
**The Dimensions and Essence of Relationship in Education:
Towards an Authentic Learning for Subjectification**

By

Rev. Fr. Dr. Kingsley Anagolu¹

ABSTRACT

Learning/Education is an encounter of the human subject with the universe. Within this universe created by God, the subject encounters God, encounters Time, encounters the Other, encounters the World and indeed encounters Oneself, for [s]he is never alone. These various elements including God, Time, the Other, the World and the Self which relate to themselves in many ways become the basic condition within which a meaningful learning/education of the human person, properly called the individual/or the subject is to grow and mature towards self-discovery and independence, which, for this paper, is the endpoint of education. Thus, the learning individual (the *subject*) must be guided to relate properly with these various elements.

The method of education/learning becomes in this way, no more a crass pedagogical indoctrination of the individual or an “acting upon the self” (Stewart E., Roy A.D., 2014) as Eric Stewart writes, with certain doctored and linear information which makes the subject almost always being addressed as an object, thus making him operating under the shadows of the instructor in certain directions and never discovering “the Self;” but here, learning becomes a system of an “I and Thou” (Buber, M., 1923) relationship between the subject and his instructional ecosystem. This is adequately achieved in a dialogue established between the learning subject and the educator, a dialogue that enables the subject to really encounter these various relational elements for one’s own maturity and independence, properly termed subjectification, which “refers

¹ Rev. Fr. Dr. Kingsley Anagolu is a Catholic Priest of Awgu Diocese. Currently a formator in Bigard Memorial Seminary, Enugu. He is also the second Vice Rector of the mentioned seminary.

to the procedures by which the subject is led to observe himself, analyse himself, and recognize himself as a domain of possible knowledge...the way the subject experiences himself in a game of truth where he relates to himself” (Foucault, 1998) and to others. This relationship with the aforementioned elements births real dialogue and an encounter which is a new necessity for proper education/learning. This paper proposes that this kind of learning and prerequisite methodology make for an auto-transcendent subject, an individual who achieves self-discovery, independence and an intellectual as well as an emotional maturity which should be the aim and proper end of education.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Concept and Content of the Relationship Oriented Theory Model

Being connected with and to one another characterizes human life in all aspects. Always between two or more people, groups and another, organizations and another or between nations and nations, exists a certain level of acquaintanceship. These acquaintanceships could be shallow, deep, strong, close, weak, superficial, significant or insignificant or even indifferent, but important nevertheless. This inevitable connectedness of human beings to one another, be it ‘*via negativa*’ or ‘*via positiva*’ embodies the inherent characteristics of human relationship. Humans connect to existence in ways more than one and on different levels. Indeed, the world of people and communities, even of nations, are dependent on these relationships which exist in different dimensions and go in different directions.

From the point of view of Christian religion, this human relationship is embedded in man’s ultimate relationship to God who is at the heart of all human activities. As Reinhold Boschki writes, everyone is as a matter of fact radically understood [*and understands*] from the angle of his relationship...² Anchoring it all

² Boschki, R.: *Beziehung als Leitbegriff der Religionspädagogik. Grundlegung einer dialogisch-kreativen Religionsdidaktik.* Ostfildern 2003, 31.

from the point of view of the theology of man's relationship to God, he highlights four levels of this relationship which begins with the fact that it is God, who took the initiative to create man from his wish. This original divine creative initiative is thus the first level of this relationship understood in terms of creation theology. Consequently, man depends on this creative initiative of God and relates to him as such – this is the level of the transcendental theology. Furthermore, man remains constantly in covenant with God. This is the level of historical theology. But while man, in his anthropological givenness, requires redemption due to his nature of fallenness, Christ had to come and this is the Christological/soteriological theology.³ Hence, from the biblical stand point, the various dimensions of theology covering human relationship with God include creation theology, transcendental theology, historical theology and Christological/soteriological theology.

However, humans relate, not only to God, but to other realities within and around them. They relate to themselves and to others on different levels.⁴ Important though to ask, as Reinhold Boschki writes, is, whether people are conscious of this reality, that their various dimensions of lived relationships touch their relationship to God⁵ and that this impact their personal progress in life - learning and maturity? This subject matter of relationship comes core in the heart of education (growth) in its content where the concrete human person is the subject and occupies the centre of the various dimensions of relationship. The attendant questions thereof among others include what is this relationship, who are in this relationship and how should this relationship be structured in order for it to yield a positive result and impact the educational and developmental world of man in its concreteness? The importance of this stems from the fact that personal subjectification/maturity – *Mündigkeit* – depends largely on these relationship and their structures⁶ where the subject plays a significant role.

³ Boschki, R.: *Beziehung als Leitbegriff der Religionspädagogik*, 31.

⁴ More on these dimensions of relationship comes later in this chapter.

⁵ Boschki, R.: *Beziehung als Leitbegriff der Religionspädagogik*, 15.

⁶ Boschki, R.: *Beziehung als Leitbegriff der Religionspädagogik*, 18.

1.2 The Subject in Education vis-à-vis the Relationship Model

Any progressive and gainful education – be it on the theoretical or practical level, begins and ends with the human person as the subject in view. Thus – education – when properly directed towards the human subject, leads to subjectification – this “procedures by which the subject is led to observe himself, analyse himself, and recognize himself as a domain of possible knowledge”⁷ while becoming intellectually and emotionally autonomous, independent and self-aware, and being able to make own choice and decision. Without this independence and self-awareness objective, such education is of course self-defeating as the person remains learned yet uneducated, only but an academic human-robot. The inevitability of the centralization of the individual person is thus a fundamental issue of discourse in all of human evolution. As Reinhold Boschki writes, “*Subjektorientierung ist Grundlage der Logik wissenschaftlicher Reflexion und Methodologie ebenso wie der Konzeptualisierung pädagogischer Modelle für konkrete Praxis-felder und der Durchführung bestimmter Bildungsmaßnahmen.*”⁸This implies that subjectification is the foundation as well as the goal of the logic of all scientific reflections and methodologies. This means that both at the conceptual and practical levels, the subject is/ought to be at the centre of education. Therefore, the orientation to the subject is as a matter of cardinal principle which cannot be done without both in educational theories and practices of all sorts. This understanding is of course inextricably connected to the subject’s relationship which occurs at different levels. Indeed, to talk about the subject without talking about his relationships is not to talk about the subject because the two termini, ‘subject and relationship’ cohere consistently and persistently in human developmental psychology, and indeed in life generally. This is with the understanding that relationship is an activity of the subject and the subject cannot be understood outside

⁷Foucault, M., In: Faubion, J. D. (Ed.), *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology: Essential works of Foucault 1958–1984*. <https://foucault.info/documents/foucault.biography>. Culled 26/10/2021.

