

Action Theory, Practical Rationality, and Interpretation

This article explores the possibilities of evaluating interpretations that belong to different ›schools of interpretation‹ by means of a single shared standard. Such a standard becomes available once interpretation is described as a critical *activity*, that is, as something that we *do*. Accordingly, we describe critical activities in terms of categories taken from the theory of action. A basic action lends itself to a reason explanation. Such an explanation specifies both the goals of the agent and the means he employs for attaining them. It thereby reflects his preferences and beliefs that constitute his reasons for goal-directed action. On this descriptive basis we turn to the evaluation of interpretive activities. The theory of practical reasoning has developed a number of ways for criticizing an agent's beliefs and preferences which can be transferred to the evaluation of acts of interpretation. Thus an agent's beliefs are open to a straightforward epistemic criticism while his preferences can be criticized with reference to their epistemic basis, formal structure, and on ›substantial‹ grounds. We suggest that this approach to the evaluation of interpretation combines a number of advantages: First, by operating in the realm of practical rationality (as opposed to theoretical rationality), the approach avoids the thorny questions involved in settling the question of whether interpretative claims can be true or false. Second, it emphasizes the importance of an interpreter's preferences which have been neglected in most previous accounts. Third, our approach operates on a purely formal level and does not make recourse to the aims and subject matter of particular schools of interpretation. Therefore, it might be acceptable for those theoretical schools that are notorious for rejecting the idea of a methodologically guided approach to interpretation. Fourth, it suggests a meta-critical program for analyzing and evaluating interpretations, that it is hoped, can easily be put into practice.

Literatur

- Robert Audi, *Practical Reasoning*, London 1989.
- Lutz Danneberg/Hans-Harald Müller, Verwissenschaftlichung der Literaturwissenschaft. Ansprüche, Strategien, Resultate, *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Wissenschaftstheorie* 10:1 (1979), 162–191.
- Lutz Danneberg/Friedrich Vollhardt (Hg.), *Vom Umgang mit Literatur und Literaturgeschichte. Positionen und Perspektiven nach der ›Theoriedebatte‹*, Stuttgart 1992.
- Jacques Derrida, Letter to a Japanese Friend, in: Jonathan Culler (Hg.), *Deconstruction. Critical Concepts in Literary and Cultural Studies* Bd. 1, London/New York 2003, 23–27.
- Michael Dummett, Realism, in: *Truth and Other Enigmas*, London 1978, 145–165.
- Dagfinn Føllesdal, The Status of Rationality Assumptions in Interpretation and in the Explanation of Action, *Dialectica* 36 (1982), 301–316.
- Dieter Freundlieb, Can Meanings Be Objects of Knowledge?, *Poetics* 12 (1983), 259–275.
- Heide Göttner/Joachim Jacobs, *Der logische Bau von Literaturtheorien*, München 1978.
- H. Paul Grice, Logik und Konversation [1975], in: Georg Meggle (Hg.), *Handlung, Kommunikation, Bedeutung*, Frankfurt a.M. 1993, 243–265.
- Norbert Groeben/Ursula Christmann, Argumentationsintegrität als Ziel einer Ethik der Alltagskommunikation, *Der Deutschunterricht* 51 (1999), 46–52.
- P. M. S. Hacker, *Human Nature. The Categorical Framework*, Malden, MA; 2007.
- R. M. Hare, *The Language of Morals*, Oxford 1952.
- Gilbert Harman, *Change in View. Principles of Reasoning*, Cambridge, MA/London 1986.

