Dear RS/EALL 350 Students:

What follows is a translation of Chapter 2 of the Zhuangzi, along with the notes of the Jin Dynasty scholar Guo Xiang 郭象 (d. 312 C.E.). This work is not to be reproduced or copied except by students in this course. Please ignore the page numbers, they are a reference to the Zhuangzi jishì, which is the standard Chinese edition. The text of the Zhuangzi is preceded by “ZZ text,” and Guo Xiang’s notes are preceded by “GX note,” and a number referring to the previous section of text. Since you have already studied this chapter as translated by Victor Mair (pp. 10-24), you can concentrate most of your effort on the GX notes, and use the ZZ text just to remind yourself what the note is about.

About a quarter of the material has been edited out to make this assignment more manageable, so some text that Mair translates is not here, and some numbers in the text do not have corresponding notes (every remaining note, however, does have the corresponding text). The more important notes are highlighted in red text.

Finally, this translation is largely the result of work done this summer by myself and another grad student, Yong-yun Lee. We would like to acknowledge many hours of patient guidance and innumerable helpful suggestions by Professor Mark Csikszentmihalyi. We tried to stay as close to the Chinese text as possible, often sacrificing fluency and sometimes even grammatical accuracy. You may notice that there is also very little annotation or explanation. It is up to you to decide and determine where Guo Xiang is merely clarifying the points made in the text, and where he is using the format of a commentary to offer his own, distinct, philosophy. To get you started, I offer you this quote from Chen Xiaoming:

In addition to the idea of getting rid of knowledge, such concepts as the absence of a creator, self-generation, self-satisfaction with nature and role, dependence and non-dependence, and self-transformation are almost all discussed in the notes to “Qiwulun” (“On Seeing Things Evenly”). The functions of these concepts are closely related to Guo Xiang’s philosophical
core category: “ziran” 自然 (literally “nature” or “self-being”). This shows the significance of “Qiwulun” in the formation of Guo Xiang’s philosophy.¹

You can use Chen’s categories as a starting point to get a handle on the text, and push on to get your own idea of what Guo Xiang means by “nature.” Then we can look at the question of how much of the philosophy that is credited to the Zhuangzi originally derives from the notes by Guo Xiang.

See you Friday.


ON SEEING THINGS EVENLY

ZZ text (p. 43): Ziqi 子綦 of the Southern District sat leaning on his table. He looked up at the sky and sighed. He was detached, as though he had lost his counterpart [1]. Yancheng Ziyu 顏成子游 stood in attendance, and asked: “How can you sit there like that? Can you really make your body like gnarled wood? Can you really make your spirit like dead ashes [2]? The one who is now leaning on the table is not the one who was formerly leaning on the table [3].”

GX note 1: [Ziqi] unifies the heavenly and the human, and equates the “other” and the “I,” therefore from outside there is nothing for him to be pleased with, and in his detachment he is liberated from his body, as if he lost his matching aspect.

GX note 2: [The image of] dead ashes and gnarled wood is used to describe [the state of] being soundless and without emotion. Those who follow nature and forget [the distinction between] right and wrong simply follow heavenly truth within their bodies. What else could there be? Therefore their rest is like standing withered wood, their movement is like a

¹ Chen Xiaoming, “Qiwulun” ji qi yingxiang, (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe) 2004, p. 110.
swaying gnarled branch, their sitting is like dead ash, their walking is like roaming dust. The appearance of movement and rest is what I cannot make one. When it comes to mindlessness and self-attainment\(^2\), [in these states] I cannot differentiate [even between movement and rest].

**ZZ text (p. 45):** Ziji said: “Yan, isn't it good to ask this! Now I have lost myself, did you know it [1]? You listen to the pipes of people (*renlai* 人籁), but you do not hear the pipes of the earth (*dilai* 地籁); you listen to the pipes of the earth, but you do not hear the pipes of heaven (*tianlai* 天籁) [2].

**GX note 1:** If I lose myself, then I am [in the state of] self-forgetting; if I am [in the state of] self-forgetting, then how can anything in the world be [apparent] enough to be distinguished? Therefore only once you completely forget [the distinction between] outside and inside will you transcendently obtain everything.

