RAN LAHAV

PHILOSOPHICAL COUNSELING AND TAOISM: WISDOM AND LIVED PHILOSOPHICAL UNDERSTANDING

Modern Western philosophy has occupied itself primarily with theoretical investigations of abstract issues that are not directly applicable to the individual's everyday concerns. In this respect, it is fundamentally different from various traditional Oriental schools of philosophy according to which philosophical understanding is seen as embodied in the person's entire way of being. One salient modern attempt in the West to bridge the traditional gap between philosophy and concrete life is the new growing field of Philosophical Counseling[1] (sometimes called Philosophical Practice). It is based on the idea that philosophy can be seen as pervading our everyday life rather than as an isolated subject matter for theoretical reflection. Here Philosophical Counseling resembles those Oriental schools of thought which also regard philosophy as inseparable from everyday life.

In this paper I will argue that Philosophical Counseling's attempt to make philosophy relevant to everyday life is based upon a certain conception of the nature of philosophical understanding; and that this conception resembles a parallel conception of philosophical understanding in traditional Oriental philosophy, specifically in Taoism, which similarly allows for philosophy to be intimately related to everyday life.

WHAT IS PHILOSOPHICAL COUNSELING?

Like any other field of human endeavor, Philosophical Counseling is not a single unitary approach. Like science, art, or psychotherapy, it

Journal of Chinese Philosophy 23 (1996) 259-276

comprises a cluster of related ideas and methodologies which cannot be captured by one simple definition. For this reason, the present discussion expresses my own views about the field, but I believe that it is also close in spirit to other important approaches.

As I see it, Philosophical Counseling aims at helping individuals to philosophically examine their predicaments and life, develop their philosophical understanding of themselves and their world, and go beyond their narrow, self-contained personal perspective, reaching towards edification or wisdom. The philosophical counselor is a philosopher who discusses with counselees their personal predicaments, usually in a series of one-hour sessions. Through philosophical investigations counselees develop their philosophical understanding of the meanings or ideas that are interwoven into their lives, and open up to wider horizons of understanding. In this sense, Philosophical Counseling is faithful to the original Greek meaning of "philosophy" (philo-sophia), namely *love* of *wisdom*. *Wisdom* here is understood as an overall way of being in the world—unlike smartness or knowledge which involve only certain cognitive faculties within the person—and more specifically, as a way of being that is open and sensitive to the infinite network of ideas which underlie our world. And *love* here means that edification towards wisdom is valued for its own sake, as part of what makes life valuable. Hence, philosophizing in Philosophical Counseling aims at helping counselees in their search for wisdom as a way of being, thus helping them to deal with their predicaments and lives through greater depth and wisdom.

Despite some superficial similarity between Philosophical Counseling and psychotherapy—both usually involve one-hour talking sessions between a counselor (or therapist) and a client—the two are fundamentally different. It is outside the scope of this paper to try to define the exact boundary between the two disciplines,[2] but perhaps the most salient difference is that unlike the psychotherapist and the patient, what the counselor and the counselee do is primarily philosophize. To be sure, both philosopher and psychologist relate to the individual's concrete life (experiences, thoughts, fears, hopes, etc.), but each one "projects," so to

speak, this material onto an entirely different plain, one philosophical and one psychological. Consequently, the elements of the two disciplines—their goals, methods, basic concepts, topics of conversation, dynamics of interaction, etc.—take place in different domains, the former operating within the domain of ideas (conceptual analysis, logical relations, etc.) while the latter in the domain of psychological processes and mechanisms (emotional, behavioral, cognitive, etc.).

This points to a deeper unique characteristic of Philosophical Counseling. In aiming at wisdom, Philosophical Counseling aims at horizons that lay beyond the current person, to conceptual coordinates that extend beyond the person's present way of living. This contrasts with most forms of psychotherapy which attempt to deal with psychic materials that are already within the person, consciously or unconsciously, actually or in the form of a yet undeveloped potential: hidden desires, unconscious traumas, unelaborated conceptions of life, unexpressed tendencies, etc. While psychotherapy aims mostly at modifying the person's current psychic forces and processes, Philosophical Counseling attempts to take him to new ideational landscapes outside himself.

