

Spontaneity and the Spaces Between

Fatma Kargin

When considered in terms of museum(s), where does 'learning' really take place? In a workshop or a seminar room during a mediation offer, or in the halls and galleries of a museum with a guided tour? Or, simply, in none of these spaces? The question of space and learning is a result of my ongoing empirical research in which the spectators of an installation artwork in an exhibition room in Denmark are spontaneously asked to think aloud and film the entire process of spectatorship with a GoPro action camera. Based on the filmed *processes* that are recorded through the perspective of the spectators, research reconstructs the gaze, movement, and the constructed narratives in relation to responsivity, performativity, and materiality, and thus theorizes various styles of spectatorship. With an explorative search for the space(s) of learning, this article can also be read as a negotiation or theorization of such spaces situated at the intersection of theoretical positions between space, learning, *Bildung*, and responsive phenomenology.

For such an explorative search, the article assumes that learning in the context of museums – or even in an academic context – can be considered an event (*Ereignis*). Events, as Alva Noë argues, are “creatures of time. They are temporally extended in nature. They are never whole. At the beginning, they have not yet achieved a conclusion. At the end, their beginning is done with.”¹ Noë further concludes that the “past and the future are not present [in events], but they are implicated by them.”² In a similar manner, Bernhard Waldenfels argues that what happens ‘here and now’ constitutes the ‘not-yet’ and ‘not-anymore’,³ and therefore points to the temporally extended nature of events. Furthermore, events

have a space-time constituting effect⁴ and are results of continuous interlinking (*Anknüpfung*) and taking up of something.

Similarly, the 'learning' I refer to in this article can be understood as a playful interlinking, always at the floating intersection of movement (also as thinking), deviation, escalation, rejection, acceptance, or challenge. Constantly from one event into another, building on what is there, changing not only the *knowledge*, but also the way in which the manner of acquiring knowledge constantly deviates and shifts. Learning,⁵ as Käte Meyer-Drawe argues, can also be understood as an execution (*Vollzug*) and an activity;⁶ learning, she further concludes, always signifies the history [history of socialization] of the learners, as well as their divergent and conflictual process of change.⁷ In such an execution / activity, Meyer-Drawe ascribes an 'awakening' character to learning, whereas the learning describes a 'beginning' but by no means a 'completion'.⁸ The metaphor of 'awakening as learning' can further be understood as a transition and/or a response which do not rely or are not based on the initiative of individuals.⁹ – Such a response is always eventful. – In her concept of learning, Meyer-Drawe also differentiates between 'learning, unlearning and relearning', whereas the 'relearning' (*Umlernen*) describes something which not only happens in 'experience', but takes place 'as experience'.¹⁰ Such a relearning which equates an awakening always starts with an affect (*Widerfahrnis*) which comes from somewhere else, from others.¹¹

Parallel to the 'awakening' character, learning can be thought of as a (responsive) event, which, in itself is eventful and event-like. By being an event, and therefore having these qualities, learning, I suggest, brings forth its own temporality and spatiality. That is to say, it brings forth and claims its own space as an event. In comparing learning to an *event* and pointing out its eventfulness and event-like quality, this article lays emphasis on its space and spatiality. Such a space, I suggest, can be understood in terms of a performative space in which an event/ a performance takes place. As Erika Fischer-Lichte argues in the context of theater and performance studies, a performative space neither pre-dates a performance, nor represents a construct;¹² but, it is brought forth through the performance itself. On the assumption that this argument also applies to

learning as an event, I explore, first, the conditions of emergence and functions of performative spaces, and renegotiate them in terms of spaces of learning. With a phenomenological approach, I sketch out a *space between* that equally relies on the inevitability of responding and a request which comes from somewhere else/the Other à la Waldenfels.

