

## CHAPTER 5

### THE DEVELOPMENT OF LANDMAN'S USE OF CATEGORIES

#### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

The essences [of educating] that are brought to light by a phenomenological description and are grammatically named and organized into concepts are pedagogical categories. A pedagogical category is viewed as the best grammatical grasp of the reality of the pedagogical event (DO: 16).

According to Heidegger what was initially concealed in the reality of educating becomes unconcealed and, therefore, the pedagogical category announces the emergence of what is essentially true of a pedagogical way of being (ibid: 17).

According to Landman it is possible to use pedagogical categories as descriptive- and clarifying-means, i.e., as illuminative means of thinking because pedagogical categories cast light on the reality of educating and its fundamental structures (being-structures, real essences, preconditions). Pedagogical categories make the pedagogical being-structures categorically present. Thus, in this chapter there is a consideration of the development of Landman's use of categories.

#### 5.2 OBERHOLZER'S CATEGORIES AND CRITERIA SUPPLEMENTED AND ORGANIZED UNDER THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL CATEGORIES FROM WHICH THEY EMANATE (IFP)

##### 5.2.1 Oberholzer's categories

Whenever something essential, meaningful, fundamental is expressed, pointed to or can be verbalized about particular pedagogical realities these expressions, interpretations or

---

· Translation (2012) from: Lemmer, Catharina J.: *W. A. Landman as pedagogiker: 'n Studie in die fundamentele pedagogiek*. Unpublished D. Ed. dissertation, University of South Africa, Pretoria, 1987, Chapter 5, pp. 219-250.

verbalizations are known as categories. There is a distinction among ontological, anthropological and pedagogical categories. For Landman, as for Oberholzer his teacher, this entails an ontological anthropology. Thus this involves a [philosophical] anthropology that is rooted in reality and not in one or another anthropological conception or unreal image of being human. The anthropological categories are phenomenologically designed from the human order of being and are concrete manifestations of human being-in-the-world. As particular structures with reality-status, these categories refer to existence as the concrete way in which being human manifests itself. They form a meaningful whole and make possible a reflective access to existence. Thus, anthropological categories are truisms by which a person in his total lifeworld experiencing can be made present as he is in all of his relationship possibilities.

For one who thinks phenomenologically and thus allows the emphasis to fall on the anthropological, the world is a human world, as a horizon of intelligibility marked by the person who inhabits it, and thus must be understood as a specifically human understanding (Landman 1966: 5-6).

Landman agrees with Oberholzer about the view of categories and criteria. Therefore, it is necessary to give an overview of Oberholzer's categories and criteria, supplemented and organized by Landman under the anthropological categories from which they emanate.

#### **5.2.1.1 Pedagogical categories emanating from the category of being-in-a-meaningful-world**

From the pedagogical perspective on human being-in-a-meaningful-world, according to Landman's view, Oberholzer's categories of safe space and openness are brought to light and Landman adds the pedagogical category of address-listen.

##### **a) The category of safe space (Oberholzer)**

A child is particularly helpless at birth. He has a need for adults and his call of distress is answered by them. This answer offers him a foothold to venture into the future. The child asks for standing

room, space and a dwelling in which and from which he can live, can be peaceful and can experience emotional security. The yearning for safety begs for communication with adults. Childlike distress diminishes only where there is a safe place. The adult offers the child delimited space against dangers and with this also a perspective on the future, thus there is a progressive shifting of the boundary of the safe space.

### **b) The category of openness (Oberholzer)**

Openness is found exclusively with human beings. A child is openness and it is just with reference to this openness that the adult must act pedagogically. Because a child is openness he can and must be encountered. Because a child is in need this involves a support-giving encounter by adults.

If a child were a closed being an encounter between him and adults would not be possible and there could be no mention of the pedagogical.

### **c) The category of addressing-listening (Landman)**

The educator's addressing the educand is not merely an instrumental way of communicating. Authentic educative addressing has meaning for the sincere intimate harmony of educator and child. This is a way of intentionally reaching a child-in-education himself by which the child is made authentically present and is placed under an educative aim. Such a making present in an educative relationship makes a child an educand. The educator's addressing makes him an educator and with this an authentic being-with the educand is constituted and accepting is possible. The educator's addressing, as reaching the child himself, is possible because both participants are in an educative situation in which the child is directed to norms that are consistent with the educative aim. The educator's listening to the educand is an additional way in which his being an educator is possible. To listen, which is more primordial than merely hearing, means the educator's existential being open for the child. He listens because he understands. As understanding he makes himself subservient and he is understandingly with the child that is understood. The

trustworthy educator, as a listening, accepting person, who already understands can listen in an educative situation in which the child is dependent on him.

#### **5.2.1.2 Pedagogical categories emanating from the category of being-with**

According to Landman, Oberholzer's categories of **normativity** and **sympathetic authoritative guidance** emerge from pedagogical reflection on the category of being-with as co-existentiality and he himself adds the pedagogical category of a **face-to-face-relationship**.

##### **a) The category of normativity (Oberholzer)**

A human being occupies an exceptional position because he always finds himself in a normed relation. Humanness is a norm-centric concept. Thus, he can represent to himself the approvable and disapprovable and chose from them. He makes value judgments, holds values with their implied norms and "normalizes" his own life of choices in terms of the norms accepted and acknowledged.

The educator, as norm acknowledging adult, who purposefully intervenes in the life of a child, who offers him a particular norm system as just and good is guided in this by a hierarchy of value preferences. Without the normative there is no educating because the educator guides the child to adulthood and adulthood is directly connected with the normative.

##### **b) The category of sympathetic, authoritative guidance (Oberholzer)**

A fundamental precondition for the pedagogical is the adult's exercise of authority and its acceptance by the child. To accept responsibility means to recognize and accept authority. The educator knows and recognizes the authority of the demands of propriety. Since, in his lack of freedom, the child is not yet able to accept responsibility regarding the demands of propriety and to make choices himself, the educator must make choices for and with him and accept co-responsibility. Gradually the child must acquire

more opportunity to choose independently and to take responsibility himself.