In this sense, philosophizing in Philosophical Counseling is not a solipsistic endeavor, it does not limit itself to the domain of humanly generated ideas, but is rather a dialogue between human life and the broader horizons in which it is embedded. As Pierre Hadot aptly says in discussing the ancient Greek conception of wisdom: "For wisdom, says Diotima in Plato's *Symposium*, is not a human state, it is a state of perfection of being and knowledge that can only be divine. It is the love of this wisdom, which is foreign to this world, that makes the philosopher a stranger in it."[3] Wisdom is not invented in the person's minds but appears in the person's philosophical encounter with the world.

This conception of philosophizing may be compared to the one expressed in Plato's cave parable. Philosophizing enables the person to go out of the narrow confines of his current life and reach out to broader understandings. It is not satisfied with reshuffling and modifying the shadows which the person already has, but seeks to go beyond them.

We should not, however, be carried away by this comparison. In Philosophical Counseling the going out of the cave need not be as dramatic and radical as in Plato s parable, and the world outside the cave need not be seen as the Absolute Truth in a metaphysical realist sense. In fact, the process of going beyond our current confines is familiar to all of us from more ordinary, everyday contexts: when we go abroad and meet unfamiliar ways of life, when we are initiated into the world of art or of music and learn new ways of seeing and thinking, and when we encounter new ideas and values. In such cases, the person comes to live in a broader horizon of meanings, something he could not have done had he remained inside his personal psychic world. In an analogous manner, Philosophical Counseling uses philosophizing for going beyond the person's narrow cave.

The idea of using philosophical considerations to examine the individual s life can be found in various Western schools of philosophy, especially in ancient Greece. Thus, the Stoics, the Epicureans, the Cynics, to name only a few, developed philosophies which their adherents tried to follow in their everyday life. However, unlike most of these traditional schools which applied to the person definite theories about how life should be lived, contemporary Philosophical Counseling offers no ready-made theories. Its aim is to help counselees develop their individual path to wisdom, by raising issues rather than supplying solutions, and by offering counselees philosophical raw materials and thinking tools to use in their own way. For example, the philosophical counselor may introduce into the conversation various ideas, distinctions, concepts, etc. as raw materials for counselees to accept, reject, modify, or develop in constructing their own understanding. The philosophical counselor is therefore a partner to an open-ended philosophical dialogue. He or she helps to raise questions, uncover hidden assumptions, suggest possible implications, but imposes no specific philosophical view about what is right or wrong, what is important, normal, healthy, or what life is all about.

This modern form of Philosophical Counseling was first introduced by the German philosopher Gerd Achenbach, who in 1981 opened his

philosophical practice in Köln, Germany. Today, a number of organizations for Philosophical Counseling (or Philosophical Practice, as it is sometimes called in Europe) are operating in Germany, Holland, USA, and France. They organize lectures, workshops, and colloquia, and some of them publish journals. In addition, individual philosophical counselors are now operating in several other countries, such as Israel, Norway, Canada, England, and South Africa. In 1993 I gave the first university (graduate) course on Philosophical Counseling at Haifa University, Israel, and since then have continued to teach similar courses. In July of 1994 the First International Conference on Philosophical Counseling was held at the University of British Columbia in Canada (organized by Louis Marinoff and myself). These events will hopefully facilitate the further development of the field.

Although the idea of using philosophical thinking to deal with everyday issues is not new, it is revolutionary within the context of the 20th century. It counters the modern tendency, so common nowadays to entrust personal predicaments almost exclusively into the hands of psychotherapists, leaving philosophy in universities, away from concrete lives. This modern tendency represents a shift which took place at the end of the 19th century, from the more traditional approach of addressing life-issues through philo-sophia (love of wisdom) towards the psychologist's professional, specialized, departmentalized knowledge. Professional knowledge is, of course, welcome, but unfortunately it compltely pushed aside philo-sophia, instead of living side by side with it. To be sure, a number of psychotherapeutic approaches (Existentialist, Cognitive, etc.) have felt the need for the philosophical perspective, and accordingly incorporated some limited philosophical elements in their therapies. However, they too typically do not philosophize with counselees, but rather rely on ready-made theories (often implicit) about life: about the value and nature of freedom, creativity, assertiveness, productivity, self-confidence, etc. Furthermore, since most of their practitioners are devoid of significant philosophical education, it is hard to expect them to carry out genuine philosophical conversations.