I Performative spaces

As the text suggests that *learning as an event* takes place in performative spaces, I first discuss briefly the conditions of emergence and the modality of such spaces in relation to the co-presence of bodies. Performative spaces, as Fischer-Lichte defines them, refers to all spaces in which a performance takes place. Such spaces, usually theatres, open “special possibilities for the relationship between actors and spectators and for the movement and perception. Whatever the ways in which these possibilities are used, applied, realized, treated, or, alternatively, subverted, they affect the performative space.”¹³ They also need to be distinguished from architectural-geometric spaces¹⁴ in which a performance takes place. Fischer-Lichte compares these places, to a certain extent, to containers; as they pre-date and contain the performance/event and continue to exist long after the performance.¹⁵ While the spatiality of such “containers” is, for instance, given, the spatiality of performative spaces is brought forth anew by the performance.¹⁶

This kind of spatiality can be compared to the spatiality of the body, insofar as the body’s spatiality changes, and therefore does not represent a fixed point in space. Merleau-Ponty notes that the body’s spatiality resembles much more a *situational spatiality*,¹⁷ than a positional one. A situational spatiality indicates that, for instance, words such “here”, “under,” and “on” anchor the active body¹⁸ / phenomenal body in an object and space, and do not refer to a determinate position and place in space. A body’s spatiality, for instance, is brought forth through movement,¹⁹ and it contributes to generating the spatiality of performative spaces. Furthermore, the spatiality of performative spaces is marked as ‘unstable and fluctuating,’ as they transform and mutate with every movement

of the actors and spectators, and with spatial arrangements.²⁰ That is to say that bodies play a significant role in bringing forth the spatiality of performative spaces. If thought within the discourse of the sociology of space and in relation to bodies, Martina Loew makes a pointed and parallel argument on the construction of social space (*Sozialraum*)²¹ and argues with Bourdieu that such a space is a social structure (*Gefüge*) which is brought forth through the movements/actions²², and therefore does not pre-exist.

Similarly, in the context of stage (*Bühne*), Waldenfels notes that it is a space in which something occurs, something takes place²³. It is, particularly, a 'space in becoming'; such a space does not pre-exist, but it paves its own way, along with its spatiality and temporality during the performance.²⁴ He further explicates that such a space does not represent a mere construct, rather, it functions as an instance of orientation and anchoring in experience.²⁵ In a similar argument, Fischer-Lichte, too, indicates that spatiality is transitory and fleeting,²⁶ and argues that the performative space, unlike architectural-geometric space, does not represent a construct or a work of art, and that its performativity needs to be attributed to events.²⁷

For generating the performativity of space, and with regard to spatiality, Fischer-Lichte introduces three strategies:

“first, the use of an (almost) empty space or one with variable arrangements allowing for the unrestricted movement of actors and spectators; second, the creation of spatial arrangements enabling so far unexplored possibilities for the negotiation of relationships between actors and spectators, movement and perception; and third, the experimentation with given spaces usually fulfilling other purposes.”²⁸

Especially with the third strategy she emphasizes that this bears the potential to “blend real and imagined spaces [and thus] defines the performative space as a ‘space between.’”²⁹ Such a ‘space between’, if thought again in terms of Loew, not only comprise the real ones, but also the imagined ones.³⁰ The theory of spaces between pertains primarily to the theatre and performance studies. However, I suggest that it can be extended

to any space in which bodies co-exist, perform, act, engage, and simply, occupy that space with various purposes. Within this experimental negotiation I will focus on museums and sketch out a space between which not only results from the experimentation of given spaces, but one that can also be brought forth through experimental approaches in a broader sense.

