A. Previous Researches

There are several essays about representation of native in postcolonial field. Edward Said wrote in his book *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) about his reading of Joseph Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*. In section “Two Visions in Heart of Darkness” as quoted by Philip and Patricia (1996), he points out 2 arguments or visions from *Heart of Darkness*. The first argument is the Western imperialism that still controls their old territory in Africa and Asia “mentally and intellectually” although they were no longer ruled them physically (p. 354). His second argument is that *Heart of Darkness* was a cruel plan to civilize the savage as Said put “to bring light to the dark places”. However, both Marlow and Kurtz did not recognize the impendence of the darkness or the natives. It reflects Conrad as “a creature of his time” where imperialism still in place and he failed to see the possibility of the end of imperialism (p. 358).

Aside from his two arguments, Said implies that imperialism dominates the system of representation in which the native were not given their own voices and must rely on Marlow’s description of them in *Heart of Darkness*. The way Marlow keeps his explanation vague during his narration makes the native’s image not appears as it to be. Marlow’s miss presenting of Africa shows Conrad’s view of Africa and its native people as darkness where it needs light as presented
by the white people. Thus, to bring light to the dark places is done by civilizing – colonizing them.

Like Said, Mirela Karagic analyzes the representation of native in her essay entitled Representation of Other A Postcolonial Study of the Representation of the Natives in Relation to the Colonizers in The Stranger and Disgrace in 2013. In The Stranger (written by Albert Camus) set in Algeria, the male native only referred to “a group of Arabs” and repeatedly called as Arab (p. 9) to show their hostile behavior. On the other hand, the female native are described as exotic instead of savage like the male native since Camus uses term “Moorish” rather than Arab (p. 10). Camus is only giving them the silent gesture to reflect their inferiority in front of white people. Karagic then concluded that the Stranger is a depiction of power hierarchy in Algerian with French people as the center and the native as the background (p. 18). Her next analysis in J.M Coetzee’s Disgrace has similar point with Camus’ such as the representation of the male native as wild and the female native as exotic. This novel has taken place in South Africa post-independence which showed the shift of power unlike Camus’ The Stranger. The proof of the shifting power is Lurie’s (white protagonist character) daughter who had been raped by the native men. She decided to keep her child to maintain the peace. It shows her acknowledgement of the shifting power and the loss of white people’s supremacy to the native people (p.29). Based on her analysis in The Stranger and Disgrace, she concludes that both the native are described as “instances, exotic, strange, hostile and mysterious” (p.28).
Another essay was written by Jana Giles entitled *The Landscape of the Other: Aesthetics, Representation and the Post-Colonial Sublime in Jean Rhys’ Wide Sargasso Sea* (2002). This essay examines the tragedy of colonial romance and the self-representation in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Giles classified Wide Sargasso Sea as ethnography since Edward tried to assert himself as “Rochester” as a leader in patriarchal system and Antoinette as “Bertha” to show his hegemony. She also categorizes this novella as auto ethnography because the text is “written dialogically by and for Antoinette, Christophine and Rhys herself that heterogeneously engages with and challenges metropolitan idioms” (p. 161). In this essay, the writer mentions that both Rochester and Antoinette are in conflict in their self-representation. Edward Rochester was a naive young Englishman with colonizer education and culture. With his visit to Jamaica, he began to lose his self-representation as an Englishman and had the need to resist it by erasing Antoinette with Bertha. It is because he wanted what Antoinette had and been driven by his jealously to her (p. 174).

Antoinette, on the other hand, was conflicted where she did not belong to both white and black people in Jamaica as implied in her nickname “white cockroach” (p. 165). Her hard effort to be more connected with the land and its people in her childhood failed and her self-representation becomes a contradiction. Antoinette’s marriage with Rochester threatened her identity as Rochester tried to call her Bertha. This act was silencing and determining her voice as part of the Creole or the native people. She spoke through Rochester and fell back in silence until Rhys allowed her to talk (p. 178). Giles also finds that the black culture in this book is
described as “damnation and danger” although Rhys never uses this continually (p.166). However, Rhys gives Christophine more rational thinking than Rochester and Antoinette since she could see clearly the struggle to maintain self-representation in Jamaica.

