

Between Methodological Structure and Open Dialogue: Mapping Procedural Rigor, Clinical Boundaries, and Associated Risks in Contemporary Philosophical Counseling

Ioana Nicolescu¹

Abstract: The article examines the methodological landscape and clinical boundaries of contemporary philosophical counselling. As the field consolidates its position alongside established therapeutic professions, it navigates a central tension between unscripted, open-ended dialogical frameworks and structured, procedural models. This study provides a comparative analysis of international institutional perspectives and the contributions of the practitioners. Furthermore, the paper investigates how these divergent methods inform clinical boundaries, addressing the intersection between philosophical inquiry, non-pathologizing practices, and psychiatric classifications. Given that methodological flexibility and a lack of universal standards introduce inherent risks, such as relativism or procedural rigidity, these challenges must not be minimized. The pluralism and fluid clinical boundaries of philosophical counselling do not represent a weakness; rather, they mirror the fragmented reality of contemporary practices and demonstrate the discipline's capacity to offer viable alternatives and adapt to practical realities of human life.

Key-words: Philosophical counseling; methodology open dialogue; clinical boundaries; philosophical practice; diagnosis; pluralism;

¹West University of Timisoara, Romania, Email: ioana.nicolescu87@e-uvr.ro

Introduction

By reaching back across a century of theoretical isolation, contemporary philosophical practice reconnects modern inquiry with the discipline's ancient tradition of guiding everyday life and addressing human existence. Long before philosophy became predominantly an academic enterprise, focused on abstract analysis, it was a practical resource for overcoming ethical dilemmas, lack of clarity, and personal crises. The modern emergence of philosophical counselling revives this orientation, restoring philosophy to its role as a useful tool for human self-understanding. Today, the institutional landscape of the discipline reflects a rich, if fragmented, array of approaches. Major international organizations and academic initiatives offer diverse conceptualizations of what philosophical practice should entail. Representing the foundational origin of the movement, the *Internationale Gesellschaft für Philosophische Praxis* (IGPP) conceptualizes philosophical practice as an open, non-pathologizing dialogical space for existential orientation. By contrast, the National Philosophical Counseling Association (NPCA) emphasizes structured logic-based frameworks aimed at resolving cognitive errors, while the *Institut de Pratiques Philosophiques* (IPP) focuses on rigorous critical self-examination and Socratic dialogue. Meanwhile, academic centers such as the Liverpool-Oxford-St Andrews Kantian (LOSAK) Research Centre explore the broader epistemological and moral foundations of applied philosophy. These differing perspectives range from ordinary problem-solving to integrative therapeutic support, demonstrating the diversity of the field.

However, as the discipline consolidates its position alongside established therapeutic professions, two interconnected debates emerge:

1. *Methodological structure vs. open dialogue*: Practitioners often remain divided between models of open, unscripted dialogue that prioritize existential encounter and the demand for standardized procedures aimed at ensuring professional credibility and procedural safety.

2. *Clinical boundaries*: Divergent views persist regarding whether philosophical practice should be strictly limited to non-pathological clients, or extend its inquiry to individuals experiencing psychiatric

conditions. Far from being separate issues, these two axes closely inform one another, though not in entirely predictable ways. While it might seem that open-dialogical frameworks are inherently more inclusive toward clients with severe distress, some proponents of standardized models argue the exact opposite. For instance, structured, technique-oriented models can utilize clear procedural criteria not as exclusionary filters, but as stabilizing frameworks that allow practitioners to safely engage even with clients experiencing psychiatric conditions. Rather than advocating for a specific professional model, this article maps the procedural and clinical boundaries of contemporary philosophical counselling. Specifically, it examines the comparative risks, theoretical implications, and boundary conditions of both structured (methodological) and unstructured (open-dialogue) approaches.

