

Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology

ISSN: 2079-7222 (Print) 1445-7377 (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/ripj20

Becoming porous listening bodies: On Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological experience of dialogical encounters in philosophical counselling

Jaco Louw

To cite this article: Jaco Louw (14 Dec 2025): Becoming porous listening bodies: On Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological experience of dialogical encounters in philosophical counselling, Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology, DOI: 10.1080/20797222.2025.2588877

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/20797222.2025.2588877

© 2025 The Author(s). Co-published by NISC Pty (Ltd) and Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

Published online: 14 Dec 2025.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 46

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=ripj20

Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology 2025: e2588877 (9 pages)
https://doi.org/10.1080/20797222.2025.2588877

©2025 The Author(s)
Open Access article distributed in terms of the
Creative Commons Attribution License [CC BY 4.0]
(https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0)

IPJP
2025
Indo-Pacific
Journal of
Phenomenology
ISSN: 1445-7377 (online)

Becoming porous listening bodies: On Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological experience of dialogical encounters in philosophical counselling

Jaco Louw

Department of Philosophy, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa
Correspondence: 18658547@sun.ac.za

ABSTRACT: Maurice Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological description of the authentic dialogue serves as an ideal framework for the embodied experience of listening, especially in philosophical counselling. Even though philosophical counsellors such as Gerd Achenbach and Anders Lindseth provide their own phenomenological accounts of listening in their practices, I argue that these descriptions lack corporeal grounding. Drawing on Merleau-Ponty's concepts of reversibility, encroachment and the chiasm, I provide what I call the *porous listening body*, a framework that positions listening not as a skill to be mastered, but as a *mastery of vulnerability* – a continuous state of porosity. This embodied condition and ethical stance of radical receptivity allows both philosophical counsellor and the guest to be genuinely transformed by this encounter. Through three theoretical reframings, I translate Merleau-Ponty's principles into a lived practice: encroachment becomes permeability, reversibility becomes a dynamic reception and the chiasm becomes the very structure of porosity itself. The porous listening body emerges as an active chiastic site where both participants dwell in the productive silences of the *écart* – the irreducible gap between the self and the other. By placing the framework of the porous listening body in dialogue with Achenbach's and Lindseth's work, I demonstrate how a Merleau-Pontian perspective not only deepens our understanding of philosophical counselling, but offers a concrete, embodied model for practitioners seeking to heed the call of truly listening.

KEYWORDS: authentic dialogue, being-shared-by-two, encroachment, intertwining, reversibility, vulnerability

Introduction

Maurice Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological description of the authentic dialogical encounter captures the complex and layered experiences of both speaker and listener. Through this experience, both participants – listener and speaker – potentially unlock knowledge and insight to which they had no access beforehand (Merleau-Ponty, 1964/1968; 1945/2002). At work is thus a kind of mutual transformation that can only truly emerge *through* a lived, intercorporeal dialogical encounter itself.

In philosophical counselling, a relatively recent movement in practical philosophy that emerged in the 1980s from the work of Gerd Achenbach who saw its practice as an alternative model to therapy, *listening* plays a fundamental role. This is especially evident regarding what the philosophical counsellor can offer the guest who visits their practice, that is, a "sustained, in-depth and shared exploration of whatever evaluative, conceptual or existential issues the [guest] might wish to think through" (Allen, 2002, pp. 4–5). Achenbach (2024, p. 124) himself describes the philosophical counsellor as someone who "is philosophy 'incarnated'". This statement, often only taken metaphorically, is literal in one sense: philosophy "become[s] my very flesh" through the act of listening (Achenbach, 2024, p. 124). Every encounter draws the philosophical counsellor's breathing, posture and attention into dialogue.

From this, philosophical counselling can be read as an attempt to enact and actuate Merleau-Ponty's authentic dialogue: the philosophical counsellor meets a guest, and then they mutually allow each other to enter their respective lives, and, thus listening becomes the very "soul of the conversation" (Achenbach, 2024, p. 36). Both the philosophical counsellor and the guest can potentially be transformed through this genuine encounter.

This article develops a framework through which these descriptions of listening are given corporeal grounding that allows such listening to organically emerge from especially the philosophical counsellor's *listening body*. This prohibits listening from being a merely cognitive activity or skill (technique). Instead, through this grounding, (embodied) listening is a practice or condition that involves the philosophical counsellor's body becoming porous – a continuous state of being open (to be touched and to touch, to listen and to be listened to).

Drawing on Merleau-Ponty, I argue that a framework of the *porous listening body* offers an embodied, ethical stance of radical receptivity that allows both the philosophical counsellor and the guest to be transformed by this encounter. Here the body is not a passive vessel, but an active site where permeability is cultivated. The listener's openness, however, is not infinite; it is disciplined, responsive, and alive to the touch of the speaker. In such dialogue, the speaker-listener roles are radically reversible, where the listener ultimately lends the speaker an ear to hear themselves anew (Achenbach, 2024). Listening, then, is less a skill to be acquired than a *mastery of vulnerability* – a response and commitment to the ethical

demand of an encounter that is acknowledged as rare, difficult and potentially dangerous (Lindseth, 2015b; Achenbach, 2024).

To lay the foundation for the porous listening body framework, the article will unfold in three sections. The first section lays the necessary philosophical groundwork through a detailed discussion of Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological description of the authentic dialogical encounter. I trace his argument from the primacy of the lived body or body-subject (*le corps propre*) as the site for all meaning-making through the concepts of intersubjective encroachment (*empiètement*) and reversibility. The discussion culminates in his later work on the chiasm and the gap (*écart*) as the ontological structure that underpins this shared experience of dialogue.

Building on this foundation, the second section constructs the conceptual model of the porous listening body. Porous is used here to indicate the cultivation of a bodily capacity to be genuinely affected and altered by the presence of the other. Through three *reframings*, I attempt to translate Merleau-Ponty's ontological principles into the proposed lived and embodied stance: (i) encroachment becomes permeability, (ii) reversibility becomes a dynamic reception and (iii) the chiasm becomes the very structure of porosity. These reframings establish the core characteristics of the porous listening body: its permeability, its capacity for dynamic reception and its attunement to productive silences. Ultimately, I argue that the porous listening body is a conscious ethical choice to not only embrace vulnerability, but to continuously be in a state of permeability, and thus practising becoming a porous body.

