



# Methodological Guidelines of Dialogization of Cultural and Educational Practices

Irina Barantsova, Natalia Milko, Nadezhda Denisenko, Tatiana Diuzhikova, Marina Tkach, Viktoria Kotlyarova, Ernest Murtaziev<sup>1</sup> 

Received: 18 December 2019 / Accepted: 20 December 2019 / Published online: 25 January 2020  
© The Author(s) 2020

## Abstract

The article deals with the methodological ideas of dialogue. It is stated that the dialogue, as a construct of understanding, is within the limits of constructivism to be the basis of the theoretical and methodological support of the spiritual development of a man. The attention is also focused on the functional purpose of the dialogue, namely on its definition as a goal (deliberately chosen image of the intended result) and as a mechanism of transformation of the world that infinitely creates new goals (goalsetting). Everyday dialogical communication outside the philosophical and nonscientific worldview positions of subjects often loses human activity and even makes it impossible for certain productive ways, means and receptions of interaction. In an effort to understand the world and another person, the person always faces new problems that require the abandonment of previous views, so the constructs allow you to gradually move in the world of objects by doing logical operations, interpreting them for mutual understanding.

**Keywords** Dialogue, spiritual development, communication, mutual understanding

In modern conditions, all the various external manifestations of the spiritual essence of a person are complicated by the lack of development of target objects, principles, potential of cultural-educational and pedagogical means of harmonizing the interaction of people, in which the first place is asserting the dialogic style of life of the subjects involved in cultural and educational space. The dialogue, in our opinion, as a construct of understanding, is within the limits of constructivism to be the basis of the theoretical and methodological support of the spiritual development of a man.

Extremely important theoretical foundations for overcoming the contradictions in this process are studies in which the methodological ideas of dialogue as a way of being and dialogical understanding are substantiated (M. Bakhtin, V. Bibler, H. G. Gadamer, G. Dilthey, P. Rickor, F. Schleiermacher, etc.), which explore the problem of understanding in detail.

---

✉ Irina Barantsova,  
irene25@list.ru

<sup>1</sup> Melitopolcky derzhavny pedagogichny univercitet Bogdan Khmelnskiy, Ukraine

The problem of dialogical understanding as a way of being, which leads to the spiritual growth of a man and the question of dialogical ontology, is disclosed in the writings of M. Buber, F. Rosenzweig, et al. The concept of “dialogical situation” and its essential characteristics were outlined by Y. Bogachinska, the implementation of the principles of dialogue in cultural and educational practices - by V. Bieberer, N. Bourbules, P. Kendzor and others.

Definition of the earlier nature of the dialogue, from a philosophical point of view, as an element of the theoretical, methodological, spiritual and ethical principles, in particular as a fundamental principle that is subjectively a fundamental requirement and a prerequisite for the thinking and behavior of the individual (maxim), and objectively leading the spiritual and practical norm of human co-existence [25, c.26], makes it possible to conclude that such a methodological guideline is not leading in existing cultural and educational practices that remain beyond the scope of dialogue, without the use of dialogue in the cultural and educational process.

In this way, its essential characteristics are not disclosed, and, therefore, the possibilities of influence on the cultural and educational situation to a large extent do not unfold. Moreover, if one or another of the dialogue remains beyond the actual problems of modernizing modern education and the “knowledge society”, the general feature of which, according to S. Proletov, is “... a profound transformation of knowledge into various information constellations and the primacy of flexibility and speed of operation from information on conventional intellectual procedures and practices [19, c.7-24], then it cannot be considered a complete process of human spiritual development. Since the philosophers' postulate about the cultivation of a cultural person remains unchanged, the theoretical justification of the anthropological movement of a man from knowledge (in its broad substantive content as meaning) to the intellectual-ethical and spiritual interaction of the subjects of the world is needed.

However, as noted above, its original goals are: the content of dialogue as a form of dialectics, a means for defining concepts as a method of finding truth, which often remains beyond the comprehension of phenomena and is replaced by the analysis of many existential, practical actuals, etc. Therefore, remembering Socrates, who considered the dialectic to be worthy of the only human problem, its morals and, unlike the Sophists, who first laid the basis for the dialogue as a logical operation and a way of philosophizing and even the “middle” art of the birth of truth in human consciousness (Mayevics), his positions should be considered imperative. It should be noted that in present conditions of the communication of different cultures, each of which is unique, without a “dialectical dialogue”, as the prevention of the destruction of cultures in general, the absorption of certain cultures more technologically developed and, moreover, the promotion of the preservation of cultures and the enhancement of cultural heritage and the creation of a “cultural circle” is not possible. This has particular significance with regard to the dialogue that addresses spiritual values, which, in our opinion, has not yet been fully involved in a large-scale social dialogue and in cultural and educational process.