The growing influence of psychotherapy during the present century is only part of a broader trend in the modern world, namely, psychologization: that of viewing all aspects of life from a psychological perspective. It is found nowadays not only in therapy, but also in the cinema, literature–including children's literature, education, and virtually all aspects of modern life. This trend expresses the self-centered character of our modern society Everything is seen as already contained within the psyche. Personal predicaments start and end inside our heads. In order to live the good life all that is needed is for the patient to delve into his psyche and modify it. Life is no longer an encounter with the beyond but a private game within ourselves. Consequently, there is no longer room for distinctions between the deep and the superficial, the sublime and the base, wisdom and crudity. Personal taste and self-satisfaction are the measure of all things.

Against this background, Philosophical Counseling expresses a new vision: Philosophy should no longer be limited to the construction of abstract theories about general issues, for it has important things to say about the living moment, the individual's concrete life, the most mundane issues. It helps the individual to go beyond the current psyche into new horizons of understanding.

TWO CONCEPTIONS OF PHILOSPHICAL SELF-UNDERSTANDING

In contrast to Philosophical Counseling, when one reads mainstream modern Western philosophical discussions, one is struck by how far removed they are from the non-academic concerns of the individual. Admittedly, these discussions sometimes deal with topics such as knowledge, the self, love, and morality, which also appear in everyday life, but they are usually discussed on a level of abstraction which makes them inapplicable to everyday concerns. In this respect, mainstream philosophy is clearly different from Philosophical Counseling and Oriental schools such as Taoism. I will argue that this difference in relevance to everyday life expresses a fundamental difference between two basic conceptions of

the nature of *philosophical understanding;* where by "philosophical understanding" I mean, roughly speaking, the understanding achievable through philosophy.

What conception of philosophical understanding underlies the mainsteam abstract type of philosophizing? I suggest that the mainstream trend towards abstraction reflects the presupposition that there exists a sharp distinction between the realm of philosophy on the one hand and the individual's concrete living on the other, between philosophical understanding and everyday life. The underlying idea here is that philosophical understanding is a function of a specific cognitive faculty which is isolable from the rest of the person's life: from the person's emotions, interpersonal encounters, moral attitudes, habits, etc. Presumably, in order to gain philosophical understanding one needs to put aside one's everyday life and to exercise a specific mental capacity, namely abstract thinking, while concentrating on the specific issue at hand. Anything other than thoughts about the issue is regarded as irrelevant to the philosophical enterprise, or even a harmful intrusion of confounding elements. The ideal philosophical inquirer is a disinterested thinker. It follows that one may be an excellent philosophical thinker while being at the same time a crude insensitive person, or conversely be a good person and lead a good life without any philosophical understanding.[4]

Here modern mainstream philosophy in the West is fundamentally different from various Oriental philosophical schools (as well as some ancient Western schools of philosophy) for whom philosophical understanding and concrete life are not separable in this way. Thus, for example, Taoist or Confucian texts often deal both with abstract ideas and concrete life-issues without attempting to distinguish between them. Indeed, practical and theoretical considerations are often intertwined so intimately that it is impossible to divide them into pure philosophy on the one hand and its concrete applications on the other.

In recent years, several attempts have been made in the West to bridge the traditional gap between philosophical thought and concrete life. Much popularity has been gained in English-speaking countries by the

field of Applied Ethics, which uses ethical considerations to address dilemmas commonly found in real life. However, although this represents an attempt to apply philosophical thought to real-life situations, it still assumes a distinction between theory and practice: between the theoretical considerations for solving an ethical dilemma and the person's concrete life to which these considerations are to be applied. Dilemmas are first to be solved in the abstract, and the solutions are then to be applied to specific cases.