The final section demonstrates the practical significance of this framework by placing it in dialogue with the work of two philosophical counsellors, namely Achenbach and Anders Lindseth. Through a critical analysis of their descriptions of listening, I identify moments where their language and frameworks implicitly evoke Merleau-Pontian structures, even though they do not state this as such. Here, I show how their phenomenological descriptions of listening in philosophical counselling serve as practical evidence for both the porous listening body and, importantly, Merleau-Ponty's work on the authentic dialogical encounter. Ultimately, I show that a Merleau-Pontian perspective not only deepens our understanding of these practices, but also offers a concrete, embodied model for any practitioner seeking to heed the call of fulfilling the difficult task of truly listening while at the same time remaining porous (vulnerable).

Merleau-Ponty on the dialogical encounter: From the living body to porous listening

The profound significance of dialogue, especially as it is presented through Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological description of the dialogical encounter with the other, emerges from understanding the body as a central site of meaning-making, revealing such encounters as ontological events rooted in our shared corporeality. A radical intertwining of intersubjectivity requires a receptive interpenetration of the self by the other (and the other by the self), a dynamic that I will develop as "porous listening".

The significance of the lived body and embodiment as precondition for intersubjectivity

For Merleau-Ponty (1969/2000), corporeality is the starting point to meaning-making and for engaging with the other through dialogue. The world is experienced through the body with the body being much more than another object *in* the world. Rather, "as flesh applied to a flesh", there is a "reciprocal insertion and intertwining of one in the other" (Merleau-Ponty, 1964/1968, p. 138). The body is thus "*of* the world" (Du Toit, 2024, p. 311; emphasis in original). The body-subject (*le corps propre*) goes beyond mere isolated intellectual cerebrations; we are bodies full of potentiality. One's body is experienced as a "*unified entity full of potentials*" (Guilherme & Morgan, 2018, p. 94; emphasis added). It becomes a "dynamic horizon of experience" (Du Toit, 2020, p. 2). It is more than cognitive abstractions, for "consciousness is in the first place not a matter of 'I think that' but of 'I can'" (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2002, p. 159). And this is experienced through the body, for "we are born with eyes expecting to see, with ears expecting to hear, and with bodies expecting to feel and to be touched" (Shaw, 2004, p. 274).

In his later work, Merleau-Ponty developed the body-subject into his notion of the flesh (*la chair*). The flesh becomes the fabric of being, a single interwoven element, a "continuous surface" from which both "crossing of the body-subject to the world and the intertwining of the body-subject" emerge (Du Toit, 2024, p. 311). It is an ontological principle that emphasises the intertwining of the body-subject and the world, an embodiment in which the two – body-subject and world – cannot be conceived separately (Du Toit, 2024). For, as Merleau-Ponty (1964/1968, p. 248) notes, "my body is made of the same flesh as the world"; knowing, in this sense, happens *through* the body.

The embodied experience is not solitary; our very corporeality makes an encounter with the other possible. As Merleau-Ponty writes (1969/2000, p. 138; emphasis added), "there would not be others or other minds for me, *if I did not have a body* and if they had no body through which they slip into my field". The other's body is never a mere object in the world; "[i]t is *through* my body that I understand other people" (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2002, p. 216; emphasis added). For "[i]f my consciousness has a body, why should other bodies not 'have' consciousnesses?" (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2002, p. 409). The other, similar to me, becomes a centre of experience, and not just a mere object in the world – I immediately grasp the other's body, like my own, as a centre of experience. This recognition is an active, embodied and intersubjective process of meaning-making. It is a process that constantly shapes and reshapes our experiences, but, most crucially, it *establishes* the "interworld" (Merleau-Ponty, 1964/1968) – the shared space where being-shared-by-two (*être à deux*) becomes possible.

Dialogue as a co-constitutive ontological event: A being-shared-by-two (être à deux)

Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological approach reveals dialogue as a deeply embodied, co-constitutional event and not just as a mere communicative "tool". Our engagement with the other (in their otherness) reveals the world to us in a different yet profound way that could not have emerged if not for this entangled encounter: "A genuine conversation gives me access to thoughts that I did not know myself capable of, that I *was* not capable of", Merleau-Ponty (1964/1968, p. 13; emphasis in original) writes. These new thoughts, this shared world, multiply from within the dialogical encounter itself, from *within me* (Merleau-Ponty, 1969/2000). This encounter can be understood as world-making, an ontological event, or what Grosz (2017) might call an *onto-ethic demand*, where the shared world is co-constituted through an experience that throws up its own

sets of questions that demand attention and intertwining. The intertwining of self, others and the world – intercorporeality and the interworld – becomes important; interaction does not merely shape the individual, but becomes the very precondition for the individual to be. As Merleau-Ponty (1945/2002, p. 191) explains that "my body…is…what opens me out upon the world and places me in a situation there…[my body] opens itself to others or to the past…to co-existence and…acquires significance beyond itself". Being-shared-by-two (*être à deux*) thus points to experience being fundamentally dialogical and relational; ontologically speaking, authentic dialogue *is* the unfolding of shared embodied being. "Dialogue happens", as Guilherme and Morgan (2018, p. 98) write, "with another embodied individual, who is present to one and to whom one is also present". Meaning is thus co-constituted through, in and with dialogical encounters and active and dynamic engagements (De Palo, 2023).