The essays mentioned above inspired me to conduct this study about the representation of native people in “The Man Who Would Be King”, “The Revenge of Her Race”, and “An Outpost of Progress” from the point of view of the colonizer. Furthermore, this study tries to see the condition of colonialism era from the short stories.

B. Postcolonial Studies

There are many varieties about the term postcolonialism in this field. The term of “postcolonialism” is often written with hyphen between the words (post-colonialism) and without hyphen (postcolonialism). The same variation is applied with “post-colonial” and “postcolonial”. Both terms are used by many critics with various definitions. It makes the final meaning of both terms are confusing. However, this study follows the term used by John McLeod (2000), that is, “postcolonialism” and “postcolonial” (without hyphen). In the introduction of his book, he states that postcolonial with hyphen (post-colonial) is referring more to the historical period and equals with “after colonialism” or “after independence”.
Then he argues that postcolonialism is not merely a historical period but deals also with “representations, reading practices, and value” (p.5).

Postcolonialism or postcolonial study is a study of relationship between the once colonizer (West/ First World) with the once colonized countries (non-West/ Third World) as Prasad claims

Prasad’s statement above implies that postcolonial theory deals with the relationship between the ex-colonized and colonizer’s country both in past and present day. The relationship can be seen from many aspects such as politics, psychology and culture. Because of this, postcolonialism needs other related studies which makes postcolonialism as interdisciplinary field.

According to Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin (2001), the main concern of postcolonialism is the effects of colonization on cultures and societies (p.186). This term was originally used by the historians to classify the era after colonialism. However, from the late 1970s onward, the literary critics also use this term to discover the culture effects of colonialism.
In literary field, literary works become the perfect tools to discover the relationship of West and non-West and its effect. It is because the works are treated as a record of its author who experiences colonialism. From their experiences and their ideology, the authors then construct the other party. Thus, the knowledge and power of the authors create what later known as representation. Since earlier works were written by the colonizer, the author created the representation of the native which becomes a myth for the non-West people. However, after India independence in 1947, many native writers created their works to give another view of colonialism, specifically in the native’s view. In 1970s some critics from various fields began to publish their works regarding the author’s representation of native people.

Some of well-known critics who wrote about the representation of native people are Edward Said with *Orientalism* in 1978, and Homi Bhabha with his collection of essays entitled *The Location of Culture* (1994). Their works have the same subject, that is, the East or Oriental (Said’s term) is shaped based on the West people experiences in that place which makes the appearance of the native people is miss presented. Their works also shape postcolonial theory in general and representation of native specifically.
1. *Orientalism* by Edward Said

Orientalism is one of pioneer works in postcolonial studies. This book is first published at 1978 and still quoted by the most books about postcolonial. Orientalism is reprinted in 1995 (new afterword) and 2003 (updated preface). This book is divided into three long chapters with 12 smaller subchapters.

According to Said in his preface (2003), this book is already translated into 36 languages all over the world and discussed by many intellectuals (p. xi). In his introduction, Said informs that his definition of Orientalism is broader than the other academics’ definition. Then he defined Orientalism as “a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient.” (p. 3). His hypothesis of Orientalism is “the Orient is not an inert fact of nature” (p. 4) which means the Orient is constructed by many intellectuals for a long time and by generalizing many Orientalist assumptions and stereotypes (Ashcroft et al., 2001, p. 168). Said adds that “The relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony,…” (p. 5). This relationship then allows the Occident to recreate the Orient because the Occident is the one who discovered the Orient.