II Spaces between

To further conceptualize performative spaces as ‘spaces between’, I suggest broadening and negotiating this concept and its emergence in relation to presence, presentness and mood. Performative spaces as spaces between offer the possibility of blending the *real* and the *imagined*. As they accommodate such a possibility, they also function as a ‘liminal space’, a space for possible transformations.³¹ Fischer-Lichte notes that the spatiality of performative space “results not just from the specific spatial uses of the actors but also from the particular atmospheres these spaces exude.”³² Atmospheres, according to Boehme, represent the collective reality of the perceived and the perceiver. That is to say, it is the reality of the perceived as a sphere of its presence, and, at the same time, it is the reality of the perceiver, insofar that the perceiver experiences their own corporeality while experiencing the atmosphere.³³ Following Boehme’s definition, Fischer-Lichte argues that through atmospheric space, spectators become aware of their own corporeality; the atmosphere penetrates the bodies and breaks down their limits.³⁴ Accordingly, she concludes that through this process, the performative space functions as a liminal space of transformation.³⁵ Spectators are not “positioned opposite to or outside the atmosphere; they are enclosed by and steeped in it.”³⁶ Following Boehme, atmosphere is considered as a “sphere of presence,” which is neither specifically located in a thing that radiates them nor pertains to a person who experiences them.³⁷ Atmosphere pertains to both of them,³⁸ that is to say, it lies in-between, as present.

However, I suggest that spheres of presence or the presentness of the spaces between does not only represent or result from atmospheric space, à la Boehme. In his text *Bildung vor Bildern*, Pazzini negotiates the concept of mood (*Stimmung*) in the context of educational processes.³⁹ As he notes, a mood can be brought along, found in a space, or, alternatively, it can emerge ad hoc, or be triggered.⁴⁰ Moods affect, and are infectious. They pertain neither to objects, or attached to things that causes them, nor to the bodies that radiate or perceive them. Moreover, a mood is not a representation of something; it is, nonetheless present as spatial and temporal.⁴¹ Mood, Pazzini argues, exceeds the individual subjects, affects and encompasses multiple individuals, and sets something in motion.⁴² Mood, in this sense, can be regarded as transformative; since it “arouses, and can be aroused. It captivates, it can carry one away, and can lead one up until the point of a lapse.”⁴³ The concept of mood, as vague as it may seem at first sight, captures the spheres of presence and the presentness of the spaces between. Mood, in my view, shapes the spaces in-between, and brings them forth as such. Through ‘mood,’ temporality and spatiality of the spaces between become present (for individuals). Moreover, in/with a ‘mood,’ individuals experience their own corporeality, spatiality, and temporality, since they experience themselves as present.

Presence emerges, is articulated and perceived through the body.⁴⁴ Fischer-Lichte notes in the context of performance that, presence does not refer to the appearance of something extraordinary; “instead, it marks the emergence of something very ordinary and develops it into an event.”⁴⁵ – One might add that this kind of emergence occurs in experience. – Similarly, with regard to the presence of bodies and that of events/performances, Waldenfels argues that a performance, an event, or any kind of happening which takes place brings forth its own temporality and spatiality.⁴⁶ Especially in the context of events he notes that every event in which the individuals are particularly involved takes place in an intermediate area.⁴⁷ – that is to say, in spaces between. – An intermediate area can further be understood as a betwixt and between space which emerges in experience as such. Moreover, Waldenfels argues that such spaces are, to a certain extent, ambiguous.⁴⁸ This kind

of ambiguity results from the condition that a stage/a space between can only be considered and brought forth as such, if the individuals perform, if the performance/event attracts attention and manages to transform the present bodies into spectators [or co-actors].⁴⁹

Spaces between emerge as present. They pertain neither to particular individuals that may partially trigger or be involved in them, nor do they merely belong to the space itself.⁵⁰ This kind of presence results from the movements, interactions and, more generally, from diverse responses of the individuals, either semi-scripted or temporally structured ones as in the case of some performances, events or mediation offers, or rather spontaneous ones. If thought again in terms of Pazzini, spaces between also emerge as present in, through and out of a certain mood – while also establishing a certain mood and functioning as captivating and contagious (*ansteckend*). As a direct response to that what is happening, taking place, they can be triggered spontaneously, or come forth unexpectedly and spontaneously. In this regard, I will briefly discuss the concept of spontaneity – as developed in my doctoral research – as a responsive-transformative strategy (*Anlass*) for museums as spaces of learning, as spaces between.