⁸Boschki, R.: *Subjekt*. Culled from: <http://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/stichwort/100312/>. 08.05.2017.

his dialogical and relational orientation⁹ given that he is a “being-with”¹⁰ others only that he is at the centre of the relationship where the emphasis is put on the person qua person. This is the process of subjectification or maturity (*Mündigkeit*), which makes for the subject’s autonomy and capacity for responsible and independent thinking and action.

In an academic/human formative environment, the knowledge/harmony of the human person with his socio-anthropological and psychological consciousness together with his healthy relationship to the environment in union with the external universe is an inevitable precondition to his process of becoming, that is, self-actualization (subjectification). In view of this, Augustine of Hippo makes the case in this direction for the necessity of the adequate knowledge of the background, birth, parentage, provenance and personality of this [human] subject.¹¹ Thus, what is one’s driving force and experience? How old is one and what gender is being talked about? Is one rich or poor and indeed, what is the totality of the socio economic and probably political environment that one is coming from? This precondition asks after the entire person in their day to day life as well as their personal (pre)dispositions and experiences, that is, the general biography. The determination of the above mentioned (pre)conditions is a major advantage in the understanding and consequent education of the person towards his/her authentic personhood. Nevertheless, this is not to say, as Reinhold Boschki writes, that learning/education must always harmonize with the life biography of each subject because education does not have to

⁹ Cf. Boschki, R.: Von welchem Subjekt reden wir eigentlich? Für eine beziehungsorientierte Subjektconstruction in Pastoraltheologie und Religionspädagogik, in: Nauer, D. et al. (Hrsg.): Praktische Theologie. Bestandsaufnahme und Zukunftsperspektiven (Ottmar Fucks zum 60. Geburtstag). Stuttgart 2005, 58-64, 58.

¹⁰ Martin Heidegger uses this compound word in his general concept of “being-in-the-world” to explain human relations in the world, to oneself, to people and to things. He uses words such as “*Dasein*” (Being-there) and “*Mitsein*” (Being-with others) to buttress this idea of “being-with” relationship (cf. Heidegger, M.: *Being and Time. A Translation of Sein und Zeit*. Tr. by Stambaugh, J. State University of New York Press, New York 1996, 107/110).

¹¹ Cf. Aurelius, A.: *Bekenntnisse* (übersetzt von Hans Urs von Balthasar). Einsiedeln 1985, 8.

harmonize necessarily with the lifeworld of each person.¹² It however means that the various individual identities and biographies necessarily ought to be taken into account in the life of each subject and by extension, in the basic planning of any event around them. This is the classical dimension of the pedagogic didactic of the fundamental option for the personhood which, among other things, emphasizes and highlights the various situations of everything about everybody – the advantaged and the disadvantaged alike.¹³ Priority hereof is the alignment of the institutional offers and plans to reflect the overall conditions and lifeworld of the people who are being planned for in order that they may not be left out in the programme which is meant for them. In this light, learning and education of the subject is primarily socio-anthropological and psychological. It is directed towards the proper knowledge of the person in his/her various levels of relationships because he/she is not a lonely being who circles around himself/herself but is basically understood as a relational being.¹⁴ As a matter of fact, it is in and from these various levels of relationships that the subject is understood and could be approached. Hence, the educators and the *educands* (subjects) ought to be in a relational alignment in order to achieve a productive educational engagement. This makes the whole educational programme therefore a dialogue between the subjects and the educators, within the subjects themselves and among the educators themselves. This dialogue extends, as it were, to dialogue with the environment and to the whole world by and large. Indeed, a dialogic orientation towards the subject with regards to his various levels of relationships and connections is the stable footing in learning/education.

It remains nevertheless to clarify the concept of the subject in this connection. What Eric Stewart and Ariel Roy call “death of the

¹² Cf. Boschki, R.; Kießling, K.; Kohler-Spiegel, H.; Scheidler, M.; Schreijäck, T.: Grundoptionen der Religionspädagogik, in: Boschki, R., Schreijäck, S., et al. (Hrsg.): Grundoptionen der Religionspädagogik, 20.

¹³ More on this fundamental option will still be treated later in this write up.

¹⁴ Cf. Boschki, R.; Kießling, K.; Kohler-Spiegel, H.; Scheidler, M.; Schreijäck, T.: Grundoptionen der Religionspädagogik, in: Boschki, R., Schreijäck, S., et al. (Hrsg.): Grundoptionen der Religionspädagogik, 22.

subject”¹⁵ has awakened the necessity of unearthing the thematic of what/who the subject is. Thus, who is the subject and what is it all about? Andreas Schmidt and some other thinkers of the western enlightenment talk of it as the carrier of consciousness and the place of thought and desire.¹⁶It is “the mind, ego, or agent of whatever sort that sustains or assumes the form of thought or consciousness.”¹⁷In classical philosophy, the French philosopher, René Descartes, following his methodic doubt, in his “Discourse on Method of Rightly Conducting the Reason, and Seeking Truth in the Sciences,” understands the subject as the thinking being (*cogito ergo sum*) which distinguishes itself clearly from the objective world of nature.¹⁸ For the purpose of this writing, we delimit this philosophical enquiry into subject-hood to that of Rene Descartes in that it helps to distinguish clearly between the subject who is the thinker and what is being thought about (things outside of him). This makes the thinker relate in his thought and action to himself and to the rest of the world in different ways.

Beyond this Cartesian philosophical distinction, the issue of the subject and consequently subjectification comes up significantly in the theory of education where it is associated with the concept of maturity (*Mündigkeit*),¹⁹which entails making an own decision about the important things of life as well as being able to make a sound and responsible evaluation of other people’s lifestyle as well as social developments.²⁰ To this issue of maturity of the human individual who is the subject matter of education, belongs the ability to make independent decision (liberation of the mind/divorce from bias), competence to argue, empathy for others, among other things. The subject herein is characterized and distinguished by his biography, individuality, identity, experiences, autonomy and

¹⁵Stewart, E., Roy A.D.: Subjectification. In: Teo T. (eds) Encyclopedia of Critical Psychology. Springer, New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5583-7_358. Culled 26/10/2021.