Additionally, Said mentions that there is no method allowing the scholar or writer to be detached with their surroundings. The same case applies with the link between ideology and writing. He states that Orientalism is not only a political affair or some the Occident’s scheme to control the Orient but
it is, rather than expresses, a certain will or intention to understand, in some cases to control, manipulate, even to incorporate, what is a manifestly different (or alternative and novel) world; it is, above all, a discourse that is by no means in direct, corresponding relationship with political power… intellectual,… cultural,… moral… (p.12)

Then, Said tells his aim to study Orientalism as “a dynamic exchange between individual authors and the large political concerns shaped by the three great empires—British, French, American—in whose intellectual and imaginative territory the writing was produced.” (p. 15). He also states his research questions as “How did philology, lexicography, history, biology, political and economic theory, novel-writing, and lyric poetry come to the service of Orientalism’s broadly imperialist view of the world? What changes, modulations, refinements, even revolutions take place within Orientalism?” (p. 15). Said then moves to his methodological focus which about “the history authority” and “the personal authorities of Orientalism”. His methodological devices to investigate authority are strategic location and strategic formation. Said’s limitation in Orientalism is “the Anglo-French-American experience of the Arabs and Islam, which for almost a thousand years together stood for the Orient.” (p. 17) or Near Orient because he can separate the interaction between the white people and Near Orient with the events in Far East (India, Japan and China). The term “Near Orient” refers to the close position of Arabs from Europe geographically. He elaborates that his limitation is not ignoring
Orientalism in Far East. It is because many events in Far Orient with the Occident cannot be separated with the condition in Near Orient.

Said begins with analyzing the speeches about Egypt by Arthur James Balfour and Lord Cromer. Then he concludes from the speeches into the simplest outline as “There are Westerners, and there are the Orientals. The former must dominate; the latter must be dominated, which usually means having their land occupied, their internal affairs rigidly controlled, their blood and treasure put at disposal of one or another Western power.” (p. 36). The outline also supports the idea that the Occident is superior to the Orient because the British have more knowledge about the Orient than the Orient themselves. This allows them to create the image of Oriental as Said illustrates

The Orient was viewed as if framed by the classroom, the criminal court, the prison, the illustrated manual. Orientalism, then, is the knowledge of the Orient that places things Oriental in class, court, prison, or manual for scrutiny, study, judgment, discipline, or governing. (p. 41)

The image of Orientalism serves as the display of the Western’s strength and the Orient’s flaw according to the Western (p. 45). Another effect of this image is the polarized position of the Orient to show the differentiation from the Western. People between the Orient and Occident is not encouraged to encounter each other as he expresses “Orientals lived in their world, “we” lived in ours. From this point, the Western scholars at the time had drawn an imaginative geographical line between the West and the Orient. According to
Said, this line can be seen from the ancient Greece texts Aeschylus’s *The Persians* and *The Bacchae*. The purpose of this line is to draw the distinction between the Orient and Occident which shown Europe as “powerful and articulate” and Asia as “defeated and distant” (p. 57). Again, this shows the West as “a genuine creator” of the Orient’s image. Said then portrays the concept of representation in theatrical way

The Orient is the stage on which the whole East is confined. On this stage will appear figures whose role it is to represent the larger whole from which they emanate. The Orient then seems to be, not an unlimited extension beyond familiar European world, but rather a closed field, a theatrical stage affixed to Europe. (p. 63)

Said then explains the various projects done by the Orientalist about Orient and Islam. Islam, according to him, is a challenge to the Western and Christianity since Islam’s territory is geographically and culturally close to Europe. This way, Orientalism can be defined as “the discipline which the Orient was (and is) approached systematically, as a topic of learning, discovery, and practice.” (p. 73). The Orientalist collected the data of the Orient throughout their task such as the text and languages. This data were used to create the Orient as a peculiar place and distant.

Napoleon’s expedition to Egypt and the opening of Suez Canal also part of Orientalist project. The failure of Napoleon’s expedition to Egypt did not obliterate his purpose of Orient. On the contrary, this event leads to “the entire modern experience of the Orient as interpreted from within the universe of
discourse…” (p. 87). Moreover, the Suez Canal project changes the view of Orientalist. The canal represents the destroyed distance between Orient and Occident and de-polarized world of West and East into “our world”. Because of this, the idea of Orient is moved into “an administrative or executive one, and it subordinate to demographic, economic, and sociological factors.” (p. 92). This marks the shift of Orientalism from an academic study into imperialism practice.