This dynamic is captured by a key passage from Merleau-Ponty.[1] It sets the stage for understanding the processes of mutual constitution and encroachment (*empiètement*). "In the experience of dialogue" Merleau-Ponty (as quoted by Cibotaru, 2023, p. 5) argues, "a common ground is constituted between me and another". Here, our thoughts "form a single fabric (*tissu*)" (Merleau-Ponty; as quoted by Cibotaru, 2023, p. 5); we are not two separate minds, nor do I perceive the other as an object in the world. Instead, we are "for each other, collaborators in perfect reciprocity"; we are "inserted into a shared operation of which neither of us is the creator" (Merleau-Ponty; as quoted by Cibotaru, 2023, p. 5). In this state of being-shared-by-two (*être à deux*), the other's and my own perspective "slip (*glissent*) into each other" as "we coexist through a common world" (Merleau-Ponty; as quoted by Cibotaru, 2023, p. 5). Here, boundaries are blurred, and through this encounter new meanings – "thoughts that I did not know myself capable of" (Merleau-Ponty, 1964/1968, p. 13) – emerge that belong neither to me nor the other alone. Merleau-Ponty (as quoted by Cibotaru, 2023, p. 5) concludes this passage on dialogue, saying that "even the objection raised by my interlocutor draws from me thoughts I did not know I possessed such that if I lend him thoughts, he makes me think in return". In responding (to the "objection raised"), we will discover ourselves to be thinking differently. This interpenetration, this co-constitution of meaning with a "single fabric (*tissu*)" that arises through this engagement becomes the central point of the dialogical (ontological) event.

Reversibility, porous listening and the chiasm

The radical nature of the dialogical encroachment has some profound implications for "the boundary between what I am and what the other is" (De Palo, 2023, p. 27): it dissolves, slips, fades, or as I argue, *becomes porous*. This porosity is not simple merging, for as Merleau-Ponty (1969/2000) describes, there is a *slippage* that allows for difference to be emphasised, pointing to the (experience of the) *self* becoming decentred. "Myself and the other", he writes, "are like two nearly concentric circles which can be distinguished only by a slight and mysterious *slippage*" (Merleau-Ponty, 1969/2000, p. 134; emphasis added). Being is thus revealed as fundamentally relational (Merleau-Ponty, 1964/1968). "[M]y body and the other's are one whole, two sides of one and the same phenomenon, and the anonymous existence of which my body is the ever-renewed trace henceforth inhabits both bodies simultaneously" (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2002, p. 412). The shared fabric (*tissu*) implies that "I" emerge from and am sustained within an interconnected whole (De Palo, 2023). Yet otherness, or my own perspective, does not completely dissolve into this whole. Rather, what occurs is a dynamic which I refer to as a *porous reverberation*: a non-coinciding relation – "unity-in-difference",[2] or a gap (*écart*) – where distinct perspectives resonate within a shared dialogical space (Merleau-Ponty, 1964/1968; Dallmayr, 2009).

The decentring of the self finds a concrete expression in the act of listening. Listening is not passive reception of what the other provides; for as Merleau-Ponty (1969/2000, p. 144) insists, "I am not passive while I am listening". Rather, the self is in an active state of *encroachment*, or what I call *becoming porous*. The strict borders between myself and the other are again blurred as the *listening body* becomes porous – a porous site – when I am actively listening and the other speaks. As Merleau-Ponty (1969/2000, p. 19) notes, "[w]hen I am listening… the conversation pronounces itself within me. It summons me and grips me; it envelops and inhabits me to the point that I cannot tell what comes from me and what from it". The listener, in this sense, is profoundly affected – in fact, *constituted* – by the other's speaking.

Yet the distinct line between the roles of listening and speaking are blurred; a radical uncertainty begins to take hold. More specifically, it thwarts the "[p]resupposed division" between listener-speaker, subject-object, self-other, that usually "operates as a hidden assumption" (Letiche, 2008, p. 68). This blurring of selves is underpinned by the principle of reversibility, which extends to the roles within dialogue. The active-receptive mode of listening dissolves the distinction between speaker and listener. Listening becomes a kind of enunciation, while speaking becomes a kind of listening, until "I no longer know who is speaking and who is listening" (Merleau-Ponty, 1960/1964, p. 97). Dallmayr (2009, p. 36) rightly notes that this *place of dwelling* is a "shared experience where…speaking and being heard come together". This intertwining-and-difference, i.e. coming together (never as a complete subsumption), allows for something radically new and different to emerge, something that neither fully belongs to either speaker or listener.

The dynamic of intertwining-and-difference is structured by Merleau-Ponty's image of the *chiasm* (Bindeman, 2017). The chiasm explains how shared, intersubjective understanding is possible: participants are interwoven into a common ontological ground, yet their perspectives and embodied particularities – their distinct threads of the same fabric (*tissu*), or the tangible-corporeal parts of the porous body – remain different, there, present. Crucially, the chiasm is underpinned and maintained by a persistent divide, a fission, a gap (*écart*), or a kind of irreducibility (Dillon, 1988). This irreducible-reversibility – the blurring of boundaries that is never an absolute, that never coincides – maintains the dynamic tension necessary for authentic dialogue. This tension emerging from the gap (*écart*) prevents both the isolation of individual particularity and the absolute subsumption of the other (Merleau-Ponty, 1964/1968; Dallmayr, 2009) – the listener is never merely an empty vessel through which the other speaks. As Merleau-Ponty (1969/2000,

1 For this passage, found in Merleau-Ponty (1945/2002), I will be using Cibotaru's (2023) translation, as indicated.

2 Fred Dallmayr (2009) notes that the phrase unity in diversity, used by Hans-Georg Gadamer, is equally applicable to Merleau-Ponty.

p. 134; emphasis added) notes, "I give birth, this other is made from my flesh and blood and *yet is no longer me*". It is in this tension or *slippage* – a space between intertwining and difference – where the phenomenological experience of authentic dialogue has the most profound impact for the porous listening body.

Conceptualising the porous listening body

Having now established that authentic dialogue occurs within the tension – the slippage – between intertwining and difference, I want to argue that it is through becoming a *porous listening body* that this space can be subjectively experienced. It is not only learning to inhabit this tension, but an onto-ethical demand to remain porous. This concept attempts to translate Merleau-Ponty's insights concerning the phenomenological experience of the dialogical encounter into an embodied stance: a mode grounded in radical receptivity where boundaries between the other and self are blurred and dissolved, and where listening becomes, so to speak, "inhabited" as the "conversation pronounces itself within me" (Merleau-Ponty, 1969/2000, p. 19).

Before defining the porous listening body, though, I propose three "reframings" of Merleau-Ponty's core concepts as fundamental to this new conceptual model. These are attempts to emphasise and enact his ideas of a lived, embodied dialogical encounter in a new register. Permeability suggests how present bodies lean into one another; dynamic reception suggests that listening is a movement of mutual touching-touched; and the chiasm understood as the structure of bodily porosity reveals how self and other are interlaced in responsive tensions. These reframings emphasise how the porous listening body is a mode of being that the body already knows how to perform.