A more far-reaching attempt to abolish the gap is Philosophical Counseling. Like some Oriental traditions, it does so on the basis of a different conception of philosophical understanding, one which makes philosophy an integral part of life. On the basis of this conception, Philosophical Counseling attempts to develop the counselees' philosophical understanding of their predicament or life and unfold the broader horizons towards which they can grow. I am often asked by (Western) philosophers how philosophical understanding can possibly be applied to mundane situations. As I see it, the answer is that philosophical understanding need not be *applied* to everyday life, because it already pervades it. To live is to embody a specific understanding of oneself and one's world. A philosophical understanding is an aspect of the individual's way of being in the world.

More specifically, the idea is that in our everyday life we constantly interpret ourselves and the world, or in other words, we express various understandings of reality. Not only our thoughts, but also our emotions, plans, hopes, behaviors, fantasies, choices, are ways of relating to, or ways of understanding, the world and ourselves. For example, if I indulge myself in a fantasy about being a basketball player and being admired by crowds of people, I am thereby expressing the value of being admired. My pleasant fantasy is a statement, so to speak, about what is valuable in life, namely, that it is good to be admired by many people (even though a moment later another fantasy may express a contradicting idea). Similarly, if I suffer from feelings of worthlessness, these feelings reflect a certain conception about what counts as worthy. They express the idea that there

are certain standards of personal worth, and that I fall short of them. In sum, to feel or behave or think one way rather than another is to express a certain understanding about the nature of the self, about what is important, moral, or beautiful, about what is love, friendship, courage, and so on. We constantly interpret our world, not just through beliefs and thoughts, but through our entire way of being.

Hence, our way of being expresses certain ways of understanding life and our world (although they are not necessarily coherent and unitary; our lives are often inconsistent). It embodies an understanding of life which resembles a personal philosophical "theory"; although it is a "theory" which the person *lives*, not necessarily thinks in words. I will call a philosophical understanding that is embodied in the person's way of being a *lived philosophical understanding*, or for short, a *lived understanding*.

It is important to note that people are usually not fully conscious of their lived understanding. But neither do they have it in their *un*conscious. Lived understanding is not statements residing in the person's head, but rather the "statements" made by the person's way of being towards himself and his surroundings. It is embodied in the way the person relates to the world through his behavior and feelings and comports himself towards life. For example, my tormenting guilt-feeling may be said to express the idea that what I did was morally wrong. However, to the extent that this is a *lived* understanding, "I am morally wrong" is not an idea in my mind but one which I embody in my attitude towards myself. The structure of my attitudes and feelings reflects the structure or meaning of the concept of guilt—which includes moral wrongness—but this meaning need not have a psychological reality in my head, either consciously or unconsciously.

A few analogies may illustrate this point. Consider, for example, a piece of art and its aesthetic meanings, or a move in a chess-game and its strategic meaning. A painting can be said to express a balanced composition without regard to the psychology of the painter, and a move on a chess board may constitute a threat to the right flank independently of

what goes on in the player's mind. In an analogous manner, a person's attitude to herself and to her environment may express a certain understanding of her world, regardless of her depth psychology. Just as a brushstroke on canvas may express a joyful mood even if the artist was sad while painting it or unaware of its meaning, a counselee's anxiety may express the idea that life leads nowhere, even if this idea is not an actual part of the person's psychology. A lived philosophical understanding is not a mental process or event within the person's cognition.

Philosophical counselors are like art critics or tutors, in the sense that they help explore the canvas of the counselee's life for meanings that need not have any psychological reality inside the person's head, and open new avenues for transcending the current canvas to other, broader and richer canvases. The aim of Philosophical Counseling is to explore the world as "understood" by the counselee's emotions, behavior, thoughts, hopes, desires, and unfold broader worlds which can be "understood" through other ways of being. And just like an ordinary philosophical theory, a person's lived understanding can be examined philosophically. One can examine how rich or coherent that lived understanding is, expose its fundamental structure and interconnections, uncover its hidden presuppositions, analyze its basic concepts and values, and so on. Through such an investigation, counselees develop new ways of comporting themselves towards the world. They broaden their horizons of understanding of what is important, interesting, pretentious, mediocre, humiliating, cowardly or courageous, and how these and other notions are interrelated. This edification also helps counselees deal with greater wisdom with their personal problems and predicaments.