It is for this purpose that in the educational and cultural environment where there is a collision of various scientific, philosophical and religious discourses and where a certain continuum is born, such as the unity of institutions of education, science and culture, as the unification of the interests of various cultural identities, as the unification of personal, group and universal human positions, we should implement the idea of polydiscursivity. It suggests that perception of one or another phenomenon is possible only in the intersection of various communicative practices, and when the phenomenon of inter-religious, intercultural dialogue forms the basis for establishing multicultural stability, tolerant socialization of the individual, and the dialogue becomes in fact a polylogue and a way of finding, in our opinion, interculturalism. In this sense, the fundamental question is the use of various discourses that have a certain social significance and specificity in dialogue, since “discourse” in scientific literature is defined as “linguistic activity regulated by socio-cultural codes (rules, traditions and values) of a particular social practice (science, justice, medicine, religion, politics, education, etc.), through which people - within the limits of this practice - produce, use and broadcast socio-cultural meanings, models of social experience, realize their own objective and / or communication needs” [16, c.37].

Thus, a scientific discourse aimed at an efficient process of creating, translating, and using knowledge and, in our opinion, until recently, according to its most active representatives, is most productive in finding the truth, because it implies: objectivity, installation in search truths, conceptuality (theoretical), empirical, logical, methodological, substantiation, critique and creativity.

The study of the works on intercultural dialogue, referred to above, made it possible the provision that scientific discourse is focused on the rational organization of communication and its social effectiveness, on the disclosure of ideological contradictions, based on the following principles: - the principle of cognition, according to which the modality of discourse is realized in the space of subject-object relations and evaluated in terms of the classical concept of truth (“true” or “false”), which differs from the communicative modality of the pragmatic theory of truth (“effective” or “ineffective”); - the principle of reflexivity and objectivity of discussion, which manifests itself in the rational conceptual nature of the process and the result of communication, in the transition from ordinary consciousness to rational one during the dialogue; - the principle of systematic and organized dialogue, which organically combines all levels of human consciousness (public, personal); - the principle of a high logical culture of dialogue, which involves knowledge of the laws of formal logic and rules of reasoning, the opposition to manipulative techniques in communication, as well as the criterion of seriousness, the inadmissibility of irony in relation to the sphere of sacred view; - the principle of objective unity and functional complementarity of the positions of the parties in the dialogue, based on the idea that all social institutions in society (religion inclusive) form the functional integrity of society, mutually reinforcing each other, solve common problems and have a common goal - a stable civil democratic society with high morality; - the principle of scientific and historical ways in the conduct of dialogue, the inadmissibility of non-scientific, non-historical arguments in the dialogue of religions, taken from questionable sources both to the religious audience and to the scientific community;

- the principle of deideologization, when the model of dialogue is based on deideological practice, on non-political engagement and on the avoidance of manipulative schemes and techniques by different ideologues of politicized consciousness (the concept of state religion, world domination of religion); - the principle of demythologization, the overcoming of value-emotional representations (mythologeme), and the stereoretitis, which are manifested at the level of social psychology, mass consciousness, for example the existing belief that in Islam the spirit of aggression and evil prevails, that the woman is enslaved there, that Christianity is degenerated, there is polytheism and paganism, etc.); - the principle of emotional and psychological support of the parties in the dialogue, support of psychological comfort and empathy.

In a somewhat different aspect, these authors traditionally present the tradition of philosophical discourse in a dialogue that dates back to antiquity - from the mayevtics of Socrates, and is now represented by the works of F. Rosenzweig, O. Rosenschtock Hussy, F. Ebner, M. Buber, M. Bakhtin et al. In contrast to the scientific and religious discourse involved in the dialogue, philosophical discourse is fundamentally polyphonic, pluralistic, subjected to various epistemological, methodological, and value-setting approaches that fundamentally differ, but keep "definitive correctness and logical coherence" [16, c.37].