Reframing I: Encroachment as permeability

The ontological principle of encroachment (*empiètement*) – the dissolving of clear boundaries between myself and the other (De Palo, 2023) – is the foundation for permeability. This is a permeability that allows the other and I, as "concentric circles", to be distinguished by a mere "slippage" (Merleau-Ponty, 1969/2000, p. 134). This is a kind of porosity, which allows for the otherness of the other to "come inside" myself, and my otherness to penetrate the other – porousness points to a mode of being where pieces of myself (and that of the other) can easily be broken off. In fact, Merleau-Ponty (1964/1968, p. 123) writes that "a sort of dehiscence [fission or non-coincidence] opens my body in two…there is overlapping or encroachment, so that we must say that the things pass into us as well as we into the things".

This dynamic movement might be captured by the movement of the ocean, where "the in-and-out, the comings and goings, as exteriorities cross (always permeable) borders to become interiorities that soon exude" (Bennett, 2020, p. x). The bodies of the speaker and listener, like the oceanic movement, move toward one another, boundaries shifting and folding as each becomes open to the other. It is thus through porous boundaries that the other's and my own perspective can easily "slip (*glissent*) into each other" (Merleau-Ponty; as quoted by Cibotaru, 2023, p. 5), where the other's perspective as exterior enters me, becoming interior, radiating and multiplying within me (Merleau-Ponty, 1969/2000). The same process happens in the other's confrontation with me (where I become an other for them).

At the same time, the porosity leads to an openness that is necessarily *vulnerable*. Porous and permeable boundaries open one "to suffer, to fall prey to violence and be harmed" (Gilson, 2011, p. 310). Yet as Gilson (2011) argues, this vulnerability should not be understood as a limitation, but rather as an enabling condition. The vulnerability to get hurt, to fall prey to the outside (exterior) upsetting the interior, is exactly what allows us to also "fall in love, to learn, to take pleasure and find comfort in the presence of others, and to experience the simultaneity of these feelings" (Gilson, 2011, p. 310). Becoming porous – becoming susceptible to "being affected and affecting in turn" (Gilson, 2011, p. 310) – thus embraces vulnerability as a necessary condition for meaningful interpenetration.

The encroachment, the dissolving of boundaries "between what I am and what the other is" (De Palo, 2023, p. 27), or the embrace of permeability, is thus the first step toward what I want to call a porous stance or embodiment. It is the blurring of boundaries between the present bodies of both speaker and listener, leaning into one another in a moment of radical vulnerability, a porous encounter where both bodies open themselves to be touched (affected, listened to) and to touch (affect, spoken to).

Reframing II: Reversibility as dynamic reception

In the experience of authentic dialogue, the self and the other, the speaker and the listener, become decentred, radically reversible and ambiguous – as much as I am speaking, I am also listening and I am constituted by the other in their listening-speaking disposition. The boundaries between the role of speaker and the role of listener are, as noted above, dissolved. This allows for the radical reversibility Merleau-Ponty (1960/1964, p. 97) describes, where our perspectives, in *perfect reciprocity*, "slip" into each other to the point that it is no longer clear "who is speaking and who is listening". Therefore, it is no longer clear who is giving and who is receiving; there is only the inseparable to-and-fro movement, like the ocean waves, that distorts exteriority and interiority – exteriority is internalised, while interiority is externalised.

Permeability implies absorption but also a boundary – skin is both the outer protective layer, but also a permeable layer that allows for absorption. The skin, a permeable border, thus seems to be breathing; it both separates and connects, inside and outside are allowed to pass into each other as air moves through the porous skin (Nieuwenhuis, 2019). In this sense, the listening body breathes through contact, an embodied openness that blurs the line between sensing and responding, and a mode of listening where one breathes the other's words. This dynamic reversibility – where listening is perceived as activity (Merleau-Ponty, 1969/2000) – points to the continuous and energetic essence of experiencing authentic dialogue, where listening becomes an event of the body. The reframing of reversibility, therefore, reveals the porous body's capacity for dynamic reception: an active participation in a dialogical exchange where the roles of speaker and listener are not fixed. Instead, in accordance with the demands of the dialogue, these roles become perpetually co-created, allowing for a movement of mutual touching/affecting.

Reframing III: Chiasm as the structure of porosity

In the chiasm, the speaker and listener become reversibly intertwined, yet there is a crucial gap (*écart*) – a tension – that is maintained by the "slippage", or the discernability between myself and the other. This allows for a recognition by the "I" and the other, but importantly, it possibly allows for new understandings and insights to take hold of both speaker and listener. As Merleau-Ponty (1964/1968, p. 224) writes, "[t]he others' words make me speak and think because they create within me an other than myself, a divergence (*écart*)". Listening thus becomes "inhabited" by a conversation that pronounces itself *through* me and the other (Merleau-Ponty, 1969/2000), an event that unsettles, encroaches and creates a vulnerable openness – to be touched while at the same time touching, to listen while at the same time speaking, to be permeable and absorb the exteriority of the other. But the two – touching and to be touched, listening and speaking – "are never exactly the same thing" (Bindeman, 2017, p. 57), maintained by the tension that keeps them separate and where there is still a form of "strict identity" (Dillon, 1988, p. 164).

Through this final reframing, the chiasm is revealed as the very structure of porosity and the *unity-in-difference* it describes is the precise tension that the porous listening body learns to inhabit. The gap (*écart*) thus becomes a productive silence, a silence that resonates, fertile ground from which authentic dialogue reverberates through the porous listening bodies, and a weaving of the body through which self and other are held in responsive tensions. The porous listening bodies are slightly open, touched and touching, listening *through* their bodies.

Toward practising becoming a porous listening body

The *porous listening body* is underpinned by the three reframings – permeability, dynamic reception and the chiastic structure. It becomes an embodied stance of radical porosity, openness and receptivity. Listening happens *through* the body, one that is radically open and permeable – where boundaries are dissolved and roles are radically reversed yet upheld by the tension of a *unity-in-difference*. The boundaries between listener and speaker – both bodies that are vulnerable to be touched, but both capable of touching and leaning into each other – dissolve, yet there is no subsumption of the other, nor does the other subsume me. Instead, ideas are allowed to reverberate through the hollow channels of the porous bodies, coming alive on the skin that breathes. Even exteriority that might upset and harm can be internalised, resonating through the receptive body and the breathing skin.

