Contents

Full Issue: www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4892131

Editorial

Solidarity and Hope

These are terrible and fearful times. Some 3.55 million people have been infected by COVID-19 and nearly a quarter of a million have perished. Billions of people are on lockdown or in self-isolation, uncertain, lonely and afraid.

Yet this pandemic and the fear, dread, and anxiety that it has caused has led to an increase in solidarity, write Ulrika Modéer and Anna Ryott at United Nations Development Programme (Modeer & Ryott, 2020).

No one doubts that COVID-19 is one of the most serious threats the world has ever faced. And yet, amidst the confusion and anxiety, there are ever stronger signs of hope and solidarity, a sense of, and desire for, togetherness.

It is this spirit of global togetherness that gives us hope. In this time of crisis, we are all neighbours in the world, and success will only be achieved when all people, in all countries, are protected.

Thankfully, this shared sense of responsibility has seen a world come together in ways that we have not seen for some time, and the examples are everywhere.

The New York Times reports about a special situation in the United Kingdom: "When the government appealed recently for 250,000 people to help the National Health Service, more than 750,000 signed up. They had to stop taking applicants so it could process the flood."

In Somalia, where health infrastructure and traditional media have suffered under decades of strife, local storytellers are being equipped with the skills and tools to reach remote communities and educate them on best practices against COVID-19 (Modeer & Ryott, 2020).

Without ignoring the terrible and tragic realities we face, it is clear that the world is reaching for a positive message. These words were echoed by UN Secretary-General António Guterres to world leaders, as he emphasized the need for solidarity and global cooperation.

His call has resonated. Long sought-after partnerships with private sector companies are suddenly coming to fruition as everyone steps up to pitch in. UNDP has recently partnered with Variety on global ad campaigns to promote the awareness about COVID-19 pandemic.

The four articles in this issue deal with articles on science, philosophy and religion, which will bring depth and meaning to our lives.

May we be agents of solidarity and hope in these troubled times! May we learn lessons from this pandemic so that we may truly live like brothers and sisters.

The Editor

Modeer, U., & Ryott, A. (2020, May 5). *COVID-19: A reminder of the power of hope and solidarity*. United Nations Development Programme. https://www.undp.org/blogs/covid-19-reminder-power-hope-and-solidarity

The Four Fundamental Principles of Bioethics: Their Need and Relevance for Today

Esther Macedo Chopra
Research Scholar, Jnana Deepa, Institute of Philosophy and Theology

Abstract: Before formulating any comprehensive or common understanding for the moral arguments that have been surrounding the end of life decisions for terminally ill patients. The world has been forced to witness, make decisions and care or leave the sick to die on their own. Ethical decisions and conduct have torn the world between reality and theory.

The world turning into a medical warzone as the Covid-19 pandemic causing catastrophic dilemmas witnessing the unprecedented number of critical patients that are requiring urgent treatment. The ethical questioning of whom should be provided with treatment or who should be left out has never been questioned as much as today. The calamity has

left medical workers, patients and their families in a deep and harrowing sense of dysphoria. The ripples of dire suffering of physical, emotional and mental have been felt in almost all parts of the world. The current situation has induced humanity to act in ways that they would have never believed themselves to behave in.

In these critical times, an infected human being is negated due to the uncertainties that surround the virus as it threatens a contagion outbreak leading to the fear of death.

In these unchartered waters, medical personals have been reduced to observers wherein they are learning and trying with great intensity to be as moral as possible. The need for the principles of bioethics has never been felt as acutely as today.

Let us get an understanding of the principles of bioethics in the event of treating patients – autonomy, allocation of resources and justifying actions.

Keywords: Autonomy, Beneficence, Non-Maleficence, Justice, Principles of Bioethics

What is bioethics? What are its basic principles? The principles of bioethics form the fundamental values and the central role in any biomedical decision, research and actions that are taken. "Bioethics is not only limited to biomedical ethics but to everyday life as well, regardless of culture or region" (Tyler, 2010: 96). The common goal is often described as actions for the benefit of the larger part of society, however, when it comes to ethical situations the count of people or society is not the leading factor, it is only about doing right or wrong.

The principles of bioethics were formulated due to the upscale of the modern development of science and research so that in any given event of medical trials the lives of people should not be comprised. "It is within such a moral chaos that health care policy must be framed and safeguarded" (Tristram, 1996: 6).

Bioethics is a conscious act of understanding human behaviour when put into a medically challenging situation. Exploring the depths of why certain decisions are taken or made during the effort in the treatment or caretaking of a patient. Beauchamp & Childress have brought about an awareness in their writing that it becomes quite a challenge making it difficult within the realms of biomedical ethics to maintain a balance of the four principles (Tyler, 2010: 98).

Most human beings carry out their mundane activities unknowingly according to these principles as they are also the underlying fabric of human moral actions. Before the pandemic, the understanding of these principles was narrow in the field of medicine, psychology, philosophy and few other disciplines. However, unawares to most the world is witnessing the pragmatics of the principles of bioethics.

The Four Principles of Bioethics

Van Rensselaer Potter studied the four principles of bioethics in his book *Bioethics: A Bridge to the Future* (1971), "bioethics as a bridge between science and humanities" (Eckenwiler & Cohn, 2007: 4). Potter was influenced by the article "Bioethics the science of survival" (1970) by Aldo Leopold, a land ethicist and conservationist. Thus, it was with both Potter and Leopold that the term bioethics was born.

The fundamental principles of bioethics arise from the actions of human tendency which is descriptive in nature that ought to be the pathway for comprehensive amalgamation of treating patients with utmost morality. Thus, we can rightly say that bioethics is carrying out one's moral duty, not as a means to an end, but an end in itself. (Matthew, 2011: 29).

Alas, the prescribed form of ethics has an innate approach of being deontological. (Boyle & Sumner, 1996: 4). Deontology as propounded by Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), is the act that

ought to be carried out as a categorical imperative, which implies that according to the bioethical principles all patients ought to be treated in the same manner. As Kant's universal law, "Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that others should act upon it" (Warnock, 1964: 308). To act in a manner that is driven by morality is a means whereby signifying subtly that, "Kant elaborates an ethics of respect for persons" (Tristram, 1996: 105). This respect ought to be meted out not only to those that are hale and hearty but also those that are vulnerable, sick and dying.

The fundamental principles of bioethics are built on being respectful of decisions made, carrying out acts that will benefit the sick, causing no harm and being just. Thus, it also makes it a requisite for workers in the discipline of medical ethics. Treatments provided to patients are to be based on these four principles of bioethics: autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence and justice.

> The four principles of bioethics are: autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence and justice.

Autonomy

During the rule of the Greek empire, autonomous acts were considered to be the rights of the leaders. Leaders made decisions for themselves, without any interference from other kingdoms or emperors. An autonomous decision is based on self-determination and not on the injunction of an authoritative body. Perhaps one can exclusively determine it as self-rule.

The expression autonomy was first found in the Nuremberg code that arose from the Nuremberg trials that

ended on 19th August 1947 (Weindling, 2001: 37-71). This code came into effect due to the medical and experimental atrocities committed by the Nazis on human subjects. The International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg was presented by five scholars that constituted from the four allied nations namely the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and France over the war crimes in Germany. It was a means to prosecute and punish the wrong and hateful crimes that were inflicted by the Nazi regime. With this trial, the international court of crimes codified the rules for any future research and trials on human subjects. The mandate of permission ought to be sort and documented by researchers, autonomous decisions to be made by the subjects themselves.

During modern times the word autonomy is heard in most disciplines, especially, within the realms of deciding on available choices for human beings during treatments or surgeries. Autonomy is about the self-governance of rational beings. Autonomy is now understood as a right to freedom and to be able to choose the best from the available choices. According to Kant "autonomy flows from our natural capacity to reason out" (Laceulle, 2018: 160-161)

Autonomous decisions are normally considered what we hold as priorities or that the person deems best for themselves. But, can an act be called an autonomous act of reason if one does not have complete information. We can still consider it as the same since the one that is carrying out the act is under the assumption that they have been told everything.

Autonomy may be overridden at times when patients are not aware of themselves due to a comatose state or mentally competent persons, the family might consider what the patient would have wanted or they will decide on the current economical and medical situation. "Normally, the autonomy of the patient is considered." According to Beauchamp and

Childress's argument "respect for autonomy has priority over all other principles" (Kanniyakonil, 2007: 63).

Oral cancer is one of the most prevalent cancers in India which accounts for 30% of the cancer disease (Thavarool et al., 2019: 15). "Oral cancers are common in South Asian countries due to the consumption of tobacco, alcohol and betel leaves" (Montero & Patel, 2015: 491-508). The number of male cancer patients is higher than female patients in India, females suffering from the disease is lesser due to the lower usage of tobacco products and alcohol.

A pragmatic case was witnessed first-hand of the autonomy for an oral cancer patient where respect to continuing treatment as per the wishes of the patient even though the surgery was futile. The male patient aged 62 suffering from oral cancer was in a counselling session with a palliative surgeon on the prognosis of a surgery that he wanted to undergo. The cancer had grown into the jaw bone due to which the jaw had broken and needed reconstruction. As the patient was in the advanced stage of cancer, he was advised by a number of surgeons that there was a high possibility that the infection will spread even after surgery. There was one surgeon that was very optimistic about the surgery and the prognosis of the treatment and this brought hope for the patient. The patient's family was worried that the surgery might be futile and may have adverse effects. The family sought help to counsel the patient against the surgery. The advice given to the family was profound, they were told that they had to respect what the patient desires and will have to go through the surgery since the patient is well aware of the benefits and risks. The patient, in this case, said, "I don't want to lose myself to this disease without fighting."

The autonomy of the patient was given utmost importance as he was in a mentally competent state and was well aware of the entire process.

Autonomy has never been placed as high as it is today. With science and medicine spoiling us with a wide variety of choices, sometimes making it difficult for us to understand what is morally right anymore? Undermining our own capacity at times further blows out our confidence to make autonomous choices. Patients and sometimes families as well, are incompetent as they do not have the knowledge or a clear understanding of the medical status of their sickness. This then leaves the responsibility to further explain the pros and cons of the treatment and prognosis by physicians.