In general, the specifics of philosophical discourse are summarized by the authors to the following principles: - the principle of philosophical pluralism, the plurality of different approaches to understanding problems with the condition of respect for religion and the different views of subjects of dialogue; - the principle of the interdependence of the parties to the dialogue in relation to the ideological completeness of views, which implies the emergence of a commonality of the semantic space of the parties ("I and the Other"), during which both participants of the dialogue recognize "Another as a neighbor" or within the limits of the religious concept, when they are "in God", or in the personal concept, when a person can become a personality only among other persons and the integrity of the identity of a person depends on the integrity of the consciousness of society and other personalities [2]. - the principle of humanism, respect for human rights in all his individual identities, the assertion of the right to self-determination, freedom of thought, the realization of their abilities and their religious identity; - the principle of the aspiration of human harmony with nature and with society, progress, understanding of the value of all living, ideology of non-violence, self-restraint instead of consumption [22]. - the principle of tolerance, behavior, customs, feelings, beliefs, thoughts and ideas, which allows the parties to accept and understand each other (this principle is based on the following axioms: the presence of socially significant differences in the parties of the dialogue; overcoming the feeling of hostility to others (the axiom of overcoming negativity); the refusal of violent manipulative methods of rejection and suppression of others (the axiom of non-violence); overcoming alienation and conflict (the axiom of compromise); awareness of a common living and a common identity (the axiom of value identity); the general rejection by the parties of the dialogue of the violation of morality, human rights and freedoms (the axiom of evaluation), the deduction of tolerant consciousness from the rules of socio-economic and legal behavior of citizens (the axiom of social relativism) [2].

Thus, only the most general dialogical principles of philosophical discourse are listed. In each particular case of philosophic schools of dialogue (M. Heidegger, F. Rosenzweig, A. Rosenschuss, F. Ebner, M. Buber), it is possible to take on the methods used by them. In general, one can conclude that not only interreligious dialogue, but also any socio-cultural dialogue can only effectively be realized on the basis of philosophical discourse, which removes denotations and connotations of other discourses participating in the dialogue, due to its most abstract and reflexive nature.

With such a characteristic of discourse you can agree, but under certain conditions: firstly, one cannot refuse any discourse in dialogue, since the goal of dialogue is understanding, and discourse is not a formal phenomenon: it represents a particular type of worldview, that is, attitude towards the world; consequently, if different positions are not articulated in the interaction, to find an understanding and consensus in the dialogue; and secondly, discourse is the result of the knowledge of the world of each type of worldview, therefore, the picture of the world becomes much more complete due to the polydiscursiveness; thirdly, you can not simultaneously and quickly teach different people the best ways to understand the world. That is why the problem of discourse should be translated into a plane of cultural and educational space in which the educational discourse prevails, the essence of which is not defined by E. Dobrenkov as a formalized system of transfer of knowledge, but as a problem field for the development of subjects of the discourse of educational and scientific knowledge, which testifies about their temporary status as agents of cognitive dialogue or the information process of knowledge exchange [8, c.14].

Moreover, if one understands the discourse (from the Latin *discere* to wander) as "an orally or in writing an articulated form of objectification of the content of consciousness, which is determined by the type of rationality dominant in a certain sociocultural tradition [17, c.148]. First of all, it should be noted that full education can not be built, leaving beyond the limits of the constitutive factors of influence on the spirituality of a man, because the changes taking place now in the global environment are increasingly "compressing" the cultural space by expanding the interconnection, interdependence of different countries, peoples, cultures (national, ethnic, gender, political, economic, religious, etc.). At the cultural level, humanity is interested in finding an agreement, consent in resolving controversial issues, preventing the escalation of violence, which may lead to conflicts and other threatening phenomena.

Consequently, the scientific discourse in the dialogue focuses on the rational organization of communication and its social effectiveness, but its representatives are obliged to "remove" ideological contradictions and to carry out the proliferation of the principles of cognition, reflectivity and objectivity, to provide a high logical culture, target unity and complementarity of positions in the sub dialogue, as well as science and historicity, deideologization and deliberation, emotional and psychological support, etc.

It is impossible to ignore the tradition of philosophical discourse in a dialogue that has a rich history and which at all times differed from all other discourses by the principle of plurality, polyphony, the diversity of epistemological, ontological, methodological, value-semantic concepts that preserve definitions of correctness.

