CHAPTER II

A CLOSER ESSSENCE-ANALYSIS OF THE CATEGORY "BEING-IN-THE-WORLD"

2.1 INTRODUCTION

From the previous chapter it is evident that the category being-in-the-world is the first precondition for designing additional categories, thus for practicing science. Being-in-the-world makes science possible; it is the ontological determination of practicing science. This means that it is the fundamental precondition for scientific categorical thinking.

However, in this study, the author will attempt to bring greater clarity to the necessity for and the scientific meaning of this ontological category. This will also occur in the following two chapters. In the present chapter it must be shown that being-in-the-world makes phenomenology possible, i.e., that being-in-the-world is a precondition for reality (here the reality of educating) to come to speech in its real essentiality and meaning. By positing being-in-the-world as an ontological category it is acknowledged that the pedagogician is going to allow this "coming to speech" to be realized in scientifically accountable ways, and further that scientific isolation from the real essentials is broken through by being-in-the-world. It will also be indicated how scientific thinking proceeds from ontological to pedagogical categories and how ontological status can be attributed to such pedagogical categories. Finally some pedagogical categories must be described in such a way that there is clear evidence that they are particular categories of being-in-the-world, thus are categories with ontological status. The reason for this is that the right of existence of a pedagogical category, as an illuminative means of thinking, is justified if its necessity for understanding the pedagogical can be convincingly shown.

2.2 BEING-IN-THE-WORLD IS A CATEGORY THAT LETS REALITY ITSELF "COME TO SPEECH"

2.2.1 The concept "come to speech"

Here one is involved with a concept for which the following synonyms are found in the phenomenologically oriented literature: to bring to light, to bring to clearness, clarify, illuminate, to make transparent, uncover, disclose, unveil, to bring to appearance, make unconcealed, to make present, verbalize, express and to allow to enter the unhidden.[1)] In other words, in order to let [something] come to speech, these activities must be exercised and this is really essential to let **phenomena** as real essences become visible.

The meaning of the expression "phenomenon" is "das Sich-ihm-selbst-zeigende" (that which shows itself), i.e., what manifests itself, what comes to speech itself. There is light or clarity thrown on the matter. "To come to speech" means **seeing** [something] as it **lets itself be seen**, the self-showing, the manifesting, in other words, **a coming forth in a person's speaking about things.** The matter itself is made **present** in its real essentiality. It is an unveiling, opening, clarifying and revealing of **meaning-** and **being-structures** as real **essences**.[2)]

2.2.2 The concept "letting-be"

By implication "to come to speech" means that all beliefs, dogmas, theories, biases, indifference toward reality etc. must be held in abeyance or suspended otherwise the fundamentals, the ontic universalities cannot come to an **unveiling** through **appearing**. This requires of the scientist an attunement or disposition of a thinking viewing of and **listening** to the **language of the phenomenon itself**.[3)]

The concept "letting-be" refers specifically to an act, a purposeful activity of the scientist as a person and it is a precondition for bringing reality itself to speech. A reality [phenomenon] itself speaks its own language and now depends on whether a scientist is ready to let this language figure forth [as speech]. This "letting-be" demands that the scientist banish and eliminate all indifference toward reality. This means he **stands open** and in doing so draws his attention just to the fundamentals because it is always the scientist himself, because of his being-in-the-world, who reaches reality and allows it to be seen as it essentially is. "Letting-be" is

possible because a person is not only enmeshed in the world but can consider it and reflect on it phenomenologically.[4]

From the foregoing it thus seems clear that **it** can**not** be allowed that something might come between the scientist and reality. The scientist searches purposefully and systematically for the **general essence** that is valid everywhere and always and because some beings can conceal and obscure other beings, this requires that a scientist have a **method** that **lets** the being of beings appear, thus that the real essences of beings (e.g., the reality of educating) and their meanings come to light.

The question is what is it that comes between the scientist and the universal life reality? It is the **non-anthropological** obfuscations and particular **anthropological conceptions**. These obscurers do violence to life reality because they promote essence blindness and therefore they must be disengaged, or nullified or **provisionally** bracketed because they deprive the scientist of his foothold or grip on reality as it essentially is. Within such **light-depriving perspectives** indeed it happens that beings appear "**but** then they do not appear as they really essentially **are** but as disturbed"[5] (Heidegger) and a scientist must **never allow this**. The perspectives that are **provisionally** bracketed do have post-scientific relevance.

2.2.3 The ontological category makes "coming to speech" and "letting-be" possible

"Coming to speech" and "letting-be" presume each other because they are concerned with reality itself as it essentially is and as its meaning essentially is. The **ontological category** "being-in-the-world" is a **precondition**, more strongly stated, it is the **only** way in which "coming to speech" and "letting-be" can be actualized because they "are the juncture where reality as presence is illuminated".[6]

Being-in-the-world is an **understanding-precondition** for a human way of being and all of its distinguishable activities (e.g., educative activities), and "coming to speech" and "letting-be" are possible because through being-in-the-world various beings can be

distinguished from each other, be described and be dealt with (Heidegger). Only as being-in-the-world can a person be directed to uncovering, unveiling and disclosing as well as revealing meanings of reality. Thus this being-in-the-world further implies that the real essences and meaning of being human and human activities can be disclosed only because of his **presence-in-the-world**.[7]

2.2.4 Implications for pedagogical thinking

Without **being-in-the-world** the humanness of a human being in all of its variations, thus also being human in pedagogical situations, is not graspable. Understanding means to have insight into essences and to acquire this insight requires thought-work (reflection). Thus through reflective fathoming and radical thinking through, the fundamental pedagogician searches for critically justifiable and generally valid knowledge, for pedagogical structures and pedagogical evidences, i.e., for meaningful essences of the reality of educating. He searches for them there where the educative reality is embedded (rooted) in the universal reality of life.[8]

The question is how is it possible that these fundamental structures of the educative reality are brought to light, disclosed, and verbalized by the fundamental pedagogician? In other words, what is the **precondition** (prerequisite), the **basis** by which he, through thinking, can acquire a grip on the real essences of the reality of educating? Stated still differently, what is the first fundamental precondition that makes being human possible in all of its ways of being in life reality? There is only one answer possible: The reality of educating (pedagogic phenomenon) that shows itself as pedagogic events in pedagogic situations as the involvement of a not-yet adult and an adult in dialogue with a world out of which educative relationships and activities flow **is only fathomable and understandable via thinking on the basis of a pedagogician's being-in-the-world.** Being-in-the-world is a human being's first and original attunement to being and refers to the entirety of relationships that are designed by him in his life reality (Heidegger).[9]

SUMMARY: Being-in-the-world is thus a precondition (precondition for understanding) for all pedagogical thinking, in particular,

pedagogical **essence** thinking. Therefore, Landman postulates that authentic pedagogical thinking (as pedagogical essence thinking) is not possible "if the pedagogician does not show **prior to** such thinking that his own being-in-the-world is a precondition for it."[10]