There may be times that a physician might lead one on to make a particular decision in favour of what might be feasible to the hospital or the health institution. The physician might act in a paternalistic manner, without the awareness of the patient, the patient may be coerced into making a decision, which he has hardly or no knowledge of. (Hodson, 1977: 61-69).

Here, we can consider it as the patient's decision alone, however, one may argue that it may not be a rational one. But, we can still consider it as a completely autonomous decision taken by the patient as he/she might have been provided with selective information by the treating physician but according to the patient, it was a completely informed decision.

Informed consent, according to Beauchamp and Childress, is based upon "competence, disclosure, understanding, voluntariness and consent" (Scaria, 2007: 87).

Competence: "Our legal system endorses that all patients are competent enough to make reasoned decisions unless they are deemed to be otherwise" (Leo, 1999:131-141). The decision made must be solely that of the patients, without any influence or external pressures whatsoever.

Disclosure: A patient that is sick will only share their innermost fears with a doctor if they know their information is respected by not divulging their symptoms to anyone unless discussed and agreed upon. On the other hand, the doctor needs the patient to be truthful and give the exact and complete symptoms of their illness, so the doctor can diagnose correctly and provide or advise the right treatment required as per diagnosis (McLean & Mason: 2003:2). There is an unsaid bond that builds over time between a doctor and a patient. Both the doctor's and the patient's trust are built upon how much information is disclosed to the other.

Understanding: To begin with, when patients are diagnosed with a sickness the patient should be made to understand their illness. The key to getting treated is by sharing all the information with the doctor, there are times that a patient might hold back information that they think is embarrassing or out of character. Holding back any information may slow down the process of being treated. Getting to know the procedures and how they will affect the prognosis of the disease is a step towards making informed decisions. On the other hand, the medical practitioner ought to work as a disciplinarian along with other nurses, medical technicians and caretakers (Gillett, 2004: 40). The Hippocratic Oath condemns the procedure of advising or administering any drug that brings about death; the oath states, "I will give no deadly medicine to any one if asked, nor suggest any such counsel." If any of the patient's information or privacy is violated the medical practitioner is required to be dismissed. The patient's permission needs to be requested by the doctor in case the doctor needs to discuss any medical information with another medical worker, physicians can get verbal consent but it is evidently legally acceptable if it is documented.

Voluntariness: According to Beauchamp and Childress, voluntariness is "as being independent of controlling influences exerted by others, discuss coercion and persuasion" (Hewlett, 1996: 232-237). In any event of a medical procedure or treatment, the consent of the patient is required. However, there might be situations that the consent of the patient cannot be taken like in an emergency situation of an accident where the patient might not be in a conscious state or an unforeseen situation arises during surgery. The surgeon and the team might need to make on the spot table decisions in the operation room, to save the patient's life in such a situation; the team cannot waste precious moments to seek permission as every moment might be crucial for the survival of the patient during a procedure. However, after the procedure, the information needs to be discussed with the patient and the family by giving them clarity and understanding as to why the procedure was necessary.

Consent: The notion of consent is based upon the time when a decision is made with having complete knowledge of the situation. (Campbell & Higgs, 1982: 12-14). In other words, the information provided to a patient is all about facts. Sometimes physicians might decide for themselves that they can leave out information that might be complicated for the patient to understand or might lead to more questions or doubts. The complete onus needs to be taken by the doctor to explain the details of the treatment and the prognosis of the disease and treatments thereafter. Once this step by step process is taken care of by the doctor, the patient in all awareness decides for or against the treatment, this is called consent.

Beneficence

"Beneficence is defined as an act of charity, mercy, and kindness with a strong connotation of doing good to others

including moral obligation." (Kinsinger, 2010: 44-46). When it comes to the medical practitioner, it becomes the fundamental ethical act to consider the well-being of the patient. Every medical therapy that is performed ought to benefit no one else besides the patient. "It is firmly established that a doctor cannot impose a treatment on an unwilling patient even though he or she is convinced it is the right treatment and even though the patient's refusal may result in his or her death" (McLean & Mason, 2003:23).

According to Daniel Callahan, assisting euthanasia in any form by a doctor goes against the very fundamental goal of medicine and the capability of the physician-in-charge of treating the patient with or without a terminal disease. (Gula, 1994: 33-36). Medicine and the integral role of the doctor commenced with the only aim of assisting or taking care of patients to rid a patient of their disease. Treatment was sorted by patients to free them of their pain. Killing or allowing to die was not the normative way of ending the suffering of an incurable disease by a physician (Gula, 1994: 33-36).

We can categorize beneficence into two acts – altruism and obligation.

Altruism: The word altruism, was first coined by Augustus Comte, in his work 'System de Politic Positive' (1851), a combination of the Latin word *alter* with *ui* that literally means 'to this other' (Scott & Seglow, 2007: 1)

Altruism to quite an extent is doing to others what you would want to be done to you. This thought process has a subtle aspect of a religious connotation to it; from the Bible, "Therefore, whatever you want men to do to you, do also to them, for this is the Law and the Prophets"

Obligation: Some actions may be called obligatory as we find it necessary to only do what is required even if it may not be what we want. We have only duties of beneficence that derive from specific roles and assignments of duty that are not a part of ordinary morality can be said to fall under obligatory acts. (Beauchamp, 2019).

If we continue to do everything with the thought of benefit all benevolence will be lost.

However, can we say that this might edge onto acts that have an extrinsic motive? Taking a cue from Kant's universal law of the categorical imperative if one acts only to be returned with the favour sometime in the future, it cannot be called a moral act. (Scott & Seglow, 2007: 21). Most acts are done after adequate reasoning. There can be acts that are done spontaneously if there is a person trying to cross the road and suddenly trips. A person nearby will, without thinking spring into action to help either to stop the person from tripping or might help them to get back on their feet. In such a situation there is no time for reasoning or giving a thought. It is the innate behaviour of human beings to act accordingly when it comes to at the spur of the moment. There is no time for considering the decisions we make. Human society to an extent is quite altruistic in nature. The actions that require reasoning, give a human being an opportunity to think about the deed they might carry out. These acts can be considered moral or immoral. This also leads to a biased or an unbiased thought while doing something for each other. (Vine, 1992: 73-103).

Non-Maleficence

The first ancient maxim of treating patients is not to harm anyone, "First do no harm" (Pence, 1990: 168). Negation of unrealistic prognosis should also be avoided, as there are times that physicians give complete assurance that the disease will be taken care of. If the disease still prevails then it can cause

not only physical harm but also psychological harm. "Physicians and nurses are confronted repeatedly with conflicts between respecting the freedom of patients and doing what is in their patients' best interests" (Tristram, 1996:103). Patient's autonomy will be overridden if they are not competent and would not want to be tied down to a bed for medical procedures, it will be beneficial here for a physician to carry out the procedure as long as it is causing no harm to the patient.

A physician can yet be questioned on the ethics of such a procedure, only because a patient is incompetent can a physician continue treatment as they cannot decide for themselves. According to ethical values, persons are to be treated as equal to competent persons and not discriminated against on their capacity of rationality.

Justice

This implies justly allocating resources: A term never felt more relevant than ever before the Covid-19 pandemic. Right now, the medical and political fraternity is reeling under pressure and trying with great difficulty to reason out, for whom to provide treatment or to be left out. Situational and time constraints are making it extremely hideous to allocate resources in a justified manner. According to UNICEF, "The disease caused by the Novel Coronavirus first identified in Wuhan, China, has been named Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) – 'CO' stands for corona, 'VI' for VIrus, and 'D' for Disease" China, one of the developed countries of the world was rudely awakened to the disease that left them gasping on how to combat the issue. The Chinese government did take unprecedented steps to curb the spread of the disease. Then the virus set out to spread its drastic effect worldwide. Sending the entire world into unchartered territory, not

foreseeing how life could come to a standstill even for the economically affluent nations.

Along with this came ethical issue for the allocation of medical resources to patients that needed treatment.

In the month of February 2020, Chinese doctors were put to test by deciding on life and death decisions for 1000 patients that needed to be put onto ventilators as they had only 600 mechanical ventilators available (Elegant, 2021).

Italy one of the countries to have been hit dreadfully with the Covid-19 virus until 14th, May 2021. Italy has seen 4,139,160 patients that were infected, deaths were at 1,23,745 and those that recovered were at a staggering number of 3,669,407 (Worldometer). According to a document by Crisis Management of Turin on March 14th 2020, if there are any emergency situation patients over the age of 80 years, they will not receive intensive care treatment. This situation will come into effect only and only if there is a grave shortage of health resources. "No one is getting kicked out, but we're offering criteria of priority," said Dr Petrini, Director of Bioethics Unit, Italian National Institute of Health.

The question that raises concerns in a pandemic outbreak is that, is this the right time to behave principled? How does an allocator of resources divide the available resources in a justified manner?

As humanity is facing a kind of medical war, the physicians are working under a practical and psychological strain that is draining them out and also killing some. The one thing that doctors are not supposed to do is the management of resources, they are taught to treat everyone alike, and they learn not to become God. In situations such as this, doctors are becoming Godlike, as it is left to them which patient will be treated. Those that are treated have the attitude that a doctor can treat

them due to the advancement in medicine and the updated medical facilities.

"In the present bioethical discussion, moral concern mainly focuses on particular persons; it does not focus on human beings, as such" (Gordijn, 1999: 347-359).

Situationally the main concern right now is to try and treat everyone alike. If the situation turns significantly graver than the present, and the number of patients escalates to a number more than the available resources, there will be a distinction made based on age. The younger and stronger will be given a higher preference since their chances of survival is greater. As the treatment will be cost-effective, in the manner that there will not be any wastage of resources on the elderly as it might not benefit them as much as the younger patients. One might call this maximizing the health benefits and resources available for the general population. Therefore, normative ethics investigates this decision of distributing resources impartially in regular and emergencies. Fair distributions embody a bioethical methodology in complex decisions.