In this context, philosophical discourse in any dialogue has the advantage, since it represents a higher degree of reflection, comprehension of the essence of the subject of dialogue, based on philosophical categories and universals. The categories as “the most general concepts of a particular field of knowledge and science serve to reduce the experience of finding objective relations, dismemberment and synthesis of reality ... and universals, which belong to a being” allow you to liberate the essence of the phenomena around which the dialogue is unfolding, from denotations and connotations of other discourses [5, c.522].

Understanding, as a procedure for comprehension or creation of meaning, categorical status was given by F. Schleiermacher, who interpreted it as a procedure for identifying the meaning of the text in the process of its interpretation and reconstruction of the original plan. Based on this idea, V. Abushenko adds that understanding is a way of explication of the question which was asked before and was laid in text. The main classical concept of understanding, in our opinion, was formulated by W. Windelband, H. Rickert and other philosophers whose ideas were then reflected in social knowledge of M.Weber, V.Diltey and found their “existential” continuation in “postmetaphysical thinking” of Yu.Habermas and in the concept of dialogue of M,Bakhtin. Due to the theories of many famous scientists the dialogic strategy, in our opinion, passed from an extremely important plane, which is social communication, to cultural, educational and spiritual space that enriched not only complex and contradictory process of knowing the world, but also filled the multifaceted human life with dialogues and dialogue situations.

At the same time the possibility and potential of dialogue as a way of realizing individual subjectivity in cognition and activities, as well as algorithms of human movement from ignorance to understanding and comprehension of the metaphysical reality is not sufficiently grounded in science, although many thoughts and attitudes of today, which are based on dialogic universals of being and which should be assimilated by a person, in one form or another have already been considered in the past. In this sense, an important appeal to the philosophy that has presented the apodictic meaning of the phenomenon of “understanding” appears.

Polish professor E. Matinya writes that “... in society sometimes there is a protest, as well as a struggle with imposed forms of behavior ... these protests can be compared with the carnival, along with the temporarily sanctioned disagreements embedded therein. But, she says, “... this volatile sphere of community and dialogue plays a significant role in the emergence of a network of civic attitudes and the revival of the embryonic public sphere”, and suggests several thoughts that can be transposed into social and religious practice: they should be viewed locally to the ground under their feet, to the places that each of us knows best, to places and narratives that have helped each of us overcome political and cultural separatism, reduce tension ...; one should learn the readiness to detolate the truth in the ecumenical approach; hospitality and generosity should be a key element of practice ... regardless of context; epistemologically it is necessary to pay attention to “knowledge with an accent”, which can become for us the source of new plans and decisions of the problems of divided communities and societies; to bring to life the hospitality and openness that spread the dialogue in all its diversity, to embody them in the model of “civil architecture” [6, c.559-567].

Thus, for the sake of the supremacy of a higher level of human interaction - understanding - and in order to prevent the era of silence, dialogue is precisely the “frontier”, where there is a combination of fragmented parts of the consciousness of different cultures and identities, and where, on the basis of mutual understanding, the walls of identity are overcome, the competences of their interweaving, the ethos of the border is popularized, and cities are presented between people of different cultures, religions and ethnic groups (colloquiums of dialogue, mobile academies of dialogue, “round tables”, “word-café”, religious festivals, etc. And finally, it should be noted that all previous analysis makes sense only if the dialogue needs to be learned and practiced in the cultural and educational space, which today is only in the stage of formation and which only begins as “full” subjects, to engage in religious practices. It is in this space that the scientific and vital knowledge, rational values and semantic orientations, education and culture, intentions and aspirations of the subjects of education, the goals, content and organizational and managerial technologies of the institutes of science, education, religion, culture should be in dialogue. and social life.

This scientific search must be, of course, problem-oriented and object-oriented both in the past and in modern times. In addition, it should first of all be aimed at substantiation of dialogical strategies, which, by purpose, through the purpose and mechanisms of the implementation of the idea of dialogue, carry out a theoretical transition to operational action, from the theory to practice. Moreover, it is necessary to do this in the cultural and educational space, in which cultural and educational practices among them should unfold the mode of the traditional institution of socialization of personality and the translation of experience in the mode of cultural and educational designing of equal interaction, in which communication and dialogue appear not only regulators of relations of objects, but also ways of persuading a person in the necessity of co-operation with other people, assimilation of basic moral and ethical truths, filling of individual existence with the meaning of comprehension with a bundle of their individual being with a certain spiritual integrity.