Again, Said argues that text influence the construction of Orient, “… such text can create not only knowledge but also the very reality they appear to describe…. Produce tradition, or what Michael Foucault calls a discourse…” (p. 94). Since most of text about Orient is written by Western Orientalist, the knowledge of Orient is known from the Orientalist’s constructed texts about them as he declares “Orientalism overrode the Orient” (p. 96) and makes the Orient appear to be unchanging or static. These texts also make the Orient as a general object to show a part of their eccentricity (p. 102). This shows the West’s authority toward the Orient, as Said illustrates as “The West is the actor, the Orient a passive reactor. The West is the spectator, the judge and jury, of every facet of Oriental behavior.” (p. 109) although many their scholars’ texts are incorrectly describe the Orient.

The Orient in nineteenth century is resurrected and modernized by the Orientalist who saw themselves as a hero saving the Orient from its unknown. This puts the Orientalist as a “central authority for the Orient” and the Orient’s
being is “spoken for”. At the same time, the Orientalist’s gains of their position to the Orient also mean their loss of originality since the model they used was “reconstruction and repetition” (p. 122). According to Said, there are two important figures of shaping Orientalism, Silvestre de Sacy and Ernest Renan. Sacy’s focus is delivered the Orient to his student by “its most representative parts need be” and reasoned that Orient is “old and distant” and “vastly rich” (p. 125). Sacy’s view to the Orient is that they are needed to be presented by the Orientalist since they cannot gain the similar degree of civilization like the West, even with special training. Since the Orientalist is the finder of Orient, they need to “present the Orient by a series of representative fragments, fragments republished, explicated, annotated, and surrounded with still more fragments.” (p. 128). The other scholar, Ernest Renan, was associating the Orient with philology with recreated the Semitic language. This creation then known as Semitic Orient. He found that compared with the Indo-European language as “the living, organic form,” (p. 143) the Semitic is “inorganic, arrested,… Semitic is not a live language, and for that matter, neither are Semities live creatures.” (p. 145). His statement displays the act of imperial power since he constructs the Orient as non-living creature. Said then criticizes Renan’s statement with inequality comparison in terms of philologist which traced back into linguistics.

Said then discussed the Orientalist’s way to get the information of the Orient by first-hand experience without losing their objectivity. His example is Edward William Lane’s observation of Egypt who pretended to be a Moslem
to observe Egypt’s culture. To him, Lane’s action is the representation of the Occident’s penetration to the Orient. The result of the East’s observation then filtered and reproduced in and for the West. To put it another way, “the Orient… would be converted from the personal, sometimes garbled testimony of intrepid voyagers and residents into impersonal definition by whole array of scientific workers.” (p. 166). In the end, he concludes that Orientalism in 19th century is that the government and institutions work better as imperial object than the Orientalist’s individual academic object. The changes of the Orient clearly can be seen by Said, “From being place, the Orient became the domain of actual scholarly rule and potential imperial sway.” (p. 197) which continues to the following century.

Said then introduces the latent and manifest Orientalism. He defines latent Orientalism as “an almost (and certainly an untouchable) positivity” (p. 206) uses for denying the development and movement of the Orient which creates them as “static, frozen, fixed eternally.” (p. 209). He says that the root of latent Orientalism is in its geography and the way to know the Orient (p. 216). Manifest Orientalism can be described as “the various stated views about Oriental society, languages, literatures, history, sociology, and so forth…” (p. 206). He adds that the change of the Orient’s knowledge is part of manifest Orientalism. Said mentions two methods of delivering the Orient to the Occident in 20th century. The first method is institutionalized knowledge which creates latent Orientalism (p. 221) and “an important convergence” (p. 222) as the second method. Here, the Orientalist gathered the data of the
Orient distantly yet the distance is reduced in 19th century. This makes the tension between latent and manifest Orientalism.