It is easy for a child to accept authority in a loving relationship because he has a yearning for authority and sympathetic guidance.

### **c) The category of a face-to-face relationship (Landman)**

The educative situation is the possible beginning of an observable physical being-present of those participating in it as initiating a particular way of relating. Constituting a face-to-face relationship is possible. In this the face is the appeal for an encounter.

With this it also is acknowledged that the educand's face in a fundamental way is an essential characteristic by which he is a way of being human for the educator. This "is" means that the educand must not be considered as impersonal and distant but be respected through the face-to-face encounter. Then the educand is not an unfamiliar I but is a co-subject and especially is a partner and fellow traveler for the educator. This being-with-each-other is more than an encounter. It also is engagement which means that within an encounter both participants take responsibility for what results from the encounter. The view of the educator will elevate the educand to be a co-responsible partner as futurity. Thus, he is directly present to the educator in his social-moral-being-a-person. Temporal and spatial immediacy are fundamental for a face-to-face-situation as a basic structure in the pedagogical situation and they make possible the relationships of trust, authority and understanding. It is possible for the educand to play a part and participate in his becoming a person because of his involvement in a mutual, distinct present as unique person in a unique situation of intimacy.

### **5.2.1.3 Pedagogical categories emanating from the category of temporality**

According to Landman, the category of temporality gives rise to Oberholzer's categories of anticipation and futurity and he himself adds the category of becoming.

#### **a) The category of anticipation (Oberholzer)**

The pedagogical event, as the development of a child's openness, is intertwined with anticipation, expectation, hope and trust.

The adults foster certain anticipations of the child and, also from the child's side the anticipations stay alive. As a being in need, he lives every moment in anticipation of being encountered. If this anticipation occurs within the framework of an encounter of giving support, the future acquires certainty, sense and meaning.

### **b) The category of futurity (Oberholzer)**

The child is on the way to adulthood. Providing support to him in this regard testifies to futurity. The child is still becoming because he is not yet what he wants, can, must and ought to be. Educating always involves the future of the child and not the present or past. Admonishing, warning and disciplining refer to the future because these and other pedagogic interventions are future-directed. The adult concerns himself with the child with an eye to what he must do in the future, and the child increasingly accepts responsibility for his own future becoming.

### **c) The category of becoming (Landman)**

The childlike participation in life reality is a reality in which he is appealed to by adults to-be-able-to-be-different because of a must-be-different on the basis of an ought-to-be-different. Thus, educating is supporting him in his ought-to-become-different, it is help in becoming. The educative event, as help in becoming, is the most fundamental way in which the child can be involved in his own becoming because educating is entirely an influencing of his existential becoming.

The childness of the child, i.e., that which makes him what as a child he really essentially is, comes in the form of progressing in the direction of continually bringing forth other ways of being. The dialectic tension between non-adulthood and adulthood makes educating possible. This fruitful tension leads to a call for a figuring forth and deepening of the self that essentially is a call for a

dialogue with fellow persons (co-existences), things, demands of propriety, values and God.

The child becomes through his dialogue and without a change in his dialogue, he cannot become. He cannot be dialogically in his meaningful world without his becoming (as dialogue) being changed. Thus, his becoming is a task for himself that he can only fulfill through adequate dialogue. Each adequate occurrence of dialogue is a moment of becoming in the service of this task and as realized in a pedagogical space as a space for becoming. The child himself is a task and for that reason he is increasingly involved in becoming via task acceptance. Educating continually includes self-educating. This implies that the self-becoming of a child, as well as his becoming toward his fellow persons, is a call to change his dialogue with his world. It is a being-called to continually elevate his dialogue to another level until he inhabits his world in a proper and acceptable way.

The fundament nature of dialogue elevation, as changing meaning, i.e., as becoming a person, is hereby stated. Being-in-the-world is essentially real, appropriate, meaningful change in dialogue as a continual elevation in dialogue within a field of tensions among values.

The continual elevation of dialogue to another level implies that a particular stage of carrying on a dialogue is reached, mastered and then proceeds to a new and different way of dialogue. This is a continual change in world-relationship that is only possible through giving pedagogically accountable support.

A fundamentally meaningful world relationship is a relationship or dialogue with the other. The child becomes in the direction of the other, and the quality of his intentionality, as existentiality, depends on the quality of his real relationships with and to the other. This is a becoming through educating in which everything pedagogically permissible and accountable is done in order to allow the child to find a way to his fellow persons and Creator in order to allow humanness to flourish in him and to avoid everything that can harm his fundamental relationship with his fellow persons and his God.

It is clear that childlike becoming from one level of dialogue to another must take a course in time. The child's course of becoming is a continually differing situatedness in time, i.e., a changing relationship with the past and future and indeed a relationship that makes possible and necessary a gradual elevation of the event of educating. It is a pedagogically activated becoming in the direction of one's own possible future because the child is always in advance of himself in his own can-be (Heidegger) that, as "I can", expresses his total intentionality (Merleau-Ponty). This "I can" refers to the potentiality for moral self-determination that cannot be completed without pedagogical guidance and pedagogically accountable authority.

His becoming is a progression in his understanding of how he must assume his standpoint in life reality as he ought to, and this is only possible in educative situations, i.e., where the educator influences the child's being-there and becoming.

#### **5.2.1.4 Pedagogical categories emanating from the category of being-someone-oneself**

As far as the anthropological category of being-someone-oneself is concerned, according to Landman this leads to the pedagogical categories of freedom-to-responsibility and adulthood.

##### **a) The category of freedom-to-responsibility (Oberholzer)**

The pedagogical event is giving support for acquiring freedom as accepting and shouldering responsibility.

A human being is freedom-as-potentiality. As a potentiality it therefore is opportunity. Freedom is given with being-human and at the same time it is a task. Although free, he is never free in the sense that he is without norms and thus should be totally unbound. Freedom is an opportunity to something, to responsibility in being bound to the highest authority. Without acquiring freedom as the acceptance and shouldering of responsibility the child's human dignity would be threatened and harmed.