III Spontaneity

Interactions of individuals/spectators with each other, with the space, and with the event shape the spaces between. Such interactions can be the result of a certain mood or affect. Alternatively, they can also constitute a certain mood and thus bring forth a space between as present. Fischer-Lichte indicates that a performance/event only comes into being and claims its space through the performance/event itself; that is to say, through the interactions between the performers and spectators.⁵¹ Resulting from this argument, she further concludes that “the act of receiving is a creative and transformative act.”⁵² Fischer-Lichte’s ‘act of receiving’ is by no means a passive digesting. On the contrary, it relies heavily on individuals and therefore their capabilities of bringing forth the performance/event and its performative space as such. For the spaces be-

tween sketched out here, I would like to think Fischer-Lichte's creative and transformative act of receiving more in terms of a creative and transformative way of responding, and therefore renegotiate it in terms of responsivity.

As Waldenfels argues, responsivity refers to the understanding that "all of our speech, action and feeling begins elsewhere, namely with our being struck, touched, affected or approached, and that we respond to this, whether we want or not."⁵³ Responsivity, he further concludes, needs to be differentiated from "the orientation of intentionality to sense as well as from the rule-directedness of communicativity."⁵⁴ More generally, he defines the responsivity as the main character of human behavior,⁵⁵ which calls for a specific form of response.⁵⁶ Such a form is not reduced to a linguistic response, rather, it is a bodily response in corporeal responsory and shapes the entire behavior of individuals to themselves, to others, and more generally, to the world as such.⁵⁷ In addition, Waldenfels differentiates between two types of responses; productive/creative and reproductive responses.⁵⁸ By creative response he indicates that the responder never gives a pre-existing response to the stimuli, rather, a response first develops in the process of responding.⁵⁹ One might add that such a response shapes/ and emerges in spaces between. Waldenfels argues that "the *by-what* of being touched [gets] transformed into the *to-what* of responding,⁶⁰ – and this with a genuine shift in time – and therefore points at the transformative character of the responding process. Waldenfels furthermore defines 'responding' as a performative act⁶¹ and therefore distinguishes it from the content of the response itself. Responsivity, he argues, is directly connected with a request which comes from the Other/ Somewhere else.⁶² Such a request can take the form of a demand, appeal, claim, excitement or a challenge;⁶³ alternatively, it can also appear as a disruption or an interference.⁶⁴ Such a request is, he argues, nothing but that to-what we respond when we say something and act.⁶⁵ Consequently, he then defines 'a response' as our touching upon that which we feel affected, struck by or appeals to us.⁶⁶

More crucially, Waldenfels lays emphasis on the inevitability of responding when faced with a request/demand; and argues that, for in-

stance, a conscious not-responding defines actually a form of response; a looking-away is a form of looking; and similarly, a remaining silent is at the end a form of speech.⁶⁷ This kind of inevitability is, in the end, what a performance/ an event relies on. A not-responding is a direct and inevitable response to that which occurs, takes place. Moreover, a not-responding can also be interpreted as a creative and possibly transformative way of responding, since it becomes a part of what is happening, taking place, and therefore, shapes it as well.

As mentioned above, a disruption, an interference, or, alternatively, a direct irritation can function as a request by appearing as a rupture in the everyday course of events which then imposes a response on the responder/spectator. Such a rupture can occur either spontaneously, as something that falls out of the ordinary, or can be brought about by someone as a spontaneous request to act, perform or engage. Such spontaneous requests can be experienced as inviting, playful, or alternatively, repelling, provoking, and disturbing. Moreover, they can also set an uncertain and ambiguous mood in motion, and thus attract curiosity and therefore elicit a collaborative behavior, or, alternatively, result in a sort of resistance – which is a response nonetheless. Whatever the ways in which such requests are experienced, they trigger, ultimately set something in motion and even act as an event by themselves.