2.3 PRACTICING A SCIENCE IS NOT POSSIBLE IF A SCIENTIST IS ISOLATED FROM REALITY

2.3.1 The concept "practicing a science"

The concept "practicing a science" presumes a **practitioner** and refers to a particular way of **acting** (activity). Bakker states it clearly: "The practice of science is foremost among human beings"[11] and therefore human subjectivity is a precondition for practicing science. Each scientist is a particular, individual, concrete person with his own nature and history who practices science as it is and not otherwise in order to be able to be what he is. The particularity of a person undoubtedly has an effect as a particular factor in scientific reflection, but **this particular factor in a scientist as a person is extra-scientific, or pre-scientific of non-scientific in nature.**[12]

Practicing science is a **deed** that in its core is built on a free decision. The scientist as practitioner carries out particular **acts** that are purposeful, systematic, thought through, planned and controlled. These particular **activities** of a scientist in reality are an essential mode of his original being-in-the-world. It is one of the ways in which he tries to find a course in the open world in which he finds himself. The appeal of Bakker to reflect on the question of what a scientist does when practicing science is in the interest of a person, the truth and science because here there is mention of self-reflection, accountability, human freedom, openness and the meaning of beings.[13]

Practicing science is the figuring forth of scientific reflection, i.e., an act of knowing and to be able to know requires a method of knowing. This possibility and **indubitable certainty of knowledge** must continually answer to the demands of **general validity** and **necessity**. To insure this, a way of knowing or a method is required that will lend itself to accessing the **real**

essences and **meaning** of the known. The most meaningful way of accessing for scientific practice seems to be the phenomenological attunement because the object of study of **phenomenology** is precisely a **scientist** in his **encountering** the various **phenomena** of his science as they make themselves available pre-scientifically. In this meaning-giving encounter with reality (the world) the scientist is not an "uninvolved" bystander but a co-player: "The involvement between the subject and the object is not in the first place a knowing relation but a relation of being in which the subject is affected as much by the object as the object is by the subject"[14] and none of this is possible if the scientist is not in-the-world.

The practice of science does not appear through the logical or systematic coherence of a report or the mere collecting of facts and drawing logical conclusions, but is a **purposeful reflecting on** and a searching for the **foundation** (grounding), a describing and an explicating of **fundamental structures**. It is a confidence in **how**, **when** and **why** certain activities are carried out. This critical thinking through and describing (verbalizing) asks for the design of categories and criteria that are rooted in the life world with its primordial structures as activity structures.[15]

Scientific practice makes it possible for a scientist to give attention to questions **about** science and thus a space is created within which science arises and flourishes, but in his involvement a scientist must continually fulfill the demands of critical self-reflection and accountability.[16]

Dreyer[17] indicates that a practitioner of a human science unavoidably makes value judgments. A value judgment in the sense of approval or disapproval is not practicing science but is a **manifestation of a philosophy of life**. However, where the appreciating [valuing/evaluating] is part of the **description of a phenomenon**, i.e., when a scientist appreciates in order to differentiate and to specify his object of study, he is involved in realizing a **function that is necessary for practicing science.**

2.3.2 The concept "isolation"

The word isolation literally means separating, cutting off. i.e., being-opposite-to, a thing along side of other things. It refers to a mere being-there as if there is an unbridgeable gulf between a person and the perceivable world (reality).

The obfuscations between person and reality as discussed in section 2.2.2 are what cut one off or isolate one from the essences of reality. In this connection there is thought about Husserl's notion of the covering of ideas: "It lays a cover of ideas over the life world, the cloth of objective-scientific truths."[18] This means that everything that can be **reality-covering** (one's own and other's perspectives from which a scientist often will not free himself) throws a cloth over, forms a covering over the essences of reality and its meanings. These cloths cover, veil, obscure the **essences**, i.e., no relations (thought relations, research relations, etc.) can arise between a scientist and reality. They banish the scientist from reality and hinder him in arriving at the real essences that he searches for. For a pedagogician this means that he will not have the ability to design pedagogical categories and criteria nor to formulate them in terms of scientific judgments about educative realities. Moreover, then there can be no construction of an autonomous pedagogics, because a pedagogician who is isolated from the reality of educating is no longer a pedagogician, and a pedagogics that is denied its rootedness in the life world cease to be pedagogics.[19]

Because these cloths of bias, presupposition, philosophy of life, etc. are of no importance for a phenomenological illumination of reality in its real essentiality and meaning, Husserl clearly states that all "questionable constructions"[20] must be eliminated. This means that scientific practice in isolation from reality leads to pure speculation by which nothing authentic regarding that life world can be disclosed. Only after these idea-coverers are provisionally removed (put in brackets) by a series of acts of reduction can a scientist, by means of radical reflection and intuitive viewing, allow the real essences to appear and illuminate them as they essentially are. This radical reflection has the scientist's being-in-the-world as a first precondition.

2.3.3 The ontological category makes isolation impossible

The ontological category being-**in**-the-world (Dasein) is an expression of a being-by-and-with-the-other, a being directed to and standing open for things and the other, thus also a scientific being-by-and-with-reality. "In" does not refer to spatiality but means **inhabiting** as designing, shaping, planning and constructing a personal, **lived** experienced, **lived** through, **meaning-**given world (Oberholzer). The prefix "Da" refers precisely to the eccentric character of human subjectivity. This **being-in** is thus a particular way of being, namely, a being-in of a **subject** in a human world and therefore Kockelmans postulates "However deeply one also penetrates into human subjectivity, one always finds the world there because the world penetrates to the heart of subjectivity"[21] and this also holds true for the scientist in his practice of science.

The human being as person-in-the-world, thus also as scientist, knows that he finds himself in reality, is part of it and participates in it. That is, being human is being-conscious-in-the-world, inhabiting the world, being acquainted-with-the-world. It is a world in which a person encounters and is encountered, a world of dialoguing and communicating. Buytendijk states this clearly, "A person is not 'something' with characteristics but an initiative of relationships to a world that he chooses and by which he is chosen."[22] To try to reach and express real essences and their meanings in scientifically accountable ways, i.e., to take a scientific initiative, a scientist's being-in-the-world is a first precondition.

The category being-in-the-world refers to a coherency, a co-bondage, a being interwoven, an indestructible being connected of person and world because "as soon as a person says I he expresses himself as being-in-the-world."[23] This means that without this world-experiencing life, the practice of science as the search for real essences and their meanings is unthinkable because everything the scientist is and does, he does by being involved and this involvement is not possible if his being-in-the-world is negated.