As freedom, from the moment of his birth the child is ethically threatened and he cannot yet dwell in his world with responsibility. This means that he must travel a difficult, wearisome and very demanding way, paired with sympathetic support, in order to acquire his freedom to properly obey the authority of norms.

### **b) The category of adulthood (Oberholzer)**

There is no pedagogical without adulthood because whoever is concerned with the pedagogical has in mind the idea of adulthood as full-fledged human dignity. The pedagogical involves a moral adult giving support to a child so the latter also can attain adulthood.

There are particular reciprocal relationships among the categories that are so intrinsic that no classification can do them justice. Thus, the categories in the above discussion could be organized in many other ways. The following are a few examples of categories that can serve as pedagogical criteria after their evaluative significance is illuminated.

### **5.2.2 Pedagogical criteria**

The pedagogical categories that fundamental pedagogics brings to light can also be implemented by the pedagogician as criteria or yardsticks to evaluate pedagogical thoughts, activities and occurrences. The evaluative significance of these categories must be illuminated as preconditions for their validity as criteria for evaluating pedagogical permissibility. This means that, just as in the case of categories, there must be a search for the grounds of the pedagogical criteria and, indeed, in ontological-anthropological realities.

In this regard, a first criterion of reality is Da-sein as being aware-in-the-world. The first evaluative question can be formulated with respect to whether regarding human being there is reflection and involvement in observance of the fact of being that he is never subject without world and also there is no world without subject. Anthropological criteria such as being-in-a-meaningful-world, being-

with, temporality and being-someone must be applied as criteria for thinking about, dealing with and regarding human being. Thus, there must be an account taken of the particular ways in which he shows himself in his being-human-in-life-reality.

From a pedagogical perspective on the mentioned anthropological criteria with reality (ontological) status, pedagogical criteria such as the following are distinguished.

#### **5.2.2.1 The criterion of safe space or the success of [establishing] affective security (Oberholzer)**

A safe space must be offered to the child from which he can explore and to which he can again return as soon as he experiences insecurity. The acceptance [by the child] of pedagogical intervention by the adult depends on whether he has allowed the child to experience the desired security. The question is if he has awakened the confidence and courage in the child to venture into the future. Consequently, this pedagogical criterion is if indeed a future is being created. If this is not the case, this [criterion] is being dealt with in pedagogically unaccountable and thus unacceptable ways and as a result a gratitude to his parents [educators] for a safe space will be lacking.

#### **5.2.2.2 The criterion of normativity or norm-centricity or ought-to-be or the validity of the demands of propriety (Oberholzer)**

Pedagogical permissibility means that neither the child nor the adult is at the center of the event of educating but rather norms are. Pedagogically, both child- and adult-centeredness are impermissible.

The child must be viewed as he ought to be; then he is inspired to be what he can be (Goethe). Each person will know if he means something and if he also means something for the other and not how bad and deplorable he is.

Ought-to-be does not mean that each child must now be allowed to follow his own way or to nullify acts of authority. With each pedagogically permissible means, it is imperative to stop what is

objectionable but it is equally necessary to extol what is approvable. Thus, pedagogical permissibility requires acting against the objectionable and acknowledging the approvable.

#### **5.2.2.3 The criterion of being-someone-oneself or being-human as being-a-person who must do-something-himself (Oberholzer)**

The child calls because he needs the adult. Pedagogical permissibility is when the adult in answering gives evidence that he recognizes the child as being-a-person. This excludes any form of objectifying and forsaking; rather it is recognition of child-being as being a person in his being the bearer of dignity. Hence, it is pedagogically unacceptable to view the child as a means to an end.

In all pedagogical events justice must be done to the unmistakable fact that the child wants-to-be-someone-himself. He must be given the opportunity to do things himself. He must do things personally and it is pedagogically unacceptable if the child is not called to do this. Whoever does (and decides) everything for the child deprives him of his human potentialities (Langeveld). His character of being a personal task then becomes damaged and even destroyed. On the other hand, there is the possibility that the child can be overtaxed and even the impossible can be expected of him. This is just as unacceptable pedagogically as doing everything for the child.

#### **5.2.2.4 The pedagogical criterion of adulthood (Landman)**

The following can be applied as criteria to determine whether or not the child has stepped over the threshold of adulthood.

- *Meaningful existence:* a person is adult
  - when the idea breaks through that he is the one who is accountable and he must answer by living a responsible life;
  - when the willingness to give meaning to his existence as such dominates;
  - when he feels responsible for fulfilling the meaning of his life;

- when all of his actions are carried by the idea that life is meaningful and that this idea is also at the basis of each decision he makes;
  - when the meaningfulness of life as such is fulfilled, for the sake of the values that can be realized through his living, so that in doing so a dynamic directedness to the future arises.
- *Self-judgment and self-understanding:* a person is adult
    - when he is able to judge himself by taking a personal, active, critical position toward himself;
    - when he can express a moral judgment about himself, his life plan, choices and actions; and
    - when he has arrived at a self-illumination, and after a critical interpretation of his positive personal human potentialities he is able to integrate this self-understanding with the demands and opportunities of his lifeworld.
- *Human dignity:* a person is adult
    - when he is aware of his dignity as a person and that there are demands placed on him in his human dignity to which he must be obedient in his freedom and on the basis of his own choices; and
    - when a yearning to live the life of adults with adults leads to a notion that through self-forming in morally independent ways he must remain involved with human dignity.
- *Morally independent choosing and acting:* a person is an adult
    - when he can remain true to the most extreme consequences of his decisions and can carry out his choices;
    - when his choices and the actions that emanate from them are determined by a personally dignified value-idea that confronts him with demands of propriety;
    - when he, as someone who can, ought to and will change so as to have become the “someone” that he