In this process, even if we mean the above-mentioned growth of the public dialogue, the lack of cultural and educational management, capable of bringing a person's life out of everyday life, remains to a large extent. The arsenal of management and strategies and technologies of education, science, culture, religion used in the past day can not be met today by a person who seeks for free self-development, respect and cooperation. The problem of communicative strategies in one way or another is presented in the works of K.O.-Apel, E. Bern, V. Bibler, M. Bakhtin, I. Kagan, V. Lorenz, V. Malakhov, A. Yermolenko, J. Habermas, K. Jaspers and other philosophers. The thorough disclosure of the functions of communication and dialogue as regulators of relations of the subjects of society, the definition of the principles of sociophilosophical analysis and the methodology of the study of the components of communication and dialogue have greatly enriched as the science and practice of strategic management of social and cultural-educational processes, as well as the technology of directing human self-movement to intelligence, morality and spirituality.

However, applied developments, in which scientists offered the mechanisms and algorithms of management or implementation of communication and dialogue precisely in our time and in a concrete context, are not sufficient. It is worth mentioning the work of the authors who explicitly and substantively explored the essence of communication and dialogue as ways of consolidating communities of different levels in concrete forms, in particular in the socio-cultural space and in different management situations. These are the works of such scholars as H. Ball, V. Beh, J. Habermas, G. Schedrovitsky, A. Shyuts, A. Yermolenko, K. Jaspers and others. At the same time, the common practice of cultural-educational direction, which attracts more and more people, nevertheless, often remain outside of these developments and continue to take into account only everyday experience and the "world of life". This state of affairs makes it possible to "slip" the search for constructivism towards profanation, to simplify the situation. Hence, these practices and actions deprive the interaction of intellectual and value-semantic content. An analysis of the ways of communication and dialogue in the form of communicative and dialogic strategies, which are important ways of constructing self-development of the individual and various forms of social relations, shows the need to consider any activity, including religious, through the prism of the components of activity as such, its functions, and the conceptual dimension of the actions of the person himself.

Not going deep into the philosophical and psychological concepts of activity as a form of an active attitude of a man to the world in order to transform it, it should be noted that activity, the main characteristic of which is consciousness, morphologically consists of the subject of activity, motives, tasks, actions, operations, etc., where social actions appear to be the simplest units of activity. However, the emphasis on the morphological aspect of the activity, as evidenced by experience and practice analysis, tends to lead to fragmentary activity, when its true characteristics (purposefulness, objectivity, universality, creative and general significance, etc.), as well as its internal mechanisms remain outside the analytical and operational action. In this way, understanding does not allow identifying the activities and actions that are defined by psychologists as "the purposeful transfer of motion and information from one participant to another ... (direct - contact, mediate - distant)" [26, c.69].

In this state, the result of action, as noted by V. Krzhevov, V. Kuznetsov, O. Oganov, A. Panarin, A. Razin and other philosophers, correlates with the needs and interests, as well as with the goals and motives of the subject, and therefore the result can be regarded as a new component of the objective situation, in which the subject and characteristics of which he should take into account in the new cycles of activity [18, c.520].

Taking the unequivocal assertion that communication is reflected in strategies and technologies realization of which is associated with significant goals and objectives, it should be noted that in the forms of socio-cultural choices, human actions also display a certain type of language, its meaning, its values and preferences of personalities. Dialogue in the cultural and educational space is a dynamic factor in its balance, establishing equal participation of subjects in preventing conflicts, destabilization and entropy.



Everyday dialogical communication outside the philosophical and non-scientific worldview positions of subjects often loses human activity and even makes it impossible for certain productive ways, means and receptions of interaction. In an effort to understand the world and another person, the person always faces new problems that require the abandonment of previous views, so the constructs allow you to gradually move in the world of objects by doing logical operations, interpreting them for mutual understanding.