SUMMARY: "My being human **is** being-in-the-world. Thinking the world away means thinking human being away."[24] This means that isolation is impossible because whoever says human being means world involvement and whoever speaks of world immediately presumes human being. This world (reality) is no pure opposition

but a world-for-me and thus a person, and also a scientist, must continually determine and take up anew his position with respect to reality and to do so requires being-in-the-world. Luijpen states clearly, "The unity of mutual implication of subject and world is the original dimension in which a person stands, thinks and speaks."[25] The **fact of being** that the world is saturated with humanness and a person is permeated with world makes possible:

(i)   scientific practice as a particular way of being [human] as a scientist,

(ii)   finding the fundamentals, as the essential and meaningful, because the scientist's disclosing, uncovering, illuminating and unconcealing [activities] as well as all further thinking, describing and interpreting are **grounded** in the foundation of **being-in-life-reality**.[26]

2.3.4 Implications for pedagogical thinking

For pedagogical thinking this means that there is a unity of reciprocal implication between the pedagogician and the educative reality that is rooted in the life world. **Being-in-the-world**, as the first and original [primordial] attunement of being of a person, makes it possible for a pedagogician to search for critically accountable and generally valid knowledge of the pedagogical **phenomenon** that shows itself as **pedagogical events** in pedagogical situations. The **educative reality** itself that is embedded in the universal life reality now can be **radically penetrated and thought through** in order to uncover, unveil what is essential for its appearance and existence and to describe and interpret it in such pedagogical categories and criteria that its universal **sense** becomes manifested.[27]

Kilian[28] shows that pedagogical thinking and educative reality require each other because through pedagogical thinking the pedagogical structures (being-structures) are brought to light, designed and constituted. This scientific thought-work in connection with the person in order to manifest the **sense** of being human as a **questioner** and **grasper** of **being** is possible because the pedagogician is **openness in**-the-world without which he

cannot think and without him no world can be thought. This means that all thought-work is also dialectic thought-work as a particular way of thinking that is **grounded** in an **already-being-in-and-at-the-world**.[29)]

It is meaningful for the pedagogician to also state the **contradictories** [of his categories] because in this way the ontological status of his pedagogical categories can be evaluated and expressed against the universal life reality itself as background. The contradictory of being-in-the-world is being-**opposite**-the-world, i.e., being world-less, indicating a person as isolated from the world. The pedagogical **meaninglessness** of this contradiction is that the pedagogical event is impossible because it shows itself as an involvement of a not-yet adult with an adult in **dialogue with a world.** Thus there also can be no pedagogical thinking as a reflective consideration of the reality of educating as it appears in life reality. The contradiction "being-**opposite**-the-world" thus has no right of existence and since a pedagogician searches for non-contradictory, generally valid and indispensible pedagogical categories, the category "being-**in**-the-world" is valid. Being-in-the-world is a **fundamental category** from which all further thinking regarding the humanness of persons is affirmed and made possible.[30)]

2.4 THE ONTOLOGICAL CATEGORY MAKES FURTHER ANTHROPOLOGICAL THINKING POSSIBLE

2.4.1 The concept "further thinking"

A person is openness and an initiator of further thinking. Further thinking brings **clarity** because openness guarantees the accessibility of thinking to what is reflected on.[31)]

The concept "further thinking" implies that there is already thought, i.e., there is a **precondition** for being **able** to think and to be able to think **further.** From what has already been described, it is shown that this precondition, this foundation for all thought-work is the scientist's **being-in-the-world.** Without the being-in-the-world of a scientist thinking and all further thinking are not

possible and only pure speculation is possible by which nothing authentic can be made manifest.[32]

From this ontological category further **describing** and **interpreting, as well as designing** categories and criteria, i.e., further thinking are now possible. These systematic and purposeful acts of designing and interpreting are not matters of deductive reasoning or rational construction but are a **thinking search for essences and essences of essences.** In other words, further thinking is a thoughtful viewing, an **essence-analysis** of real essences and also of their essences such that generally valid knowledge is arrived at. This further thinking as reflecting, as reflecting deeper, as further intensive thinking means an uncovering, a penetrating investigation, a making visible and grasping of **particular ways of being-in-the-world** that the scientist is going to use as categories in his thinking-work.[33] In this way all further thinking and reflection about **being human** is grounded in life reality itself. In other words, this step in thinking of the work of thinking is to bring to light the essences of the essences, i.e., a purposeful thinking search that leads to a **grounding** and **designing** of **further** categories and criteria. For a pedagogician this further thinking-work means implementing the phenomenological method to particularized these and other categories and to illuminate their **pedagogical relevance.**[34]

SUMMARY: "Further thinking" as a thinking-describing activity of a person (scientist) really is essentially a modus of his original being-in-the-world. It is a thinking-acting way to arrive at phenomenological-hermeneutic thinking-work. It is done to arrive at judgments that are necessary and generally valid, i.e., scientific judgments. This thinking activity (further thinking) is not a process of abstraction but a **thinking event** that through critical and sifting distinguishing, ordering, investigating and describing **penetrate** to an **essence analysis,** grounding and designing of categories and criteria in terms of which the essentials, the meaningful, the fundamentals are verbalized and evaluated. Thus, further thinking is **categorical thinking** and categorical thinking has as a precondition the pedagogician's being-in-the-world.[35]

2.4.2 Anthropological thinking as ontological thinking

41

a) The transition ontological-anthropological

A human being is that being (of being) who asks about his own way of being and about the beings with which he is continually in communication in a world in which he participates. Thinking-work is a modus of a person's being-in-the-world and to be able to think is to implement categories. Thus, involved here is the mutual implication of **thinking** and **being**. This pronouncement about thinking, i.e., the application of categories is **thinking itself**[36] and this means that what the thinker will say ontologically can be said only through particular words. This implies that the **pronouncement of real essences through categories is an ontic-ontological matter**.

It was already indicated that the ontological category (being-in-the-world), as a real essence of the universal life reality itself, is the **fundamental category** for all thinking and further thinking. In order to now unveil, to grasp and to verbalize the **essential** possibilities and the **meaning** of being human, a scientist must implement **particular** categories that are constitutive of **human** being-in-the-world. These particular verbalizations of concrete manifestations of the human of persons (anthropological being) are **anthropological categories** According to Heidegger: existensialia), that are grounded in life reality itself, i.e., they are real essences of the ontological category. This means that the **ontological category is a precondition** for the first step of thinking and the anthropological categories are the **second** precondition for further thinking about being human and human activities (e.g., the educative event) and their **meaning**. Although in thinking-work there can be a transition from the ontological to the anthropological, the conceptual pair "ontological-anthropological" indicates that the point of departure for the anthropological is the ontological and therefore Landman clearly postulates: "Together the ontological category and the anthropological categories are the categorical expression of the ontological-anthropological being."[37]

b) Dasein-in-general to Dasein-in-particular

To the question, what is the meaning of being, Kockelmans shows, linking up with Heidegger, that there is only **one** being which can give an answer to that question: "That being is the being which can question itself—human being. Thus only through a penetrating analysis of human being (Dasein, Existence) can we arrive at an insight into the meaning of being."[38]

Heidegger uses the concept "way of being" as a particular modus of being. It is the nature of the being of being human as it comes to expression in reality. It is a particular way of being that is totally and radically different from an animal-like or thing-like being because **way of being** refers to a way of being in which the essence of the being-there (Dasein) comes to expression.[39] In the prefix "Da" lies the concept **presence** or as Kockelmans, following Merleau-Ponty, states: "Person and world are merely two abstract moments of one ... simple structure contained in a **presence**"[40] but then a presence as **openness** that means a being-directed-to, a standing open for the world (reality). A human being does not merely constitute a part of the world but the world appears to him as meaningful by which he carries out a meaningful existence in the world. Without this essential intentionality, as world-experiencing life, a human being and all thinking about being human are incomprehensible because "On the one hand, the meaning of things is permeated by our humanness but on the other hand indeed they are also continually present in the world."[41]

Dasein, existence, intentionality as world-experiencing living are all synonymous concepts in the phenomenological literature for verbalizing, understanding and interpreting being human as being-**in**-the-world. Dasein in general, in other words, is a precondition for being human and also is the beginning point (point of departure) for all further thoughtful-describing and interpretation of being human. In other words, Dasein-in-general makes possible the understanding of Dasein-in-particular.