¹⁶ Cf. Schmidt, A.: Subjekt, in: Enzyklopädie Philosophie III. 2010, 2632-2637.

¹⁷<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/subject>. Culled, 26/10/2021.

¹⁸ Cf. Descartes, R.: Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting the Reason, and Seeking Truth in the Sciences. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1637, 19.

¹⁹ Cf. Bergold, R.; Boschki, R.: Einführung in die religiöse Erwachsenenbildung. Darmstadt 2014, 15.

²⁰ Cf. Bergold, R./Boschki, R.: Einführung in die religiöse Erwachsenenbildung, 15.

peculiarity.²¹ In theological considerations, the subject – the concrete human person – cannot be defined without his connection to God. He is always interpreted in the context of his relationship to God and thereby is the focus of mainstream theological reflections as exemplified in Karl Rahner's concept of the "supernatural existential,"²² a concept which highlights the transcendental destiny of man (the subject cannot become or mature in God, unless he is relating actively to God). In this supernatural dimension, the subject is however horizontally anchored in his environment through dialogue which is an inevitable condition of his being with others. In this way, the subject's relationship with others is maintained while his individuality is safeguarded. This kind of dialogue also finds meaning in the individuality of each subject²³ as each is unique in their experiences and personhood. Hence, dialogue – with self, with others, with cultures, with languages, with ideologies and theories – is essential in the constitution of the subject. This leads to what Reinhold Boschki calls 'productive difference,'²⁴ which is a principle of individual's complementarity of one another.

1.3 The Subject and Relational Education: Its Hermeneutics/Roots

The concept of relationship concerning the subject, as is located within the context of theoretical and practical education that ultimately leads to subjectification, derives from a three

²¹ Cf. Wulf, C.; Zirfas, J. (Hrsg.): *Handbuch pädagogische Anthropologie*. Heidelberg 2014, 537-608.

²² Rahner, K.: *Über das Verhältnis von Natur und Gnade*, in: *Schriften zur Theologie* 1. Einsiedeln 1954, 323–45. See also Ernst, Cornelius: *Concerning the Relationship between Nature and Grace*, in: *Theological Investigations* 1. Helicon, Baltimore 1961, 297–317.

²³ Cf. Zima, P.: *Theorie des Subjekts. Subjektivität und Identität zwischen Moderne und Postmoderne*. Tübingen/Basel 2000, 408.

²⁴ The idea of productive difference bespeaks that the aim of dialogue and communication (in the pastoral) is not an ideal understanding and unopposed consent of the pastoral players but a situation where the divergent and unique identities and experiences of each is a complementary enrichment to one another. Cf. Boschki, R.: *Subjekt. Cullud from*: <http://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/stichwort/100312/>. 10.05.2017.

dimensional level of interdependent factors.²⁵ Thus education of the subject occurs, as Reinhold Boschki writes, when certain prerequisites are present in at least three levels vizly:

- a) Preoccupation with the content of the education
- b) Connection between the teacher (formator/educator) and the learner (formandi/educand), and
- c) Communicative condition of the learning process.²⁶

These levels are however to be more clearly appreciated through the three hermeneutical routes of understanding the interrelation between subjects and life.²⁷ These three routes include:

1. The content acquisition hermeneutic
2. The mediation hermeneutic
3. The relationship hermeneutic.²⁸

Thus, through the relationship existing within and around the subject, he maturely acquires the content of the mediated information while achieving his own autonomy. It is hence at the meeting points of these triad routes that the education process of the subject occurs and is understood because the subject cannot be understood outside his relationships.²⁹ Therefore the human person (the subject) becomes the (mature) subject through relational education.³⁰ Indeed, the content and methodology of this education is constituted by the various levels of relationships within which the subject finds himself.³¹ An indispensable element to this relationship is trust, which Martin Buber writes, “is the most inward

²⁵ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik. Darmstadt 2017, 102-103.

²⁶ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 103.

²⁷ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 103.

²⁸ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 103.

²⁹ Cf. Schwab, U.: Wahrnehmen und Handeln. Praktische Theologie als Subjektorientierte Theorie, in: Hauschild, E.; Schwab, U. (Hrsg.): Praktische Theologie für das 21. Jahrhundert. Stuttgart 2002, 161-175, 167.

³⁰ Cf. Mette, N.: Bausteine einer praktisch-theologischen Subjekttheorie, in: Mette, N.: Einführung in die katholische Praktische Theologie. Darmstadt 2005, 64-79, 66.

³¹ Cf. Boschki, R.: Die Beziehungen stärken, die Sachen klären. Konturen einer dialogisch-kreativen Religionsdidaktik, in: Schreijäck, T. (Hrsg.): Christwerden im Kulturwandel. Analysen, Themen und Optionen für Religionspädagogik und Praktische Theologie. Ein Handbuch. Freiburg i. Br. 2001. 507 – 254, 509. See also Boschki, R.: Subjekt. Culled from: <http://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/stichwort/100312/>. 10.05.1017.

achievement of the relationship in education.”³² This element of trust serves as a cohesive force within the relationship hermeneutics.

1.3.1 The Hermeneutic Approaches/Routes

*The Routes to subjectification*³³

1.3.1.1 First Route – Learning/Content (*Aneignung*): Experience and Subject Oriented

This angle engages squarely with the subject and his life experiences in the transmission of the content of education. As it asks about the content of knowledge, it asks after the conditions and the understanding capacity of the subject. This aspect searches into the sociological, developmental and psychological status like one’s pre-experience, pre-knowledge, social origin and milieu.³⁴ It has the subject at its focus as it investigates that which is to be known.

1.3.1.2 Second Route – Transmission (*Vermittlung*): Content and Tradition Oriented

This is the level of transmission of knowledge which is indeed more than mere instruction or transfer of contents. At the level of mediation in education, Reinhold Boschki writes that a reflection of the content occur while their relevance to life are determined.³⁵ Thus it goes beyond mechanical transfer of content from one person to another to a relational understanding of the meaning and relevance of the content as well as the biography of the subject.