- must and ought to become on the basis of his positive human potentialities; and
  - when his decisive and active participation in life reality is characterized by an inner independence, as a dependence-on-a-higher-authority and sense of responsibility.
- *Responsibility:* a person is an adult
  - when he understands being-responsible as a fundamental principle of his existence;
  - when his attunement to reality gives evidence of a full awareness of what his being-responsible includes and he knows that human participation in life reality is a task-achieving participation.
- *Norm identification:* a person is an adult
  - when his identification with his educators has proceeded to a norm-directed identification that is an indication of his own, independent, accountable idea of propriety; and
  - when he has identified completely with a particular way of life and the demands of propriety that speak from it.
- *Philosophy of life:* a person is an adult
  - when his choices and actions that emanate from his philosophy of life are characterized by moral independence as an absolute being bound to the demands of life obligatory values as embraced by his philosophy of life to which he will constantly show obedience;
  - when the values that he holds and has intrinsically appropriated for himself address him in a particular hierarchy of value-preferences;
  - when his life of choices and related activities show a genuine being bound to one or another form of propriety. This being bound is a sensitivity for a commitment to and constant obedience of the demands of propriety as embraced by his philosophy of life; and

- when his educating has led to a notion of Someone who as Giver of mandates calls him to show the norm-image of adulthood in his way of living.

The following examples of the practical application of pedagogical categories are given and show that pedagogical criteria in reality are pedagogical categories in the form of questions.

### 5.3 ADDITIONAL DESCRIPTIONS OF PEDAGOGICAL CATEGORIES AND EXAMPLES OF THEIR PRACTICAL APPLICATION (DO)

The pedagogician can direct his phenomenological essence analysis from the reality of his pedagogical perspective to life reality itself. In doing so, the ontological-anthropological categories show him realities that have potential pedagogical categories locked within them. These potential categories are implementable by him as descriptive and interpretive means, thus as (illuminative) means of thinking. Whoever describes and interprets phenomenologically reflects (thinks); i.e., the scientist then implements categories as means of thinking. The particular categories of concern are pedagogical categories. These categories are essences of the pedagogical itself, and are used by the pedagogician to think pedagogically about being human and describe and interpret his pedagogical concerns, thus to reflect.

Pedagogical categories, as the verbalization of educative reality, make its pedagogical being-structures present. Making the pedagogical being-structures present occurs through pedagogical categories and evaluating the realization of these being-structures occurs via pedagogical criteria. Such pedagogical criteria are evaluative questions by which the admissibility or inadmissibility of the way of actualizing the pedagogical activities is determined. Thus, in order to determine in a scientifically accountable way if the realization of the pedagogical activities are correct or not, pedagogical categories must be used as pedagogical criteria and this occurs by *rephrasing the pedagogical categories in the form of questions*.

The *existentialia* or anthropological categories of being-in-a-meaningful-world, being-with, temporality and being-someone-oneself especially appear to have pedagogical relevance. These anthropological categories can also be applied as anthropological criteria by putting these categories in the form of questions. The following shows how this occurs.

### 5.3.1 Categories of being-in-a-meaningful-world

A human being gives sense and meaning to the human world in which he lives and in doing so designs a lifeworld for himself. The essence of a human being as a meaning-giving existence shows the human task of letting-meanings-be. The child must realize this letting-meaning-be in ever more accountable ways. Then the child is progressively able to grasp his being-in-the-world because such a human world becomes all the more meaningful as a result of grasping and meaning fulfilling (i.e., meaning-giving) activities with adults. A pedagogical perspective on the anthropological category of being-in-a-meaningful-world shows that the childlike person must increasingly be responsible for meaning and himself for his way of giving meaning. Now it is possible to disclose as a pedagogical category with ontological-anthropological status: *giving-meaning-on-one's-own-responsibility*. This category can also be applied as a pedagogical criterion if it is change into the form of a question: **is giving-meaning-on-his-own-responsibility found in the educator-educand's being-with-each-other in the educative situation?**

A person is intentionality and he implements it by a moving directedness-to-the-world. For him the world is a movement-space and by moving he makes the world a meaningful-world-for-himself. The participation of the child in his world is a dynamic, participative giving meaning to co-existents and the continually increasing supplementing of already existing movements are ways that the child becomes. These movements, as meaning-giving, occur within a field of value-tensions as a field of meaning. In light of the child's potentiality to become *movement-as-a-breaking-away-from-homeostasis* (lack of exertion) can be particularized as the second pedagogical category from the anthropological category of being-in-a-meaningful-world. By changing this pedagogical category into a

question it becomes a pedagogical criterion: **is there mention of movement-as-breaking-away-from-homeostasis in a particular concrete pedagogical situation?**

In his bodily directedness to the world a child responds to the normatively demanding imperative of being obedient to what is proper on a continually higher level. In an educative situation the educator as well as the educand are addressed by the appeal from what ought to be. The child's course of becoming on the way to adulthood only opens for him when he gives evidence of an attitude of a will-yet-become-what-ought-to-be. For the child this involves experiencing bodiliness as corporeality in a normative way. A third possible pedagogical category from the anthropological category of being-in-a-meaningful-world now can be stated: *normed corporeality*. Normed corporeality can also be applied as a pedagogical criterion by changing the category to a question: **Do educator and educand give evidence of normed corporeality in the educative situation, thus of a total and unconditional being-claimed by the demands of propriety?**

### 5.3.2 Categories of being-with

Being-human is disclosed in life reality through co-existentiality and therefore being-with must be stated as an anthropological category/criterion with ontological status. In the pedagogical situation the educator and educand must venture in trust with each other in a necessary being-with; i.e., the pedagogical situation is a common situation that the educator to educator and educand to educand makes. It is justifiable to design *venturing-with-each-other* as a pedagogical category from the anthropological category of being-with. To apply venturing-with-each-other as a pedagogical criterion, the fundamental pedagogician can ask: **is venturing-with-each-other in the being-with of educator and educand identifiable in the particular educative situation?**

Being-human is a being-with-others-in-the-world that really essentially implies a being-with as an affectionate-being-with-each-other (Binswanger). Each person yearns for an affectionate space that he can experience as home or abode and this assumes an acceptance by the other so that together an intersubjective being at



home can be constituted. As a wanting-to-be-someone-himself on the basis of a self-yearning to become grown up, the young little child must grow up within a secure space. He will then show his gratitude to the adult for such an experience of security by progressively manifesting the norm-image of adulthood. A second possible pedagogical category can be particularized from the anthropological category of being-with: *gratitude-for-security*. To use this category as a criterion it must be changed into a question: **regarding a child in a concrete educative situation is there gratitude-for-security?**