For understanding this **particular** being-human-in-the-world Heidegger implements categories that necessarily belong to Dasein and he calls these existentialia.[42] Landman describes these existentialia as follows: " Existentialia are anthropological categories that are phenomenologically particularized from the human order

of being and constitute concrete manifestations [verbalizations] of human being-in-the-world [Dasein]."[43]

From the above it thus appears that only after Dasein-in-general or human being-in-the-world is determined and verbalized as a category can there be a transition or progression to categories that describe Dasein-in-particular because a human being (also a scientist) is first Dasein and then he defines himself (Sartre).[44]

c) The anthropological categories have ontological status

Human being is a particular distinctive way of being and when there is scientific reflection on the meaning of being human and human activities (e.g., educative activities), **anthropological categories** must be implemented because these existentialia (Heidegger) essentially are particular existence-**verbalizations** and manifestations of **human** being-in-the-world. Given the aims of this study it is not possible to give an explanation of the meaning and sense of all of the existentialia, namely: being-in-a-meaningful-world, being-with, temporality, being-someone-oneself, etc. since various writers[45] have already done this. These anthropological categories as particular verbalizations of ways of being human are **grounded** in the universal life reality itself. This means that the anthropological categories and what they verbalize are real essences of the ontological category, namely scientific being-in-the-world. Therefore, they can only appear, be brought to light if the phenomenological field of light is thrown on human **being-in-the-world** (Dasein). In other words, the first category of reality or the ontological category is the **precondition** for these categories (anthropological categories) that describe interpret the humanness of being human as it really is. The fundamental category "being-in-the-world" attests that a human being is world-relationship and each of the other categories that verbalizes Dasein-in-particular and that have their origin in this category are categories with ontological status.[46]

SUMMARY: There can be no mention of ways of being human and the categorical verbalizing of them if there is no person (*Anthropos*) **in**-the-world. Verbalizing these ways of being human is only

possible because these anthropological categories are rooted (embedded) in life reality as it is verbalized through the category "being-in-the-world". These anthropological categories are categories with ontological status because:

(i)   they are **grounded** in the **ontological category** as a particular verbalization of the scientific-being-in-the-world and

(ii)   they say something **really essential** regarding **being human** and its **meaning** against the universal life reality as background.[47]

2.5 THE CONCEPTUAL GROUP: ONTOLOGICAL-ANTHROPOLOGICAL-PEDAGOGICAL

2.5.1 Explicitation

In the above the relationship ontological-anthropological was stated by which there is evidence that a person is involved in the world and in world-constituting. As soon as a person is a child as one involved in communicating with reality, the pedagogical arises. Among the variety of human events as modes of being-in-the-world, the pedagogical event appears as a **particular inter-human relation**, as a normative event that is given with being human. This means that the pedagogical, as an ontological event with a particular structure, stands within the anthropological. Therefore, Schoeman clearly postulates, "it is always the case that the pedagogical is an anthropological phenomenon, and what is more, the pedagogical is subsumed by the anthropological."[48]

Viljoen indicates that the adjective pedagogical can show a connection with the pedagogic as well as with pedagogics. In this context the concern is with pedagogics. For him (Viljoen) pedagogics [pedagogy] is parallel to ontology and anthropology although of a different structure namely "the reflection on and fathoming of the educative event as a matter of elevating the level of the dialogue that a child carries on with his world".[49] This means that a child belongs to the reality in which the pedagogical is also embedded. Through reflective thinking that wants to **ground**, thus understand, the fundamental structures of the pedagogical event,

thus a child-being-in-education, must be illuminated. In other words, with the pedagogical situation as foothold the educative reality that is rooted in the universal life reality itself must be viewed and penetrated phenomenologically so that the **essential** structure, the essence of **child-being-in-education,** can be uncovered, known and grasped. Thus, in pedagogics there is involvement with the fundamental structures that a phenomenon of reality such as the pedagogical makes possible.[50)]

SUMMARY: Pedagogics, as a reflection on and fathoming of the educative event, interrogates this ontological-anthropological reality **from** an autonomous pedagogical perspective that is a phenomenological perspective. In doing so pedagogical being-structures (relationship-, sequence-, aim-, categorical- and criterial-structures) are illuminated. As a result of this illumination pedagogics becomes ontologically-anthropologically grounded.

2.5.2 Pedagogical categories are particular anthropological categories with ontological status

The mentioned ontological-anthropological categories must be viewed from a pedagogical perspective in such a way that pedagogical categories are brought to light from them. This means that the pedagogician must now look from the pedagogical situation to the realities that are verbalized by the anthropological categories. The ontological-anthropological categories show realities to the pedagogician that possess pedagogical relevance. By implementing the **phenomenological method** the **pedagogician illuminates** this **pedagogical relevance**.[51)]

For the pedagogician this involves the **reality of educating** that is rooted (embedded) in the **life world** or life reality. In particular, for him this has to do with **verbalizing** the reality of educating that is embedded in the **verbalized** life reality because to really know and understand the pedagogical, he must be able to meaningfully verbalize it. The bringing to light of the pedagogically meaningful, thus real essences (as stated in a previous section) means a critical-accountable thinking as **designing particular** anthropological categories, namely **pedagogical categories** by which the essences of the educative event, thus the educative phenomenon, are brought

to speech (disclosed). In other words, the pedagogician **verbalizes** pedagogical essences in terms of pedagogical categories and because the educative reality is rooted in life reality, pedagogical categories are also **particular life world categories**. These pedagogical categories, as **particular** anthropological categories and thus **particular** life world categories, are the only and best grammatical or linguistic grasps of the pedagogical reality itself, and by which thinking-descriptive understanding and interpretation of the reality of educating in its real essentiality and meaning are possible.[52]

SUMMARY: Pedagogical categories are the **verbalized essences** of the pedagogical itself. In other words, pedagogical categories are verbalizations, truisms of pedagogical realities that are embedded in the universal life reality itself. This means that pedagogical categories are not only real essences of particular anthropological categories but indeed are real essences, thus essential structures, of life reality as it shows itself in the form of the reality of educating. In other words, pedagogical categories, as verbalizations of the reality of educating, are founded (grounded, based) in the life reality categories. **Thus, pedagogical categories have ontological-anthropological status because they are rooted in the life reality as it is verbalized by the [ontological] category "being-in-the-world" and the anthropological categories that have ontological status.**[53]

The following pedagogical categories are brought up to date[54] by illuminating and describing them. In this section there is an attempt to give a brief description of these categories in order to show that they possess **ontological status**. In other words, here it is now going to show that these categories are real pedagogical essences. This means that, as far as the pedagogical is concerned, these categories, and what they verbally express cannot by denied [thought away].