Defining Philosophical Counseling: Conceptual Clarifications

There are numerous perspectives on what philosophical counseling involves and, equally, what it does not. The literature offers a range of clarifications originating from different theoretical frameworks, institutional practices, and practitioner perspectives. In an effort to capture and illustrate the methodological diversity of the field, ranging from unstructured, open dialogue to logic-based interventions and academically integrated frameworks, four institutional perspectives are examined below. At the foundational origin of the movement, the *German Internationale Gesellschaft für Philosophische Praxis* (IGPP) conceptualizes philosophical practice not as the mechanical application of theoretical doctrines or techniques, but as a dialogical space for personal reflection and existential orientation. According to the IGPP framework, philosophical consultation avoids schematic categorization, standard norms of normality, or hasty pathologization, treating the visitor not as a clinical case to be remediated, but as a unique conversational partner seeking conceptual clarity. Rather than applying philosophical theories as prescriptive rules to solve everyday problems, the practitioner engages the guest in an open, non-judgmental inquiry aimed at examining ingrained thought patterns, clarifying personal values, and navigating life challenges (IGPP n.d.).

The National Philosophical Counseling Association (NPCA), based in the United States, defines philosophical practice as follows:

"Philosophical counseling uses philosophy, its theories and ways of critical thinking, to help counselees address ordinary problems of living. Such problems include mid-life crises, loss, career changes, moral problems, work-related stress, and a host of other common, human, life challenges. Often, these problems can be addressed philosophically by helping the counselee to examine and reassess his or her reasoning about such matter ". (NPCA n.d.)

A complementary perspective is provided by the Liverpool-Oxford-St Andrews Kantian (LOSAK) Research Centre, which highlights the integration of philosophy with modern psychotherapy.

Philosophical counselling builds on the well-established practices of modern psychotherapy by incorporating some of the most practical and therapeutic ideas from the long history of philosophy. At its core are three key features: critical thinking (the idea that clearer thinking enables better living); attitude (a reflective and philosophical orientation towards life rather than a narrow problem-solving mindset); and therapeutic benefit (the often powerful experience of finding one's struggles articulated in philosophical texts written centuries ago). (University of Liverpool 2025)

For the France-based *Institut de Pratiques Philosophiques* (IPP), philosophical consultation "is about the care of the self, about the «know thyself», about searching for a «good life», a quest for wisdom, becoming conscious of oneself and the world".

Philosophical counseling distinguishes itself from traditional psychotherapy and life coaching. Rather than focusing on emotional expression or pragmatic problem-solving, it operates as a rigorous intellectual exercise centered on conceptualization, hypothesis testing, and critical inquiry. Within this framework, individual narrative serves not as an end in itself, but as the starting point for deep, demanding philosophical examination (Pratiques Philosophiques n.d.). Although often understood today as a practical manifestation of a largely theoretical discipline, philosophical inquiry served, for much of classical antiquity, the explicit purpose of helping individuals overcome existential and ethical challenges. Within the literature of contemporary philosophical practice, it is argued

that during the twentieth century, academic philosophy increasingly distanced itself from these practical applications. Critics point to the growing institutional overspecialization and formalization of the discipline, particularly within analytical traditions, as primary factors that rendered philosophy largely detached from everyday human concerns. As Lou Marinoff observes:

After Russell, Moore, and Ayer in England and Frege, Schlick and Carnap on the continent, post-Enlightenment philosophy rapidly separated from the empirical, moral, social and political world and became totally self-sufficient. [...] And the problem is not that philosophy in its orientation became too theoretical and self-sufficient, but mostly that (by the middle of 1970s) its practical applications stopped keeping up to the volume and variety of its theoretical evolution. (Marinoff 2016, 49–50)

Ultimately, philosophy is undergoing a return to its historical foundations, yet with a major shift in perspective. While ancient schools of thought typically relied on theological or dogmatic frameworks that prescribed universal doctrines for the good life, contemporary philosophical counseling operates within a post-dogmatic, pluralistic paradigm. Rather than proposing external normative, modern practice respects client autonomy and their unique way of understanding life. Philosophy thus functions as a collaborative instrument of inquiry rather than a universal blueprint. Given that individuals construct meaning through distinct lived experiences and unique conceptual frameworks, philosophical practice seeks to uncover and analyze these personal orientations to foster conceptual clarity, self-understanding, and autonomous decision-making. Consequently, contemporary practitioners refrain from prescribing standardized, universal solutions, treating philosophical reflection as an individualized process.