Kipling’s representation of the European in his works shows the imperialism by British. Said’s analysis of the white men’s pronoun usage “we” shows that the Orient cannot be “independent and rule themselves” (p. 228). The pronounce “we” also indicates the polarized West and East and forces the distinction of the Orient (p. 230) and until the East catch up the rational thinking of the Europe, the pronoun “our” cannot be used. He expresses this polarization the impact of generalization of the Orient.

Orientalism begins to enter new era where the Western Orientalist found the Orient more challenging and the West itself has a new cultural crisis. Then, Said shifts his attention to other phenomenon which is Islamic Orientalism and its growth. He examines Louis Massignon and H. A. R. Gibb and concludes that although old Orientalism is separated in many parts but all those parts still serves the traditional Orientalist dogma (p. 284).

Orientalism also has influence in United States after World War II. As Said mentions, United States become the center of world politics left by Britain and France. Later, United States continued the tradition from the West of Orientalism as part of their cultural relation policy. Finally, Said concludes the book with the triumph of Orientalism, as the Orientalist cannot ignore and avoid the Orient’s presence because “the answer to Orientalism is not Occidentalism.” (p. 328).
2. *The Location of Culture* by Homi Bhabha

Homi Bhabha is known as one of leading figures in postcolonial field. One of his remarkable works is *The Location of Culture* (1994). This book contains his essays regarding the hybridity of the Orient entitled “The Commitment of Theory”, “Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of colonial discourse”, “Sly civility”, “Sign taken for wonders: Questions of ambivalence and authority under a tree outside Delhi, May 1817”, and “DissemiNation: Time, Narrative, and the margins of modern nation”. In this book he also included his introduction and the conclusion of his previous essays in “Conclusions: ‘Race’, time and the revision of modernity.”

Bhabha introduces his mimicry theory in “Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of colonial discourses”. Then he defines mimicry as “a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite” (p.86). He elaborates further that mimicry is used by the colonizer to make the native follows the colonizer’s desire. The colonizer’s purpose of mimicry is to normalize them, in accordance with the Occident’s standard of civilization.

Bhabha also states the foundation of mimicry as

A desire that, through the repetition of *partial presence* which is the basis of mimicry, articulates those disturbances of cultural, racial, and historical difference that menace the narcissistic demand of colonial authority (p. 88)
The repetition in mimicry can be traced from the colonizer’s writing, as his examples of Joseph Conrad’s *Nostromo* and V. S. Naipul’s *The Mimic Men*. Furthermore, in cultural aspect, the attempt of mimicry is shown by the native’s repressed tradition, along with other aspects such as political and economic.

Bhabha expresses that the effect of mimicry is ‘profound and disturbing’ (p. 86). It is because the native assumes they are a step higher that their fellow native based on the way they dress and speak. This native alienates their own culture to accept the colonizer’s culture. However, this attempt shows the imbalance effect to the person. This imbalance of the partial representation means as ‘incomplete” and “virtual”. There is a possibility that the native does not notice this unbalance and creates the illusion of him or herself as equal with their colonizer.

The colonizer’s attempt to instill their culture is not fully succeeded. The clash between two cultures – native and colonizer – makes mimicry is slipping away. The repetition of the colonizer’s knowledge creates a pull between the native which causes them to be a partial presence. Bhabha explains further in his essay “Sly Civility” that mimicry creates ambivalence in both the native and the colonizer. It is because the ambivalence happens as the effect of partial and double repetition in mimicry, as Bhabha writes

Both colonizer and colonized are in a process of miscognition where each point of identification is always a partial and
double repetition of the otherness of the self – democrat and despot, individual and servant, native and child (p. 97).

In his other essay “Sign Taken for Wonder: Questions of ambivalence and authority under a tree outside Delhi, May 1817”, Bhabha explains further about ambivalence and gives example of the presence of English book in India. These books create “ambivalence between the origin and displacement, discipline, mimesis, and repetition” (p. 110). To the colonizer, the English books were sign of authority since the native were going to learn from these texts.