For bringing forth the spaces between, spontaneous requests/demands function as a sort of rupture – which falls out of the ordinary – and as such, they ultimately provoke an action, a response, either a linguistic or a bodily one. They therefore trigger a process, an event-like situation which is only constituted through the responses of the individuals/spectators. Spontaneous requests to act or engage in various settings can thus be understood as responsive – even performative – as they are directed towards a response. They can also be thought of as transformative; not only because the responding is a performative act, as Waldenfels states, but because of the possibility of undergoing a (temporary) transformation during the process of responding – which is a liminal state. Spontaneity as one of the basic forms of human behavior can thus be understood as a responsive-transformative strategy that

brings forth the spaces between. Where the real and imagined melt into each other.

IV Conclusion

Now, after this brief discussion on the conditions of emergence, possible triggers, presence, and the presentness of the spaces between, I would like to take a step back and pose the same bundle of questions that initiated this entire negotiation. “When considered in terms of museum(s), where does ‘learning’ really take place? In a workshop or a seminar room during a mediation offer, or in the halls and galleries of a museum with a guided tour? Or, simply, in none of these spaces?” *Learning as an event* is the presupposition of this article. And as such, it is a temporally extended process, one that brings forth and claims its own space as a responsive event. Moreover, learning is eventful and event-like. As indicated in the introduction, learning signifies a playful interlinking, a constant movement at the intersection of deviation, escalation, rejection, and challenge. Always from one event into another. Or as Meyer-Drawe puts it, learning is an awakening, a beginning without a certain completion.

If thought about in the context of museums, the structure and the variety of settings differ from a classical teaching setting at an academy. However, as indicated above, such a structure can be compared to a container, which is given and its spatiality does not rely on the co-presence of the bodies. Spaces between as the spaces of *events and spaces of learning*, on the other hand, can only be brought forth through the co-presence of bodies, through actions, interactions, and responses. *Spontaneity*, for instance, can be used not only to create an event, but as an event, an occasion (*Anlass*) by itself. Such an event can take the form of a direct appeal for spectators to engage with a certain work of art, or to collaborate with each other. Only during such an engagement or encounter between a spectator and a work of art, or during the interaction of multiple spectators a space between can be brought forth as present. If thought again with Meyer-Drawe, such an ‘awakening’ can also be thought in terms of

an encounter with a work of art, whereas the artwork functions as an impulse which comes from somewhere else, attracts attention and therefore requires a response. Only in the process of responding does such a space between emerge as present.

Through this brief and experimental discussion, the article compares learning to an event in order to negotiate a space for it. With the assumption of learning as an event, it argues that it takes place in *spaces between* – a performative space where the real and imagined melt into each other. Such a space is transitory, and constantly mutates, as is the case with performances and events. Spaces between, I would like to argue, ultimately rely on the inevitability of responding and a request which comes from the other, somewhere else. Moreover, such spaces are responsive and transformative. Similarly, in terms of Fischer-Lichte, also liminal. Spaces between as sketched out here emerge in experience as present and do not represent a physical construct. They emerge not only as a result of the experimentation with given spaces – as conceptualized for performances – but also through a range of experimental approaches in general. For instance, through the introduced concept of spontaneous request to act, perform, or engage in the context of the museum. Such requests, as explicated, can define something which attracts attention, or induce a sort of provocation, alternatively, can be a direct appeal for an engagement, be it with a work of art or with the other spectators. At this point, I also would like to emphasize that my sketch of learning, *Bildung*, and spaces between are also equally applicable concepts to academical settings where the learning processes can also take place spontaneously, eventfully and unexpectedly. However, within the current discourse of *Bildung* and skills-based learning-and-teaching, as well as in the context of related theoretical positions, such concepts are mostly neglected, or barely considered.