This becomes most obvious when it comes to communicative and dialogic strategies, the formation of which involves a significant number of subjects in the cultural and educational space (students, teachers, scientists, heads of cultural and educational institutions, representatives of state power, local authorities self-government, political parties, religious and confessional movements, communities, public organizations, national-cultural movements, mass media, etc.). We propose to focus on the following types of communicative and dialogic strategies that are widespread in religious practices: - presentation, as an open and a passive way of social communication, according to some researchers [4] (a presentation that does not involve discussions, open disputes during its conduct, nevertheless has a dialogue that can be authentic and anticipate fair activity; besides, understanding without articulation of the interests of the community or personal is not possible); - manipulation, as a hidden and active way of influencing the subject in such a way that the addressee of the manipulation perceives distorted information (race information, submission of selective information, concealment of important information, presentation of it in a certain context, etc.) as a true and allegedly self-formative opinion and behavior; - opposition, as a reaction of the counteragent on one position (often on manipulative actions) and presentation of counterarguments to the position of interlocutors; - a convention that provides through a chain of consensual content agreements between different segments of the environment or within a single segment and which is possible only on the basis of understanding as the goal of dialogue with its attributes (tolerance, empathy, orientation on the positive, even potential, properties of the interlocutor, etc.).

Regardless of the theoretical and methodological support of dialogue in religious practices, it would be possible to add only the means of each of them to these strategic types (for a presentation - a message, for manipulation - unregulated messages and information, for a convention - a dialogue, for the opposition - polemics, etc.), but this support requires methodological knowledge and evaluation as a full-fledged humanitarian technology. First, they can not but foresee the purpose, content and mechanisms of the communicative strategy of the meaning of communication and dialogue as an understanding of the subjects of communication. In this context, it seems to us that two strategies (manipulation and opposition) should be excluded from the arsenal of finding consensus, and hence from the planning and modeling of support. This, of course, does not mean that they are not in reality. But without consensus, which involves decision-making and strategic steps that take into account the experience of each of the communities without squeezing its dialogue, understanding is impossible.

---

**References:** 1. Abuzhenko V.L. Understanding / The New Philosophical Dictionary: 3rd ed., Corrected. - Mn.: Book House, 2003. - 1280 pp. - (World of Encyclopedias). - S. 767769., P. 767. (in Russian) 2. Bakhtin, M. Aesthetics of verbal creativity. - M.: Art, 1979. - 424 pp. (in Russian) 3. Bakhtin M.M. Problems of Dostoevsky's creativity // Makhlin V.L. Mikhail Bakhtin: The Philosophy of the Deed. - M.: Politizdat, 1990. - P.49 -54 / Tsit. for: Modern Philosophy: Dictionary and textbook. - Rostov-on-Don: Phoenix, 1997.-511 pp., P.450. (in Russian) 4. Borodina T.V. Social dialogue: communicative strategies for the personal representation of social relations. - Electronic resource: <http://cheloveknauka.com/sotsialnyy-dialog-kommunikativnye-strategii-lichnostnoy-reprezentatsii-obschestvennyh-otnosheniy#ixzz3ZHassy/> (in Russian) 5. Bulatov M.O. Philosophical Dictionary / M.O. Bulatov. - K.: Stilos, 2009. - 575 pp., P. 522. (in Russian) 6. Dialogue / Head Guides. Ed. I. Belov / Translation by D. Viren, A. Davtyan, V. Okun. - Sorright by the Foundation "Borderland", Seyyne, 2015. - 590 pp., P. 559567. (in Russian) 7. Contemporary global transformations and the problem of historical self-determination of the East Slavic peoples / Ch. S. Kirvel [and others]; ed. Dr. philosopher Sciences, prof. Ch.S. Kirvel - 3rd ed., Pererab. and add - Minsk: Four quarters, 2010. - 548 pp., P.544-545. (in Russian) 8. Dobrenkova, E.V. Social morphology of educational discourse: theoretical, methodological analysis: author's abstract. diss ... doc. sociologist sciences - Rostov-on-Don, 2007. - P. 14. (in Russian) 9. Habermas J. Ruckkehr zur Metaphysik. – Eine Tendenz in der deutschen Philosophie? In: Merkur, H.439/440, Oltober 1985. – 898 ff. (in German) 10. Habermas J. Theorie des kommunikativen Handels / J. Habermas. - Bd.2. - Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1981 - 348 s. (in German) 11. Hosle V. Der Philosophical Dialogue Eine Poetik und Hermeneutik / V. Hosle. - Munchen, Verlag C.H.BeckoHg, 2006 - 494 p. (in German)

---

## Compliance with Ethical Standards

**Conflict of interest** On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

**Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.