**GX note 2:** Pipes refer to recorder-type flutes\(^3\). These pipes have varying lengths, and the notes have varying pitch. Hence the multiplicity of long and short, low and high, sounds. Although the sounds are innumerable and diverse, the measure with which they are endowed is one, so good [sounds] and bad [sounds] have no gap separating them. How much more so for the wind and things; they are different in sound but the same in this [endowment]. They all select themselves from it, thus the pipes of heaven and earth appear.

**ZZ text (pp. 45-46):** Ziyu said: “I venture to ask its method.” Ziji answered: “The great clod (*dakuai* 大塊) exhales breath (*qi* 氣); this is called wind (*feng* 風) [1]. This is merely when it does not act, but when it acts then the myriad holes howl fiercely [2]. Haven't you heard its moaning [3]? The clefts and crevasses of mountain forests [4], the holes and hollows of great trees a hundred spans around, like noses, like mouths, like ears, like sockets, like cups, like mortars, like puddles, like pools [5]. [Sounding like] rushing water, whizzing arrows, shouting, breathing, calling, crying, moaning, gnashing [6]: those in front singing *oooh*, those behind

---

\(^2\) a spiritual state (*zide* 自得) is Guo Xiang’s term that he inserts here without much relation to the text. “Mindless” is clearly implied by the text, but much less so “self-attainment”

\(^3\) Held vertically, not horizontally.
singing woong. A cold breeze evokes a small response, a powerful gale evokes a mighty chorus [7]. When the fierce wind dies down, then all the holes become empty [and silent] [8]. Haven’t you seen the tossing and trembling [that goes on] [9]?

GX note 1 (p. 46): The great clod has no substance. How could the emission of breath have substance? The breath is clod-like; it just emits itself, and that’s all. The way things arise is in every case clod-like and from themselves, so clod-like manifestation is great. Therefore “great clod” is used as a name for it.

GX note 2 (p.46): This is saying the wind is merely (in its state of) non-action. When it acts then the myriad holes all move and make sound.

GX note 7 (p. 47): Although there are innumerable transformations in the notes of the sound, singing harmonizes the high and low⁴, in every case⁵ they are named by what they receive and each conforms to its [proper] role.

GX note 8 (p. 48): When the fierce wind blows then the numerous holes are filled; when it stops then the numerous holes are empty. Although empty and full are different, in so far as each fulfills itself they are the same.

GX note 9 (p. 48): Tossing and trembling (diaodiao daodao 調調刀刀) is the image of moving back and forth. It says that since the sounds of things are different, the back and forth movement of their forms is also dissimilar. Although the movements are dissimilar, [the manner in which] they are endowed with these properties is evenly one. How could tossing (diaodiao 調調) solely be right and trembling (daodao 刀刀) solely be wrong?

⁴ Text actually says “great” and “small”大小. Because context is musical notes we say “high’ and “low’.
⁵ Text has mo bu 莫不 (“none do not”) which we translate as “in every case” for smoothness.
ZZ text (p. 49): Ziyu said: “The pipes of the earth are just the numerous holes, the pipes of people are just bound bamboo tubes. I venture to ask what the pipes of heaven are. Ziji replied: The exhaling [produces effects that] are innumerable and dissimilar, and they are allowed to be [what they are]; [each] is merely made what it is out of itself [1]. Who makes them howl [2]?

GX note 1 (p. 50): This is the pipes of Heaven. The so-called pipes of Heaven, how could there possibly be some thing other [than this]? When the kinds of [things that Zhuangzi calls] “numerous holes and bound bamboo tubes” connect with the category of living things, then they join together to make a single Nature. Since non-being is non-being, it cannot produce being. When being is not yet produced, it cannot produce anything. Then what is the thing that produces living things? In a clod-like manner things produce themselves, and that’s all. It is merely that things produce themselves, it is not that “I” produce [them]. The “I” clearly cannot produce things, and things also cannot produce the “I”, so of itself the “I” is as it is. Of themselves things are as they are, so we call this tianran 天然 [nature]. This so-called tianran, is not intentional action, so we use tian 天 to speak of it. We use tian 天 to speak of it, in order to clarify that of themselves things are as they are. How could [tian 天] be a reference to the blue sky? But the confused might say that the pipes of heaven control things and make them follow it. [However] heaven cannot even possess itself, how much less could it possess other things? Therefore heaven is the general name for the myriad things. No [particular] thing can be called tian, so who actively controls things? Therefore each thing generates itself; there is no place from which they arise. This is Tian Dao 天道 [the natural Way].