A patient above 80 years and a patient that is 45 years require a mechanical ventilator, without thought the younger one will receive the treatment. The 80-year-old is considered to have completed their time of living while the 45-year-old has yet to live their life, hence, the younger patient gets preference over the elder. Nevertheless, it is a tough call for physicians to choose between two patients on whose life needs to be preserved. The main principles of policymakers are to distribute resources mindfully, however in situations as such interventional treatment, automatically have a fallout with the most vulnerable segment of society; the elderly. (Baltussen & Niessen, 2006: 14) By providing treatment to the one that has a

higher chance of living is said to be utilizing resources in the most optimal manner.

The concept of the person in such situations is based on the parameter of age. The elder the patient the lesser he/she is a person? If the elderly are continued to be treated as they are right now in this pandemic situation, there will be an adverse effect on the average age of elderly people worldwide. This effect will be visible as we see that by 2020, there will be nearly 2 billion people over the age of 60. (Noronha, 2016: 260). Only time will tell us if the complex choices that are made during the adverse crises of the current times are morally right or wrong.

Conclusion

Bioethics emerged from the field of ethics, questioning the usage of technology and inventions by humans on humans and animals. The principles of bioethics are the touchstone of morality in medicine and research. It encompasses the normative ethics in times when human beings have alternative choices to choose from. Although it is a relatively new theory in the field of moral conduct of the 1970s, however, it is rapidly finding its hold as an interdisciplinary study as well. The ethical choices within the field of medicine are very complex sometimes leading to situations that are very challenging and highly pressured leading to overwhelming outcomes that are detrimental. Decisions made during the treatment of patients may be ambivalent, however, these principles make sure that there is a conscious effort to carry out only that which is moral and will benefit the patient or persons in maintaining the respect of the individual at all given times. Learning bitter lessons from the atrocities that were inflicted previously, one cannot bring those back from the dead or unhurt them but the principles are a means of showing them that "we are sorry" and

all steps are taken in making sure that no one ever gets hurt again intentionally.

Reference

Altman, Matthew, C. (2011). *Kant and Applied Ethics: The Uses and Limits of Kant's Practical Philosophy.* London, Wiley.

Baltussen, Rob. & Louis Niessen. (2006). "Priority setting of health interventions: the need for multi-criteria decision analysis." *Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation.* (2006), article 4, no. 14.

Boyle, Joseph., & Leonard W. Sumner. (1996). *Philosophical Perspectives on Bioethics.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Campbell, Alastair V. & Roger Higgs. (1982). *In That Case: Medical Ethics in Everyday Practice.* British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data, London.

Day, J, P. (1964). *A Critical History of Western Philosophy.* "John Stewart Mill." O'Connor, D. J., & Paul, Edwards. Eds.

Engelhardt, Tristram, H. (1996). *The Foundations of Bioethics*, Oxford University Press,

Gillett, Grant, R. (2004). *Bioethics in the Clinic – Hippocratic Reflections.* The John Hopkins University Press. Maryland.

Gordijn, Bert. (1999). "The Troublesome Concept of the Person." *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics.*

Gregory, Pence, E. (1990). *Classical Cases in Medical Ethics: Accounts of the Cases and Issues that Define Medical Ethics.* Fifth Edition.

Gula, Richard M. (1994). *Euthanasia: Moral and Pastoral Perspectives.* Paulist Press.

Hodson, John, D. (1977). "The Principle of Paternalism." *American Philosophical Quarterly*,

Kanniyakonil, Scaria. (2007). *The Fundamentals of Bioethics: Legal Perspectives and Ethical Approaches.* Kottayam: Oriental Institute of Religious Studies.

Kinsinger, Frank, Stuart. (2010). "Beneficence and the professional's moral imperative." *Journal of Chiropractic Humanities.* (2010), vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 44-46.

Laceulle, Hanne. (2018) "Chapter 6 Autonomy." *Aging and Self-Realization: Cultural Narratives about Later Life*.

Leo, J, R. (1999). "Competency and the Capacity to Make Treatment Decisions: A Primer for Primary Care Physicians." *Primary Care Companion to The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry.* (1999), vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 131-141.

Lisa, Eckenwiler, A. & Felicia G. Cohn. (2007). Eds. *The Ethics of Bioethics: Mapping the Moral Landscape.*

McLean, Sheila., & John Kenyon Mason. (2003). *Legal and Ethical Aspects of Healthcare.* London: Greenwich Medical Media.

Montero, Pablo, H. & Snehal G. Patel. (2015). "Cancer of the oral cavity." *Surgical Oncology Clinics of North America,* (2015), vol. 24, no.3, pp. 491-508.

Muttath, Thavaroll, Geetha. Sangeetha Nayanar. et al. (2019). "Improved survival among oral cancer patients: findings from a retrospective study at a tertiary care cancer centre in Kerala, India. *World Journal of Surgical Oncology.* (2019), article 17, no. 15.

Nandimath, Omprakash, V. (2009). "Consent and medical treatment: The legal paradigm in India." *Indian Journal of Urology: IJU: Journal of the Urological Society of India*, (2209), vol. 25, no. 3. pp. 343-347

Noronha, Konrad, SJ. (2016). *"Psychospiritual Perspective on the Other" Jnanadeepa Pune Journal of Religious Studies.* (December 2016), vol. 20, no. 1-2, p. 260.

Sarah Hewlett, Sarah. (1996). "Consent to clinical research - adequately voluntary or substantially influenced*?*" *Journal of Medical Ethics,* (1996), vol. 22, pp. 232-237.

Scaria, Kanniyakonil. (2007). *The Fundamentals of Bioethics: Legal Perspectives and Ethical Approaches.* Oriental Institute of Religious Studies India

Scott, Niall., & Jonathan Seglow. (2007). *Altruism*, McGraw-Hill Education.

"The Hippocratic Oath." (1912). *The British Medical Journal.* (1912), vol. 1, no. 2679, pp. 1032-1034.

The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. (Matthew 7:12) (2002). The Holy Bible, New King James Version. The Gideons International in India.

Tristram, Engelhardt, H. (1996). *The Foundations of Bioethics,* Oxford University Press, Incorporated.

Varelius, Jukka. (2006). "The value of autonomy in medical ethics." *Medicine, health care, and Philosophy*. (2206), vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 377-388.

Vine, Ian. (1992). "Altruism and Human Nature: Resolving The Evolutionary Paradox." Pearl M. Oliner. Samuel P. Oliner. Lawrence Baron. Lawrence A. Blum. Dennis L. Krebs and M. & Zuzanna Smolenska. Eds. *Embracing the Other: Philosophical, Psychological, and Historical Perspectives on Altruism*. (1992), pp. 73-103.

Weindling, P. (2001). *The Origins of Informed Consent: The International Scientific Commission on Medical War Crimes, and the Nuremberg Code. Bulletin of the History of Medicine.*

Esther Macedo Chopra is a research scholar at Jnana Deepa, Institute of Philosophy and Theology, Pune, India. She has been specialising in palliative care and euthanasia. Email: esthermacedo0405 @gmail.com ORCID: 0000-0001-6411-0944

Heuretics Modelling as Our Response to the Digital World

Victor Ferrao
Dean of Philosophy, Patriarchal Seminary of
Rachol, Goa

*Abstract***:** We encounter picto-ideo-phonographic texts on the internet. We enjoy them and have become cybernauts. We are inventive and use grammatology and heuretics to surf through the worlds of the internet. This is why we propose a conscious adoption of the practice of heuretics as a mode of response to the Digital world. We elaborate on the CATTt model of Gregory Ulmer and also attempt a demonstration of the same to manifest that it is effective and can enable us to produce a responsible and emancipative response.

*Keywords***:** Heuretics, Hermeneutics, cybernaut, CATTt, Hypertext, Trace, Traceology, Signifier, Signified

Gregory L Ulmer has offered heuretics as the practice that suits the new electronic media. It is an alternative and not an opposition to hermeneutics and critique. It supplements these already established academic practices. Like them, heuretics is concerned with the text but strives to approach them with an inventive intent. In the context of this study, we shall first try to understand Heuretics as taught by Ulmer and then take it to understand how it has become part of our practice in the cyber world. Finally, we shall close with a demonstration of doing hereutics to manifest how it can model our creative, responsible and emancipative response to the worlds of the internet.

The Method in the anti-Method of Heuretics

Heuretics has been characterised as the other of hermeneutics which is a science of interpretation. We can derive its links with eureka, heuristics and even heresy. Hermeneutics asks, what can we make of a text? Heuretics asks, what can be made from the text? Hermeneutics gained popular currency while Heuretics is still in the waiting queue. Here we shall try to understand what is heuretics and try to unearth how they can enable us to understand and respond to the cyber world. Heuretics strives to use texts generatively. It is inventive in nature. Gregory Ulmer, an American thinker has elaborated it in his books, *Teletheory* (Ulmer, 1989) and *Heuretics* (Ulmer, 1994). Textual production has become the goal of hermeneutics these days. In fact, hermeneutics has become a road that leads to heuretics. Any text is germinative and productive. Heuretics depends on the potency of the text. Ulmer proposes that we need heureutics to understand and respond to the texts of the new communicative media that are based on the web.

The invention in the classical oral and print culture is an art of recalling and determining what it is that one would think or say regarding a given subject (Vitanza 2012). Ulmer teaches that Grammatology of Derrida assists inventive writing (Ulmer, 1994). This belief enables him to move from linear discursive production of discourse to non-linear, hypertextual / multi-media production. The discovery or inventive writing is inventive in the process of writing. This means composition becomes discovery. It is serendipitous. It calls us to return to rhetoric/ poetics. But this return is an anti-methodology. It is not concerned with critique or what could be the meaning of the existing text (hermeneutical concern). This means Ulmer does not critique ludic discourses for not being political but calls for them to invent politics (Vitanza, 2012). Therefore, the principle of heuretics is not about saying what something is by saying what it is not. But by affirming heretofore unacceptable connections. This is why heuretics are heretical. Maybe we can call it her-ethical to demonstrate the unacceptable connections of the word heretical and thus manifest how we can write heuretically. Thus, heuretics take a leap out of oneness, binaries to threes-as-excess and transcend the either/ or binary structure of our habitual thinking.