The above discussion is not intended to serve as an account of philosophical understanding, but rather to delineate the direction in which more work needs to be done in order to explicate the theoretical basis of Philosophical Counseling.[5] But even this preliminary discussion is sufficient to make my point: Philosophical Counseling (as I see it) is capable of making philosophy relevant to everyday life because it uses a conception of philosophical understanding (whose details are to be investi-

gated) which is interwoven within everyday life. This conception is fundamentally different from the one common in mainstream Western philosophy. The latter regards philosophical understanding as a specific mental function that is isolable from much of the person's life. In Philosophical Counseling, in contrast, philosophical understanding is embodied throughout one's entire way of being.

A CASE STUDY

Since it is outside the scope of this paper to present an entire case study, from beginning to end, let me illustrate the main ideas described above through a particular move that took place within a broader context of a series of counseling sessions.

The counselee, let us call her S., a free-lance journalist and mother of two, sought my counseling in connection with her feeling of being constrained and unfree in her life. She had married at the age of thirty, mainly for the sake of the possibility of raising children, despite the fact that she had previously enjoyed her life as a single woman. Now, several years after her marriage, S's feelings towards her husband were rather cool. She longed for her previous kind of lifestyle in which she could meet new people, have fun, be able to return home whenever she wished, meet new men and fall in love again. Not wanting to hurt her children, she rejected the idea of divorce. A home like theirs, she said, where the parents treated each other with respect and consideration, even if without real love, was incomparably better than a single-parent family.

She saw no way out of this situation. What she missed most was not so much specific activities such as going out with new people, but the very fact of being able to do whatever she wished. She felt shackled, forced to perform chores she had not chosen, to carry on in a meaningless relationship with her husband, and be constrained to a definite time schedule as a mother and wife.

I made it clear to S. that if she chooses to see me, our aim would be primarily to deepen and enrich her understanding of her way of being.

This may or may not open new avenues for overcoming her predicament. Greater understanding does not always lead to solutions for personal problems. She agreed.

The move which I would like to mention here was the exploration of the concept of freedom. Through our conversations we came to see that her attitudes expressed a particular conception of the nature of freedom. Freedom for her was the state of not being constrained by external constraints, or what in the philosophical jargon is termed "negative freedom" (freedom-from). This conception was not something she had thought about in words, but one which was "lived" by her through her longing not to be constrained, her nostalgia for her previous lifestyle, the absence of any clear idea what she wanted to do with her freedom, and so on.

After we exposed this conception of freedom, I pointed out that it is only one among several others, and furthermore, that it is not obviously the most valuable. During the following conversations we explored other conceptions of freedom. Using my philosophical knowledge, I brought up alternative conceptions: freedom-for, i.e., the inner capacity to have an inner ideal or goal, follow it, and thus do whatever one really wants to do; the Bergsonian freedom of acting spontaneously out of one's entire personality; Gabriel Marcel's view of freedom as a capacity to create one's life in a way that stands against societal norms and pressures the Stoic notion of freedom as accepting whatever happens to one; and the conception of freedom, often appearing in religious writings, of the capacity to do that which is good.

We explored these conceptions keeping one foot in her concrete world of experiences and the other foot in philosophical considerations. Thus we examined the inner logic of each of these conceptions; their implications concerning the concepts of the self, authenticity, responsibility, and other related concepts; and their connection to concrete life, and specifically to her past, present, and future life.

The result was that S. came to see her predicament from a broader perspective. She now saw the broader network of ideas that were inter-

woven into her way of being in the world, as well as of further horizons of other possible ways of being. She realized how narrow her urge for freedom-from had previously been, and now wished to go beyond it. In our following conversations we worked on expanding and exploring this new understanding in a way that could be interwoven into her concrete way of living.