Spaces between can further be situated in the context of transformative educational processes. The main premise of the theory, as Koller argues, marks the higher-level learning as educational processes (*Bildung*) and indicates that individuals in such processes not only acquire new knowledge, but they may undergo a certain transformation.⁶⁸ Behavioral changes (*Denk-, Handlungsdispositionen*), as Koller argues, can

be consequences of such transformations in relation to the self, and the world.⁶⁹ Inquiring about the possible cause(s) for transformative educational processes, Koller concludes that the impulse always comes from somewhere else, therefore indicates that educational processes are always *responsive events*, and do not refer to the unfolding of the inner potential of individuals.⁷⁰ Following this argument, and on the basis of the concept sketched out above, I suggest that such responsive events along with the suggested transformations regarding the shifts in terms of perception and behavior take place in spaces between.

Notes

- 1 Noë, Alva: *Varieties of Presence*, 2012, p. 77.
- 2 Ibid., p. 78.
- 3 Waldenfels, Bernhard: *Phänomenologie der Aufmerksamkeit*, 2019/2004, p. 47.
- 4 Ibid., p. 47.
- 5 With my sketch of “learning” I lean on the phenomenological, educational-theoretical positions in which the concept of learning and/or *Bildung* is always thought as an open-ended process with an event character. See: Käte Meyer-Drawe, Bernhard Waldenfels.
- 6 Meyer-Drawe, Käte: *Lernen als Erfahrung*, *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, Vol. 6, issue 4/2003, p. 508.
- 7 Ibid., p. 506.
- 8 Meyer-Drawe, Käte: *Zur Erfahrung des Lernens. Eine Phänomenologische Skizze*, *Santalca, Filosofija*, 2010 18(3), p. 7.
- 9 Ibid., p. 7.
- 10 Ibid., p. 7.
- 11 Ibid., p. 8.
- 12 Fischer-Lichte, Erika: *The Transformative Power of Performances. A new aesthetics*, 2008, p. 114.
- 13 Ibid., p. 107.
- 14 Ibid., p. 107.
- 15 Ibid., p. 107.
- 16 Ibid., p. 107.
- 17 Merleau-Ponty, Maurice: *Phänomenologie der Wahrnehmung*, 1966, p. 125.
- 18 Ibid., p. 125–126.
- 19 Ibid., p. 128.
- 20 Fischer-Lichte, Erika: *The Transformative Power of Performances. A new aesthetics*, 2008, p. 107.
- 21 Löw, Martina: *Raumsoziologie*, 2012/2001, p. 26.
- 22 Ibid., p. 26–27.
- 23 Waldenfels, Bernhard: *Die Bühne als Brennpunkt des Geschehens*, 2016, p. 18.

- 24 Ibid., p. 18.
- 25 Ibid., p. 18.
- 26 Fischer-Lichte, Erika: *The Transformative Power of Performances. A new aesthetics*, 2008, p. 107.
- 27 Ibid., p. 114.
- 28 Ibid., p. 110.
- 29 Ibid., p. 114.
- 30 Löw, Martina: *Raumsoziologie*, 2012/2001, p. 27–28.
- 31 Fischer-Lichte, Erika: *The Transformative Power of Performances. A new aesthetics*, 2008, p. 119–120.
- 32 Ibid., p. 114.
- 33 Böhme, Gernot: *Atmosphäre. Essays zur neuen Ästhetik*, 2013 (7th edition), p. 21.
- 34 Fischer-Lichte, Erika: *The Transformative Power of Performances. A new aesthetics*, 2008, p. 119–120.
- 35 Ibid.
- 36 Ibid., p. 116.
- 37 Ibid., p. 115.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 Pazzini, Karl-Josef: *Bildung vor Bildern. Kunst – Pädagogik – Psychoanalyse*. 2015, p. 317.
- 40 Ibid., p. 323.
- 41 Ibid., p. 318–319.
- 42 Ibid., p. 319.
- 43 Ibid., p. 320.
- 44 Fischer-Lichte, Erika: *The Transformative Power of Performances. A new aesthetics*, 2008, p. 98.
- 45 Ibid., p. 99.
- 46 Waldenfels, Bernhard: *Phänomenologie der Aufmerksamkeit*, 2019/2004, p. 47.
- 47 Ibid., p. 41–42.
- 48 Waldenfels, Bernhard: *Die Bühne als Brennpunkt des Geschehens*, in: Norbert Otto Eke, Ulrike Haß, Irina Kaldrack (Hg.): *Bühne. Raumbildende Prozesse im Theater*. Paderborn: Fink 2016 (Schriftenreihe des Graduiertenkollegs “Automatismen”), p. 13–26, here p. 20.