- Rom Harré/Michael Krausz, *Varieties of Relativism*, Oxford/Cambridge, MA, 1996.
- Göran Hermerén, Interpretation: Types and Criteria, *Grazer philosophische Studien* 19 (1983), 131–161.
- , *Art, Reason, and Tradition. On the Role of Rationality in Interpretation and Explanation of Works of Art*, Lund 1991.
- Eric Donald Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation*, New Haven/London 1967.
- Tom Kindt/Hans-Harald Müller, Narrative Theory and/or/as Theory of Interpretation, in: T. K./H.-H. M. (Hg.), *What Is Narratology? Questions and Answers Regarding the Status of a Theory*, Berlin/New York 2003, 205–219.
- Bernd Kleimann, Wie sprechen und urteilen wir über Kunst?, in: Christoph Jäger/Georg Meggle (Hg.), *Kunst und Erkenntnis*, Paderborn 2005.
- Tilmann Köppe/Simone Winko, *Neuere Literaturtheorien*, Stuttgart/Weimar 2008.
- Michael Krausz, Introduction, in: M. K. (Hg.), *Is There a Single Right Interpretation?*, University Park, PA 2002, 1–5.
- Wolfgang Künne, *Conceptions of Truth*, Oxford 2003.
- Robert Matthews, Describing and Interpreting a Work of Art, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 36 (1977), 5–14.
- Julian Nida-Rümelin/Thomas Schmidt, *Rationalität in der praktischen Philosophie*, Berlin 2000.
- Stein H. Olsen, *The End of Literary Theory*, Cambridge 1987.
- Gerhard Pasternack, *Theoriebildung in der Literaturwissenschaft. Einführung in Grundfragen des Interpretationspluralismus*, München 1975.
- Karl R. Popper, *Die offene Gesellschaft* Bd. 2: *Falsche Propheten. Hegel, Marx und die Folgen*, Bern 1958.
- John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, Cambridge 1999.
- John F. Reichert, Description and Interpretation in Literary Criticism, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 27 (1969), 281–292.
- Richard Rorty, *Truth and Progress. Philosophical Papers* 3, Cambridge 1998.
- Siegfried J. Schmidt, Bemerkungen zur Wissenschaftstheorie einer rationalen Literaturwissenschaft, in: S. J. S. (Hg.): *Zur Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, München 1972, 41–65.
- Holmer Steinfath, *Orientierung am Guten. Praktisches Überlegen und die Konstitution von Personen*, Frankfurt a.M. 2001.
- Charles L. Stevenson, Interpretation and Evaluation in Aesthetics, in: Max Black (Hg.), *Philosophical Analysis*, Englewood Cliffs 1950, 319–358.
- Jeffrey Stout, What Is the Meaning of a Text?, *New Literary History* 14 (1982), 1–12.
- Peter Strawson, *Individuals. An Essay in Descriptive Metaphysics*, London/New York 1959.
- Werner Strube, Über Kriterien der Beurteilung von Textinterpretationen, in: Lutz Danneberg/Friedrich Vollhardt (Hg.), *Vom Umgang mit Literatur und Literaturgeschichte*, Stuttgart 1992, 185–209.
- Werner Strube, Die literaturwissenschaftliche Textinterpretation, in: Paul Michel/Hans Weder (Hg.), *Sinnvermittlung. Studien zur Geschichte von Exegese und Hermeneutik* 1, Zürich 2000, 43–69.
- Ernst Tugendhat, *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die sprachanalytische Philosophie*, Frankfurt a.M. 1976.

- Simone Winko, Autor-Funktionen. Zur argumentativen Verwendung von Autorkonzepten in der gegenwärtigen literaturwissenschaftlichen Interpretationspraxis, in: Heinrich Detering (Hg.), *Autorschaft. Positionen und Revisionen*, Stuttgart 2002, 334–354.
- Thomas Zabka, *Pragmatik der Literaturinterpretation. Theoretische Grundlagen – kritische Analysen*, Tübingen 2005.
- , Interpretationsverhältnisse entfalten. Vorschläge zur Analyse und Kritik literaturwissenschaftlicher Bedeutungszuweisungen, *JLT* 2:1 (2008), 51–69.

Full-length article in: JLT 2/1 (2008), 1-18.

How to cite this item:

Abstract of: Christoph Dennerlein/Tilmann Köppe/Jan C. Werner,
Interpretation: Struktur und Evaluation in handlungstheoretischer
Perspektive.

In: JLTonline (03.03.2009)

Persistent Identifier: urn:nbn:de:0222-000043

Link: <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0222-000043>