This stance of radical reversibility means that the porous listening body cultivates a state of *continuous listening*[3] even when speaking; it is an *active* openness, a constant state of being porous. It embodies an attentive presence. When in the listening role, one remains receptively silent yet open to the other's speaking, attentively listening and creating a space for the other to be heard. Simultaneously, the porous listening body embraces a productive silence, actively listening *for* silences within dialogue. These silences become meaningful, where they at once become open spaces through which meaning can reverberate, and where silence itself also becomes tangible: an audible hum of the world. "You feel the world's word as a tension", writes Annie Dillard (2013, p. 89–90). This tension becomes an audible "*hum*, a single chorused note everywhere the same. This is it: *this hum is silence*" (Dillard, 2013, p. 89–90; emphasis added). In the attentive listening position, one becomes a space where the exteriority of the other can reverberate through one – penetrate one. But also, a tension, an audible hum to which the speaker – even while speaking – listens; where one's silence becomes a tangible reverberation that penetrates their speaking.

We might thus begin to see how the porous listening body can be practised in becoming silent or sharing silence with another and "allowing yourself to be touched by the meeting" (Håkansson, 2014, p. 110). Steen Halling and Mical Goldfarb (1991, p. 321) describe a practice in which one sits quietly and "turns one's attention to the centre of the body". The body is engaged and one notices how, in the throat, solar plexus, or abdomen, subtle textures of being are addressed (Halling & Goldfarb, 1991). Such attention, they write, reveals "felt responses to life, events, people, thoughts, and even dreams", sensations that are "frequently difficult to describe", yet are the body's own manner of thought (Halling & Goldfarb, 1991, p. 321). In this position, when one sits with another, and perhaps when spoken words fall away, the body itself begins to listen-speak. The porous listening body becomes attuned to the reverberations and reversibility between self and other, between what might have been spoken and its afterlife in the porous listening bodies, or pre-reflective thoughts. The silence becomes a suspension, which Halling and Goldfarb (1991, p. 327) call a "turning towards an unknown", but now in the context of the blurring between self and other, listening and speaking, silence and the hum of the world.

This receptive stance loosens one's body, which then becomes "part of what one becomes receptive to in listening" (Halling & Goldfarb, 1991, p. 327). The porous body becomes an embodied capacity to receive and resonate, and in doing so practices the vulnerability Merleau-Ponty discerned between touching and being touched. Sitting in this silence, shared listening is enacted through borders becoming porous, a willingness to be impressed upon and to respond in kind.

Halling and Goldfarb (1991) (drawing on the work of psychiatrist Peter Kramer) describe an instance where a social worker, confronted by a patient's eruptive anger, did not retreat but stepped forward to embrace the patient. This brief wordless moment illustrates, in a different way than the above example, how the body of the social worker already knew how to listen, receive and *answer*. The porous listening body embodies this tacit knowledge in which it is not merely a vessel through which silence might reverberate, but a body that intuitively responds. More specifically, the body is present in the moment and attesting that listening is something the body already knows how to do – "being present…is synonymous with being attentive; listening, seeing, feeling and sensing", as Carina Håkansson (2014, p. 108) notes. The porous listening body, then, engages all the senses. Following Andrea Giomi (2019, p. 3–4), such embodied listening "always provokes an activity on the gravitational-muscular level", one that "involves visual stimuli, proprioceptive sensations, tactile/haptic perceptions and…a kinaesthetic response". Embodied listening thus implicates the body and the senses in being *there* with the other. The body becomes a source to which the other can listen, while posture, gestures and variation of breath offer various testimonies of oneself. "Body movements and gestures tell one's life story", as Edward Sampson (1996, p. 620) observes. Here, then, the porous listening body invites one to read its story as

3 Gadamer (1960/2013, p. 481) uses the phrase "uninterrupted listening" to refer to the hermeneutical experience.

being open, its movement orientating, hospitable, receptive and gesturing toward another's presence and speech.

The porous listening body becomes an ethical choice, a response to the onto-ethical demand to be vulnerable, to become porous – permeable – and to invite the other to engage in an authentic dialogical encounter. This stance is radically ethical and a conscious aspiration towards the reciprocity described by Merleau-Ponty. Becoming porous *is* choosing – *taking the risk, risking* – to become vulnerable, a state in which the self is decentred for the sake of the other and the authentic dialogical encounter. However, there is always the present risk that this moment might never arrive (in its authentic instantiation), that *perfect reciprocity* remains a rare event, even an *accident*, or that in this perfect reciprocity a threat can be internalised – brought in(side) from the other (outside) through the porous boundaries. Yet it stands as an ethical practice of preparing the ground – a *corporeal/embodied foundation* – for this encounter. This preparation is not a passive waiting. Instead, it is an active cultivation, especially in terms of cultivating a specific *therapeutic space*. This space must be established before meaningful questions can be asked, where authentic dialogue and intertwining can emerge. This cultivated space, especially because of the listening it creates, must become a central concern for practitioners of, in this case, philosophical counselling. It begins when the listener's body becomes porous, reversable, a chiastic site where listening becomes a *gift* (Achenbach, 2024), where the guest can *listen to themselves anew* (Lindseth, 2015b) and where silence becomes an audible hum for the speaker to attune themselves to.

Porous listening bodies and dialogical encounters in philosophical counselling

This final section demonstrates the practical relevance of the porous listening body as an ethical and phenomenological stance in philosophical counselling. Achenbach and Lindseth's phenomenological accounts of listening already gesture towards the dynamics of permeability (encroachment), dynamic reception (reversibility) and the chiastic gap (*écart*). Yet while their language of presence, flesh and incarnation signals embodied sensibility, it often remains metaphorical by emphasising the philosopher's attitude or character rather than the lived and sensory operations of listening itself. The porous listening body, by contrast, renders these elements corporeal, tracing how listening happens through the body, as flesh that perceives, receives and responds, and where the boundaries between philosophical counsellor and guest become porous, permeable and uncertain. By doing this, it provides an ontological and practical grounding for philosophical counselling, showing how Merleau-Ponty's ideas become more than metaphor – how the porous listening body names the continuous bodily practice through which the philosophical counsellor responds to the onto-ethical demand of being present and embodied. But this listening otherwise is also potentially puzzling and strange, thereby limiting its applicability to those who are willing to be discomforted.