> Maybe we can call it her-ethical to demonstrate the unacceptable connections of the word heretical and thus manifest how we can write heuretically. Thus, heuretics takes a leap out of oneness, binaries to threes-as-excess and transcends the either/or binary structure of our habitual thinking.

The either/ or thinking puts all our thinking to two tests to qualify to become knowledge. The first test checks whether thought is universal and the second test checks whether it is teachable (Vitanza, 2012). Right from the time of Socrates and Plato, all knowledge had to submit to this Phallus. Hence, often such a piece of knowledge is thought to be masculine. Heuretics being heretic and being her-ethics does not Oediplalize to the phallus of either/ or thinking. It stays generative and productive by negating the principle of contradiction and thus it makes room for the return of the excluded third…fourth…fifth… This means hereutics as taught by Ulmer is unaccountable and as such is an anti-methodology. But in the very unaccountable position, we can find accountability. This is why we can trace a method in the anti-method of Ulmer's heuretics. Hence, we find an acronym CATTt to stand for his anti-method:

C = Contrast (opposition, inversion, differentiation)
A = Analogy (figuration, displacement)
T = Theory (repetition, literalization)
T = Target (application, purpose)
t = Tale (secondary elaboration, representability) (Vitanza, 2012).

Contrast counters the dominant discourses. This is the first step of the anti-method. It breaks the either/ or thinking and makes a way to move beyond one (monism), two (dual dialectics) to three (trilectics) and beyond. This is further achieved by reading the discourse, not at the level of its arguments but the level of its particulars, such as its examples, analogies etc. This exercise displaces the argument. Once the argument is displaced, we replace it with an opposite argument that is also made coherent (secondary elaboration). This brings us to the step of poetising. It is the moment to say yes to the text twice. It leads to the affirmation of other connections that makes room for novelty/ third option to irrupt. This shows that Ulmer

invites us to concentrate on the tropes and not on the linear logical argumentation of the text. It is in the tropes of the text one can find ways of novel writing of the text that grammatology challenges us to do. It challenges us to say that which remains unsaid. It leads us to say the unsayable. This means it takes us away from the binaries to excess. This approach to writing is different from the protocols of normal academic writings that are linear and hierarchical (Ulmer, 1994).

Perhaps, heuretics and not hermeneutics will explain how we deal with the worlds generated by the internet. It is heuretics that go beyond linearity and logicality and takes us into the non-linear trans-logical world that might have the keys to explain why we enjoy hopping from one site to the other on the internet. Conventional either/ or thinking cannot explain this illogical and somewhat non-cognitive behaviour. This space cannot be colonised like Euclidian topographic culture. We need a new logic that is non-linear, non-Euclidian. This new logic has to be anti-tree but rhizomatic. The old binary logic that tied to either/ or thinking is simply replaced by associational networks. Therefore, it also simply replaces topos/space with Chora, the excluded one between being and becoming (Platonic celestial and the terrestrial) (Vitanza, 2012). This replacement enables us to view the worlds of the internet/ cyberspace with the dynamic imagery of choreography. This choreography brings us to the grammatology of the internet and heuretics enables us to have an insight into what we do with the cyber world. The internet is a world of abundance and we explore its inexhaustibility until we ourselves are exhausted. This is why to respond to the dilemma, trilemma, quatrilemma of the internet we need to adopt Hereutics and find the third, fourth and fifth

option that remains hidden because of our habituated binary logic of the either/ or thinking.

Understanding the Cybernaut in Us

The dynamics worlds of the internet are taking us into a gap between being and becoming. The gap that has always been between the signifier and signified is widened and rendered deep by the dance of the worlds of cyberspace. This barrier is growing today faster than ever before. But this gap enables productivity. It renders the signifiers of the digital world emptied of partial meaning and makes them ready for us to insert the meanings that we bring into them. The Asemiotic semiologies on the internet then are semiotized to suits the desires of those who mediate their life on its basis. There is no one meaning that animates the dance of a set of signifiers on the web. Each of us has become inventive and use hermeneutics that has become heuretics to write meanings with the alphabets/ signifiers that dance on the internet. As we surf the net, we are actually composing our stories/narratives. Strictly speaking, the internet has broken down our logic that is based on the principle of identity, contradiction and excluded middle. We know that we can have several identities on the web, the self can have larvae selves as taught by Deleuze and Gauttari (Gaudlitz, 2011). Besides, the fact that we can insert meanings into the signifiers that are dished out to us in the worlds of the internet, we can experience that there is no strict identity between the signified and the signifier. Thus, the principle of identity is demolished by the internet. As a result, we have made room for the return of the third which becomes the return of the suppressed/ repressed, the unnamed, all that has been not thought by our canonical either/ or thinking.

Ulmer says that the logic of the internet and allied communicative technologies are governed by the principle of choreography (Tofts, 2012). He says that this logic does not

choose between the meanings of the term but compose by using all the meanings. This means the logic of the internet makes room for grammatology. This is a mode of saying yes to everything. It connects the dots (write) in unexpected ways that lead to novel paradigms of thought. It is heuretic and inventive and thought generative. We are hybridizing the texts of the internet. We have become cybernauts who are using grammatology to make sense of the texts of the internet. The GPS of the web has become the EPS (existential positioning system) for us. We are living a life mediated by the internet. Each of us is indeed a cybernaut in our own right.

We live our life mediated by the picto-ideo-phonographic writings of the web. It is exactly a return to what we do with spoken language while we write or speak. We use the phonetic alphabets (signifiers) and infuse meaning (signified) into them. This meaning is found in the collective language that we have within our society.[1] But we are inventive too. We also assign our own meanings to what we speak or say. We are composing and therefore, are grammatologists. Unfortunately, we are lost in the logocentrism of the language and have forgotten that our own role in the construction of the meaning while we speak or write. That is why we have to come to realize that we have been always heuretics and clever users of grammatology. Today with the widening of the gap between the signifier and the signified, our dexterity at heuretics becomes radical.

With the growing gap between the sign and the signifier, we are facing the death of the signifier and we are left with the trace of the play of signs in the web. This is why Ulmer puts together electricity and trace and holds that we have

---

[1] Ferdinand Saussure's Langue/ parole binary can explain us this.

come to electracy in a new world of electronic media (Ulmer, 2019). We begin and end with nothing but the play of traces. This play is digitized and electrified. Our life is mediated by these traces and we leave our traces on the various platforms of the internet to be used as raw material by the world of big data analytics. This is why traceology cannot be overlooked. It has become the alphabets of our life. We are into plastimatics of the trace. We adapt them to our conditions. When we panic like the Disney games, our legs become elongated when we are amazed our necks grow longer. The cyber-world is shaping our life.

Traceology is mediating our life. This akin to drawing. It shows the power of a line. We are drawing/ writing our lives using the resourceful traces that we find on the internet. We are plasticizingly transforming the texture of our life as cybernauts. This has an impact on our political life. There is a trace in democracy. We are simply left with traces of democracy in an age of electracy. When l life becomes a plasticized dance of plastitracy, we are left with nothing but its traces. We do figure out our ways of assembling these traces into stories that animate our own stories of life. This can be amplified by inventive heuretics. We have this gift and are already at work. We have to become conscious of the same to be able to resist mind manipulations and the theft of our freedoms that are employed for both commerce and politics these days.

Conscious we must be because we love experimenting, looking for novel experiences. This desire to experiment to experience the novel on the web is haunted. It is haunted by its dissatisfaction/ failure as well by the danger of those that might use it as baits to trap and manipulate us to ride the flow of worlds of electracy towards their purposes and goals. There is a threat to our freedom as much there is an expansion of the space for freedom on the net. As cybernauts, we have to take

responsibility for our flight and surfing in cyberspace and choose emancipating freedoms that set us as well as others free.   In the days of orality, humanity was parroting what it gets outside itself. It was hey time of mimesis. This made us largely a herd.   In the days of literacy, humanity became individualized and found its own voice. In our times of electracy, humanity is dividualized (Smith, 2012). and disperses and disseminating its traces everywhere on the internet. It time that the cybernaut in us stands up and takes note.

Heuretizing 'The Nation Wants to Know'

Applying heuretics to the new media is a challenge. Here I take up this challenge and try to do what may be called applied grammatology. The work of Ulmer is our lighthouse in this task of heuretics.   Maybe we can take the notorious prime time debate on television by a famous editor anchor who often shouts at the top of his voice: 'Nation wants to know' (World, n.d.). as our case to perform heuretics. Using the heuretics, the anti-method of Ulmer which is portrayed to us by the acronym CATTt, we may begin our applied grammatology. The effort here is to let the same text produce altogether different meaning, the meaning remains hidden or unaccounted. Here we have taken the statement, 'nation wants to know only for pedagogical reasons and there is no intention to bring any discredit, defame and pain to anyone. We are only activating the heuristic generator of the statement, 'nation wants to know' in all its senses. To take us to our goals we use the anti-method of Ulmer given to us by the acronym CATTt.

Contrast

The nation already knows. The nation wants to know frames the debate. It marks what is acceptable and what is

illegitimate. It draws the boundary between a nationalist and a traitor. Therefore, in the very first step, we break the frame when we say: the nation already knows. It does not mean that there is nothing to be known. The new frame is a puctum.[2] It punctures the structure of the old frame. It knows that one who claims that 'nation wants to know' also known to the nation. This means the new frame marks space and time. Its spacing and timing actually turn the table on the one who asks the nation to want to know. The nation knows who knows whom. Thus, we have not taken a linear, vertical and hierarchical approach. We have taken a horizontal approach and just juxtaposed a contrast with the existing frame. We are not analysing any arguments. We are just taking a trope and replacing it with a contrasting trope.