³² Buber, M.: Über das Erzieherische, in Reden über Erziehung. 7th Ed. Lambert Schneider, Heidelberg [1925] 1986, 40.

³³ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 103.

³⁴ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 103-104.

³⁵ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 103.

1.3.1.3 Third Route – Relationship (*Beziehung*): Communication/Dialogue Oriented

This approach focuses on communication and relationship orientations. Relationship here, writes Reinhold Boschki, “is more than sympathy,” “means absolute acceptance,” “means responsibility,” “is really encountering and assimilating (*vergegenwärtigung*) the reality of the other person,” “is mutuality (*Gegenseitigkeit*).”³⁶ He considers this multifaceted aspects of communication and relationship, especially as it concerns learning and life which could have influence on the teaching and learning, in connection with the subject, who is at the centre of the relationship.³⁷ As it were, this subject enters into this relationship with himself, with nature, with others, with time, with culture and ultimately with God.³⁸

As it concerns this relationship theory, Reinhold Boschki writes:

Der entscheidende Punkt dieser Theorie religiöser Beziehung ist nun, dass sich die drei Hermeneutiken der Vermittlung, Aneignung und Beziehung von ihrer inneren Logik her nicht fremd sind, im Gegenteil, sie sind von ihrer Kernstruktur aufeinander bezogen. Vermittlungs-, Aneignungs- und Beziehungshermeneutik sind nicht drei verschiedene Verstehensweisen religiöser Bildung, die erst, ‚künstlich‘ zusammen gebracht werden müssen, sie sind im Grunde der Seiten der einen (Bildungs-) Wirklichkeit.³⁹

The above implies that the three hermeneutics of learning: content, transmission and relationship are deeply connected with one another in their inner logic. They are not to be seen as three different routes to education which ought to be cosmetically brought together, but are to be viewed as different sides of one reality. To

³⁶ Boschki, R.: Re-reading Martin Buber and Janusz Korczak. Fresh Impulses towards a relational approach to Religious Education, in: Religious Education. An Interfaith Journal of Spirituality, Growth and Transformation (Journal of the Religious Education Association of America), 100 (2005). No. 2, 114-126,118.

³⁷ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 104.

³⁸ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 104.

³⁹ Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 104.

further illustrate this, Reinhold Boschki centralizes the principle of the subject and his experiences as the fulcrum from where the other factors are to be understood. The subject here is the concrete human person in all his social, cultural, familial and institutional contexts, as well as his developmental possibilities and personal challenges.⁴⁰ Thus, the human subject becomes the central anchor point for education. Of importance is the understanding that the human subject is never comprehensible in isolation, but as a relational being.⁴¹ Reinhold Boschki puts it thus:

Menschsein und Glauben sind Beziehungsgeschehen unter den Bedingungen von Zeit. Menschsein und Glauben sind nur in Beziehung möglich. Die Beziehungen der Menschen sind vielfältig, vieldeutig und gleichzeitig gefährdet, das heißt, sie tragen einen Zeitindex. Alle menschlichen Beziehungen, insbesondere in ihrer Kontingenz und in ihrem Scheitern, werden theologisch im Horizont der Gottesbeziehung gedeutet.⁴² Menschsein heißt in Beziehung sein. Lebenswelt ist stets Beziehungswelt.⁴³

This relationship theme of the human subject becomes the central theme around which this paper is built. It centers on the subject of educational acquisition who is the agent of development and the locus of the interaction between the past and future as well as that of human culture in terms of in-culturation.

⁴⁰ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 104.

⁴¹ Cf. Bergold, R./Boschki, R.: Einführung in die religiöse Erwachsenenbildung, 14.

⁴² Boschki, R.: Beziehung als Leitbegriff der Religionspädagogik, 30.

⁴³ Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 104. See also Grümme, B.: Menschen bilden? Eine religionspädagogische Anthropologie. Freiburg 2012, 255-292; Boschki, R.; Kießling, K.; Kohler-Spiegel, H.; Scheidler, M.; Schreijäck, T.: Grundoptionen der Religionspädagogik, in: Boschki, R., Schreijäck, S., et al. (Hrsg.): Grundoptionen der Religionspädagogik. Freiburg/Basel/Wien 2008, 22.

1.4 Expanding the Relationship Approach – The Subject as a Relational Being

The human person in his uniqueness is not an isolated being. He is a relational essence. His process of subjectification (becoming - *Mündigkeit*), that means, acquiring his identity, autonomy, independence and maturity occurs not in isolation, but in relation to the universe around him. “*Er-ziehung*,” writes Reinhold Boschki, “*folgt Be-ziehung*.”⁴⁴ This suggests that education/upbringing presupposes relationship without which it is almost impossible for the person to become a subject. This relational dimension means that man is not alone in his world. He sustains his existence through his relationship to his environment, both immediate and remote, natural and supernatural. His existence by and large thereby has a natural and supernatural dimension whereby he depends, not only on himself, but significantly on external factors. This he does through various relational connections, on both horizontal and vertical dimensions. Writing on this, Reinhold Boschki and Ralph Bergold comment thus: “*Menschen sind nicht Einzel-sondern ,Beziehungswesen’. Sie können nur in ihren vielfältigen Beziehungen verstanden werden: ihren Beziehungen zu sich selbst, zu anderen, zur Welt, zur Zeit und in all diesen Beziehungen in ihrer Gottesbeziehung*.”⁴⁵ This implies the understanding of the subject, not as a monad, but as a relational essence. These various dimensions of human relationship touch the essence and core of the person who is in this relation with oneself and/or with others, especially with God the ultimate being. The relationship to God serves here as the basis of all other dimensions of human relationship whereby the human person could be understood entirely.

1.5 The Dimensions of the Subject’s Relationships

Albert Biesinger writes to the opinion that relationship is highly essential for subjectification and therefore the process of becoming a subject cannot happen outside the realm of relationship.⁴⁶ Within

⁴⁴ Boschki, R.: *Beziehung – Grundprinzip religiöser Bildung*, in: *Katechetische Blätter* 129 (2004), Heft 2, 140-148, 140

⁴⁵ Bergold, R./Boschki, R.: *Einführung in die religiöse Erwachsenenbildung*, 14.