The double vision in the text shows the partial presence of the representative of whole. Bhabha mentions his example as “… the Bible translated into Hindi, propagated by Dutch or native catechists, is still the English book…” (p. 108). The double forces in these books then cause a discrimination of the native who is treated as the colonizer’s fantasy in matter of identity. The discrimination also occurs between “the mother and its bastards”, where the repeated party is evolving into something different – “a mutation, a hybrid” (p. 111). This phenomenon is theorized by Bhabha as hybridity. Bhabha then defines what he means of hybridity as

Hybridity is the name of this displacement of value from symbol to sign that causes the dominant discourse to split along the axis of its power to be representative, authoritative. Hybridity represents that ambivalent ‘turn’ of the discriminated subject into something terrifying, exorbitant, object of paranoid
classification – a disturbing images and presence of authority. (p. 113)

From the definition above, it is clear that hybridity makes the colonizer lose its authority. Their manifestation of authority is no longer visible within their English books. They also lose its fantasy identity of the native such as the Arabs with its brutality and the laziness of the Indian. Because of this Bhabha concludes that every English book is read as a product of hybridity, it retains its existence but no longer a whole essence.

Hybridity also can be seen as the native’s resistance. Bhabha shows this resistance when he quotes the native’s words Amund Messeh’s tale, “we are willing to be baptized, but we never will take the Sacrament.” (p.103). The native later explains their refusal to Sacrament because they (European) eat cow which is sacred in India. From the tale above, the colonizer through the missionaries are only able to instill half their authority.

Finally, Bhabha makes a link between mimicry, ambivalent, and hybridity. He states that mimicry is caused by hybridity which includes ambivalence in it. Hybridity then becomes a mockery for the authority after they lose the power. Then he offers a third choice of Fanon’s “turn white or disappear?” which is a camouflage (p. 120) for the native when facing the colonizer’s force.
C. Hermeneutic Phenomenology

Hermeneutics is originally a method used for interpreting the sacred texts such as Bible. This method also related closely to semiotic and philosophy. The development of hermeneutics allows the non-sacred text to be analyzed with this method. The recent development of hermeneutics is known as hermeneutic phenomenology. Hermeneutics Phenomenology is first introduced by Martin Heidegger and Hans-Georg Gadamer. From the term itself, it is clear that hermeneutic phenomenology is a unification of hermeneutics and phenomenology to achieve deeper understanding of text. Later, Paul Ricoeur improves this method with the influence of structuralism and psychoanalysis.

Paul classifies text a discourse (writing text) and dialogue (oral text). According to him, discourse has less limit than dialogue since dialogue is a closed relationship and locked in ‘I-thou relationship’ (1966, p. 90). He also assumes text as an autonomous works which means independent to its author and reader. Ricoeur’s reason to treat text as an object is to achieve better understanding, since text escapes the original writer’s intention. This independence opens new meaning of text based on the reader’s situation (Suazo, 2014:4).

Paul next step to achieve an understanding of text is to offer distanciation and appropriation. The main purpose of distanciation is to distance the object from its author’s psychology and ideology. Distanciation also confirms text as an autonomous system since the result of this method is an objective understanding.
John B. Thompson provides the summary of Ricoeur’s four principles in distanciation as follows:

1. First principal, the surpassing of the event of saying by the meaning of what is said.
Ricoeur explains that the original text is expanded into different pattern of speech act such as “intentional exteriorisation”. This expansion also happens in writing. The various phrasing in writing makes the meaning in writing goes beyond the real event in speech act.

2. Second principal, distanciation concerns the relationship between the inscribed expression and original speaker.
This principle contains Ricoeur’s explanation about the relationship between speech and writing. Here, text is a bridge between the writer and the (original) reader. However, the write’s intention is altered from the speech to writing as the reader’s initial understanding. He argues that the altered text now has different reader from a distance of the original reader.