Procedural Frameworks and Risks:

Methodological Structure vs. Open Dialogue

While the scope remains similar, guiding people toward living a better life, the methods used to achieve it differ significantly. This brings us to one of the most intensely debated questions in the field: should

practitioners follow a methodological structure, or engage in an open dialogue with their clients?

Gerd Achenbach, who is considered the founder of modern philosophical counseling, affirms that we cannot talk about a clear and articulated method in this practice. Achenbach founded his practice on the idea that a method is not something necessary. His approach represents a "beyond method" way to interact with the counselee, an open-end inquiry. He affirmed that "Philosophy does not use methods, it develops methods; it does not use theories, it develops theories". (Schuster 1999, 36)

This "openness" to interpretation is regarded as an advantage.

He explicitly rejects the application of standardized techniques. In his view, strict adherence to procedural rules is a characteristic of empirical science rather than philosophical inquiry. Instead of guiding the interlocutor along a pre-arranged cognitive track, philosophical reflection should deliberately disrupt established thinking routines, aiming to assist individuals in clarifying and navigating their own distinct paths. Guests' matters are neither treated with philosophical text, as "readings are no recipes for healing ", nor served with sophisticated remarks or theories.

"In this way, the philosopher takes his visitor seriously: He isn't understood by theories, i.e. schematically; not as an <<example for a rule>>, but as the unique human being which he is. He isn't judged by any <<measure>> (also none of <<health>>), the question rather is whether he lives according to himself – with Nietzsche's famous phrase: whether he became what he is" (Neubauer n.d., 1307–1308).

Anders Lindseth's vision seamlessly supports Achenbach's non-methodological stance. He redefines the concept of method by returning to its etymological roots, noting that the word originates from the ancient Greek *methodos*, consisting of *hodos* ("way") and *meta* ("to, over, above"), thus designating a meta-way or a meta-hodos (Lindseth 2015, 56).

Lindseth considers that method in philosophical practice should not be interpreted as a rigid procedure, but rather as a reflective "meta-way" of examining and navigating the journey of life. Drawing on Hans-Georg Gadamer's notion of *methodos* as "a way of following," Lindseth argues that a philosophical method allows the individual to step back into

a reflective meta-position to continually test and arrange their path (Lindseth 2015, 47). In his view, methods can take very different forms. For example, dialogical methods, in contrast to monological ones, "offer space and almost invite creation and the unexpected". He states that the method of Philosophical Practice has to be a dialogical one (Lindseth 2015, 47).

In sharp contrast to Achenbach's non-methodological framework, Raabe contends that an open-ended, unstructured dialogue fails to address the pragmatic realities of actual counseling sessions. He asserts that while Achenbach's ideal may sound appealing in theory, it disregards concrete constraints such as limited session time, client expectations, and financial considerations (Raabe 2001, 58–59).

Drawing on broader critiques within the discipline (e.g., Goord; Jongsma; Boele), Raabe shows that the absence of a clear method brings risks such as fostering a vague "anything-goes" relativism. Consequently, he advocates for an explicit, structured procedural framework capable of establishing professional boundaries, setting clear standards for practitioner training, and offering functional guidance for clinical practice (Raabe 2001, 58–59).

