpretation form in general. Therefore, it is present also where the interpretation is not at all likely lingual, so it is not at all about a text, but instance of an art opera or musical arts. Language is the universal medium of performing understanding. Thanks to its linguality any interpretation contains a report as possible to others. There can not be speech to meet the one who speaks at whom it is addressed. This is available also for the hermeneutic process. But this report does not

determine thus- as a conscious adaptation to a situation of pedagogic type – making the interpretive comprehension, but this execution is nothing more than the materialization of meaning itself. Interpretation is potentially contained by the understanding. It does nothing to identify explicit understanding. Interpretation is not therefore a mean by which to induce understanding, but disappeared in the content of what is understood. The modality of making understanding is interpretation. The whole understanding is interpretation.

References

Agrey, L. G. 2014. Philosophical Hermeneutics: a Tradition with Promise, *Universal Journal of Educational Research* 2(2): 188–192.

Bernstein, R. J. 1983. *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism: Science, Hermeneutics, and Praxis*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bratosin, S. 2011. Pour une épistémologie de la communication: approche herméneutique de la concertation, *Revista de Studii Media* 2(10): 3–12.

Buber, M. 2002. *Between Man and Man*. London and New York: Routledge.

Buber, M. 1970. *I and Thou*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Corradi Fiumara, G. 2006. *The Other Side of Language: A Philosophy of Listening*. New York: Routledge.

Costache, A. 2016. *Gadamer and the Question of Understanding: Between Heidegger and Derrida*. Maryland: Lexington Books.

Craig, R. T. 1999. Communication Theory as a Field, *Communication Theory* 9(2): 119–161. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1999.tb00355.x

Craig, R. T. 2009. Dewey and Gadamer on Practical Reflection: Toward a Methodology for the Practical Disciplines, in Perry, D. K. (Ed.). *American Pragmatism and Communication Research*. Series: Lea's Communication Series. Bryant, J.; Zillmann, D. (General Eds.). Mahwah, New Jersey, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 127–144.

Craig, R. T. 2015. The Constitutive Metamodel: A 16-Year Review, *Communication Theory* 25(4): 356–374. https://doi.org/10.1111/comt.12076

Deetz, S. 1978. Conceptualizing Human Understanding: Gadamer's Hermeneutics and American Communication Studies, *Communication Quarterly* 26(2): 12–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463377809369288

Dumitru, A.; Budică, A. B.; Motoi, A. G. 2016. Managerial-Systemic Profile of a Tourism Company, *Polish Journal of Management Studies* 13(2): 36–45. https://doi.org/10.17512/pjms.2016.13.2.04

Gadamer, H.-G. 2001. *Adevăr și metodă*. București: Teora.

Gadamer, H.-G. 1975. Hermeneutics and Social Science, *Cultural Hermeneutics* 2: 307–316. https://doi.org/10.1177/019145377500200402

Gadamer, H.-G. 2008. *Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

Gadamer, H.-G. 1990. The Universality of the Hermeneutical Problem, in Ormiston, G. L.; Schrift, A. D. (Eds.). *The Hermeneutic Tradition: From Ast to Ricoeur*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 147–158.

Gadamer, H.-G. 2004. *Truth and Method*. London, New York: Continuum.

Grondin, J. 2011. *Hans-Georg Gadamer: A Biography*. Paris: Grasset.

Grondin, J. 2005. La fusion des horizons, *Archives de philosophie* 68(3): 401–418.

Heidegger, M. 2003. *Ființă și timp*. București: Humanitas.

Kovacs, G.; Kot, S. 2016. New Logistics and Production Trends as the Effect of Global Economy Changes, *Polish Journal of Management Studies* 14(2): 115–126. https://doi.org/10.17512/pjms.2016.14.2.11

Ricoeur, P. 1976. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.

Ricoeur, P. 2004. *The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics*. Ihde, D. (Ed.). London, New York: Continuum.

Schmidt, L. K. (Ed.). 2000. *Language and Linguisticality in Gadamer's Hermeneutics*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Lexington Books.

Simms, K. 2015. *Hans-Georg Gadamer*. Series: Routledge Critical Thinkers. London and New York: Routledge.

Vallée, M.-A. 2013. *Gadamer et Ricœur: la conception herméneutique du langage*. Series: Philosophica. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Vattimo, G. 1997. *Beyond Interpretation: The Meaning of Hermeneutics for Philosophy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Vattimo, G. 2000. The Story of a Comma: Gadamer and the Sense of Being, *Revue Internationale de Philosophi*e 54(213): 499–513.

Vattimo, G.; Rovatti, P. A. (Eds.). 2012. *Weak Thought*. New York: State University of New York.

Vėželis, T. 2016. Čiabūties (*Dasein*) egzistencinių (*existenziell*) ir egzistencialiųjų (*existenzial*) apriorinių struktūrų analizė M. Heideggerio veikale *Būtis ir laikas*, *Filosofija. Sociologija* 27(3): 257–265.

Vlăduțescu, Ș. 2013. A Completion to the Traditions Matrix-Standard – R. T. Craig, Induced by the Transformation of Communication-as-a-Field Membrane in Communication-as-a-Universe Membrane, *American International Journal of Contemporary Research* 3(10): 6–12.

PAGRINDINIAI H.-G. GADAMERIO KOMUNIKACIJOS HERMENEUTIKOS ELEMENTAI

Ştefan VLĂDUŢESCU, Xenia NEGREA, Dan Valeriu VOINEA

Šiame tyrime nagrinėjama Hanso-Georgo Gadamerio hermeneutikos komunikacijos raiška. Taikyto tyrimo metodas – tai metaanalitinio metodo, komparatyvistinio metodo ir hermeneutinio metodo junginys. Jis prasideda nuo prielaidos, kad, siekiant suprasti komunikacijos visumą, tai turi būti įvertinta pagal santykį su kai kuriomis iš anksto nustatytomis ašimis. Analizės pagrindas – tai Gadamerio hermeneutikos darbas. Mes įrodinėjame, kad Gadameris, kaip filosofinės hermenetikos pradininkas, taip pat yra komunikacijos hermeneutikos pagrindėjas. Tetinė Gadamerio radiografijos raiška išryškina hermeneutikos veiklos rūšis, kurios neišvengiamai vyksta komunikacijoje; komunikacija apima stiprius interpretacinius ir hermeneutinius srautus. Interpretaciją Gadameris laiko vidiniu komunikacijos procesu – negali būti komunikacijos be interpretacijos. Straipsnyje rodomi pagrindiniai gadameriškosios komunikacijos hermeneutikos koncepcijos elementai: interpretacijos universalumas (proto, kalbos ir supratimo), hermeneutinė situacija (nukreiptumas, horizontų susiliejimas), interpretacijos principas ir kriterijus.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: komunikacijos hermeneutika, horizontų susiliejimas, Hansas-Georgas Gadameris, hermeneutinė situacija, kalbiškumo supratimas.