⁴⁶ Cf. Grümme, B.: *Vom Anderen eröffnete Erfahrung. Zur Neubestimmung des Erfahrungsbegriffs in der Religionsdidaktik*, Gütersloh 2007; Biesinger, A.:

the above line of thinking, and with the general relational approach to education as found in Martin Buber,⁴⁷ who assigned relationship to the very beginning, when he writes, “in the beginning was relation,”⁴⁸ and from the other fields of education at the background, Reinhold Boschki highlights the contents of education (i.e., teaching and learning) along these five relational dimensions:

- A. Relationship to God (*Beziehung zu Gott*)
- B. Relationship to oneself (*Beziehung zu sich selbst*)
- C. Relationship to other people (*Beziehung zu anderen Menschen*)
- D. Relationship to the world (*Beziehung zur Welt*)
- E. Relationship to time (*Beziehung zur Zeit*).⁴⁹

To be mentioned however, is that these different dimensions crisscross one another and are theological as well as anthropological categories which define the subject in his vertical and horizontal relationships, thus, to God and to the created universe of man and nature.

Religionsunterricht als Beziehungslernen. Thesen zur Aufhebung falscher Alternativen, in: *KatBl* 108 (1983), 820-827.

⁴⁷ Cf. Buber, M.: Über das Erzieherische, in *Reden über Erziehung*, 30.

⁴⁸ Cf. Buber, M.: Ich und Du [I and Thou], in *Das dialogische Prinzip*. 5th Ed. Heidelberg [1923] 1984, 15/22.

⁴⁹ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 106; see also Boschki, R.: Beziehung – Grundprinzip religiöser Bildung, in: *Katechetische Blätter* 129, 3; Boschki, R.: Die Beziehung stärken, die Sachen klären. Konturen einer dialogisch-kreativen Religionsdidaktik, in: Schreijäck, T. (Hrsg.): *Christwerden im Kulturwandel. Analysen, Themen und Optionen für Religionspädagogik und praktische Theologie. Ein Handbuch*. Freiburg i. Br. 2001, 507-524, 510; Boschki, R.: The concept of relationship and its centrality to religious education, in: Bates, D. et al. (Eds.): *Education, Religion and Society. Essays in honour of John M. Hull*. Routledge, London and New York. 128-138, 131/136-167; Cf. Boschki, R.: Von welchem Subjekt reden wir eigentlich?, 63.

1.5.1 Relationship to God (*Beziehung zu Gott*)

Man is not just of an anthropological dimension, but by his nature of createdness, a “supernatural existential.”⁵⁰ He is essentially connected to God and cannot be defined without this God’s imprint. His being is hence the responsibility of a higher being that gave him life and sustains it in love. As it were, the first movement of the relationship between man and God comes from God to man in love, and the second movement goes from man to God through faith. In the Christian religious circle, faith is a cardinal element without which there is indeed no religion. Faith connects one to God and is the element of the relationship with him. The human person as the subject, in his personal development and process of maturity and learning, enters into a relationship with God although it is God who initially opens this relationship possibility given that in the Christian tradition, he stays in a basic relationship and communication to the world and humans as their creator, offering them by this token the possibility of communicating with him. Thus, from the Christian theological point of view, this relationship to God is a manifest divine gift and grace and is not a thing achieved per human effort. In the line of this understanding, Eberhard Jüngel writes thus:

Allein durch Gottes gnadenhaftes Handeln in Jesus Christus und im Heiligen Geist ist der Mensch gerechtfertigt und zum Glauben fähig. ‚Sola gratia – allein durch Gnade‘, allein durch Gottes barmherziges Wirken, nicht durch menschliches Wollen oder Verdienen, können die Menschen zu Gott finden, können sie ihn erkennen und an ihn glauben. Dieser sog. ‚Exklusivpartikel‘ sola gratia stellt sicher, ‚dass alles, was Gott der Menschheit in Jesus Christus, durch ihn und um seinetwillen zugewendet und angetan hat, ein bedingungsloses göttliches Geschenk, dass die Rechtfertigung des Sünders an ihm allein [...], aus lauter väterlicher, göttlicher Güte und

⁵⁰ Rahner, K.: Über das Verhältnis von Natur und Gnade, in: Schriften zur Theologie 1, 323.

Barmherzigkeit ohne all mein Verdienst und Würdigkeit‘ widerfahrenes Ereignis ist.⁵¹

This implies that it is God who offers humans his unconditioned and unconditional grace, salvation and his relationship as a gift. Nevertheless, this is not to negate the importance of human effort without which it becomes improbable for the realization of this relationship. God it is, who primarily takes the initiative towards this relationship to humans. One only has to recognize and appropriate this divine relational initiative for one’s own personal discovery, development and maturity.

An elemental factor that plays a major role in this relationship to God is his love. Nothing is more talked about in the Christian circle with regards to God as his love, for love is God’s nature (cf. 1 Jn 4:8). Hence, a basic ingredient in the relationship to him is loving him just as he loves the world (cf. Jn 3:16). To be more explicit, the relationship to God, as Reinhold Boschki writes, does have to occur in a trinitarian manner, thus, to God the Father, to Jesus the Christ and to the Holy Spirit.⁵² This is because Jesus Christ for one, remains as the final self-revelation of God in history and is thus so central to the content of Christian education. He – Jesus – is God’s relational offer to the world. As well, the Holy Spirit, as an undomesticated element in the Godhead, connects man and God mightily and serves as the enabling factor to discernment and recognition of the work of God among his creation. From the Holy Scriptures, one gains equally the insight into the depth of relationship existing between God and the world as well as that among men. Right from the creation narratives and down across the entire Scriptures, this relationship between God and his creation makes itself so evident. As a matter of fact and in the theological sense of it, all other dimensions of relationship derive and go back

⁵¹Jüngel, E.: *Das Evangelium von der Rechtfertigung des Gottlosen als Zentrum des christlichen Glaubens. Eine anthropologische Studie in ökumenischer Absicht.* 5. Aufl. Tübingen 2006, 148.