Echoing and expanding upon these practical concerns, Ida Jongsma directly challenges the notion that philosophical counseling should define itself by the absence of method. Rebutting Achenbach's view, Jongsma warns that claiming philosophy has no particular method carries "the dangerous consequence of giving license to philosophical counselors to do whatever they please". She contends that without a shared methodological framework, the boundaries of the field remain dangerously vague, undermining its institutional credibility, complicating client referrals, and preventing the establishment of formal training programs. Crucially, Jongsma does not advocate for rigid dogmatism; instead, she proposes a balanced approach, a common framework grounded in explicit assumptions that sets clear professional parameters without dictating every procedural step (Raabe 2001, 58–59).

Other practitioners maintain that the practice is based on several methods and defined in terms of their corresponding procedures. These unclear positions, according to Peter B. Raabe, "serve to make the new practice less credible rather than more" (Raabe 2001, 43–44).

Another prominent figure who strongly advocates for a structured methodology in philosophical counseling is Elliot D. Cohen. In 1985, he laid the groundwork for Logic-Based Therapy (LBT), a structured counseling framework which integrates critical thinking, logic, and philosophy into psychological and behavioral guidance. Cohen argues that philosophical counseling requires a systematic, step-by-step process to decode and rectify the logical errors underlying human emotional distress. Rather than relying solely on open dialogue, LBT employs practical syllogisms to unmask irrational premises, identify philosophical fallacies, and apply historical philosophical antidotes to guide the client toward rational ways of living.

Highly rational and meticulously structured, Cohen's methodology stands in direct opposition to unstructured practices. Rather than depending on spontaneous intuition, Logic-Based Therapy (LBT) operates through a rigorous five-step process that treats emotional and behavioral disturbances as the product of erroneous logical reasoning. The model provides practitioners with one of the most clearly defined and formalized technical architectures in philosophical counseling (Cohen 2013).

Peter B. Raabe emphasized a few possible limitations in the logic-based approach, acknowledged by Cohen himself, noting primarily that the method lacks "universal utility in every instance" and cannot successfully address all the diverse issues clients might present to a philosophical counsellor. Cohen said that while it could be argued that logic-based counseling might suffer from the same flaw as Rational Emotive Therapy (R.E.T.), specifically its potential failure "to address the client's emotions", he maintains that "since emotions are based on beliefs, and beliefs can be altered by means of critical thinking, it seems reasonable to hold that emotions can also be altered by means of critical thinking" (Raabe 2001, 70). Furthermore, Raabe raises a valid concern regarding Cohen's foundational theoretical justification for the method; he argues that Cohen's attempt to position the logic found in critical thinking as the definitive standard for all forms of philosophical counseling relies on a "simple nonapodeictic syllogism" that requires significantly more robust support to be entirely convincing (Raabe 2001, 71).

In addressing the dichotomy between structured method and unstructured practice, Lou Marinoff adopts a stance of pragmatic pluralism. He values the open-ended approach, which he categorizes as

"Type A" counseling, noting that it "has no predefined methodology and therefore fosters a kind of spontaneity that many clients find refreshing or attractive". This approach is defined as a generic philosophical inquiry into a problem where the client engages in a conversation with a philosopher. In his opinion, the fact that the practitioner thinks and speaks like a philosopher, yet in terms the client can understand and apply simultaneously, is what imparts a philosophical nature to the conversation, serving as a salutary and therapeutic example of deformation professional (Marinoff 2016, 97).

However, Marinoff does not reject methodological frameworks; rather, he embraces them when they serve the client's practical needs. He validates "Type B" counseling (the application of specific philosophical theories to particular problems), stating that this approach "works admirably well", and also "Type C", or bibliotherapy (where the practitioner recommends philosophical texts to the counselee). Ultimately, his caution is directed not against methods per se, but against their dogmatization, warning against reducing philosophical inquiry to mechanical "incantations" rather than maintaining an authentic, adaptable dialogue (Marinoff 2016, 99-103).

Clearly identified as a pluralistic approach, the various ways of practicing this profession can be associated with the philosopher who created it. It is debated again if this aspect can be formulated in terms of good or bad, right or wrong. (Raabe 2001, 43-44)

For example, Dries Boele suggests that this is not a desirable way of defining any new practice (Raabe 2001, 18).