Analogy

Here we choose to go by phonology. The sound now also resonates and sounds like no. The semantics are different. There is sonic congruence between the word know and the word no. The statement nation wants to know, sounds like a big no. By inserting the big no in the nation wants to know, we get nation do not want to know. Therefore, the question is what does the nation does not want to know? Or rather who wants the nation not to know? What has to be kept out of the knowledge of the nation? What is the secret that the nation does not know? What will happen if the nation knows that secret?

Theory

The word know also means to sleep with, to have sexual intercourse (Merriam-Wester Dictionary). Hence, the nation

---

[2] Puctum is not a point. It is a duration. In this contest, Puctum is duration that breaks apart the frame. It becomes a tenacious resistance. It cause doubling. It shatters the frame but it is still the frame. See Burchill, L. (2015).

already knows who is sleeping with whom. Who is a presstitute. The nation recognizes, identifies the pressitutes who thinks that nobody knows. The body of the nation knows. The nation knows that God knows that it knows who is wounding its body.

Target

Our target concerns with the demonstration of the fact that when anything is framed as 'nation wants to know', it becomes a divisive operation. It becomes a wall that breaks our nation. The statement 'nation wants to know' hides something that it wants the nation not to know. Hence, our aim is to manifest that which is hidden. That which is kept out of the horizon by the logocentric principles of identity, contradiction and excluded middle that frame our either/ or thinking.

Secondary Elaboration

We have shown that statement, 'nation wants to know' also includes the one who is using the statement to mark those that are loyal and those that are traitors. This means 'the nation wants to know' whether the one who wants to know knows the powers that be and he/she is, therefore, a presstitude. This means nothing can be kept secret to the nation that wants to know. The one who hides by the statement 'the nation wants to know' is also included in this thirst of the nation to know.

We have tried to use the heuretic anti-method of Ulmer to the notorious statement: 'nation wants to know'. We have not used critical hermeneutics but have tried to engage inventive heuretics to open the horizon of the statement: 'the nation wants to know'. We have successfully transcended the logocentrism of the principles of identity, contradiction and excluded middle and brought into our view, the hidden, the repressed meaning which simply

says that one who is using the statement 'nation wants to know' is also included in the frame of the statement. This is why one who is using the statement to mark those that are loyal and traitors to the nation is also marked by the same statement. The statement becomes the judge of its users. Often we have come under the discourse of 'the nation wants to know'. Somehow it had triggered our love for our nation and produced hatred of its enemies. Indeed, it fired our neurons together. It is said that neurons that fire together wire together. This is perhaps why we like what is called the godi media in our country. We enjoy others when they are marked as traitors and by the logic of either/ or thinking, we count ourselves as loyal nationalists. But our heuristic grammatology has demonstrated that we are blinded. The breakdown of either/ or thinking has shown that we can be counted among the traitors of our nation. I have tried to do this experiment to open what remains closed by the statement that we have tried to heuretize. This is why I think we have to recognize that we use heuretics as we engage with cyberspace. Once we recognize it and we shall begin to see its value it has to widen our often narrow horizons. It has been rightly observed that with the growth of the internet humans have become narrow-minded across the globe. Hence, conscious cultivation of the heuretics will enable us to offer a responsible and emancipative response to the worlds of the internet.

Conclusion

We have attempted an applied grammatology to understand and respond to the new electronic media that blooms and flowers on our internet. Applied grammatology has introduced us to heuretics, an inventive science that takes us beyond the structure of either/ or thinking. It enables us to understand how we have productively engaged it in our dealings with the worlds of the internet. This is why we have concluded with a

---

demonstration that we can use it to develop a creative, responsible and emancipative responses to the cyber world.

References

Burchill, L. (2015). *Derrida and Barthes: Speculative Intrigues in Cinema, Photography, and Phenomenology* (pp. 321–344). https://doi.org/ 10.1002/9781118607138.ch19

Gaudlitz, Erika. (2011). Differential desiring practice – A path into a Deleuze inspired literary discourse. Victoria: University of Ballarat.

Smith, K. (2012). From dividual and individual selves to porous subjects. *The Australian Journal of Anthropology*, *23*(1), 50–64. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1757-6547.2012.00167.x

Tofts. (2012, January 31). *Illogic of Sense | The Gregory L. Ulmer Remix: Introduction › electronic book review*. https://electronicbookreview.com/essay/illogic-of- sense- the- gregory -l-ulmer-remix-introduction/

Ulmer, G. (2019). *The Apparatus of Attractions*. Retrieved May 29, 2021, from https://www.academia. edu/34786168/ The_Apparatus_of_Attractions

Ulmer, Gregory L. 1989. *Teletheory*. New York: Routledge.

Ulmer, Gregory L. 1994. *Heuretics*: *The Logic of Invention*. London: John Hopkins Press.

Vitanza, V. J. (2012, January 31). *Writing the Paradigm › electronic book review*. http://electronicbookreview. com/ essay/writing-the-paradigm/

World, R. (n.d.). *Nation Wants To know*. Republic World. Retrieved May 29, 2021, from https://www. republicworld.com/ shows/nation-wants-to-know

Victor Ferrao is Dean of Philosophy, Patriarchal Seminary of Rachol, Goa. He obtained the first PhD from India on science and religion dialogue. Email: victorferrao@yahoo.co.uk ORCID: 0000-0002-5008-8114

Syadvada: A Theory of Relativity of Truth in Jainism

Anmol Bara
Licentiate in Philosophy, Jnana Deepa, Institute of Philosophy and Theology

Abstract: The doctrine of *syadvada* is a teaching of Jainism which emphasizes all-embracing truth. The truth according to *syadvada* is not one-dimensional resulting in a dogmatic attitude, but it is a multi-dimensional reality that comes only when one humbles oneself to accept other's viewpoint as in the parable of the blind men. The sevenfold predication or *saptabhanginaya* is one such teaching of Jainism which attempts to unfold reality that lies hidden in the narrow and exclusive understanding of the reality. The reality, in one way, can be Characterized by the beautiful expression used by Jaina, that is, '*syat*'. The study of the theory of *syadvada* holds relevance in the context of the dogmatic scenario of our present world.

Introduction

The doctrine of *syadvada* is a teaching of Jainism which emphasizes all-embracing truth. The truth according to *syadvada* is not one-dimensional resulting in a dogmatic attitude, but it is a multi-dimensional reality as that in the parable of the blind men. The sevenfold predication or *saptabhanginaya* is one such teaching of Jainism which attempts to unfold reality that lies hidden in the narrow and exclusive understanding of the reality.

Preliminary Understanding on *Syadvada*

Syadvada or the theory of relativity of Jainism stands upon *anekantavada* and *nayavada*. *Anekantavada* is a central philosophy of Jainism which declares that reality is relative (Krishnaswamy, Mishra & Ram, 2013: 27). *Anekanta* or non-one-sidedness is a negation to whatever is *ekanta* or one-sidedness. It is a philosophy of synthesis and toleration which tries to bring into synthesis the extreme views and finds a way out for reconciliation (Matilal, 1981). *Anekantavada* has two main accessories as it is said, the bird of *anekantavada* flies on its two wings of *nayavada* and *syadvada* (Padmarajiah, 1963: 273). *Nayavada* is an analytical method to investigate reality from different standpoints. It is defined as a particular opinion or a viewpoint which does not rule out the other viewpoints but rather it expresses the limitation we face in determining an object (Padmarajiah, 1963: 310).

Significance of the Word 'Syat'

As being a complementary factor, *syadvada* investigates the various strands of the truth given by *naya* to integrate them into a consistent and comprehensive synthesis with the help of predications or an alternative or a possible truth (Krishnaswamy, Mishra & Ram, 2013: 333).

In ordinary Sanskrit, the word '*syat*' refers to the third-person singular operative form of the verbal root *as* which means 'exist'. In normal circumstance, *syat* could also be translated as 'it could be' or 'it should be' or 'maybe' or 'it is possible that' (Long, 2009: 146). For instance, if we ask the question "Is *A B*?" The possible answer to this question will be either 'yes' or 'no' or 'may be'. The 'may be' refers to the third possibility, the possibility of '*syat*' or probability (Koller, 2000: 404). But the Jaina sense of *syat* is not of the probability (*sambhavana*) of something but more than that, in a sense it is a conditional 'yes' which if put in the predications mean "If *p* then *A* is *B*" (Matilal, 1981). However, Padmarajiah points out that the significance of *syat* lies in its emphasis on the indeterminate or manifold nature of the real, meaning that real cannot be determined as having only such and such attributes and not something else. Hence, the conception of reality as extremely indeterminate is the essential

> The significance of *syat* lies in its emphasis on the indeterminate or manifold nature of the real, meaning that real cannot be determined as having only such and such attributes and not something else. Hence, the conception of reality as extremely indeterminate is the essential meaning of *syat* meaning 'in a certain sense'

meaning of *syat* meaning 'in a certain sense' (Padmarajiah, 1963: 338).

Sevenfold Predications of *Syadvada* (*Saptabhanginaya*)

Jainism proposes the doctrine of sevenfold conditional predication to understand the reality in the mode of *syat* because every proposition of existing thing gives us limited knowledge in affirming or denying since there is an endless account of the complexity of any reality (Radhakrishnan, 1923: 302). In *saptabhanginaya* all the seven predications are prefixed by the term *syat* which means 'in a certain sense'.

Syad asti **(a thing is).** In a certain sense, a jar exists. When we say jar exists, it exists of its own substance, attributes, place and time. The jar is an entity that exists when it is related to the thing it is made of, the place where it exists and the time when it exists (Gopalan, 1973: 154). Radhakrishnan sums up, "The jar exists as made of clay, in my room at the present moment, of such and such a shape and size" (Radhakrishnan, 1923: 302). The proposition (jar exists) signifies that for some reason in the moment of our assertion, our attention is primarily fixed on the positive existence of the jar (Padmarajiah, 1963: 343).

Syad nasti **(a thing is not).** In a certain sense, a jar does not exist. The second mode of predication speaks of the non-existence of the jar. Just as the jar is existent under certain condition of its own substance, attributes, place and time, now in reference with another substance, attributes, place and time jar does not exist (Radhakrishnan, 1923: 302-303). When Jaina speaks about the non-existence of jar, what is denied is not the existence of the jar as a jar but the jar as metal or cloth (Gopalan, 1973: 154).