Educator and educand are responsible for the origin and course of the educative event as a particular relationship event. The child addresses the adult by appealing to him for pedagogical support and he responds by addressing the becoming adult. Both educator and educand must be held responsible for the quality of realizing the pedagogical relationship of encounter. A third possible pedagogical category that can be designed from the anthropological category of being with is: *responsibility-for-relationships*. By changing it to a question it can be applied as a pedagogical criterion: **do educator and educand give evidence of taking responsibility-for-relationships in a particular educative situation?**

### 5.3.3 Categories of temporality

A person's being-in-the-world is a temporal being-in-the-world. The past, present and future of a person are intertwined with each other, i.e., the past and future are fundamentally connected with the present (IFP: 56). Because in the eyes of a child an adult can do and know everything, the adult world is something wondrous for him. For a child this adult world is futurity and therefore he gladly wants to grow up. This hope-for-the-future makes the child's becoming adult meaningful and awakens in him pleasant expectations for the future. Thus, it is pedagogically meaningful to particularize *hope-for-the-future* as a pedagogical category from the anthropological category of temporality. This category can be applied as a pedagogical criterion by changing it into the question: **in an educative situation, does the child show that he hopes-for-the-future?**

In his present a person always is simultaneously his future and his past. That is, his present is filled with the designs that he makes on the basis of the possibilities his past offers him and the urgings of his future expectations. The future will not be a realizable possibility if there is not an active involvement here and now in designing his future as a lifeworld. Situations are possibilities that must be realized through the child's self-design; that is, because of his thrownness-into-the-world a child has the constant task of designing possibilities on the basis of his openness as a human being. By giving him pedagogical support the child must be guided to make responsible choices that are necessary for his becoming adult. A second possible category that can be particularized for the pedagogical then is: *the task-of-designing-possibilities*. Changed to a question, this pedagogical category can be applied as a pedagogical criterion: **in an educative situation does the child show that he is ready to accept the task-of-designing-possibilities?**

In the pedagogical situation it is the aim of the adult to allow the child to reach his destination as an adult person; i.e., the educator views himself as one called and destined to allow the child to reach adulthood by supporting him pedagogically. Thus, the child must gradually and progressively live the norm image of adulthood and the way in which he manifests such an image is an indication of the particular level that he has already reached on his way to his destination. A third pedagogical category that thus can be particularized from the anthropological category of temporality is: *fulfilling-destination*. This pedagogical category can be changed to a question and implemented as a pedagogical criterion: **is there a yearning for fulfilling-his-destination observable in the child in concrete educative situations?**

#### 5.3.4 Categories of being-someone-oneself

The yearning to be someone is a general human phenomenon that is particularly salient with the educand. The individuality of the child appears not only because he can be distinguished from other beings but in particular because he is a unique way of being-in-the-world. This means that the child as a unique person acquires a particular dignity on the basis of his personal being-in-the-world. This

uniqueness or particular dignity of the child is really, essentially corroborated if the child himself and the adult have respect for his dignity. Consequently, it seems pedagogically meaningful to state *respect-for-one's-own-dignity* as a pedagogical category from the anthropological category of being-someone-oneself. Once again, this category can serve as a pedagogical criterion if it is changed to a question: **is there respect-for-one's-own-dignity by educator as well as educand in the particular educative situation?**

A person, as someone-who-wants-to-be-someone-himself, necessarily must think about the “self” of such self-being-someone. Thus, he has increasing self-understanding as a task. For increasing self-understanding by the child it is necessary that the educator will enter a relationship of encounter with the child in an educative situation, which means that the child increasingly comes to self-understanding through the adults. Thus, the *task-of-increasing-self-understanding* can be designed as a pedagogical category from the anthropological category of being-someone-oneself. To implement the category “task-of-increasing-self-understanding” as a criterion it must be changed to a question: **is the educand, with the help of the educator, involved in performing his task-of-increasing-self-understanding?**

A child, as becoming adult, has the task of acquiring his freedom. This means he has as a task the increasing acceptance and shouldering of responsibility and this implies that his educators will know how much responsibility he is capable of. The child must increasingly understand that his freedom, as a human given [i.e., an ontic datum], is a freedom-with-a-mandate. Such freedom is possibility and hence a matter of gradually and increasingly living the norm image of adulthood. It is therefore meaningful to phenomenologically particularize *freedom-to-responsibility* as a third pedagogical category emanating from the anthropological category of being-someone. Also this category can be used as a pedagogical criterion by stating it in the form of a question: **in a particular educative situation does the child show that he experiences and lives his freedom as freedom-to-responsibility?**

Above, twelve pedagogical categories/criteria were described as particularized by Landman from the anthropological categories/criteria of being-in-a-meaningful-world, being-with, temporality and being-someone. To assert that these are the only pedagogical categories/criteria is, according to Landman, to fall into an unscientific absolutism. For him the mentioned pedagogical categories and criteria are possibilities that by applying the phenomenological method have been elevated to grammatical or linguistic expression. They are real essences that are necessary for the being of the pedagogical and for evaluating the realization of the pedagogical in particular educative situations (Landman).

It is clear that in particularizing these pedagogical categories and criteria Landman has implemented a particular hierarchy of thinking, i.e., ontological – anthropological – pedagogical.

Fundamental pedagogics, as an ontological-anthropological pedagogics, is a search for ontic structures as being-preconditions for the pedagogical to appear-as-phenomenon. Landman is in agreement with Klafki where he explains that for the pedagogician, as scientist of the way of being of educating that it is impossible to give scientific pronouncements if they do not emanate from an ontological determination of the reality of educating. The following is an attempt to justify the pedagogical categories epistemologically by indicating their ontological-anthropological grounding.