Hospitable space: Permeability and encroachment in practice

Lindseth (2015b, p. 47) emphasises that the first and most fundamental task of the philosophical counsellor is to create what he calls a "space of attention", or a "free space" for thinking (Fastvold, 2005, p. 172). This space, I argue, is a direct result of the philosophical counsellor's embodied permeability. The guest is "granted unrestricted freedom of speech" to voice their concerns, an openness which points to the philosophical counsellor possessing an "attentiveness and a willingness" to engage (Fastvold, 2005, p. 172). As Lindseth (2015b, p. 47) notes, "[m]y attitude expresses a Welcome!". Within this space, the philosophical counsellor is *touched* by the guest's narrative, allowing it to leave "an unforgettable impression" on him (Lindseth, 2015a, p. 50). Lindseth (2014, p. 13) calls this the principle of "touched not-knowing": the philosophical counsellor does not yet know the guest's situation to the full extent, yet she is already invited to have an opinion, to be affected by their story. This is where I find the porous boundary already in action, where the narrative of the philosophical counsellor and the guest start to blur *en route* to becoming porous.

Achenbach's notion of *Eingelassenheit* – an act of "letting in" – along with the notion of a "hospitable silence", furnishes Lindseth's "free space". For Achenbach (2024, p. 40), *Eingelassenheit* "suggests the verb *einlassen*, meaning 'to let in' or 'to let enter'". From this, he arrives at three ideas that point directly toward permeability. First, through an active listening, one lets the other in, opening one's borders so the other might easily cross them. Second, being affected by the other, one lets oneself into the other's world, taking their perspective seriously. This points to a permeability that is reciprocal, where it is not just my boundaries that are blurred, but also the other's. Third, this is a co-presence or interpenetration, where attending to the other blurs boundaries to such an extent that, in Merleau-Ponty's (1969/2000) terminology, the other and I become *concentric circles*. At this point, *Eingelassenheit* becomes a porous disposition that enables hospitable listening, giving the other permission and support to "speak themselves free" (Byung-Chul Han; as quoted by Achenbach, 2024, p. 39). Philosophical counselling thus becomes a practice of reciprocal permeability where both parties make themselves vulnerable, both "letting in" and both co-constructing meaning.

While both Achenbach and Lindseth describe a *hospitable space*, the porous listening body framework explains *how* such spaces can be created. This hospitality becomes an embodied reality for the porous listener, a lived experience of Merleau-Ponty's encroachment. The philosophical counsellor's body becomes receptive to the guest's presence, a permeable site for the other's expressions to reverberate through its hollow channels, to breathe through its skin. This active listening is not just for words, but also for the "audible hum" of the silences between them, allowing the weight of the guest's words to sink in. The porous listener thus allows themselves to be touched or impressed by the guest's story through their body. Words are allowed to reverberate through them – the philosophical counsellor's body and the guest's body are interwoven in a shared world – without the immediacy of quieting the resonance or movement. The philosophical counsellor listens through their body, through breathing that changes, pauses that take hold and where silences become tangible, feeling it almost beneath their skin.

A reversable ear: Active listening and "structive" dialogue

Listening becomes pure and "utter activity" for Achenbach (2024, p. 39). This listening is not done merely to understand, but for the much harder task of listening "to understand how [the guest] is trying to make himself understood to me, how he would desire to be understood; that is, to understand *how he understands himself*" (Achenbach, 2024, p. 38; emphasis in original). It becomes a listening through the body so that it reverberates. Here, Achenbach (2024) turns to a striking metaphor of lending the guest an ear that is precisely *not* their own, allowing them to hear their own story differently. The other – i.e. the guest – is listened to as if it was the listener's – i.e. the philosophical counsellor's – own story. The other's story is thus internalised by the listener; it metaphorically "belongs to me" (Achenbach, 2024, p. 40), yet it remains the guest's story. This tension illustrates the Merleau-Pontian gap (*écart*) within a *unity-in-difference*, where even though there is a blurring of borders, there remains a "strict identity" (Dillon, 1988, p. 164). Achenbach (2024, p. 40) all but names it as such when he writes that "one who listens to me is close to me, is 'at my place' and yet, at the same time, is another". The *concentric circles* are only differentiated by a slight *slippage*; the listening partner lends their ear and in that moment of shared hearing, they almost become one – they are, ontologically speaking, variations of the same shared fabric (*tissu*).

One might here turn to Lindseth for a phenomenological description of the result from the lending of one's ear. He notes that through this listening posture, the guest's words can "gain new relevance" because they are listened to "in a new way" (Lindseth, 2015b, p. 49). For Lindseth (2015b, p. 49), after such a dialogue, both parties are changed because they have "entered a movement in which life forces have been set free". This is reversibility in action, a dynamic that Lindseth captures with the term "structive" – a third category that transcends or moves beyond the binary of "active/passive" (Fastvold, 2005, p. 175). Through this "working mode", the guest's expressions and thoughts are allowed to reverberate through the porous listening body of the philosophical counsellor, or the space opened by their listening posture and, as a result, the guest and the philosophical counsellor are united "in an enterprise of structivity" (Fastvold, 2005, p. 175).