But as mentioned above, there is currently no universal agreement on the general outlines of the methods used in philosophical counseling.

The tension between methodological structure and open dialogue cannot be fully analysed without examining the borders of the profession itself. The choice of procedure directly influences how philosophical practitioners set the boundary with psychology and psychiatry, determining whether they strictly limit their practice to non-pathological consultations, or if they utilize their chosen frameworks to engage with people in emotional or mental distress. The following section explores these clinical boundaries, analysing how different philosophical methods approach the overlap with other therapeutic professions.

Clinical Boundaries: Assessment and Limits of Engagement

A legitimate question arises: what is the link between non-methodological approaches and a more inclusive orientation toward individuals experiencing psychiatric conditions? Drawing a clear demarcation line proves far from simple. Unstructured models usually reject rigid procedural protocols and clinical diagnostic grids. From this perspective, by refusing to reduce the philosophical encounter to a sequence of technical interventions, these approaches seek to engage the client as a whole person, rather than a category within clinical classifications. The counselee is treated as a conversational partner whose existential distress is interpreted as a meaningful human experience rather than a set of symptoms to be remediated. However, this openness also highlights the ongoing debate regarding clinical boundaries and risk management in non-methodological practice.

This perspective does not suggest that practitioners who follow concrete methods or operate within institutional settings inherently exclude individuals with psychiatric diagnoses.

While unstructured approaches maintain a flexible, non-diagnostic entry point, structured frameworks typically employ standardized protocols to screen for severe psychopathology, often establishing clear criteria for clinical referral or collaborative care. Consequently, whereas non-methodological practice emphasizes the unmediated dialogical process itself as accessible across a broader spectrum of distress, practitioners adhering to specific methods usually work with individuals experiencing psychiatric conditions within clearly defined operational parameters. To formalize these parameters, the National Philosophical Counseling Association (NPCA) recognizes two kinds of philosophical practitioners: philosophical counselors and philosophical consultants. These titles clearly specify the clinical limitations inherent in their practice.

Philosophical counselors should be trained and hold a certification in a philosophical practice that is recognized by the association, as well as a minimum of a Master's degree in a mental health area. They may apply philosophical practice techniques with clients who suffer from a range of mental disorders, as provided in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5), that include the following: neurodevelopmental disorders, psychotic disorders, bipolar and depressive

disorders, anxiety disorders, obsessive-compulsive disorders, trauma and stress disorders, dissociative disorders, somatic symptom disorders, feeding and eating disorders, elimination disorders, sexual dysfunctions, disruptive, impulsive-control, and conduct disorders, substance-related and addictive disorders, neurocognitive disorders, personality disorders, and paraphilia's (NPCA n.d.).

Philosophical consultants, on the other hand, should be trained and hold a certification in a philosophical practice recognized by the association, alongside a minimum of a Master's degree in philosophy. They do not address mental disorders, but can help their clients overcome difficult situations or problems encountered in everyday life, such as: moral issues, values disagreements, political issues and disagreements, time management issues, career issues, procrastination, job loss, financial issues, disability-related issues, retirement, age-related issues, bereavement, midlife crises, parenting issues, loss of a pet, friendship issues, religious issues, discrimination and rejection issues, breakup and divorce issues, family problems, romantic relationship issues, etc. (NPCA n.d.). The above distinction is made by the Society for Philosophy in Practice in the United Kingdom as well.

In terms of strict boundary demarcation, the American philosopher Lou Marinoff believes that individuals should make an appointment with a philosophical counselor when they need to talk about certain events in order to understand them or to clarify their meaning, purpose, or value. In his opinion, philosophers can offer advice and a large diversity of perspectives (Marinoff 2013, 28-29).