#### **5.4 THE ONTOLOGICAL-ANTHROPOLOGICAL GROUNDING OF PEDAGOGICAL CATEGORIES/CRITERIA (FPOW)**

Moreover, it is meaningful to be accountable in implementing categories and criteria by inquiring into their grounds.

The ontological-anthropological perspective on life reality is a perspective that is characterized by its grounding in the universal life reality. Such a perspective is possible only in a phenomenological way and is built on two cornerstones, namely: phenomenology is meaningful only as ontology (Landman) and ontology is possible only as phenomenology (Heidegger). If pedagogics will make the claim of ontological status this only is possible by means of phenomenological reflection on the

pedagogical event and this amounts to an ontological determination (description and explication) of the pedagogical as ontic. As a pedagogician, Landman founds his pronouncements about the pedagogical way of being ontologically, i.e., he grounds them in life reality itself.

A scientist who wants to build his scientific thinking on the above two cornerstones must consider the following in his reflecting and explicating:

- that in his describing and explicating he is involved in allowing reality itself to come forward;
- that his scientific practice is impossible if he isolates himself from life reality itself, e.g., through a non-anthropological approach or through a particular anthropological conception;
- that to disclose, uncover, to bring to light, to make unhidden are possible only on the basis of his own being-in-the-world;
- that being-in-life-reality is the basis on which all further thinking about being human is possible, and
- that a fact of being is that the world is saturated with humanness and being human is permeated by the world, in other words, that the person-world relationship is a relationship of being and that, consequently, his practice of science is a particular way of being.

From the above it can be inferred that for his scientific describing and explicating the scientist must take particular means of describing and explicating that, indeed, are means of thinking as his point of departure; in other words, an ontological category or first category of reality is necessary as his point of departure. He finds that this category can and must be named “being-in-the-world”, “Da-sein” or “openness”.

Thus, human being is a phenomenological being. This means that he can disclose the real essences of reality; i.e., he is an ontological being. In Heidegger’s words being human is ontic because he is characterized as ontological. He implements the only method, namely the phenomenological method, to arrive at the real essentials of reality and their meaning against reality itself as background. He describes and explicates while he reflects and in his

describing and explicating he wants to remain faithful to reality. This means that he must also search for his media and means of describing, explicating and thinking in terms of reality, and they also are phenomenologically designable in terms of particular realities in the lifeworld. These media and means are the categories and now the scientist must make it clear that he will remain faithful to reality itself in the first category that he uses and that his further thinking must remain grounded in reality itself. Therefore, he also lays down the first or ontological category of reality, namely, “being-in-the-world”. All additional categories are grounded in this one. Being-in-the-world or Da-sein as first category of reality is the precondition for the possibility of all other categories. All of the other categories that are mentioned here are categories that fulfill particular demands, namely, they are categories that are ontologically founded (grounded) and thus are categories with ontological status that:

- can describe and explicate the sense of a human’s (Anthropic) Da-sein (being-in-the-world);
- can bring to light the real essences of existence as a concrete way of manifesting being human;
- represent and verbalize particular ways of being human in life reality;
- present a human being in all of his relationship possibilities as he is;
- can show that being human essentially is being a person;
- manifest and verbalize the essential possibilities of being human;
- can give expression to the fact that a human being first is Da-sein and can define himself;
- can disclose what the categories of human life are; and
- are exclusively applicable to the humanness of being human.

Such categories indicate the essence of Da-sein as existence and are known as existentialia or anthropological categories of which the following are viewed as fundamental: being-in-a-meaningful-world, being-with, temporality, being someone oneself and religiosity. These five anthropological categories have ontological status because they are grounded in the ontological category and they say something really essential about being human and its meaning

against reality itself as background. Therefore, there also can be mention of *ontological-anthropological categories*.

Now the pedagogician can direct his phenomenological essence analysis to life reality itself from the reality of his pedagogical perspective. The ontological-anthropological categories indicate to him realities that are contained in them as potential categories. These potential categories are shaped by the scientist into real categories for implementation by him as media for describing and explicating, thus as media for thinking. When a scientist describes and explicates phenomenologically he reflects (thinks) and then uses categories as means of thinking. The particular categories involved here are *pedagogical categories*. These categories are the essence of the pedagogical itself and are used by the pedagogician in order to think pedagogically about persons and to describe and explicate, thus reflect on, their interventions.

As is evident from a study of Landman's works he identifies himself in his own pedagogical thinking with a pedagogical system of thinking or system of pedagogical categories (criteria): ontological categories (criteria)-anthropological categories (criteria)-pedagogical categories (criteria) with phenomenology as the way (method) of thinking. This system of thinking implies using a particular hierarchy of thinking, namely ontological - anthropological - pedagogical.

According to Viljoen ontological-anthropological as a combination is tautological. The anthropological cannot take any accountable point of departure other than the ontological. The concept pedagogical is parallel to ontological and anthropological although it has a different structure. Thus, all phenomenological-pedagogical investigating, describing and explicating necessarily must also be anthropological-pedagogical (Lemmer 1984:55).

For Oberholzer, as professor of Landman, it is a foregone conclusion that a scientifically founded pedagogics, i.e., an ontologically-anthropologically founded pedagogics is hermeneutically-descriptive work and never personal-prescriptive (Oberholzer 1968: 299).

Finally, there is a consideration of an etymological and phenomenological analysis of the concept “categories” and their use in bringing to light fundamental-pedagogical essences is demonstrated.

## 5.5 ETYMOLOGICAL AND PHENOMENOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CONCEPT “CATEGORY” AND ITS USE IN FUNDAMENTAL PEDAGOGICS (PFP)

### 5.5.1 Etymological and phenomenological analysis of the concept “category”

It is meaningful to give an etymological analysis of the concept “category”. The etymological is already an aspect of phenomenology because each word has an historical origin, on the one hand, and on the other hand, is the appearing (being) of a being (aspect of reality). This means that by verbalizing, a real essence is made present as it is. The appropriate word says how a being is. No being is when the verbalization of it is missing because the appropriate word lends being to a being. Hence, word and being cannot be thought of apart from each other. The etymological study of a particular word, e.g., “category”, then is really a beginning-phenomenological analysis of the particular reality that is being verbalized.