⁵² Cf. Boschki, R.: *Einführung in die Religionspädagogik*, 107.

to the primal relationship to God.⁵³ WITHOUT RELATIONSHIP TO GOD, ONE CAN NEVER BECOME

1.5.2 Relationship to Oneself (*Beziehung zu sich selbst*)

The first step to relating to oneself is identification of oneself (*Selbsterfahrung*). Here one asks the questions: “who am I?”, “what belongs to me?”, “what is important to me?”, “what can I do?”, “What and where are my strengths and weakness?”, “who am I in relation to others?”⁵⁴ These questions occupy a central position in the process of self-realization and growth especially when it comes to subjectification. Everybody wants to understand and be themselves, even as they want to be understood and known by others. Heiner Keupp, as it concerns this, writes that, “*Identität ist ein Projekt, das zum Ziel hat, ein individuell gewünschtes oder notwendiges ‘Gefühl von Identität‘ (sense of identity) zu erzeugen. Basale Voraussetzungen für dieses Gefühl sind soziale Anerkennung und Zugehörigkeit.*”⁵⁵ This connotes the desire to become, to be and to belong. No one wants to be excluded from the order of things and no one wishes not to be known. Foremost however, it has to do with the sense of being identical with oneself. Reinhold Boschki opines that one cannot acquire this feeling alone, but has to be mediated through social factors especially through relationships, for instance, to peer groups, circle of friends, work groups, clubs, cliques etc.⁵⁶ These avenues, he writes, are essential means of finding one’s own identity.⁵⁷ However, the modern time poses even a difficult identity challenge given its fluidity (Liquid modernity – Zygmunt Bauman), and there seem no more to be a constant but a mish mash of identities. Here, Heiner Keupp talks about patchwork of identities (“*Patchwork-Identitäten*” – [Photo-shopped identity]),⁵⁸ a term that implies an unsteady and mixed up

⁵³ Cf. Boschki, R.: Die Beziehungen stärken, die Sachen klären. Konturen einer dialogisch-kreativen Religionsdidaktik, 512.

⁵⁴ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 61.

⁵⁵ Keupp, H.: Diskursarena Identität. Lernprozesse in der Identitätsforschung, in: Keupp, H.; Höfer, R. (Hrsg.): Identitätsarbeit Heute. Klassische und aktuelle Perspektiven der Identitätsforschung. Frankfurt/M 1998, 34.

⁵⁶ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 62.

⁵⁷ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 62.

⁵⁸ Keupp, H. et al.: Identitätskonstruktionen. Das Patchwork der Identitäten in der Spätmoderne. 4. Aufl. Reinbek bei Hamburg 2008.

identities. Sequel to this, Reinhold Boschki comments that, *“Identität ist demnach keine feststehende Größe, die einmal erworben für alle Zeiten unverändert bliebe. Im Gegenteil: Identität ist ein dynamischer und lebenslanger Prozess.”*⁵⁹ This goes to buttress the point that the issue of identity acquisition is a steadily progressive life project which cannot be completed. By this very standard, self-identity is also a progressive affair. It is a fact that people could, with time, change or retain their disposition and identity, depending on the factors playing around them at any given time. This informs the rationale behind the writing that individual identity can be an essential composition of the totality of human identity.⁶⁰ From this point of view, it becomes tenable to say that one’s status of relationship to God helps one to mold one’s own self-identity. It helps one to understand one better and aids one in one’s relationship to the society or to other people thereby helping in a better identity and personality formation. Herein, the subject comes to terms with himself and about his strengths and weaknesses. This he learns also through prayers and meditations as well as inner soul searching exercises. Through this he discovers his inevitable connection to the rest of reality, beginning with God and then to the rest of the world and then how to love them all. To this, Reinhold Boschki writes that, *“Gottesliebe, Nächstenliebe und Selbstliebe bilden eine Einheit.”*⁶¹ This trinitarian love of God, of neighbour and of self therefore belong together and cannot be separated without harm being done to the essence of love and relationship.

In connection to self-identity is self-confidence, self-trust and self-respect. Reinhold Boschki writes in this direction that the learning of identity as an acquisition of autonomy and independence as well as self-identification leads to self-confidence and self-trust. In this way, learning process mediates the knowledge that the human person is not just mechanically dependent on God as a weak creation, but helps him to recognize himself as the image of

⁵⁹ Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 62.

⁶⁰ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 110.

⁶¹ Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 110.

God.⁶² An important aspect to this self-identity is what Boschki links to the Christian concept of metanoia, which implies self-reflection and inner conversion. This is the factor of positive self-relationship, which he says, presupposes metanoia - self-reflection, auto-critique and a readiness, always for a new beginning.⁶³ The last point raised by Reinhold Boschki in this relationship to oneself in this horizon is the factor of prayer and meditation.⁶⁴ These offer one the opportunity for confrontation with the Supreme Being – God, as with oneself. To be with oneself and with God is a thing taught and learnt in Christian education given that this urge for a divine and self-connection is a critical human need.

1.5.3 Relationship to Others (*Beziehung zu anderen Menschen*)

Man does not relate to himself alone, but is inextricably connected to others in what Martin Heidegger calls “Being-with” (*Mitsein*)⁶⁵ in his concept of *Da-sein* and *Mitda-sein*.⁶⁶ In this regard Martin Heidegger means that each (human) being is connected to the other and relates as such with others ontologically, hence, he is never without others.⁶⁷ The taxonomy of this being in its essence includes the supernatural and in this teaching, education communicates that man relates to others, as ordained by God,⁶⁸ even beyond one’s own faith persuasion, across other confessions and religions. The above heideggerian concept of “being-with” others in this sense entails the orientation to communion and setting up of communities extending even to ecumenical ones where persons of different fields and disciplines could interact with one another in an interdisciplinary fashion because even the ethical implications of living maintains that no one particular discipline does have the monopoly of truth,⁶⁹ in the becoming of the subject, and each can learn from the other.

⁶² Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 110.

⁶³ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 111.

⁶⁴ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 111.

⁶⁵ Heidegger, M.: Being and Time, 110.

⁶⁶ Heidegger, M.: Being and Time, 113.

⁶⁷ Heidegger, M.: Being and Time, 110.

⁶⁸ Cf. Groome, T.: Education for Life. A Spiritual Vision for every Teacher and Parent. The Crossroad Publishing Company, New York 2001, 80-81.

⁶⁹ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 110.

Indeed, these interdisciplinary indices are instances of learning in the academic/learning field where it becomes imperative to connect to other people with the fundamental understanding that man cannot be understood in isolation of his relationship to others especially as it concerns his status of createdness. Because of this, virtues such as academic compassion, empathy and justice, as well as the removal of unjust socio-mental dis-enfranchising ecosystemic structures while replacing them with just ones becomes ethical and formative duties and demand that ought to be learned and instituted in a learning environment in order to enhance a subject's process of complete becoming.