(1) Giving-meaning-with-increasing-responsibility

Giving sense as giving and experiencing meaning is a human way-of-being because a person as task has to make reality a personally meaningful world and thus is obligated to do so with responsibility.

The words "-with-increasing-" in the title of this category shows that a person (giver of meaning) mentioned here cannot from the beginning fully carry and accept responsibility for giving and experiencing sense. This means that for a **developing child** giving sense as giving and experiencing meaning to his own world **must be** actualized in an increasingly more responsible way because by this his being-in-the-world becomes increasingly understandable and meaningful.[55]

As far as the pedagogical is concerned, this category is necessary because giving-meaning-with-increasing-responsibility implies that an adult **unconditionally accepts** a child as a giver of meaning to the world and that the child himself **turns-in-trust-to** the adult with the **aim** that the adult will **support** him just **enough** in his being-on-the-way to being able to constitute his own life world with **increasing responsibility.** In other words, without "giving-meaning-with-increasing-responsibility" a child can never reach independence and be able to design a personal ordered and meaningful life world in a responsible way.

(2) Gradual-breaking-away-from-a-lack-of-exertion

The total course of a person becoming toward a responsible inhabiting of his life world is carried by what he **is** and what he **ought** to be. This means an **answering** [being accountable] within a **field of tension of values** as a breaking away from any form of homeostasis as a way of dwelling without tension.

A gradual breaking away requires the help and support of someone who has already broken away and where giving support to breaking away is **experienced**, a child proceeds to **self activity** as a meaningful acting in order to be able to gradually inhabit his own **dwelling-space** responsibly.[56]

The tension between **is** and **ought** refers to the **ontological sense of being human.** For pedgogics "gradually-breaking-away-for homeostasis is essential because without it the aim structures, namely, responsibility, moral independence and meaningful existence, cannot figure forth because their figuring forth are ways of breaking away from a lack of tension. This breaking away is

possible where a **caring space, an acting-in-love, a space for one's being at home** exist and are guaranteed. This category and what it verbalizes is necessary for the pedagogical because only by gradually breaking away from his freedom from care and stability can a child in his total humanness as being-in-the-world increasingly give form to what he ought to be, namely a proper adult.

(3) Exemplifying-and-emulating-norms

A person is **meaning creating.** This means among other things that he **answers** to and is himself **accountable** with respect to all of the situations and possibilities of his being-in-the-world.[57)]

The "exemplifying" refers to an example **worthy of imitation**, i.e., someone who stands in the **service** of the worthiness that he **carries** as the creator of meaning. The "emulating" emphasizes becoming as the gradual figuring forth from what **is** to what **ought** to be. In other words, the exemplifying of the adult creator of meaning to a not-yet-adult is a responsible example of the life of propriety as meaningful and this initiates in a child, as someone-who-wants-to-be-someone, a yearning to imitate what is proper. This imitating of the proper must necessarily be present in a pedagogical situation to insure the increasing possibility of a thriving humanness in the life of a child.

"Exemplifying and emulating norms" is a purely pedagogical category because the **idea** that must be striven for (the aim, the destination) as it figures forth in the exemplifying is an indication of the value-possibilities (norm images) that can and ought to be realized by a child through the **educator's presence**. The adult as **living** example of **human dignity** in his exemplifying of the norm-image-of-adulthood (norm identification) is the direction-giver and value determiner without which the **pedagogical** event is not possible.[58)]

The quality of the exemplifying determines the caliber of a child's **turning-to-in-trust** and **readiness to relate.** In other words, this category and what it verbalizes are fundamental for pedagogical event to arise and continue in all of its essences because through

this way of acting by the adult the child obtains a continually clearer idea of what being an educator as being an adult includes. In other words, exemplifying and emulating norms guarantees the continuance of the pedagogical situation because the child as **partner** knows through **experiencing** the observed **exemplifying** that **sympathetic, authoritative guidance** and **providing support** are at one's disposal.

(4) Venturing-with-each-other-pedagogically

Being-there as being-in-the-world is a being-with (Heidegger) or a being-with-another (Binswanger). This means that the presence of the other **compels** a person to share the world in their encounter while the other **dares** to **commit** himself to the one encountering. Thus, "venturing-with-each-other" is an **ontic necessity** because no person can be a full-fledged human being without the other person.[59]

The word "pedagogical" makes the venturing-with-each-other a **particular** activity of **particular** persons, namely a not-yet-adult (becoming adult) and an adult as presenter of the normative that is jointly dealt with in the pedagogical situation. In his involvement in his becoming, a child on his way to adulthood must progressively become an adult himself in the **presence of an adult**. The being-in-the-world of the persons as participants in the pedagogical situation makes their presence **by** each other (association) into a presence **with** each other (encounter). This being-with-each-other (pedagogical encounter) is a precondition for venturing to a being-**for**-each-other (pedagogical engagement). In other words, without venturing-with-each-other-pedagogically the venturing to **pedagogical intervention** is not possible because whoever wants to educate must **give** a child **freedom to himself act in a venturesome way**, i.e., give him the opportunity to increasingly venture in order to answer the appeal of the demands of propriety.[60] Venturing-with-each-other-pedagogically must necessarily be present to make it possible for a child to realize his future adulthood. The **participation** of the educator and the educand in a pedagogical situation as a venturing-with-each-other-pedagogically, i.e., as a pedagogical **we-ness** implies a **joint** venturing by which a child's becoming adult is possible. This

category implies mutual **trust**, thus an **accessibility,** a **belongingness** of educator as well as educand. It is essential for the pedagogical because by this knowledge and understanding are possible that are so necessary in order to give sense and meaning to one's own life on the way to adulthood and as an adult.

(5) Being-grateful-for-pedagogical-security

A person seeks security and is thankful if he experiences it. The experience of thankfulness is the basis for personal initiative by which willing thrives and giving meaning becomes possible. That is, this category is a precondition for giving-meaning-with-increasing-responsibility.[61]

The gratitude discussed here is an experience of a **particular** security. Pedagogical security is an ontological-anthropological existential because a child **is** in need of support and experiences insecurity in his wanting-to-be-someone-himself. The pedagogical space in which all pedagogical activities are established and realized is a loving, **accepting** space in which a child experiences **security** and shows **gratitude** for it.[62] This experience of pedagogical security is possible because it is done out of **caring-because-of-love** by which **nearness** and security as particular ways of being-in-the-world are constituted and for this the child in distress is increasingly grateful. Pedagogically it is not possible to think away this category because it gives the child courage and confidence to venture with adults into the **future** while exemplifying that future as **adulthood** makes the future meaningful for a child. This making the future meaningful for a child is realized by an adult **who is already there,,** i.e., who in his own life gives evidence of the embodiment of adulthood as a normed futurity.