The word “category” originally comes from the Greek word “Kategoria” that means fundamental expression. The Greek verb “agoreuein” means to “say, name something” (DO: 16).

According to the publication “Notes of fundamental-pedagogic concepts”, of which Landman is a co-author, the word category is explained as follows:

Greek: “*kata* + *yghorein* – to accuse (to indicate or prove and eventually to ground fundamentally): *kateghoros* – prosecutor; *kategoria* – accusation, a familiar statement, a heading, a division; *kategoria* – essential for fundamental enunciation; *agoreuein* – to say something, to name something. The enunciation, designation or verbalization should not be uncontrolled or incidental but it necessarily must bring to



light the fundamentals, the essentials and universals of a particular being. This means that the categories should throw light on the essential characteristics of a being or occurrence – the concealed essentials must be brought into the open” (Van Rensburg & Landman, 1979: 78).

By a closer investigation of what is implied by “category”, Landman brings to light the following essential characteristics of it. A category is an illuminative means of thinking and an essence disclosing means of speaking. According to Landman, illuminating, creating ways of access and speaking are equivalent to interpreting. Interpreting and an interpretive method mean the following: Interpreting is understanding (grasping), indicating, conversing (Gumpenberg 1971: 89, 93, 141). Conversing is realized with a particular verbalized reality so that its real essences can be disclosed to someone who directs his attentiveness to that reality. To converse attentively with the reality lets it be and this “letting be” is what interpreting means (Ibid: 141).

Letting be cannot occur in concealment, thus in the absence of illuminating, creating a way of access and illuminative speaking. Illuminating is applying illuminative means [of thinking]: categories. Thus, categories are illuminative means of thinking and they are ways of interpreting. As illuminative means of thinking they illuminate, create ways of access and of speaking. Interpreting is clarifying and clarifying is a way of access to reality, a perspective on reality. Interpreting also means to bring to understanding (Betti 1962: 11-12). To grasp (understand) something means to fathom, penetrate it, thus to view its foundation. This means to observe and verbalize real essences. Someone who knows the real essences, meaning and coherencies of a particular aspect of reality understands that aspect.

The real essences of an aspect of reality must be observed and brought together (be ordered). Observing essences requires a method that makes this possible. A method-of-observing-real-essences that is able to illuminate, create ways of access and of speaking thus is necessary and this is the phenomenological method that is only possible and meaningful as a category-applying method. Phenomenology is an essence-disclosing method because categories

are applied as interpretive (i.e., illuminating, ways of access creating and ways of speaking) means of thinking in order to overcome essence obfuscations.

Because of the illuminative, access-creating and speaking as well as essence-disclosing ways, i.e., interpretive functions of the categories, a particular act becomes possible: the act of presenting. By presenting Heidegger means that by applying categories real essences are gathered and made present to the thinker (phenomenologist). This means that the following occur:

- Through illuminative thinking, real essences are brought to light and preserved;
- Because a way of access to the essences is created they come into existence (become present).

To implement the phenomenological method means to apply categories. The following is a demonstration of how categories are used to bring fundamental pedagogical essences to light.

### **5.5.2 The application of categories in fundamental pedagogics**

Landman shows himself to be a pedagogician who as a scientist strives to acquire a genuine understanding of the pedagogical (the reality of educating) in order to bring about a refined interpretation of real pedagogical essences (he does this to such an extent that he is known by everyone as an essence thinker) and also in order to enter a non-obfuscating conversation with the reality of educating itself (the aversion that he has for essence-blindness because of obfuscations also is known by everyone!).

From the foregoing it is clear that for a pedagogician to do all of this (understand, clarify, converse, interpret) he necessarily has to apply pedagogical categories. He must find means of thinking that can illuminate the reality of educating so that its real essences with their own meanings and coherencies can be.

A question that must necessarily be answered is which categories are at the pedagogician's disposal. It is evident that the first

category that, as it were, offers itself to him for implementation is the category “educating” or “the pedagogical”. The latter implies guiding or accompanying a child. The pedagogician now knows that he must go to the lifeworld and look there where he can observe “accompanying a child”. Now he is going to set aside other possible perspectives on the lifeworld and look at it only in terms of child accompaniment. Thus, in his investigation of the lifeworld he applies the category “accompanying a child”.

He observes that the child is guided or accompanied by an adult. There is a child and an adult: in accompanying the child there is a relationship between the child and an adult. By applying the category “child accompaniment” the pedagogician has observed a first pedagogical essence, i.e., pedagogical relationship. He decides that he must undertake a relationship-investigation.

If the pedagogician looks again at the lifeworld in terms of accompanying a child he observes, e.g., that this accompanying, that necessarily is a relationship between an accompanying adult and a child, occurs with differences in intensity. Thus, e.g., there can be a progression from more to less intimacy. Hence, he notices one or another progression or sequence. He decides that he must undertake a sequence-investigation.

The pedagogician continues his thinking search and observes that accompanying a child is related to certain activities. Adult and child are active together in that they carry out all kinds of activities together. Some activities decidedly have more significance for accompanying a child than others. The pedagogician decides that he also must do a meaningful activity-investigation.

The pedagogician observes that accompanying the child is not purposeless but indeed is directed to an aim. Accompanying a child does not occur for the sake of this accompaniment but with the purpose of reaching an aim. By applying the category “accompanying a child” he has now observed a particular real essence, i.e., the aim of the accompanying. He decides that he must undertake an aim-investigation.