Syad asti nasti **(a thing is and is not).** In a certain sense, a jar exists and in a certain sense, a jar does not exist. The third predication claims both 'jar exists' and 'jar does not exist' when analysing it from another point of reference. However,

these conjunctions are not repetitive but on the contrary, it expresses a unique feature of the Jaina logic where the combination of the two propositions presents the 'togetherness' of the two modes of reality, existence and non-existence (Gopalan, 1973: 155; Padmarajiah, 1963: 346).

Syad avaktavya **(a thing is inexpressible[1]).** In a certain sense, the jar is inexpressible. The fourth predication of *syadvada* offers us the simultaneous presentation of the togetherness of the two modes (Padmarajiah, 1963: 346). The inexpressibility of the jar results from the incompatibility of existence and non-existence of jar which is mutually exclusive and cannot be attributed to the same thing (Gopalan, 1973: 155).

Syad asti avaktavya **(a thing is and is inexpressible).** In a certain sense, the jar is and is inexpressible. If we look from the point of view of the existence of a jar in its own property jar is expressible. But it is once again inexpressible if we look from the point of view of its existent and non-existent forms which are mutually exclusive (Gopalan, 1973: 155-156).

Syad nasti avaktavya **(a thing is not and is inexpressible).** In a certain sense, the jar is not and is inexpressible. In similarity with the fifth proposition, the non-existence of the jar is presented from another point of reference. Further, the simultaneous presentation of both positive and negative aspect of the jar results in inexpressibility (Gopalan, 1973: 156).

Syad asti nasti avaktavya **(a thing is, is not and is inexpressible)** In a certain sense, the jar is, is not and is inexpressible. The combination of the existence and non-existence of the jar signifies the successive presentation of

---

[1] Here Radhakrishnan uses the term unpredictable but we shall use the term 'inexpressible' used by Padmarajiah.

togetherness of two aspects namely, the positive and negative. Later, when looked at from the simultaneous presentation of existent and non-existent, we face the inability to express any description of the jar (Gopalan, 1973: 156).

The sevenfold predication (*saptabhanginaya*) insists on the correlativity of affirmation and negation of a thing because all judgements are dualistic in their character possessing the quality of both positive and negative (Radhakrishnan, 1923: 304). As Hiriyanna rightly puts it, "Jainism recognizes both permanence and change as equally real; hence raises the difficulty to express in one step the full nature of reality" (Hiriyanna, 1932: 165).

The Parable of the Blind Men

To illustrate the many-sided reality of an object from *syadvada* points of view, we can take the parable of the blind men, who each fumbled for the touch of the elephant and laid hands on different parts concluded in describing the whole animal (Radhakrishnan, 1923: 301). Having concluded describing their viewpoint they argued themselves about the true nature of the elephant which is partially correct and also partially incorrect in so far as one would disagree with the claim of the other (Long, 2009, 118).

Charges and Criticisms on *Syadvada*

The doctrine of *syadvada* has been grossly misunderstood by many schools of Indian Philosophy. They misinterpret the philosophy and put the following accusations:

The criticism comes from the *Vedantic* tradition of Sankara and Ramanuja on the ground that it is impossible that the two contradictory attributes co-exist at the same time (Padmarajiah, 1963: 363). In reply to their criticism Radhakrishnan writes, Jainas admit that a thing cannot have self-contradiction in itself but the reality is complex, and identity in difference. For instance, when we say the tree is

moving, it means that its branches are moving, and it is still not moving since its roots are fixed (Radhakrishnan, 1923: 304).

The *Vedantins* claimed *syadvada* as a theory of doubt or scepticism. Hiriyanna points out that it is a teaching which is prejudicial against absolutism (Padmarajiah, 1963: 365). Jainas answer this criticism by saying that *syadvada* is not the theory of probabilities rather relative and conditional signifying our partial knowledge of the truth. Shankaracharya retorts saying that relativity cannot be sustained without the Absolute because if all truth is partial then *syadvada* by its own merit will be only partially true and therefore, partially false (Sharma, 1976: 55).

The critiques have objected that the theory of *Syadvada* leads to agnosticism where we cannot have the knowledge of anything in certainty. As Belvalkar writes, *syadvada* denies the possibility of any predication where *S* may be, or may not be, or maybe or may not be both *P*. In such a purely negative or agnostic attitude, one cannot have any dogma (Padmarajiah, 1963: 366). This agnostic presentation of reality can lead us to a moral vacuum where we do not have any adequate grounding for our moral claims (Long, 2009, 151).

Conclusion

The conditional nature of looking at reality has a very significant role even in today's philosophy of life and experience. *Syadvada* teaches us that no final judgement or description of reality is possible. For when we absolutize our own belief and creed we end up becoming fanatics. As a result, we exclude others because they do not fit in "my system". In connection to the present-day situations in India, there are a lot of concerns that arise because of the feelings of exclusivity sprouting within the

political, religious, cultural, linguistic and economic groups resulting in mob lynching, hatred, riots and so on.

Syadvada as the doctrine of the relativity of the judgement has a very similar tone with the theory of relativity of Einstein (Atreya & Rampuria, 2012). The doctrine of *syadvada,* on the one hand, comes as a response to absolute (*advaita*) and non-absolute (Buddhist) viewpoints. In the same way, the theory of relativity of Einstein came as a response to the deterministic worldview of mechanistic science. As a matter of fact, *syadvada* is *syadvada* is not the theory that rejects *advaita* or Buddhist's understanding but it only tries to integrate the dogmatic and non-inclusive teachings together. Einstein too does not reject the absolute understanding completely, but on the contrary, his view "represented the completion of the classical physics and the deterministic worldview" (Chandrankunnel, 2014: 291).

The doctrine of *syadvada* gives us a whole new perspective in looking at multi-dimensional reality of World-God-Man. It inspires us to see the three-dimensional reality from a relational approach. For in the past we have dogmatized these realities so much so as to serve our own selfish motives which have bad repercussions. The Cosmotheandric vision of Panikkar in connection with *syadvada,* gives us an insight into seeing truth from a new perspective as complementing factor. *Syadvada* is a teaching of seeing truth from wider perspectives and can be acquired only when we live the way of Jesus who saw reality from the perspectives of the sinners and the righteous, the rich and the downtrodden, the intellectuals and the ignorant of letters and so on. The theory of *syadvada* can be a cure to the current problems of religious intolerance, violence in the world, the communal and border tensions.

References

Atreya S. P., Rampuria S. (2012). *Anekantavada and Syadvada: Syadvada and the Modern Scientific Theory of relativity.* Retrieved from Hn4u. http://www. herenow4u. net/index.php?id=87765 on November 30, 2020.

Chandrankunnel, M. (2014). *Cosmosophy: Physics and Philosophy of the Cosmos*. Bangalore: Dharmaram Publications.

Gopalan, S. (1973). *Outlines of Jainism.* New Delhi: Wiley Eastern Limited.

Hiriyanna, M. (1932). *Outlines of Indian Philosophy*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.

Koller, John M. (2000). *Syadvada as the Epistemological Key to the Jaina Middle Way Metaphysics of Anekantavada*. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/1400182 on November 10, 2021.

Krishnaswamy, N., Mishra, S., & Ram, R.V. (2013). *India's Language Philosophy.* Delhi: Pearson.

Long, J. D. (2009). *Jainism: An Introduction.* Retrieved from https://www.pdfdrive. com/jainism-an-introduction -e1865 14427. html on November 3, 2021.

Matilal, Bimal Krishna. (1981). *The Central Philosophy of Jainism*. L. D. Institute of Indology, 79th Ser., Ahmadabad. *The Central Philosophy of Jainism*. Retrieved from

https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.429162/page/n5/mode/2up on November 5, 2020.

Mookerjee, S. (1944). *Jaina Philosophy of Non-Absolutism: A Critical Study of Anekantavada.* Calcutta: The Bharti Mahavidyalaya.

Padmarajiah, Y. J. (1963). *A Comparative Study of the Jaina Theories of Reality and Knowledge*. Bombay: Jain Sahitya Vikas Mandal.

Radhakrishnan. (1923). *Indian Philosophy*, vol. 1. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.

Sharma, C. (1976). *A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Anmol Bara is a research student at Jnana Deepa, Institute of Philosophy and Theology, specialising in Philosophy. He belongs to the Congregation of OFM Order of Friars Minor Email: anmol.bara@jdv.edu.in ORCID: 0000-0003-0711-8995

Semantic Autonomy of the Text: Towards the Infinity of Meanings

Alan T. Sebastian
Research Scholar, Jnana Deepa, Pune

Abstract: The historicist and Romanticist tradition gives a strict demarcation between explanation and understanding as well considers interpretation as one of the provinces of understanding. This demarcation was strictly opposed by Ricœur. The Phenomenological Hermeneutics proposed by Ricœur gives due importance to interpretation which is the epicentre of the Hermeneutical arc. The dynamicity of the interpretation gives way to the possibilities of infinite references which discloses by the very notion of distanciation and appropriation. The non-ostensive character of the text paves way for the world opened by the semantics lead to them not to focus on the hidden meanings of the text rather the text discloses itself towards an infinite meaning's dimensions**.** This article mainly focuses on the functional disclosing of the text to a subject with infinite references.

Keywords: Semantic Autonomy, Text, Distanciation, Appropriation, Explanation and Understanding.

Introduction

This paper mainly deals with the understanding of the text, how we make meaning in the text. The dilemma of authorial meaning and semantic autonomy has pervaded throughout history. Ricœur comes up with certain formulas to present the relationship with the understanding and explanation in terms of reading.

- Understanding is to reading = Event of discourse is to the utterance of discourse
- The explanation is to reading = Verbal meaning and objective meaning of the text
- Dialectical structure of reading = Dialectical structure of discourse.