The framework of the porous listening body provides the corporeal grounding for *why* this reversal is potentially transformative. It explains that Achenbach's "lent ear" is more than a metaphor; it is a phenomenological reality made possible by the philosophical counsellor's porous body becoming a literal sounding board for the guest's words. The philosophical counsellor who actively and attentively listens, "speaks" back to the guest, non-verbally and through bodily cues – change in posture, breathing that synchronises, nods of approval – thus creating what Lindseth (2015b, p. 47) calls a "space of attention". The guest's words reverberate and resonate through the philosophical counsellor's body – or slightly changing Achenbach's metaphor, the philosophical counsellor becomes a kind of *living mirror* for the guest. The guest's story enters the philosophical counsellor's body and remains there for a time. It is then returned, but never as pure symmetry – an intact and unchanged reflection – as listening through the other also distorts, changes and allows something which was not there to begin with to take hold of both speaker and listener. It is through the chiastic intertwining of the guest and the philosophical counsellor – the borrowed porous ear and the speaker – that *new insights* can be heard from the guest's own words. The philosophical counsellor holds onto the guest's story just long enough so that it might appear in reverse, for the guest to listen to their story differently, slightly estranged. The philosophical counsellor's porosity is the condition that allows the guest, as Lindseth (2015b) notes, to finally listen to themselves.

Mastering vulnerability: Ethics of porosity

Finally, the porous listening body is revealed as a conscious ethical choice to embrace vulnerability – an openness that might lead to nothing, to being hurt, or to internalising something that disturbs, discomforts, or even harms. For both Achenbach and Lindseth, this mode of listening is not merely a tool to be mastered, but rather a difficult, dangerous and fundamentally ethical position that needs to be (co-)cultivated. Achenbach (2024, p. 36, 39; emphasis in original) notes as much when he writes that "listening must be *mastered*" and "cultivated into proficiency", yet the genuine understanding that follows is "extraordinarily rare, and hence quite improbable". He suggests, paradoxically, that it is only when the listener fully accepts this improbability that the conditions for listening well might truly emerge. Moreover, for Lindseth (2015b, p. 49), this encounter becomes an "ethical demand" in which we "expose" and "risk" ourselves. As he writes, the "ethical demand the philosopher has to face is due to the vulnerable expressing-himself (or -herself) of the guest" (Lindseth, 2015b, p. 49).

The porous listening body troubles the notion of "mastery" in a subtle yet crucial way. It reframes mastery not as the acquisition of a skill (technique), but as the *mastery of vulnerability*. It is an ethical commitment in which the philosophical counsellor remains porous and open, resisting the urge to categorise (Fastvold, 2005; Lindseth, 2014), or to rush to agreement (Achenbach, 2024). It is the disciplined practice of inhabiting the gap, the *écart*, and using that productive silence as the very ground for what Achenbach (2024, p. 37) refers to as a "rethink-through together". In remaining porous, in accepting the onto-ethical demand of permeability, the philosophical counsellor and the guest might (re-)think together, almost as one, to allow something radically different to take hold. But it requires the bodily and embodied presence of both the philosophical counsellor and guest to listen otherwise (through the porous body) and which might lead to a certain discomfort, or even a philosophical experience of madness.

Listening otherwise: The discomfort of philosophy

If permeability begins to name the body's capacity to be hospitable, allowing the other's body to lean into and cross borders and to become a living mirror, then the therapeutic space marks where hospitality can either open understanding, or expose both parties to radical destabilisation. The guest's body displays this crossing when breathing, posture, tension and gestures become a site of a *felt sense*, a moment where articulation and thought are not of immediate use, or a moment before words can be formed (Halling & Goldfarb, 1991). At the same time, reversibility as dynamic reception indicates that the philosophical counsellor's body is not an inert instrument; she is touched by the other and, in turn, touches back through shifting her weight, subtle changes in breathing and the tone of her voice. This dynamic reception marks Merleau-Ponty's

reversibility, the intertwining of touching and being touched. The chiastic structure is what makes this mutual touching intelligible, revealing how both bodies belong to the same shared flesh of dialogue. Taken together, the reframings embodied in the therapeutic space make visible both a *promise* and a *peril*.

This permeability can, acting as an outer limit or a test to the scope of the porous listening body, bring the guest toward a moment of estrangement, especially when her own story is reflected and refracted back to her, now possibly in reverse. Read phenomenologically, this closeness to the edge of sense recalls Wouter Kusters' (2020, p. xx) personal account of psychosis or madness being a mirror world: "In madness you find yourself in a kind of inverted world that can be terrifying and repugnant – something to be avoided – but one that can also seem mysterious, meaningful and seductive". One might illustrate this with two ideas: that philosophy disturbs and discomforts, and that the philosophical counsellor can read disturbance, psychosis, or madness. Yet to disturb or discomfort is not to induce madness. The porous listening body might approach this space, but must also remain ethically alert to the difference between disorientation as possible insight, or a puzzle to be solved, and disorientation as harm. It is thus a disposition of openness cultivated by containment, where the philosophical counsellor's embodied attunement acts as the ground that prevents the encounter collapsing into confusion. This promise and peril shows the limits of the porous listening body and what it might (not) provide the guest. The porous listening body is not to be adopted as a universal posture, but one that might begin to disturb in a unique manner: the guest is interrogated through the philosophical counsellor internalising their story and providing it back in reverse, slightly distorted, and the philosophical counsellor is challenged by internalising something external: the guest's life story told through their body's movements and gestures (Sampson, 1996) that can potentially harm them.

This disruptive openness recalls Achenbach's (2024, p. 116) insistence that "[p]hilosophy…engages in sabotage" and that "philosophy that no longer disturbs and discomforts is not worthy of our attention". The same reversibility that allows the philosophical counsellor to embody and return the guest's story can also tip into enactment, emotional contagion, or the philosophical counsellor's own destabilisation. Porosity therefore requires embodied discernment, rather than unconditional openness. Practically, philosophical counsellors can modulate permeability through somatic interventions, a grounding posture, paced breathing, deliberate withdrawals of touch and gaze, or by becoming light in the moment of anticipated heaviness (Håkansson, 2014). Openness thus alternates with containment. These bodily changes are themselves communicative as the guest senses them and they help contain affect so that the guest's *felt sense* may be attended to rather than simply discharged.

Conclusion

By placing the porous listening body – informed by Merleau-Ponty – in dialogue with the practices of Achenbach and Lindseth, their phenomenological descriptions of listening are given a corporeal foundation, demanding the philosophical counsellor to remain permeable, open, porous and, importantly, *vulnerable*. The porous listening body is not offered to replace the insights of Achenbach and Lindseth; instead, it potentially provides ontological grounding to their accounts. As I argue, it becomes a continuous state of porosity. The "soul of the conversation" (Achenbach) is thus revealed to be not just a metaphor, but a reality grounded in the principles of permeability (encroachment), dynamic reception (reversibility) and an ethically vulnerable lived body. This framework is structured by the chiasm, where the irreducible gap (*écart*) is the very hospitable or free space where productive silences start to resonate and interpenetrate.