3. Third principal, introducing a similar discrepancy between the inscribed expression and the original audience.
This principle deals with the relationship between the writing and the original reader. Text experiences “decotextualise” from its original social culture when produced and read by a non-original reader.
Decontextualise of text allows the reader from different period to interpret differently.

4. Forth principal, the emancipation of the text from the limits of ostensive reference.

Ricoeur says that the speech is constricted by a closed relationship as explained before. However, text has no limit even after the writer and the original intended reader are passed away.

The second element in Ricoeur’s hermeneutics is appropriation. He defines appropriation in “What is a Text?” and cited by McCord as follows

By ‘appropriation’, I understand this; that interpretation of a text culminates in the self-interpretation of a subject who thenceforth understand himself differently, or simply begins to understand himself... thus genuinely making one’s own what was initially alien. (p. 13-14)

From the definition above, it is clear that the reader is having different interpretation from one to another. In appropriation, the reader’s subjectivity is totally visible. The different socio-culture condition is not complicating the reader to interpret, instead the reader’s subjectivity enriches the text’s meaning. The meaning is clear and familiar as Ricoeur says “making one’s own what was initially alien”. The reader’s interpretation is often far from the text’s original intention but never dominant. It is because “subjectivity is not becoming objectivity since subjectivity is grounded on the ontological participation of
being-in-the-world.” (Suazo, p. 9). All things considered, appropriation is a result from distanciation and coupled with the reader’s subjectivity.

To Ricoeur, the best way to reach appropriation is through reading. In reading, the transformation from the objectivity of text to the reader’s subjectivity where text is treated as a new knowledge occurs. Through reading, the reader’s horizon is amplified and allows them of “the possibility of seeing thing differently and orienting oneself in other ways in the world.” (Ghasemi, et. al, 1626)

Between distanciation and appropriation, there is a moment of interpretation. In interpretation, the reader must find his or her understanding from text. The first (naive) understanding allows the reader to deeper understanding after the re-read process (Ghasemi et.al, 1625). Ricoeur then develops interpretation into a theory of which the aim is

This theory seeks to integrate explanation and understanding in a constructive dialectic which is rooted in the properties of text. (Thompson, 2003: 5)

From the quotation above, it is stated that theory of interpretation consists of two points, that is, explanation and understanding. Explanation (what the text says) investigates the internal part of the text. Based on Thompson’s explanation, the result of distanciation before is the author’s intention which is treated as an unsolved understanding by the reader. Because of this, the reader must construct a whole meaning from the unsolved understanding before (p. 54).
On the other hand, understanding is focused on “grasping the meanings; the text discloses (the whole in relation to its parts)” (p. 1626) as Ghasemi et al. states.

In understanding, there are two possible approaches to text where the reader treats text as “worldless and self-entity” which Thompson elaborates as founded by the structuralist. The second possible approach to text is to find the non-apparent reference of text from their reading. These readers are no longer trying to find the hidden meaning within the text but “which is says it about” (p. 54). Ricoeur, in Thompson, claims that from interpretation the reader finds out that understanding is not accomplished by “something felt” but possibility reference from explanation, namely “a possible world disclosed by the text.” (p. 54).

From the elements above, Ricoeur creates his hermeneutic circle. This circle is not vicious but rather “a living and stimulating circle” (p. 38) as Sims quotes. Paul Ricoeur’s circle is pictured as below
Based on the diagram above, Ghasemi et al are able to create the application of Ricoeur’s hermeneutics. One important note, distanciation takes place before the interpretation begin, thus the application level only involves interpretation and appropriation element in Ghasemi et.al’s scheme (p. 1627-1628). There are three step which are:

1. level 1 analysis: Explanation (what the text says) with a naive understanding of text as the result.
2. level 2 analysis : Understanding (what the text talks about) where the reader with basic understanding is able to find deeper understanding slowly.
3. level 3 analysis: Appropriation, the turning point when the understanding of text is applied in life, thus expanding the reader’s horizon.