(6) Being-responsible-for-educative-relationships

A person is **compelled** to establish relationships with fellow persons and is accountable for bringing them about **properly**. This refers to the acceptance of responsibility because the obstruction of relationships means the obstruction of each possibility of meaning and understanding of meaning.[63]

This category is a fundamental precondition for the origin and progression of a pedagogical situation because through this responsibility the **pedagogical relationship structures** are realized. This means that this category is a real essential that refers to both participants in the educative situation taking responsibility for an adequate realization of pedagogical relationship structures **in** and **with** their relationships to the pedagogical sequence structures with the aim of attaining the pedagogical aim structures. Both the educator and the educand are held **responsible** for the **quality** of the realization of the pedagogical structures with their coherencies by which educating is then made possible. This **existential being-with** of adult and child is in the fullest sense of the word a **letting-distance-disappear**, a **bringing-the-moral-nearer**, a **being-with-each-other**, a **presence-in-trust** for which responsibility must be accepted, and that is so necessary for the needed giving of support and its acceptance.[64] In other words, where adults and children are together-in-the-world, **being-responsible-for-educative-relationships** is fundamental for the appearance and further proper course of a pedagogical situation.

(7) Wanting-(hoping)-to-attain-future-adulthood

The reality of a being-hopefully-directed to the future is fundamental because a person's future in its demand-setting respect gives to his life, as being-in-the-world, a **task character** by which possibilities for a **meaningful reality** are realized. The word 'hope-' points to a being open, an active expectation, a creation of activities by which possibilities realized serve as the foundation for further possibilities and their meanings to be able to be realized in the future.[65]

Hope-for-**future-adulthood** is a purely pedagogical category. Whoever speaks of the pedagogical has in mind the idea of adulthood as full-fledged humanness as a destination that each child hopes for because the pedagogical realizes itself in a course from guided dependence intertwined with guided independence with the aim of self-guided independence (Oberholzer). As far as the pedagogical is concerned this category is essential because it gives sense and meaning to the realization of the educative relationships because the educative aim (adulthood) and the

educand who is on the way to the future with hope form a unity in education (Langeveld). In other words, there is a profound connection between the pedagogical **relationship of understanding** (is) and the **educative aim** (ought). Between the **is** and the **ought** is a course of becoming of **participative accompaniment** so a child can meaningfully attain his destination as a moral adult. This joint course requires **understanding** and **knowledge** of the **particular state of becoming** attained by a child because thereby he is gradually made aware of the demands of human adulthood, namely to increasingly be able to accept **responsibility** for his own task fulfillment.[66] Thus it is clear that this category makes all of the educative activities meaningful, i.e., the reciprocal coherencies among all of the educative activities are affirmed by this category.

(8) Designing-possibilities-for-adulthood

Each person is possibility and the meaningful design of his positive human possibilities is an inescapable demand of propriety because thereby his own way of existing becomes understandable and inherited possibilities become chosen possiblities.[67] (Heidegger).

Designing-possibilities-for-adulthood shows the course of becoming of the pedagogical because a child is continually in a designing manner on the way to what he can be and what he ought-to-be. Without this positive possibility the acquisition of adulthood is not possible because who does not have possibilities to actualize can never become **someone-he-ought-to-be.** A precondition for the meaningful fulfillment of the task to design one's own possibilities is the **relationship of trust** because designing positive-human-possibilities requires that a child have trust in his possibility to design. This also requires a **relationship of understanding** as knowledge of such a possibility. Realizing possibilities in his dialogue with the world must occur in terms of norms. Only through **sympathetic, authoritative guidance** will a child gradually accept that his positive human possibilities must be in **his** service and that he is in the service of **fellow persons** and his **Creator.** Without this category the pedagogical is unthinkable because it is fundamental for the realization of the educative aim of adulthood as a fundamental possibility that **must** be designed.[68]

(9) Gradually-fulfilling-destination (adulthood)

Fulfillment-of-destination is a possibility that is **given with being human**. Thus it is an ontological determination. A human being not only **is** but **continually becomes** what he **ought** to become namely that for which he is **destined**. This means that a person is directed by a destination and, as such, continually strives for completion and he will do everything for reaching his planned destination as an adult in-the-world.[69]

The word '"gradually" shows:
- a) that here one is dealing with a **child** who will but only **can** fulfill this destination with the support of an adult as **fulfiller, carrier** and **embodiment** of this destination;
- b) **future**-directedness because with the existence of this destination, the **aiming** and **becoming** through self-realization acquire sense and meaning.

This category is pedagogically necessary because it makes meaningful **giving support, essential knowledge, fellow-humanness** and **understanding** of a child's form of **dialoguing** with the world. In other words, gradually-fulfilling-destination makes the design-of-possibilities-for-adulthood meaningful.[70]

(10) Increasing-respect-for-human-dignity

Being human is a unique, incomparable way of being-in-the-world because he is the bearer of **dignity**. It is a person's **obligation** as questioner of human dignity not to deny it in his own person and that of others but to **respect,** protect and guard it.[71]

A human being can never escape from the demands of propriety and therefore a child must **increasingly** discover and affirm his own **dignity** by his particular way of being-in-the-world. This affirmative answer by a proper life requires **knowledge, leading** and pedagogical **authoritative guiding.** Without-increasing-respect-for-human-dignity, i.e., experiencing and accepting the task of realizing **values** the pedagogical is unthinkable because from the beginning a child is a **meaning-bearing** being. This pedagogical

category, thus gives sense and meaning to the pedagogical event because no person (child) should be **devalued** by another person (adult). This devaluing means that a child is viewed from a distance, i.e., he becomes objectified. This objectifying means his human dignity, as a participant in the pedagogical situation as a human situation, is not respected by the educator and consequently the realization of each pedagogical structure will not be possible.[72]

(11) Achieving-adulthood-through-increasing-self-understanding

A person is someone who himself wants to be someone. This means that he must allow the humanity that is given with his being to thrive to authentic humanness. The flourishing of positive human possibilities and how they can be maximally implemented require **self-knowledge, self-understanding** and **making them serviceable**.[73]

The name of this category implies that a child, through increased self-understanding by means of real support, must learn to know and make serviceable his own positive human possibilities in order to properly fulfill his being on the way to his destination [of adulthood]. In other words, through increasing self-understanding a child discovers his own positive human possibilities and by implementing them the there of his being-there continually becomes fuller in knowing that human participation in life reality is a **responsible task-performing** participation. This category presupposes a lively-being-with-each-other as well as pedagogical relationships of understanding and trust because only then can adulthood as a destination be meaningfully reached.[74]

(12) Conquering-responsible-freedom

Freedom is an essential characteristic of existence. That is, freedom is the ground of a person **from which** he becomes and **to which** he becomes. On the basis of freedom a person is able to choose and therefore he is responsible for his deeds because he cannot do [everything] that he wants to but must do what he ought to do.[75]

The word "conquering" in the name of this category implies that freedom is not realized passively but is an opportunity for something and indeed for acquiring what is given in order to stand in the service of it. In other words, increasing opportunities must be offered a child for **freedom** and **activity** so that with pedagogical support he can gradually **acquire or conquer** his freedom. Stated differently, during the years that an educand is on his way to adulthood he abandons his not being free to then succeed, under sympathetic, authoritative guidance, in conquering authentic freedom. However, this freedom is not absolute but is freedom to responsibility and this means a person can never be-in-the-world without norms. Thus, such freedom is possibility and with it is the opportunity and the task to gradually and increasingly live the norm-image of adulthood.