TAOISM AND PHILOSOPHICAL COUNSELING

I suggest that there are important parallels between the conception of philosophical understanding found in Philosophical Counseling and that which is found in certain prominent Oriental schools of thought. In order to illustrate this point, I will focus here on Taoism, or more specifically on the writings attributed to Lao Tzu and Chuang Tzu.

It is clear that Philosophical Counseling is different in important respects from these two Taoist philosophers. For example, the latter reject the use of words and analysis, whereas in Philosophical Counseling important insights are brought about through describing and analyzing one's predicament. Also, the Taoist philosophers propose a definite way of living—one which is harmonious, spontaneous, flows with nature, etc.—whereas Philosophical Counseling aims at helping counselees develop their individual way of living.

However, despite these important differences, there are also two fundamental similarities between the conception of philosophical understanding found in Taoism and in Philosophical Counseling: First, both regard philosophical understanding as embodied in the person's entire way of life. Philosophical understanding is not an abstract endeavor that is *about* life or *applicable to* life, but is interwoven *within* the individual's concrete way of living. This similarity is hardly surprising, since the Taoists too, like contemporary philosophical counselors, were interested not in an abstract theoretical picture of the world but rather in a philosophy that can be lived. If philosophical understanding is to permeate life, as both Taoism and Philosophical Counseling believe, then it must be

capable of existing within an ordinary everyday moment, not just in special philosophical reflections.

Second, both Philosophical Counseling and Taoism regard the development of philosophical understanding as an act of going beyond the person's present way of thinking, feeling, and behaving, into a way of being that embodies something broader than the person's psychology. Taoism aims at going beyond self-centered concerns and at embodying the Tao, like the embodiment of wisdom in Philosophical Counseling.

In order to see these similarities, let us have a brief glimpse at some Taoist passages. One salient point at which the Taoist conception of philosophical understanding is illustrated is related to the idea, found throughout Lao Tzu's *Tao Te Ching*, that the Tao—or ultimate reality—cannot be described in words. This implies that one cannot understand the Tao propositionally (descriptively), through a theory about its nature, or even by entertaining an explicit thought about it. In order to be in touch with the Tao one needs to live properly, rather than think about it. This does not mean, however, that Lao Tzu despairs of the prospects of understanding the Tao. After all, the way of living which he proposes is not a blind automatic behavior, but one which involves insights, understanding, or knowledge of the Tao:[6]

> Without stirring abroad
> One can know the whole world
> Without looking out of the window
> One can see the way of Heaven.
> The further one goes
> The less one knows.
> Therefore the sage knows without having to stir,
> Identifies without looking to see,
> Accomplishes without having to act.

Here we see that although it is impossible to capture the Tao through propositional knowledge ("The further one goes the less one

knows"), nevertheless knowledge (or, in the present terminology, understanding) in another sense is still possible. As noted by the contemporary scholar Chung-Ying Cheng,[7] the Taoist sage understands the Tao by embodying it through his entire way of being. By identifying with it and participating in it he achieves an appreciation of the Tao which is beyond words. This appreciation is not a specific isolated thought or other mental event. It is, in the present terminology, a lived understanding of the Tao: an understanding that is expressed through one's way of being in the world.

A similar point can also be found in the writings of Chuang Tzu, in which numerous passages suggest that the sage, who has turned his back on propositional knowledge, understands or knows the Tao in some other sense:[8]

> He who has a clear understanding of the Virtue of Heaven and Earth may be called the Great Source, the Great Ancestor. He harmonizes with Heaven; and by doing so he brings equitable accord to the world and harmonizes with men as well.

Thus, understanding is achieved through harmonizing with, or embodying. It is this notion of philosophical understanding which enables Taoism to make philosophical understanding most relevant to everyday life. For it implies *that living and understanding cannot be separated.* A worthwhile life cannot merely *follow* the theoretical dictates of understanding, it must live it.

