

Introduction ЛЕКСИЯИ 1

Teaching the text is an activity all of us have engaged in as teachers. (Aoki, 1984, p. i) Books are for the sake of experience; they open up new possibilities of life. Life is not for the sake of books. (Novak, 1971, p. xvi) We live in the world of the text in the sense of the written text as well as in its metaphorical sense. Through our interpretation of the text, we understand the world and communicate its meaning to one another. In this way, it can be said that we live in and experience the world of the text, and thus the text and the act of text interpretation penetrate (входить, проникать в) our lives [laɪvz] prior (прежний, бывший; предшествующий) 2) более важный, веский to any theoretical explanation about them. Especially in education, text and text interpretation take a central place, because in its fundamental sense the pedagogical situation consists of communication of meanings based on diverse (различный; несходный) 2) многообразный), interpretations. No one would deny the value of the text both in pedagogical situations and in our lives, even if we limit the meaning of the text to the written one. It is by virtue [ˈvɜːtʃuː] of (by virtue of — благодаря чему-л., в силу чего-л.) texts that we can infinitely (бесконечно, безгранично, беспредельно) expand and deepen our understanding of the world going beyond the temporal (светский, мирской; гражданский) and spatial (пространственный) limitations of our own lived experience.

Without texts it may be hardly possible for us to understand the lives of the people who lived in ancient Greece or China as well as the meaning of their lives to our present situation. In pedagogical situations, a variety of texts are selected and used in order to widen and deepen the understanding of the world with a hope that such activities would be helpful for students as well as for teachers to realize the highest possibility of being in and with the world. Of course, this does not mean that pedagogical communication cannot be possible without texts. But in such a situation the possibility of a richer understanding of the world and thus that of enhancement (повышение, прирост, увеличение) of our lives would inevitably [ɪˈnevɪtəblɪ] (неизбежно, неминуемо) be limited. In the most primordial [praɪˈmɔːdiəl] (самый первый, изначальный) sense, we understand the world through our own direct experience of the world. Nevertheless, no one can experience the full possibilities of the world. Thus we open ourselves to the world of texts in order to understand a higher possibility of our existence re-experiencing the world which is even remote from us in its time and space.

In spite of this primordial character and real value of the text, the meaning of the text and the act of text interpretation tends to be misunderstood or narrowly understood in the contemporary pedagogical thought and practice, that is, it tends to be believed that a text has and should have one correct meaning and that to understand a text is to identify with this correct meaning. The reified 'ri:ifaɪ] та чассум ёфтан материализовать, превращать в нечто конкретное treatment of texts in contemporary classroom communication is based on this belief. The dominant tendency of the specification of educational objectives or the standardized educational evaluation can hardly be possible without this belief. According to this belief, it follows that, for example, Shakespeare's Hamlet must provide us the final meaning of love. Otherwise this text is regarded as worthless because it provides no correct meaning of love. Thus this narrow understanding of the meaning of the text and text interpretation tends to mislead pedagogical communication to inappropriate directions : either to the absolutization and blind obedience to the meaning provided by a text, or to the total negation of the text because of its incomplete answer to the question.

It is in this historical context that the question of the meaning of the text and text interpretation should be re-asked, because otherwise any pedagogical communication of meaning through texts can be misunderstood and thus distorted from the outset. What is the text? Where does the meaning of the text lie? What is it to construct the meaning of the text? How is it possible to judge the appropriateness of a text interpretation? Why do we read and interpret a text? If these questions are important in the effort to reflect upon the prevailing way of dealing with texts and to search for a proper place of the text in pedagogical communication, it seems worthwhile for us to open ourselves to the history of modern hermeneutics, [hɜ:mɪ'nju:tɪks] герменевтика; интерпретация, since it has centrally dealt with these questions.

The meaning of hermeneutics is rooted in the ancient Greek word, hermeneia or hermeneuein, which means "interpretation" or "to interpret." If we remain faithful to this original meaning of the word, it can be said in a loose sense that hermeneutics is "the theory or philosophy of the interpretation of meaning" (Bleicher, 1980). Before Schleiermacher, who can be regarded as a founder of modern hermeneutics, hermeneutics remained within the boundary of philology, as a way of "illuminating ... the surface or vocabulary levels of texts" Since the modern scientific revolution, hermeneutics tended to be regarded as a subdiscipline of theology, philosophy, literature, or a particular methodology for scientific investigation. Positivist

presuppositions that “the phenomena of human thought, feeling, and action are subject to fixed laws, the phenomena of society cannot but conform to fixed law”