- 49 Ibid., p. 20.
- 50 Waldenfels, Bernhard: *Phänomenologie der Aufmerksamkeit*, 2019/2004, p. 42
- 51 Fischer-Lichte, Erika: “Introduction: Transformative aesthetics – reflections on the metamorphic power of art”, in: Erika Fischer-Lichte & Benjamin Wihstutz, eds.: *Transformative Aesthetics*, 2018, p. 13.
- 52 Ibid., p. 13.
- 53 Waldenfels, Bernhard: “Metamorphoses of experience in the picture”, in: Erika Fischer-Lichte & Benjamin Wihstutz, eds.: *Transformative Aesthetics*, 2018, p. 71.
- 54 Ibid., p. 71.
- 55 Waldenfels, Bernhard: *Antwortregister*, 2016/2007, p. 327.
- 56 Waldenfels, Bernhard: “Antwort auf das Fremde. Grundzüge einer responsiven Phänomenologie”, in: Bernhard Waldenfels & Iris Därmann, eds.: *Der Anspruch des Anderen. Perspektiven phänomenologischer Ethik*, 1998, p. 45.
- 57 Waldenfels, Bernhard: *Erfahrung, die zur Sprache drängt*, 2019, p. 255.
- 58 “Produktive und reproduktive Form des Antwortens”, Bernhard Waldenfels, *Topographie des Fremden*, 2020/1997, p. 53.
- 59 Waldenfels, Bernhard: “Metamorphoses of experience in the picture”, in: Erika Fischer-Lichte & Benjamin Wihstutz, eds.: *Transformative Aesthetics*, 2018, p. 71.
- 60 Ibid., p. 71.
- 61 Ibid., p. 71.
- 62 Waldenfels, Bernhard: *Das leibliche Selbst*, 2018/2000, p. 368.
- 63 Waldenfels, Bernhard: *Antwortregister*, 2016/2007, p. 243–244.
- 64 Waldenfels, Bernhard: *Erfahrung, die zur Sprache drängt*, 2019, p. 113–114.
- 65 Waldenfels, Bernhard: *Das leibliche Selbst*, 2000, p. 368.
- 66 Waldenfels, Bernhard: *Erfahrung, die zur Sprache drängt*, 2019, p. 75.
- 67 Waldenfels, Bernhard: *Topographie des Fremden*, 2020/1997, p. 52, & Waldenfels: *Antwort auf das Fremde. Grundzüge einer responsiven Phänomenologie*, 1998, p. 46.

- 68 Koller, Hans-Christoph: “Grundzüge einer Theorie transformatorischer Bildungsprozesse”, in: Andrea Liesner and Ingrid Lohman, eds.: *Gesellschaftliche Bedingungen von Bildung und Erziehung, Eine Einführung*. Stuttgart 2010, p. 290.
- 69 Ibid., p. 290.
- 70 Koller, Hans-Christoph: “Probleme einer Theorie transformatorischer Bildungsprozesse”, in: Hans-Christoph Koller, Winfried Marotzki and Olaf Sanders, eds.: *Bildungsprozesse und Fremdheitserfahrung. Beiträge zu einer Theorie transformatorischer Bildungsprozesse*, Bielefeld, transcript, 2007, p.71.