It should be clear now that, beyond obvious differences, this conception of philosophical understanding is fundamentally similar to the one used in Philosophical Counseling. There too the fundamental type of understanding is one which is lived by the person and which leads to a supra-personal way of being, a life that extends beyond self-contained and self-centered concerns. Furthermore, the role of this conception within the frameworks of the two approaches is similar: In both cases this conception allows philosophy to be directly relevant to the person's

concrete way of life, in fact to be inseparable from it. In contrast, philosophies that are based on a cognitive type of philosophical understanding (i.e., one that requires exercising an isolable cognitive capacity), like those common in the Western tradition, are bound to be divorced from everyday concerns.

CONCLUSION

The above discussion points to the important theoretical role of the concept of lived philosophical understanding in Philosophical Counseling, as well as to the parallel role which it plays within the framework of Taoism. Philosophical Counseling is a developing field, especially in comparison with the ancient Taoist tradition. Many ideas are not yet worked out in sufficient detail, including the issue of the nature of lived philosophical understanding. Only on the basis of a proper explication of this concept would it be possible to fully see how philosophy is to be intimately related to everyday life and predicaments. It is therefore crucial for philosophical counselors to further clarify this concept.

The basic similarity, discussed in this paper, between the nature and function of understanding in Taoism and in Philosophical Counseling, suggests that in this project of clarification philosophical counselors may benefit from the ideas which have been developed for centuries in this ancient Oriental school. More generally, it suggests that various Oriental traditions are capable of making important contributions to contemporary philosophical developments in Western thought.

HAIFA UNIVERSITY ISRAEL

NOTES

1. For various approaches to Philosophical Counseling (including my previous approach) see articles by various authors in Ran Lahav and Maria Tillmanns (eds.), *Essays on Philosophical Counseling*, Lanham, USA: University Press of America, 1995. See also Ran Lahav, "What is philosophical in philosophical counselling?", *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, forthcoming, and "Using analytic philosophy in philosophical counselling," *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 10, 1993, pp. 93-101 (Reprinted in: *Inquiry: Critical thinking across the disciplines* 12, 1993, pp. 3-8). In German, see Gerd B. Achenbach, *Philosophische Praxis* [Philosophical practice], Köln: Jürgen Dinter, 1984; Gerd B. Achenbach and Thomas H. Macho, *Das Prinzip Heilung* [The principle of healing], Köln: Jürgen Dinter, 1985.
2. For a more detailed discussion on the difference between philosophical counseling and psychotherapy see Rachel Blass, "The 'Person' in philosophical counseling versus psychotherapy and the possibility of interchange between the fields," forthcoming in *Journal of Applied Philosophy*. See also various articles in Ran Lahav and Maria Tillmanns (eds.), *Essays on Philosophical Counseling*, Ibid., especially Ran Lahav s "A conceptual framework for philosophical counseling: worldview interpretation", ibid., pp. 3-24; Michael Shefczyk's "Philosophical counseling as a critical examination of life-directing conceptions", Ibid., pp. 75-84; Ben Mijuskovic's 'Some reflections on philosophical counseling and psychotherapy," Ibid., pp. 85-100; and Steven Segal's, 'Meaning crisis: philosophical counseling and psychotherapy," pp. 101-119.
3. *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, p. 57.
4. For a further discussion on mainstream Western conceptions of philosophical understanding, as well as some of its opponents (including a brief discussion of Chinese philosophies), see my article "On thinking clearly and distinctly," *Metaphilosophy* 23, 1992, pp. 34-36.
5. For possible directions in which the idea of a lived understanding (or knowledge) can be further developed see, for example, Michael Polanyi's notion of "tacit knowledge" in his *Personal Knowledge; towards a post-critical* philosophy, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958; Ran Lahav's "On thinking clearly and distinctly," Ibid.
6. *Tao Te Ching*, translated by D.C. Lau, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1976, section XLVII, p. 108.

7. "Logic and language in Chinese philosophy," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 14, 1987, pp. 285-307.

8. *The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu*, translated by Burton Watson, New York: Columbia University Press, 1973, p. 144.'