He states that people should know themselves from a medical point of view, and be capable of maintaining their physical health, including the proper functioning of chemical processes in the brain. Regarding these aspects, people should regularly visit their physicians. Similarly, people should know themselves from a psychological point of view in order to maintain their emotional health, an area where psychologists can be of great help. Philosophers, however, are the right professionals to deal with problems that are neither physiological nor emotional in nature, but rather rational. (Marinoff 2013, 29-30)

Philosophical practice is, from this perspective, a form of therapy for healthy people. One can benefit from its techniques by changing their perspective on an issue, becoming calm in stressful situations, or resolving

a moral dilemma. At the same time, Marinoff believes that too much of psychology and psychiatry has been directed toward the pathologization and medicalization of anyone entering a therapist's office. He contends that patients are too frequently told that the cause of their problems is a specific syndrome or dysfunction, when it is rather normal to encounter difficulties in life, and emotional disturbances are not necessarily mental health disorders. Most contemporary therapies imitate the medical model, with therapists using the term syndrome in the same way that physicians use it. This, he argues, is fundamentally wrong; while Down syndrome, for example, is caused by a genetic modification, a scientifically proven fact, we do not have any comparable physical evidence determining what caused Gulf War syndrome (Marinoff 2010, 47-48).

In sharp contrast to Marinoff's stance, the philosopher Anders Lindseth considers that people suffering from psychiatric illnesses can also profoundly benefit from the practical approach of philosophy. He states that a practitioner should rather not reject a task if it belongs to the field of psychiatry. Although a practitioner should sometimes help a client receive the medical support that philosophical practice cannot provide, they must under no circumstances make the client feel that a dialogue is no longer possible because of their illness (Lindseth 2015, 59).

Mental health conditions can be difficult to approach, and most of the time patients are taken away from the common life-world and put into a special world. Mentally ill people are often reduced to their diagnoses, labeled as psychotic, schizophrenic, and so on, thus identified with their condition. They are expected to behave normally in order to be considered sane again, but they cannot simply access this normality from the outside world, as their own sense of normality has already been denied. Lindseth mentions the paradoxical situations that appear in psychiatric structures when a mental health worker tries to help the patient become "normal". Patients will either strive to meet these expectations because they want to be considered sane, which does not mean they are healed, or they will fail to do so and remain incurably ill. Therefore, the philosopher believes that the patient's place in the common life-world should not be taken away from them, and their experiences must be recognized.

"Philosophical Practitioners, who have no intention to treat their guests and therefore avoid the paradox of the helper, can actually

play a role in these processes. As philosophers, they are open enough to allow the expression of the other to make an impression on them. The question is whether health care is open for such a practice" (Lindseth 2015, 63-65).

Similarly, Peter Raabe argues that simply because many practitioners avoid calling philosophical counseling "therapy," it does not mean that the method lacks a therapeutic effect. In his vision, "The philosophical counselor's intention is to help his client reach any reasonable and morally permissible goal the client has set for herself" (Raabe n.d.). He advocates for the use of philosophy-based approaches over medication for the majority of mental health issues.

In his broader critique of psychiatric classification, Raabe argues that a psychotherapeutic diagnosis is typically treated as a medical diagnosis, even though it fundamentally lacks the empirical basis of the true medical model. Relying on the work of psychiatrist Thomas Szasz, he points out that there is currently no verifiable empirical evidence that allows scientists to classify emotional distress or confusion as a legitimate medical illness. Furthermore, the traditional medical approach to psychiatry has failed to find a specific organic etiology, such as a concrete physical or biological cause, for the vast majority of client problems, including depression and psychoneuroses. Consequently, a psychiatric diagnosis is not an exacting science comparable to diagnosing a physical pathology like a brain tumor. Despite this lack of physical proof, patients are frequently categorized according to standardized diagnostic protocols and prescribed medication based solely on abstract labels rather than actual material illnesses (Raabe 2001, 180–182).