This category is essential for the pedagogical because without the progressive conquering of freedom by a child the course of educating is not possible. In addition, this conquering of freedom makes educating **necessary** in that just because of his freedom, a child can make a success or a failure of his life and he can himself become or not. That is, without conquering freedom as the acceptance and bearing of responsibility, human dignity becomes betrayed and also damaged.[76]

2.6 SUMMARY

This chapter, as a closer essence analysis of the category "being-in-the-world" shows clearly that person and world cannot be separated or thought apart from each other. A scientist can only practice science if there is nothing between him and reality. All acts of persons (thinking, acting, experiencing, investigating, etc.) are possible because they are grounded in a person's being-in-the-world. In addition, particular ways of being human are possible because a human being (Anthropos) is **in** the world and not **opposite** it because his **being-in** refers to a particular way of being-there, namely a being-there as openness, as a being-directed-to and a standing-open-for the world.

For a pedagogician as seeker of the essences of the pedagogical event as it essentially-really is, the **design** of pedagogical categories

and particular anthropological categories is a necessary act of his practicing science. Through this thought-work as continually further thinking not only is the autonomy of the pedagogical preserved and built up but it becomes possible to **converse** with other scientists without falling into the unscientific or non-scientific.

REFERENCES

1. See Kilian, C. J. G.: Die verbesondering van pedagogiese kriteria
        met ontologies-antropologiese status, 21.
2. See Heidegger, M.: Sein und Zeit, 28.
        Meyer, A. M. T., Muller, A. D. and Maritz, F. A.: Die fenomenologie, 12.
        Bakker, R.: De geschiedenis van het fenomenologisch denken, 183-185.
3. See Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J.: Inleiding tot die
        fundamentele pedagogiek, 29-31.
        Gunter, C. F. G.: Fenomenologie en fundamentele opvoedkunde, 27, 28.
4. See Meyer, A. M. T., Muller, A. D. and Maritz, F. A.: op. cit., 19, 39
        Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J., op. cit., 27-29.
5. Landman, W. A.: Aanwending van die pedagogiese kategoriee in
        die fundamentele pedagogiek, 9.
     See Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J.: op. cit., 31.
        Landman, W. A.: Enkele aksiologies-ontologiese momente in
        die voorvolwassenheisbelewing, 19.
6. Landman, W. Å. and Gous, S. J.: op. cit., 28.
7. See Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J. op. cit., 53.
        Viljoen, T. A.: Die kenrelasie gesien in pedagogiese perspektief:
        'n Studie in die fundamentele pedagogiek, 17.
8. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G., and Kilian, C. J. G.: Denkwyses
        in die opvoedkunde. Ch. 1.
        Landman, W. A.: Enkele aksiologies-ontologiese momente in
        die voorvolwassenheidsbelewing, 13.
9. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G., and Kilian, C. J. G.: op. cit., Ch. 1.
        Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 16.
        Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J.: op. cit., 4.
10. Landman, W. A.: Aanwending van pedagogiese kategoriee in
        die fundamentele pedagogiek, 10.
11. Bakker, R: op. cit., 38.
        See Oberholzer, C. K.: Prolegomena van 'n prinsipiele pedagogiek, 229, 241.
12. See Dreyer, P. S.: "Buite-wetenskaplike faktore in ons wetenskaplike besinning" in
        Tydskrif vir Geesteswissenskappe, Vol. 3, No. 3, Sept. 1963, 210, 212, 218.
13. See Bakker, R. op. cit., 19, 38, 39.
        Bakker, R.: Merleau-Ponty, 35.
14. Bakker, R.: op. cit., 30.
        See Kockelmans, A.: Phaenomenologie en natuurwetenschap, 56, 59.
        Bakker, R.: De geschiedenis van het fenomenologische denken, 24, 25.
        Strasser, S.: "Meditatie over het fenomenologische
        gezegde: Alles wat is is vor mij". In Hedendaagse filosophie,
        Algemeen Nederlands tijdschrift voor wijsbegeerte en
        psychologie, Oct. 1968, 218-220.
        Oberholzer, C. K.: "Die betekenis van die fenomenologie vir
        pedagogiese denke", In: Suid-Afrikaanse tydskrif vir die

pedagogiek, Vol. 1, No. 1, July 1967, 87.

15. See Meyer, A. M. T. and Nel, B. F.: Die wetenskap as ontwerp, 9.
    Meyer, A. M. T., Muller, A. D. and Maritz, F. A.: op. cit., 24, 26.
16. See Meyer, A. M. T., Muller, A. D., and Martitz, F. A.: op. cit., 26.
    Dreyer, P. S.: "Die grense van die wetenskap". In: Die waardes
    van die Afrikaner: Paper read at the annual meeting of the Suid-Afrikaanse
    Akademie vir Wetenskap en Kuns, July 1968, 65-67.
17. Ibid., 71.
18. Bakker, R. op. cit., 121.
    See Spiegelberg, H.: The phenomenological movement, Volume I, 105-107, 118-122.
19. See Gous, S. J.: Verantwoording van die didakties-pedagogiese, 6-7.
    Kockelmans, J. J. G. A.: De fenomenologische psychologie
    volgens Husserl, 293-298, 311.
    Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G., and Kilian, C. J. G.: op. cit., Ch. V.
20. Kockelmans, A.: Edmund Husserl, 108. **See also:** 38, 39.
21. Kockelmans, A.: Phaenomenologie en ntuurwetenschap, 41, 42.
    See Oberholzer, C. K.: Prolegomena van 'n prinsipiele pedagogiek, 161.
    Luijpen, W.: Existentiele fenomenologie, 30.
    Landman, W. A.: Enkele antroplogies-ontologiese momente
    van die eerste lewensjaar, 1, 5.
22. Buytendijk, F. J. J.: "Psychologie van de huisarts". In: R. K.
    Artsenblad, Vol. 30, No. 12, Dec. 1951, 303.
    See Luijpen, W.: op. cit., 31.
    Van Peursen, C. A.: Fenomenologie en werkelijkheid, 10-13.
23. Luijpen, W.: op. cit., 32.
    See Gous, S. J.: Die skool as weg tot wereld ontwerp in
    didakties-pedagogiese perspektief: 'n Inleidende beskouing, 30.
24. Luijpen, W.: op. cit., 193.
25. Ibid., 45. 46.
26. See Landman, W. A.: Enkele aksiologies-ontologiese momente in
    die voorvolwassenheidsbelewing, 134-136.
27. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Kilian, C. J. G.: op. cit., Ch. I.
28. See Ibid., Ch. III.
    Kilian, C. J. G.: op. cit., 283-288.
29. See Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 22, 23.
30. Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Kilian, C. J. G.: op. cit., Ch.III.
31. See Landman, W. A.: Die aanwending van pedagogiese
    kategoriee in die fundamanetele pedagogiek, 8.
    Landman, W. A.: Enkele aksiologies-ontologiese momente in
    die voorvolwassenheidsbelewing, 14.
32. See Ibid., 17, 22, 23.
    Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J.: op. cit., 53.
33. See Landman, W. A.: Die aanwending van pedagogiese
    kategoriee in die fundamentele pedagogiek, 10, 30.
    Landman, W. A.: Enkele aksiologies-ontologiese momente in
    die voorvolwassenheidsbelewing, 23-25.
    Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J.: op. cit., 54.
34. Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 14.
    Oberholzer, C. K.: op. cit., 94.
    Landman, W. A.: Die aanwending van pedagogiese
    kategoriee in die fundamentele pedagogiek, 12-14.
    Viljoen, T. A.: op. cit., 16, 17.
35. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Kilian, C. J. G.: op. cit., Ch. III.

       Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 29-32.

36. See Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 13, 14.
       Landman, W. A.: Enkele aksiologies-ontologiese momente in
       die voorvolwassenheidsbelewing, 12.

37. Landman, W. A.: Die aanwending van pedagogiese
       kategoriee in die fundamentele pedagogiek, 30.
       See Landman, W. A.: Enkele aksiologies-ontologiese momente
       in die voorvolwassenheidsbelewing, 20-24.

38. Kockelmans, A.: op. cit., 32.

39. See Heidegger, M.: Sein und zeit, 50.

40. Kockelmans, A.: op. cit., 42 (In black print by me).
       See Merleau-Ponty, M.: Phenomenology of perception, 141.

41. Kockelmans, A.: op. cit., 43.

42. See Heidegger, M. : Sein und zeit, 44.

43. Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 24.

44. See Ibid., 24.
       Sartre, J. P.: Existentialism and humanism, 28.

45. See Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J.: op. cit., 54-57.
       Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 25-37.
       Kilian, C. J. G.: 'n Fundamenteel-pedagogiese besinning oor
       aanspreek en aanhoor as pedagogiese synswyse, 7-8.

46. See Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 20-25.
       Landman, W. A.: Die aanwending van pedagogiese
       kategoriee in die fundamentele pedagogiek, 30.

47. See Landman, W. A.: Enkele aksiologies-ontologiese momente
       in die voorvolwassenheidsbelewing, 137.

48. Schoeman, S. J.: "Die mensbeeld by die pedagogiek", In:
       Jubileumlesings, 1963, 28, 29.
       See Oberholzer, C. K.: op. cit., 132-136.

49. Viljoen, T. A.: op. cit., 16.

50. See Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J.: op. cit., 51, 52, 58-60.

51. See Landman, W. A.: Die aanwending van pedagogiese
       kategoriee in die fundamentele pedagogiek, 32, 38.
       Kilian, C. J. G.: op. cit., 9.

52. See Landman, W. A.: Enkele aksiologies-ontologiese momente
       in die voorvolwassenheidsbelewing, 137.

53. See Landman, W. A.: Die aanwending van pedagogiese
       kategoriee in die fundamentele pedagogiek, 32.

54. See Landman, W. A.: Op soek na pedagogiese kriteria, 5-16.
       Landman, W. A.: Enkele aksiologies-ontolgiese momente in
       die voorvolwassenheidsbelewing, 25-39, 51-64, 144-145.
       Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J.: op. cit., 60-68.
       Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R.:
       Opvoedkunde en opvoedingsleer vir beginners, 77-97.

55. See Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 26, 51, 144.
       Oberholzer, C. K.: op. cit., 161.

56. See Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 52, 53, 144.
       Kilian, C. J. G.: Die verbesondering van pedagogiese kriteria
       met ontologies-antropologiese status, 70-72.
       Buytendijk, F. J. J.: Algemene theorie der menselijke houding
       en beweging, 568, 569.

57. See Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 53, 54, 144.
       Luijpen, W.: op. cit., 33, 34.

58. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G., and Liebenberg, C. R.: op. cit., 31, 32.
    Oberholzer, C. K.: op. cit., 275.
59. See Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 54, 55, 57, 145.
    Kilian, C. J. G.: op. cit., 113, 115, 137.
    De Graaf, J. and Bakker, R.: De mondige mens tussen goed en kwaad, 150.
60. See Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 29.
    Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R.: op. cit., 31, 32.
    Bonekamp, A.: Milieu-moeilijkheden, 130.
61. See Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 30, 56, 145.
    Kilian, C. J. G.: op. cit., 126.
    Oberholzer, C. K.: op. cit., 278.
62. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G., and Liebenberg, C. R.: op. cit., 82-83.
63. See Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 145, 58.
64. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R.: op. cit., 83, 84.
    Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 30, 31, 57.
    Oberholzer, C. K.: op. cit., 271, 272, 287.
65. See Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 145, 59.
    Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R.: op. cit., 88.
    Beets, N.: Volwassen worden, 76.
66. See Kilian, C. J. G.: op. cit., 164.
    Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R.: op. cit., 32-35.
    Oberholzer, C. K.: op. cit., 269, 270.
67. See Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 145, 59, 60.
68. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R.:op. cit., 89, 90.
    Landman, W. A.: Leesboek vir die christenopvoeder, 18, 51.
    Peters, J.: ˛in van de jeugdige existentie, 17.
69. See Landman, W. A.: Enkele aksiologies-ontologiese momente
    in die voorvolwassenheidsbelewing, 145, 61.
    Landman, W. A.: Leesboek vir die christenopvoeder, 19, 53.
70. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R.: op. cit., 90, 91.
    Landman, W. A.: Leesboek vir die opvoedkundestudent en
    onderwyser, 8, 9.
71. See Landman, W. A.: Enkele aksiologies-ontologiese momente
    in die voorvolwassenheidsbelewing, 34, 35, 62.
    Kilian, C. J. G.: op. cit., 215.
72. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R. op. cit., 93-95.
    Oberholzer, C. K.: op. cit., 165-167.
    Landman, W. A.: Leesboek vir die opvoedkundestudent en onderwyser, 6-8.
73. See Landman, W. A.: Enkele aksiologies-ontologiese momente
    in die voorvolwassenheidsbelewing, 63, 145.
    Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R.: op. cit, 95.
    Oberholzer, C. K.: op. cit., 164.
74. See Oberholzer, C. K.: op. cit., 287, 288.
    Landman, W. A.: Leesboek vir die opvoedkundestudent en Onderwyser, 6, 21.
75. See Landman, W. A.: Enkele aksiologies-ontologiese momente
    in die voorvolwassenheidsbelewing, 145, 37.
    Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R.: op. cit., 96, 97.
76. See Oberholzer, C. K.: op. cit., 285, 286.
    Kilian, C. J. G.: op. cit., 237.
    Oberholzer, C. K.: "Moderne persoonsvisies". In: Hervormde
    Teologiese Studies, July 1957, 78.
    Dienelt, K.: Opvoeding tot verantwoordlijkheid, 20, 45.