This paper follows the phenomenological process of attaining semantic autonomy of the Text proposed by Paul Ricœur. The method followed is the dialectical relation of Explanation and Understanding which shows the instant recovery of text from the romanticist clutches. This paper also deals with and tries to find the solutions for solving the paradoxes of authorial meaning and semantic autonomy which leads to infinite meanings**.** This semantic autonomy and the dynamic nature of interpretations paves a new mode of being in the world which transforms one's ego into the self**.**

The interplay of Explanation and Understanding

It is exceptionally hard to delineate the division between understanding and explanation in utterance or conversation. We explain something to another person to understand. And what he has understood, he can additionally disclose to somebody who is an outsider. We can see the overlapping of explanation and understanding, thus understanding and explanation will play a crucial role in comprehending. In this way, in

explanation, we explicate or unpack the scope of propositions and meanings, while in understanding we comprehend the subject that was explained, by the process of synthesis. Therefore, understanding deals with synthesis whereas explanation occupies the notion of analysis. This demarcation will lead to the further solving of authorial meaning and semantic autonomy of the text. This is a realisation as well as it is a genesis where Ricœur comes up with the deconstructed mode of reading the text. We had seen the strict demarcation between the explanation and understanding of the romanticist Hermeneutics.

Human Sciences and Natural Sciences

As we know, Dilthey as the founder of Romantic tradition makes the distinction between human sciences and natural sciences. In fact, natural sciences are concerned with explaining the outer experience whereas human sciences deal with understanding inner experience and its relation to the outer experience, "designate two spheres of reality." (Ricœur, 2016: 112). Natural science is the circumference contained with objects confined to 'mathematization, 'scientific observation' as well as filled with "canons of inductive logic." (Ricœur, 2016: 112). This is not the case with the human mind. The human mind has no specific rules, the study of other minds is brought by the notion of understanding. He considered interpretation as one of the notions of Understanding. Ricœur vehemently opposed the semi-role of interpretation in the realm of understanding.

Experience as the Starting Point

If discourse is produced as an event, it is understood as meaning. This is the starting point where Ricœur diverges from the thought of Romantic tradition. Mutual understanding depends on the sharing of the same meaning. Ricœur emphasis that in this sharing the dialectic of explanation and understanding has begun. Understanding, utterers meaning and utterance meaning is a circular process. Utterers meaning further constitutes understanding

whereas utterance meaning constitutes an explanation. The explanation as a process initiates when the externalisation or objectification of event through meaning through inscriptions like signs, letters etc. Understanding constitutes an intentional unity, that is to say, all understanding is the understanding of something. At any rate, we cannot cancel this dialectic and we cannot strictly demarcate the dialectic in reading. But at this juncture, Ricœur places the role of interpretation. He says,

> Then the term interpretation may be applied, not to a particular case of understanding, that of the written expressions of life, but to the whole process that encompasses explanation and understanding. Interpretation as the dialectic of explanation and understanding or comprehension may then be traced back to the initial stages of interpretative behaviour already at work in conversation. And while it is true that only writing and literary composition provide a full development of this dialectic, the interpretation must not be referred to as a province of understanding. It is not defined by a kind of object-"inscribed signs" in the most general sense of the term but by a kind of process: the dynamic of interpretative reading. (Ricœur, 1976: 74).

Ricœur in this way establishes an advancement in widening the scope of interpretation not as the 'province' of interpretation in the romanticist version rather he asserts the fundamental character of interpretation in the dynamicity of reading.

Interpretation as Dynamicity

Ricœur proposes two stages of understanding in the dynamic process of understanding and it is mediated by the explanation. The initial understanding as a guess, as he asserts that "naive grasping of the meaning of the text as a whole." (Ricœur, 1976: 74) Then sophisticated understanding aided by the explanatory methods leads to the liveliness of the language and meaning extension towards infinity. Finally, the text is appropriated which is distanciated.

Why Guess?

The guess is strongly linked with the semantic autonomy of the text. It is a naïve understanding of the text preceding reading. With writing, the psychological intention of the author blurs. Since this intention is satisfied or annulled by the text. His intention is obscure to us. The verbal intention in the text has an amazing element that the verbal importance itself. It implies that understanding happens in a non-mental and semantic circle wherein text escapes from the psychological intention of the author. This is the beginning stage of understanding and explanation. In this understanding it is not a recreating of an old event rather the reader's initiation into the reading itself is the new event starting from the objectification of the event manifested in the text. "To interpret the unexpressed within a text, the true hermeneutic endeavour requires interpretation drawing on the interpreter's preunderstandings (their foreknowledge and situatedness within the tradition) which gives them a horizon through which to engage with the horizon of the text." (Geanellos, 2001: 115).

It is more away from the Romanticist version of understanding in which interpretation concentrated on the verbal meaning to find the intention of the author. The objective meaning of the text surpasses the mental intention of the author. So, the mental intention of the author cannot be sieve by the verbal meanings. "The surpassing of the intention by the meaning signifies precisely that understanding takes place in a non-psychological and properly semantical space, which the text has carved out by severing itself from the mental intention of its author." (Ricœur, 1976: 76). So, the initial understanding of the text is a guess.

Elements in Guessing

We were dealing with the phenomenological aspect of interpretation in which interpretation is not one of the provinces of understanding rather it pervades in the whole stages of the understanding of the text. In this way, he tries to regain the lost position of interpretation

in understanding. He says that understanding of a text can be initially moulded as a guess, which is the crucial element for the explanation. We are discussing the elements of the guess in understanding.

Text as a Whole

The reading of the text instigates a prior understanding of treating text as a whole. The totality of text is not a linear collection of sentences rather its meaning is intertwined and interlinked with each other. Text is treated as a work of discourse. According to Hirsch "an individual trait will be rootless and meaningless unless it is perceived as the component in a whole must be a more or less explicit guess about the kind of utterance being interpreted." (Hirsh, 1967: 78). The plurivocity of text does not depend on the polysemy of words, rather it is attaining by taking the text as a totality. This is a presupposition engaged in dealing with the parts and parts can further modify the whole by assembling specifics making a circular process. This sphere violates the logical validities because "There is no necessity, no evidence, concerning what is important and what is unimportant. The judgment of importance is itself a guess" (Ricœur, 1976: 74).

Text as an Individual

Individuality attains through narrowing down from the whole. This the one way of localisation and the text attains its individuality in its uniqueness and the differences which demarcate the text form other categories, class, figures, and facts. This localisation and individualisation itself is a guess.
The implication by constituting text as an individual always attains a perspectival look as that of text. The same sentence can be modified and further modified for the whole understanding according to the perspectival presuppositions. This perspectival notion constituting the text itself as a guess.

A. T. Sebastian: *Semantic Autonomy*

Actualisation of Potential Horizons

This aspect is more concerned with the secondary aspects of the meaning. The secondary meaning can broaden the actual meanings. It cannot be limited to metaphors and symbols rather it pervades in every reading. This secondary meaning has the potentiality to generate much meaning in accords with the perspectival guess which we discussed above.

Validation of Guessing

He borrows the distinction made by Schleiermacher's Divinatory and Grammatical. The divinatory aspect is methodical. They relate to guessing. Validation is the Grammatical aspect. They are closer to the logic of probability than verifiability. Validation is the essential task of interpretation as a discipline. "It is the logic of uncertainty and qualitative probability." (Ricœur, 1991: 213). In this way, the text attains a scientific character. "Certainty is not attainable, such guesses can be more or less probable based on historical evidence." (Rogers ,1986: 6). There are many ways one can interpret the text. Every interpretation is different according to the outlook, context, and pre-understanding. Validation of the text relives us from extremities of interpretations.

This is the position where Ricœur distances himself from Heidegger and Gadamer. They were trying to establish a non-methodical understanding. Ricœur argued that this amethodical way of understanding will cause great issues of validity and foundational structures of the original way of interpretation. This validation is not verification but an argumentative practice, he connects it to juridical procedures used in legal interpretation. It used the thought pattern of subjective probability which is more attuned to the notion of falsification proposed by Karl Popper. In this way he tries to situate himself from the barriers of Romanticist fashion and the intention of the author.

Explanation to Comprehension

This process is mainly concentrated on the dialectical relation between sense and reference. It is a deep level of understanding in which meaning is exteriorized. It is a transition from the epistemological realm to the ontological realm. it is the regaining of the ideal meaning to the actual meaning. The differences in the situation (of both writer and reader) affects the referential dimension. The ostensive devices used in writing goes beyond the actual reference failing pointing the actual reference intended by the author. This dilemma can be solved by the attribution of dialectics of explanation and comprehension. There are two responses relating in the process of understanding (Pre-understanding) to the comprehension which involves the structuralist way of interpretation which is the initial understanding of the semantic autonomy disclosed by the text concerning the reader.

From Structuralist Way of Interpretation: Naïve Interpretation

The first response is the way of structuralist way of interpretation and then, understanding. It is initiated by the total suspending of the ostensive reference. This way of apprehension is more connected with structuralist schools. In this understanding ostensive reference is completely suspended which is the "total *epoche* of the referential function" (Thompson, 1981: 54) This will lead to the total escapement of worldly dimension in that way escapes the mental intention of the author too. "This is a suspension, the abstraction from reference to turn without an external" (Bourgeois, 1975: 136). In this case, the text is considered as the worldless entity concerned only with the interior of the text. "Working thus at the interior of a closed system of signs, linguistics can consider that the system that it analyses has no outside but only interior relations" (Thompson, 1981: 83). It is mainly based on the

closed system of semiotics. In this mode of reading the reference to the world, the inclination of the subject or intersubjective relations are bracketed or cut-offed. He connects the text with internal relations or "an interplay of relations" (Ricœur, 2016: 112). He says that,

> Similarly, a mytheme is not one of the sentences of the myth but an oppositive value which is shared by several particular sentences, constituting, in the language of Lévi-Strauss, a 'bundle of relations'. 'Only in the form of combinations of such bundles do the constituent units acquire a signifying function.' What is called here the 'signifying function' is not at all what the myth means, its philosophical or existential import, but rather the arrangement or disposition of mythemes, in short, the structure of the myth (Ricœur, 2016: 117).