Despite these clear positions, the multitude of boundary-drawing attempts fails to meet the necessary conditions of differentiation in the eyes of many, and can rather be considered incomplete. However, if we compare the concept of philosophical practice with the concept of psychotherapy, we must conclude that just as the former is not yet sufficiently developed and still requires refinement, the latter finds itself in a more or less similar position. As Achenbach notes, psychotherapy "has been expanded into an operatic multiplicity of heterogeneous shapes and endeavors". Any attempt to definitively describe psychological therapies is

likely to fall short due to the multiple, competing forms of manifestation that exist today (Achenbach 1995, 61).

A study conducted in 1986 found that there were over 400 distinct and rival schools of psychotherapy (Raabe 2001, 80). On a closer look, it is no wonder that attempts to differentiate philosophical practice from psychological therapies are proving to be remarkably difficult. Since philosophers had lost interest in the practical application of philosophy, the terrain of dialogue was abandoned to other professionals and explored in all its clinical depths. Many of the resulting therapeutic strategies share deep similarities with philosophy and were even directly borrowed from its theories and texts, yet they are traditionally correlated to disciplines, like psychotherapy, that possess a longer tradition of clinical application. While drawing clear frontiers remains a goal for many philosophical practitioners, a significant number of psychotherapists and psychiatrists believe that these distinct fields could in fact complement each other.

A large number of psychological therapies include at least one philosophical method. Some of the most important and popular are cognitive therapy (CT), cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT), rational emotive behavior therapy (REBT), and existential therapies. Existential psychologists and psychiatrists were directly influenced by philosophers such as Søren Kierkegaard, Friedrich Nietzsche, Paul Tillich, Martin Heidegger, Martin Buber, and Jean-Paul Sartre. Their philosophical works provided the foundational basis for the formation of these therapies (Corey 2009, 287).

Conversely, some philosophical practitioners have developed and utilize methods that contain strong elements of psychology. Logic-Based Therapy (LBT), mentioned in the previous section, can be described as a philosophical version of REBT. Cohen explicitly states that he does not view philosophical counseling as entirely distinct from psychological counseling. He argues that philosophers are actually more prepared than psychologists to conduct counseling that involves strict logic, and they should take an active interest in "harnessing their logical tool to solve human problems" (Cohen 1995, 131).

In the end, addressing these clinical boundaries remains contentious. Numerous criticisms have been formulated by professionals from psychology and psychiatry, though philosophical practice has frequently been criticized by philosophers themselves. Psychiatrists'

criticisms are usually related to the philosopher's interaction with clients affected by severe mental illnesses. Psychologists' critiques, on the other hand, are mainly directed toward the hyper-rational approach of philosophical counseling and its perceived lack of tools for handling emotional issues. To address these boundary disputes, avoid malpractice, and manage risks, Barton E. Bernstein and Linda S. Bolin recommend exercising strict precaution regarding specific situations that could exceed the professional competencies of a philosophical practitioner. These include cases where clients threaten suicide or homicide, counseling areas where the practitioner has familiarity but no formal expertise, clients displaying severe psychological or medical symptoms, and consultations involving minors (Bernstein and Bolin 1995, 199–201).

Final Considerations

Ultimately, methodological structure and open dialogue should not be seen as mutually exclusive approaches, but as reflecting the pluralism inherent in contemporary philosophical practice. While each orientation carries inherent risks, ranging from the potential for "anything-goes" relativism in unscripted sessions to the procedural rigidity of structured frameworks, these risks must not be overlooked or minimized. Whether practitioners rely on one approach or the other, both share the fundamental goal of fostering conceptual clarity and autonomy.

Similarly, the clinical boundaries of the profession remain fluid. The deliberate refusal to automatically pathologize human distress offers a vital alternative for individuals seeking existential guidance rather than a medical diagnosis. While the lack of absolute consensus regarding procedures and clinical limits might appear as a vulnerability, it simply mirrors the fragmented reality of many therapeutic domains.