1.5.4 Relationship to the World (*Beziehung zur Welt*)

The givenness (*Da-seinsgegebenheit*) of man's situation of "being-in-the-world,"⁷⁰ makes him ontologically part and parcel of the world. Here, the consideration about how one confronts the realities around one is brought into discussion. Realities such as the social structures, cultures, art, religion, Church, nature, etc., are realities within which man finds himself in the world. He cannot extricate himself from these and therefore is in constant interaction with them willy-nilly. Foremost, the world of nature considered from the perspective of creation is a point of contact with the creator. From the outset, man, being part and parcel of nature, is born into a culture and belongs to a particular society. His process of growth exposes him to the magnificence and wonder of a natural order which makes him embrace a type of conviction nay disposition. This disposition constantly brings him in an unavoidable contact with his world and universe, acknowledged or unacknowledged. In the academic/learning circle, this acknowledgement is deeply expressed in the subject's behaviour and characteristic manifestations even within an organized institutional curriculum and form whereby man ought to learn more and more and know himself as well as the tenets and laws of his universe. Hence, learning and subjectification do not occur in vacuum but all happen within these relational media in an institutional culture where man

⁷⁰Heidegger, M.: Being and Time, 107.

is found, and as Johann Baptist Metz writes, this occurs in the world and not near nor against the world.⁷¹ As it were, in education, hence, the healthy relationship with the world itself serves as a veritable medium of subjectification by means of the entire nature itself, through culture, the art, science and the society.

1.5.5 Relationship to Time (Beziehung zur Zeit)

One of the most observed phenomena that separates events in the human physical dimension is the concept of time. Its most consistent characteristic is the fact that it is in flux and is dynamic, ever changing and impermanent. Its passage is imperceptible and unconscious while its reality is illusory given that it is a flowing continuum. It consists of each moment during the day and across the seasons of the year. Amidst this constant inconsistency, there is the interwovenness between time and relationship⁷² especially in a subject's process of becoming. Humans relate to time and it is in time that all of human activities are ordered and organized. The basic relation to time in the human order is connected to the concept of past, present and future, in the sense of what was, what is and what is to come, whereby that past, present and the future remain an indivisible single entity. The subject relates to the past in order to evaluate it, relates to the present in order to know how to maximize it and relates to the future in order to build it – this is progressive subjectification.

Another dimension of human relationship to time as it connects to a person's subjectification is seen in individual biographies (experiences) and life. Education and learning aid in the organization and appreciation of the major events in an individual's life such as birth, puberty, adolescence, marriage, ordination, sickness, dying and death, etc., and the comprehension of these moments aid one's proper becoming as well as define one's universal appreciation of reality. Hence, for educators and for the *educands*, a panoramic appreciation of an individual's biography is

⁷¹Cf. Metz, J. B.: *Glaube in Geschichte und Gesellschaft. Studien zu einer praktischen Fundamentaltheologie*. 5. Aufl. Mainz 1992[1977], in: Boschki, R.: *Einführung in die Religionspädagogik*, 109.

⁷² Cf. Boschki, R.: *Beziehung als Leitbegriff der Religionspädagogik*, 65.

inevitable for the development of relationship between the educator and *educand* for a targeted education which leads to an individual's self-awareness and maturity, and this leads to individuation (subjectification). In all of this, being in the present or connecting to the present which implies speaking the language of the present, plays an underlying role in human relationship to his time as it is observed in that Vat. II Document, the Pastoral Constitution On the Church in the Modern World, *Gaudium et Spes*, that "The joys and the hopes, the griefs and the anxieties of *the men of this age...*" (GS 1), with double emphasis on "the men of this age."

The determinant factor in the aforementioned structuring of the contents of the subject's relationship in the above five relationship dimensions, is their interrelatedness. This means that none of the dimensions ought to be approached in isolation nor adjacent to the others, and ultimately, all of them flow into and out of one another. Boschki writes, "*Im Prozess [...] Bildung muss bei jedem Einzelthema stets der Bezug aufs Ganze und auf die Zentralität der Gottesbeziehung gegeben sein.*"⁷³ This highlights the interconnectedness of the individual dimensions with one another as well as their common source from their relation to God who gives it as a gift and ought to be brought into a lived and sensitized awareness by man.

1.6 Evaluation and Conclusion

1.6.1 Evaluation: The Subject's Relationships vs Education in the Context of Dialogue

Intrinsically connected to the theme of this relationship in the learning process and consequent subjectification is the factor of dialogue – Dialogue between the educator and the *educand* (i.e., between teacher and subject). Indeed, dialogue is the instrument of academic relationship and educational acquisition. Foremost, the concept of dialogue needs to be understood especially in the learning and subjectification context. Here, Walter Kasper

⁷³ Cf. Boschki, R.: Einführung in die Religionspädagogik, 113.

writes: “im Gegensatz zu Monolog, die in der vor einem einzigen Sprecher totalitär entfaltenen Rede ist, ist Dialog das Geschehen des Gesprächs, in welchem der Andere als er selbst zu Wort kommt wie ich selbst und die Sache, um die es im Gespräch geht.”⁷⁴ Hence, the concept of dialogue, which found its way into our academic context from the Greek⁷⁵ implies, as Emmanuel Levinas opines, an engagement between two or more parties in a conversation or mutual understanding and possible compromise to issues with the most authentic and original form of language where one is there for the other.⁷⁶ This means that dialogue lives from the reciprocity of the speech and response (it connotes here the concept of teaching – which involves the other instead of just of lecturing which pedagogically excludes the other). It consists in exchange of arguments, experiences and perspectives, and aims to understanding, clarity and consciousness. Its aim is to know and understand better. Indeed, as Pope Francis, in his 2013 Apostolic Exhortation, *Evangelii Gaudium*, has it, it is “much more than the communication of a truth...” (EG 142).