Structurally a text follows a sequence of relations and opposites, by sequence Ricœur means that "A sequence is a succession of action kernels, each one closing off an alternative opened up by the preceding one" (Ricœur, 1976: 85). This type of reading and analysis only explains the text rather not interpreting it. He means that there is a suspense or complete bracketing of the meanings within the text. This bracketing makes the text isolated from any situation of discourse and its meaning "remains in suspense, together with any realisation in present speech" (Ricœur, 2016: 118). Therefore he reconstructs the mode of explanation which was confined only to natural sciences to the field of linguistics in that way to the Human sciences too.

> The explanation is no longer a concept borrowed from the natural sciences and transferred to the alien domain of written artefacts; rather, it stems from the very sphere of language, by analogical transference from the small units of language (phonemes and lexemes) to the units larger than the sentence, such as narratives, folklore and myth. Henceforth, interpretation – if it is still possible to give a sense to this notion – will no longer be confronted by a model external to the human sciences. It will, instead, be confronted by a model of intelligibility which belongs, from birth so to speak, to the domain of the human sciences, and indeed to a leading science in this domain: linguistics (Ricœur, 1976: 86)

This comes from the semiological field, so it is possible to treat text according to the explanatory signs. Concentrated on signs not on sentences as its primal foundation. This can be treated as one of the possible approaches to interpretation. In this way, the realm of understanding is not only concerned with natural sciences. Although Ricœur is not completely denying the explanatory role in understanding, rather it also serves as the tool for deep understanding.

To Depth Semantics

The non-ostensive character of the text paves way for the world opened by the semantics lead to them not to focus on the hidden meanings of the text rather the text discloses itself towards an infinite meaning's dimensions. Discovery of the possible references which were internally confined in sense cross the shore of finiteness (already existing (the) meaning). Not something behind the text rather the text discloses. Therefore, to understand a text is a movement from sense to the reference of the text.

> What we have said about the depth semantics that structural analysis yields rather invites us to think of the sense of the text as an injunction coming from the text, as a new way of looking at things, as an injunction to think in a certain manner. This is the reference borne by the depth semantics. The text speaks of a possible world and of a possible way of orientating oneself within it. The dimensions of this world are properly opened by and disclosed by the text.

Creating a new ostensive reference which not pointing out what there exists rather extend to the possibilities. We already saw that the structural analysis of the text is static and dead. It will end up in some mathematical abstraction and solving of scientific puzzles by certain formulas. Without delving into the functions of depth analysis, the structural analysis would be condensed to the pure game as the mere algebraic expression of deriving and solving the equation. Naïve interpretation is

A. T. Sebastian: *Semantic Autonomy*

analysed into depth interpretation and the depth hermeneutics and deep semantics constitute a genuine understanding of a unique hermeneutic arc and requires the reader to understand which the text is about then the non-ostensive reference of the text. The depth semantics of the text signifies that "text communicates to a subject is a possible mode of being-in-the-world." (Dimitrov, 2019: 6) The depth semantics has also an epistemological fashion. The world opened by the deep semantics of the texts discloses the infinite possibilities of semantic innovation. To be closer the text reveals immense possibilities of the horizon without a limit opened towards infinity.

Distanciation and Appropriation

Distanciation and Appropriation function within the process of reading and are mutually connected by the very nature. Ricœur attributes an existential overtone to this dialectic. Distanciation in the literal sense, denotes estrangement, alienation but this alienation is not something totality demarcates oneself from the psychological motives, context as well as semantic autonomy rather it is the essential feature of the text. this is not an imposed or manipulated idea. The estrangement of the distanciation is rescued by the notion of appropriation. It is the process of making a text one own, attaching oneself to the reference of the text. Then, this yields distanciation constructive and productive treatment. It is a deconstructive way of drawing close to Derrida words "destruct to construct." Ricœur considers appropriation as the epistemological instrument of knowing oneself through the way of a cultural detour.

Productive Distanciation to "Making One's Own"

The notion as we above saw that it is not literally as a separation rather Ricœur moves towards the concept of productive distanciation. This is against the traditional-romanticist traditions which were linked to the contents of literary works, cultural background, as well as social conditions. This productive distanciation takes place by way of appropriation. He uses the

German word '*Aneignung'* which means 'to make one's own' which was formerly alien. He says that,

> According to the intention of the word (*Aneignung*), the aim of all hermeneutics is to struggle against cultural distance and historical alienation. Interpretation brings together, equalises, renders contemporary and similar. This goal is attained only as far as interpretation actualises the meaning of the text for the present reader. Appropriation is the concept which is suitable for the actualisation of meaning as addressed to someone. It takes place of the answer in the dialogical situation, in the same way, that 'revelation' or 'disclosure' takes the place of ostensive reference in the dialogical situation. (Ricœur, 1982: 185)

The history and culture thus suspended to attain something novel within the situations. Thus it 'brings together,' equalises, 'renders the similar' to transform oneself**.** Therefore, the meaning is not historical rather meaning is disclosed by the text, the 'presencing' of the meaning when one starts to discourse with the text. Ricœur claims that "reading a text explodes the circular movement of discourse into an arc" (Ricœur, 1982: 161). Rather than making us continually circle back onto our understanding reading radically discloses us to the other shore that free us from our original context and appropriate to our existential concerns. By analysing the objective structures of a text, furthermore, we can expand our understanding beyond our initial interpretation.

Flourishing of Oneself

By making the text 'my own' the staticity of the text fades. It diffuses to the new form of life with infinite potentialities in interpreting and understanding. The self is attaining new possibilities of knowing himself by receiving a new mode of being. The formation of the ego is not because of a particular moment rather it is evolved in and through conversing and clarifying and "subsuming alien meaning into one's own scheme of things" (Kearney, 2007:150). Appropriation takes

A. T. Sebastian: *Semantic Autonomy*

place as a possession 'taking holding of' in this way, text grabs oneself from his narcissist ego. It gives a new self-understanding. "it is the text, with its universal power of unveiling, which gives a self an ego" (Ricœur, 1991:193).

Conclusion

The problematics of sematic autonomy, authorial meaning, the historical background which was the pillars of the traditional-romanticist Hermeneutics was overthrown by the Phenomenological Hermeneutics proposed by Ricœur. The dialectical relation of explanation and understanding in which, how explanation aids as the co-joiner of pre-understanding and comprehension (deep understanding). The importance of guess (naïve understanding) in the field of understanding is very crucial. He blended the living subjectivity of the phenomenology of the language and the semiological structural analysis. We saw the notion of distanciation and appropriation. The notion of distanciation along with appropriation gives the infinite meaning dimension. How distanciation trespasses the semantic barriers and discloses to a new possible world via appropriation. The seductive quality of the appropriation transforms one from a self to the ego.

With the interior dynamic of the text, the text presents a real and phenomenological happening that affects the reader (Pandikattu, 1999). The inner dynamic of the text is not logged by the Romanticist or Historicist fashions rather the text flows oneself to the sea where no boundaries are there to restrict. This is not in a negative fashion rather this is an entry in which man finds his authentic self. The potency and dynamicity of language create a much more suitable and adaptable world.

References

Bourgeois, Patrick L. (1975). *Extension of Ricœur's Hermeneutics*. 1st ed. Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Dimitrov, Chavdar. (2019). "Philosophical Hermeneutics: Between Gadamer and Ricœur." Edited by Gergana Popova. *NotaBene* 45, no. 1 (2019): 1–21. Accessed December 21, 2021. https://www.notabene-bg.org/read.php?id=873 part 2: https://www.notabene-bg.org/read.php?id=874

Geanellos, Rene. (2001) "Exploring Ricœur's Hermeneutic Theory of Interpretation as a Method of Analysing Research Texts." *Blackwell Science Limited* 7, no. 2. Nursing Enquiry (December 25, 2001): 112–119. Accessed September 20, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1440-1800.2000.00062.x.

Hirsh, E. D. (1967). *Validity in Interpretation*. 1st ed. London: Yale University Press.

Pandikattu, Kuruvilla. (1999). Human Freedom: The Finite Quest for the Infinite. Jnanadeepa: Pune Journal of Religious Studies, July-Dec 1999(Vol 2/2), 93–107. http://doi.org/ 10.5281/ zenodo.4290067

Ricœur, Paul. (1982). "Appropriation." In *Paul Ricœur: Hermeneutics and Human Sciences*, edited by John B. Thompson, translated by John B. Thompson, 182–197. ii ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. (1976). *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and Surplus of Meaning*. 2nd ed. Texas: Texas Christian University Press.

———. (1982). "Metaphor and The Central Problem of Hermeneutics." In *Paul Ricœur: Hermeneutics and Human Sciences*, edited by John B. Thompson, translated by John B. Thompson. ii ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. (1991). "The Model of Text: Meaningful Action Considered as a Text." In *From Text to Action: Essays in Hermeneutics II*, edited by James M. Edie, translated by Kathleen Blamey and John

B. Thompson, 144–167. Evanston: North Western University Press.

———. (2016). "What Is a Text? Explanation and Understanding." In *Studies in the Theory of Interpretation- Part II*, edited by John B. Thompson, 107–126. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Accessed November 25, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316534984.008

Rogers, William E. (1986). "Ricœur and the Privileging of Texts: Scripture and Literature." *Religion & Literature* 18, no. 1, 1–25. Accessed December 20, 2012. https://www.jstor.org /stable/ 40059301.

Thompson, John B. (1981). *Critical Hermeneutics A Study in the Thought of Paul Ricœur and Jurgen Habermas*. 1st ed. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kearney, Richard. (2007). "Paul Ricœur and the Hermeneutics of Translation." *Research in Phenomenology* 37, no. 2: 147–159. Accessed March 2, 2021. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24660187.

Alan T. Sebastion holds a Licentiate in Philosophy from Jnana Deepa (JD) Institute for Philosophy and Theology (Pontifical Athenaeum), Pune, India. He has majored in Phenomenological hermeneutics. His main areas of interest are Hermeneutics, Phenomenology as well as Existentialism. E-mail: athekkelcst@gmail.com ORCID: 0000-0001-9734-9214

A. T. Sebastian: *Semantic Autonomy*