The porous listening body thus offers a concrete and embodied model for the philosophical counsellor, or any practitioner/listener, seeking to embrace the difficulty of truly listening, of entering a dialogical encounter with the other. Through the three reframings of Merleau-Ponty's core principles, this article attempts to breathe practical significance into his philosophy through the demonstration of its resonance with the lived experience of the philosophical counselling relationship. This demonstrates not only the significance and relevance of Merleau-Ponty in especially philosophical counselling, but it also shows how philosophical counsellors (or practitioners) can keep this philosophy alive in the pursuit of leading a better life – a life co-constituted through authentic dialogue with the other.

Acknowledgements

For language improvement during the finalisation of this article, Google Gemini 2.5 Pro was utilised for proofreading. The prompts used included explicit instructions to check grammar and language use.

ORCID iD

Jaco Louw – https://orcid.org/0009-0002-3341-1597

References

Achenbach, G.B. (2024). *Philosophical Praxis: Origin, Relations, and Legacy* (M. Picard, Trans.). Lexington Books.

Allen, R. (2002). Philosophical Inquiry and Psychological Development. *International Journal of Philosophical Practice*, *1*(3), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.5840/ijpp2002136.

Bennett, J. (2020). *Influx and efflux: writing up with Walt Whitman*. Duke University Press.

Bindeman, S. L. (2017). *Silence in Philosophy, Literature, and Art*. Brill-Rodopi. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004352582.

Cibotaru, V. (2023). Interreligious Dialogue: A Challenge for Phenomenology. *Religions, 14*(3), 302. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14030302.

Dallmayr, F. (2009). Hermeneutics and inter-cultural dialog: linking theory and practice. *Ethics & Global Politics, 2*(1), 23–39. https://doi.org/10.3402/egp.v2i1.1937.

De Palo, M. (2023). An "I" Locked in a Barrel "Would Not Know How to Speak": Field of Experience, Dialogue, and Encroachment in Merleau-Ponty. *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*, *45*(1), 19–39. https://doi.org/10.4000/hel.3341.

Dillard, A. (2013). *Teaching a stone to talk: Expeditions and encounters*. Harper Perennial.

Dillon, M. C. (1988). *Merleau-Ponty's ontology*. Indiana University Press.

Du Toit, J. (2020). Living in the age of the embodied screen. *Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology, 20*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/20797222.2021.1876895.

Du Toit, J. (2024). A Merleau-Pontian phenomenology of the virtual: Disembodied challenges and embodied prospects. *South African Journal of Philosophy, 43*(4), 307–322. https://doi.org/10.1080/02580136.2024.2364318.

Fastvold, M. (2005). Beyond method, Anders Lindseth style: The quest to open up philosophical space in the consulting room. *Philosophical Practice, 1*(3), 171–183. https://doi.org/10.1080/17428170600595937.

Gadamer, H-G. (2013). *Truth and Method* (J. Weinsheimer & D.G. Marshall, Trans.). Bloomsbury Academic. (Original work published 1960)

Gilson, E. (2011). Vulnerability, Ignorance, and Oppression. *Hypatia, 26*(2), 308–332. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2010.01158.x.

Giomi, A. (2019). The case for an embodied approach to listening. Bodies, technologies and perception. *Hybrid, 6*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.4000/hybrid.581.

Grosz, E. (2017). *The Incorporeal: ontology, ethics, and the limits of materialism*. Columbia University Press. https://doi.org/10.7312/gros18162.

Guilherme, A. & Morgan, W. J. (2018). *Philosophy, Dialogue, and Education: Nine modern European philosophers*. Routledge.

Håkansson, C. (2014). The extended therapy room coming from an authentic place…: A phenomenological-hermeneutic study of my experiences as a psychotherapist in the Extended Therapy Room. Doctoral thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Finland. https://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-39-9383-2.

Halling, S. & Goldfarb, M. (1991). Grounding truth in the body: Therapy and research renewed. *The Humanistic Psychologist, 19*(3), 313–330. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08873267.1991.9986771.

Kusters, W. (2020). *A Philosophy of Madness* (N. Forest-Flier, Trans.). MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11573.001.0001.

Letiche, H. (2008). Bodily Chiasms. *The Sociological Review, 56*(2), 63–83. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.00816.x.

Lindseth, A. (2014). Life as Moving Towards the Other. *Journal of Comparative Social Work, 9*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.31265/jcsw.v9i1.113.

Lindseth, A. (2015a). The Meaningfulness of and Satisfaction from Dialogues in Philosophical Practice: Considerations of Content and Methodology. In A. Fatić and L. Amir (eds.), *Practicing Philosophy* (pp. 42–56). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Lindseth, A. (2015b). Being ill as an inevitable life topic. Possibilities of philosophical practice in health care and psychotherapy. In M. N. Weiss (ed.), *The Socratic Handbook. Dialogue Methods for Philosophical Practice* (pp. 47–66). LIT Verlag.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (2002). *Phenomenology of Perception* (C. Smith, Trans.). Routledge. (Original work published 1945)

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964). *Signs* (R. C. McCleary, Trans.). Northwestern University Press. (Original work published 1960). https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203994610.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1968). *The Visible and the Invisible* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Northwestern University Press. (Original work published 1964)

Merleau-Ponty, M. (2000). *The Prose of the World* (J. O' Neill, Trans.). Northwestern University Press. (Original work published 1969)

Nieuwenhuis, M. (2019). Porous skin: Breathing through the prism of the holey body. *Emotion, Space and Society, 33*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2019.100595.

Sampson, E. E. (1996). Establishing Embodiment in Psychology. *Theory & Psychology, 6*(4), 601–624. https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354396064004.

Shaw, R. (2004). The embodied psychotherapist: An exploration of the therapists' somatic phenomena within the therapeutic encounter. *Psychotherapy Research, 14*(3), 271–288. https://doi.org/10.1093/ptr/kph025.