Martin Buber, in his ethics of intersubjectivity gives an insight into a comprehensive understanding of this concept of dialogue. For him, man is fundamentally a relational being who cannot but be in dialogue – communicate. His major thesis assumes that man, through the dialogical “Basic words,” (I-Thou) *Grundwörter*,⁷⁷ expresses his relational dispositions to his fellow man, to nature and to God.⁷⁸ These, he says, defines man’s existence and through this, man truly becomes. These *Grundwörter* or Basic words imply dialogue that comes in two different levels, either at the level of “I-It” existence or the level of “I-You” relationship.⁷⁹ Noteworthy however, is that at the “I-It” level, there is no real relationship and dialogue does not occur because at this level, man

⁷⁴ Kasper, W., in: LThK³. Bd. 3. Freiburg 1995, 191-192.

⁷⁵ Cf. Krämer, K.; Vellguth, K. (Hrsg.): *Mission und Dialog. Ansätze für ein kommunikatives Missionsverständnis* (Theologie der Einen Welt. Bd. 1). Tresburg 2012, 16.

⁷⁶ Cf. Levinas, E.: *Ethik und Unendlichkeit. Gespräch mit Philippe Nemo*, in: Casper, B.: *Dialog, Dialogik* (I. Philosophisch), in: LThK³. Bd. 3, 192.

⁷⁷ Cf. Buber, M.: *Ich und Du in Das dialogische Prinzip*. Heidelberg 1984, 7.

⁷⁸ Cf. Buber, M.: *I and Thou. A New Translation, With A Prologue And Notes* By Walter Kaufmann. Touchstone book, New York 1970, 53.

⁷⁹ Cf. Buber, M.: *I and Thou*, 56.

sees and speaks about the other only as an object of experience that could be used given that he is so distanced and feels not connected (**objectification**). In contrast to this non-dialogical connection, Martin Buber describes and proffers the real relational dialogue that defines intercommunication and intersubjectivity which comes at the “I-You” level,⁸⁰ or what Immanuel Levinas calls “the face-to-face encounter, or the intersubjective relation at its precognitive core; viz., being called by another and responding to that other.”⁸¹ This is the level of strong intersubjective relationship which does not handle the other as object but as a subject at the level of co-existential equality. This is the rank of equality, mutuality, commonality and reciprocity⁸² where relationship plays a substantive role because it is within this relationship context that the notion of dialogue can only be qualified.⁸³ At this level of dialogue, Buber categorizes three spheres: life with nature, life with men and life with spiritual beings.⁸⁴ Here, true dialogue occurs, when a valid knowledge of the other is made while the other is considered a subject, as each learns from each and each one’s life betters that of the other.⁸⁵ As it were then, human history is ontological and that implies that as it concerns his humanness and being, he cannot but be in this dialogue and encounter which could be on a deep or superficial level. At the deep level, learning is effected while at the superficial level, only indoctrination which is at best, a deformation of the subject.

⁸⁰ Cf. Buber, M.: *I and Thou*, 55-56.

⁸¹ Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: Emmanuel Levinas. Culled from: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/levinas/>. 20.10.2016.

⁸² Cf. Buber, M.: *I and Thou*, 56.

⁸³ Boschki, R.: *Die Beziehung stärken, die Sachen klären. Konturen einer dialogisch-kreativen Religionsdidaktik*, 509.

⁸⁴ Cf. Buber, M.: *I and Thou*, 56-56. The five (5) relational approach to subjectification and education derives from this Buberian categorization.

⁸⁵ Cf. Rath, M.: *Intersubjektivität*, in: *LThK*³. Bd. 5. Freiburg 2006, 564; Cf. Buber, Martin: *Ich und Du in Das dialogische Prinzip*, 1.

1.6.2 Conclusion

The above Buberian submission, especially at the “I-You” level makes a strong case for the concept of real encounter/relationship/dialogue as it is to be applied in the educational learning process, where the educator and the *educand* meet themselves at the “I-You” dialogical relationship as exemplified in Christ’s incarnation, where divinity took up humanity without the destruction of human nature but fully preserving it so that humans will fully be humans, in such manner also does the educator (teacher) have to assume the nature of the *educand* (subject) without displacing it, but aiding him in discovering it. Hence, the process of knowledge content transmission and acquisition is a fundamental reality of being human in a quasi-equal level of “being-with” because “the human being can only be really human [and come to full autonomy and self-discovery] only in relation to one another.”⁸⁶ In this transmission vs acquisition process, the educator (teacher) and the *educand* (subject) depend on this dialogue, in truth, openness and meaningful sensibility.⁸⁷ In this way learning becomes an open dialogue with the prerequisite condition of mutual listenership and co-operation with oneself, with others, with time, with the world and ultimately with God. This open dialogue and communication is fundamental and does not have the aim of unmasking self-deceit or hidden privacy of the other, but sincere openness for the sake of understanding of perspectives and hope of consensus and progress.⁸⁸ It is not to be understood as a technique in education but as a specific form of presentation, communication, information and perception of the truth of education⁸⁹ that leads to the maturity of

⁸⁶Fahlbusch, E.; Lochman, M. J.; Mbiti, J.; Pelican, J. and visher L. (Hrsg.): Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon. Internationale Theologische Enzyklopädie³. Bd. 1. Göttingen 1986, 871.

⁸⁷ Cf. Böhme, M.; Naumann, B.; Ratzmann, W.; Ziemer J. (Hrsg.): Mission als Dialog. Zur Kommunikation des Evangeliums Heute. Leipzig 2003, 5.

⁸⁸Cf. Sauter, G.: Theologische Dialogik, in: Krause, G. und Müller G. (Hrsg.): Theologisches Realenzyklöpädie. Studienausgabe, Teil 1. Bd. VIII. Berlin 1993, 703-709, 703.

⁸⁹Cf. Sauter, G.: Theologische Dialogik, 703-709, 704; cf. Lutz, B.: Dialog und Netzwerk – Elemente zukunftsfähiger Gemeindepastoral, in: Höring, P.; Dölken, C.; Agan, U. P. (Hrsg.): Theologie im Dialog mit der Welt (Jahrbuch der Philosophisch-Theologischen Hochschule SVD St. Augustin). St. Augustin 2013, 155 – 169, 157.

the subject and in this way dialogue/relationship and learning belong inseparably together,⁹⁰ and these lead the recipient subject towards auto transcendence, self-discovery and fruitful subjectification.

⁹⁰ Cf. Beinert, W.: Dialog und Kirche, 35, in: Mensen, B (Hrsg.): Dialog (Akademie Völker und Kulturen St. Augustin Bd. 25). Nettetal 2002, 33-43.