Thus far, with the help of his category of “accompanying a child”, the pedagogician has brought the following real essences to light: relationship, sequence, activity and aim. The pedagogician applies his category of “accompanying a child” still further but now focused on each of the real essences just mentioned. Because it is not possible to provide an extensive description of this here, only an essence table of this will be sufficient for the aim of this study:

Category	Real essences
1. Accompanying a child	<p><i>Real relationship essences:</i></p> <p>Relationship of understanding  Relationship of trust  Relationship of authority</p>
2. Accompanying a child	<p><i>Real sequence essences:</i></p> <p>Relationship of association  Relationship of encounter  Relationship of engagement  Relationship of interference  Relationship of returning to association  Periodic breaking away</p>
3. Accompanying a child	<p><i>Real activity essences:</i></p> <p>Giving meaning; Exerting;  Norm-involvement; Venturing;  Gratitude; Accountability;  Hope; Design; Fulfilling;  Respect; Self-understanding;  Freedom</p>
4. Accompanying a child	<p><i>Real aim essences:</i></p> <p>Meaningful existence  Self-judgment &amp; self-understanding  Human dignity  Morally independent choosing and acting  Responsibility  Norm identification  Philosophy of life</p>

Thus far, the pedagogician has advanced meaningfully with his category “accompanying a child” because with its help meaningful real essences have come to light. In order to penetrate deeper, i.e., more radically, to further real essentialities it is necessary to sharpen the light of thinking. This is accomplished by refining the category “accompanying a child” which occurs by now implementing as categories the real essences observed through the category of accompanying a child (which in reality are essences of this category). On the basis of its essentiality, each essence has categorial status (FPOW: chapter 2).

From the foregoing it is clear that the essence disclosing by the pedagogician cannot easily reach a point in which it can be said that all possible real essences have been brought to light. It is equally clear that without categories there cannot be a meaningful attempt to disclose essences.

## 5.6 SUMMARY AND THE FIFTH STATED PROBLEM

This chapter is devoted to remarks about the development of Landman’s application of categories. Initially thinking about anthropological categories and their pedagogical relevance was done by C. K. Oberholzer and others. That Landman definitely agrees with and is influenced by Oberholzer seems clear. One need only point to the number of citations or references to Oberholzer in his works. (Landman was a doctoral student of Oberholzer). At first Landman identified pedagogical categories emanating from Oberholzer’s anthropological categories and then added additional possible pedagogical categories.

With reference to the above now a further description follows of the pedagogical categories as particularized by Landman from the anthropological categories. It is shown that in reality pedagogical criteria are pedagogical categories in question form. Thus, in order to determine in scientifically accountable ways if the realization of the pedagogical activities are pedagogically correct or not, pedagogical categories must be used as pedagogical criteria and this

occurs by stating the categories in the form of a question. It is indicated how this is done.

Pedagogical categories are scientifically justified by disclosing their ontological-anthropological grounding. The anthropological categories, i.e., being-in-the-world, being-with, temporality, being-someone, are categories with ontological status because they are grounded in the ontological category and say something really essential about being human and its meanings against reality itself as background. Therefore, there can also be mention of ontological-anthropological categories.

Finally, it is indicated that word and being cannot be thought of apart from each other by doing an etymological analysis of the word “category”. By verbalizing, a real essence is made present as it is. Etymology is already an aspect of phenomenology because each word has an historical origin and is the being of a being. The etymological study of a particular word such as “category” is then really a beginning-phenomenological analysis of the particular reality that is verbalized. Because it can be said that a category is an interpretive means of thinking, attention is also given to an explication of the concept “interpret”. It implies understanding, clarifying and conversing. In addition it is indicated that “letting be” cannot occur in the absence of illumination, creating ways of access and speaking and thus assume creating a way of access and illuminative speaking. Illuminating is the application of illuminative means of thinking: categories.

In this part of the chapter it is sufficient to demonstrate the application of categories in fundamental pedagogics. This is summarized in a table of essences.

Although throughout the present study there is reference to a philosophy of life, it is necessary that a separate chapter be devoted to this. Time and again there is reference to the fact that Landman, as a Christian pedagogician, puts philosophy of life permissibility on the same level as scientific necessity in fundamental pedagogics. Chapter six will thus be devoted to Landman’s views of the significance of a philosophy of life for fundamental pedagogics. Again, there will be a chronological disclosure of the course of

development of his thinking. Consequently, in the following chapter attention is given to the following matters:

- Initially the philosophy of life was placed between brackets.
- The relationship between philosophy of life and education.
- The judgmental relevance of a philosophy of life.
- Marxist threats for Christian education.
- The significance of the historicity of a philosophy of life as a matter of enlivenment.
- Philosophy of life sources for fundamental pedagogical essences.
- Philosophy of life has structural status of equal value [to science].
- Philosophy of life permissibility and educational research.

In Chapter 6 there is a thorough exposition of the significance of Landman's views of a philosophy of life.

## REFERENCES

- Betti, E.: *Die Hermeneutik als allgemeine Methodik der Geisteswissenschaften*. Mohr, Tübingen, 1962.
- Gumpfenberg, R.: *Sein und Auslegung*. Bouvier, Bonn, 1971.
- Landman, W. A.: *Enkele antropologies-ontologiese momente van die eerste lewensjaar*. Port Elizabeth: University of Port Elizabeth Publication Series, No. 2, 1966.
- Landman, W. A. & Gouws, S. J.: *Inleiding tot die fundamentele pedagogiek: 'n Posing tot fundering (IFP)*. Afrikaanse Pers, Johannesburg, 1969.
- Landman, W. A. & Roos, S. G.: *Fundamentele pedagogiek en die Opvoedingswerklikheid (FPOW)*. Butterworth, Durban, 1973.
- Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. & van Rooyen, R. P.: *Die praktykwording van die fundamentele pedagogiek (PFP)*. Perskor, Johannesburg, 1974.
- Landman, W. A., Kilian, C. J. G., Roos, S. G. & Viljoen, T. A.: *Denkwyses in die opvoedkunde (DO)*. NG Kerkboekhandel, Pretoria, 1971.
- Oberholzer, C. K.: *Prolegomena van 'n prinsipiële pedagogiek*. HAUM, Cape Town, 1968.
- Van Rensburg, C. J. J. & Landman, W. A.: *Notes of fundamental-pedagogic concepts*. NG Kerkboekhandel, Pretoria, 1979.

---

\* See footnote p. 42 of Chapter 1 in the Afrikaans text.