Far from being a weakness, the flexible character and the diversity of forms and methods allows philosophical counseling to remain adaptable, proving that the discipline is defined not by a single universal formula, but by its capacity to engage authentically with the practical realities of everyday life.

References

- Achenbach, Gerd. 1995. "Philosophy, Philosophical Practice, and Psychotherapy." In *Essays on Philosophical Counseling*, edited by Ran Lahav and Maria da Venza Tillmanns, 61-74. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Bernstein, Barton E., and Linda S. Bolin. 1995. "Legal Issues in Philosophical Counseling." In *Essays on Philosophical Counseling*, edited by Ran Lahav and Maria da Venza Tillmanns, 199-208. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Cohen, D. Elliot. 1995. "Philosophical Counseling: Some Roles of Critical Thinking." In *Essays on Philosophical Counseling*, edited by Ran Lahav and Maria da Venza Tillmanns, 121-132. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Cohen, Elliot D. 2013. *Theory and Practice of Logic-Based Therapy: Integrating Critical Thinking and Philosophy into Psychotherapy*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Corey, Gerald. 2009. *Theory and Practice of Counseling and Psychotherapy*. 10th ed. USA: Thomson Brooks/Cole.
- Institute of Philosophical Practice. "Philosophical Consulting? Knowledge Thyself." Accessed August 2026.
<https://www.pratiques-philosophiques.com/eng#PhilosophicalPractice>.
- Internationale Gesellschaft für Philosophische Praxis (IGPP). "What is Philosophical Practice? " Accessed August 2026.
https://www.achenbach-pp.de/de/en_what_is_philosophical_practice.asp.
- Lindseth, Anders. 2015. "Being Ill as an Inevitable Life Topic. Possibilities of Philosophical Practice in Health Care and Psychotherapy." In *The Socratic Handbook: Dialogue Methods for Philosophical Practice*, edited by Michael Noah Weiss, 45-66. Vienna: LIT Verlag.
- Marinoff, Lou. 2010. *Înghite Platon, nu Prozac!*. București: Ed. Trei.
- Marinoff, Lou. 2013. *Întrebări fundamentale*. București: Ed. Trei.
- Marinoff, Lou. 2016. *Ghidul filosofului practician. Teorii, metode, aplicații*. Timișoara: ESP System.

National Philosophical Counseling Association (NPCA).
"Philosophical Practice. " Accessed August 2026.
<http://npcassoc.org/philosophical-practice/>.
National Philosophical Counseling Association (NPCA). "Practice
Areas/Boundaries." Accessed August 2026.
<http://npcassoc.org/practice-areas-boundaries/>.
Neubauer, Patrick. "What is Philosophical Practice?" Achenbach
PP. Accessed August 2026. [https://www.achenbach-
pp.de/de/en_what_is_philosophical_practice.asp](https://www.achenbach-pp.de/de/en_what_is_philosophical_practice.asp).
Pratiques Philosophiques. n.d. " Philosophical Consultation. "
Accessed August 2026. [https://www.pratiques-
philosophiques.fr/en/pratical/the-philosophical-consultation/](https://www.pratiques-philosophiques.fr/en/pratical/the-philosophical-consultation/).
Raabe, Peter B. 2001. Philosophical Counseling – Theory and
Practice. USA: Praeger Publishers.
Raabe, Peter B. "What is Philosophical Counselling." Accessed
August 2026. <http://peterraabe.ca/what.html>.
Schuster, Shlomit C. 1999. Philosophy Practice: An Alternative to
Counseling and Psychotherapy. Westport, CT: Greenwood
Publishing Group.
University of Liverpool. "Philosophical Counselling." Accessed
August 2026.
[https://www.liverpool.ac.uk/arts/news/stories/title,1540854,en.
php](https://www.liverpool.ac.uk/arts/news/stories/title,1540854,en.php).
Weiss, Michael Noah, ed. 2015. The Socratic Handbook. Wien: Lit
Verlag Munster.