GX note 2 (p. 50): Things all attain themselves, so who is in charge of having them howl as they do? This re-clarifies [the meaning of] the pipes of heaven.

… ZZ text (p. 51): [People express] pleasure and anger, sorrow and joy, worry and regret, vacillation and stubbornness, elegance and idleness, happiness and disaffectedness [12]. [These are like] music that comes out of emptiness, or fungus that comes from vapor [13]. Day and night alternate before us, but no one knows
from where they sprout [14]. Enough, enough! Morning and evening grasp this, [they know] from where they are produced [15].

GX note 13 (p. 55): This is generally the different ways things change. Up to this point [Zhuangzi] is mainly discussing the endlessness of the pipes of nature; from here on, he clarifies that that endlessness is Nature. Each thing has its own nature and does not know the reason why it is the way it is. So while the forms are increasingly different, their nature is increasingly alike.

GX note 14 (p. 55): Day and night alternate, and the old is replaced with the new. The world and the myriad things each day transform anew, and with time they all pass on. What could be responsible for them sprouting in this way? They do so naturally and that’s all.

GX note 15 (p. 55): This is saying they produce themselves.

ZZ text (p. 55): If there were no “that” there would be no “I”. If there were no “I” there would be no [agent] which could apprehend “[that]”. This is near the mark [1], but I do not know what causes it to be so [2]. It seems as though there is a true ruler, but there is no particular evidence for this [3]. He can carry out what he believes [4], but he does not reveal his form[5]. He has attributes but no form [6]. The hundred joints, the nine openings, and the six organs are all complete within my body [7]. Which should I regard as more kin to me than the others [8]? Do you show favor to them all? Or do you have a preference among them [9]? If so, do you take them all to be your servants [10]? Would these servants not be able to control each other [11]? Or do they take turns being lord and subject among themselves [12]? Do they have a true lord over them all [13]? Whether or not we succeed in specifying his attributes neither adds to nor detracts from his truth [14]. Once we have received the completed form, we remain aware of it while we await extinction [15]. In our strife and friction with things, our actions are exhausted at a gallop, and no one can stop [this process]. Is it not sad [16]? We deplete our bodies with labor but do not see its result [17]; we wear ourselves out with toil in ignorance of where we shall end. Is it not lamentable [18]? People think [at least] they are not dead, but what is the use [19]? The body dissolves, the mind dissolves with it; how can we not call this the most lamentable of all [20]? Is man’s like really as stupid as this? Or is it that I am the only stupid one, and there are others not so stupid [21]? If we
follow our fully-formed mind and take it as our guide, who will not have such a guide [22]? How can it be only those who understand change and whose hearts choose by themselves who have such a guide? The foolish also have one [23]. When there are [things that are] not yet fully formed in our minds, and yet we think we know right and wrong, would be to ‘go to Yue today and have arrived yesterday’ [24]. This is to make something out of nothing. If you say you can make something out of nothing, even the holy sage Yu cannot understand, how could I possibly understand [25]?

GX note 1 (p. 56): “That” refers to nature. Nature produces “I” and “I” is naturally produced. Therefore nature is just the nature of “I”. How could there be any distance between them?

GX note 2 (p. 56): Things are numerous, and they all exist of themselves alone; they do not cause each other to be [as they are]. Therefore [things] follow their nature and [the natural] principle itself is achieved.

GX note 3 (p. 56): The myriad things have myriad attributes, the adopting and discarding [of their attributes] is different, as if there was a true ruler making them do so. But if we search for evidence or a trace of this true ruler, in the end we will not find it. We will then understand that things arise of themselves, and are not caused by something else.

GX note 9 (p. 58): [Even if] you show favor to them all, this shows there is partiality. Once there is partiality then you are not able to exist in complete [equality]. Therefore do not show favor and exist of yourself, do not act [partially] and produce of yourself.

GX note 10 (p. 58): If we are partial to all of them, then our will has exceeded its [proper] role; the upper and lower positions endanger each other, and there are none who will act as follower or servant. If those with the capacities of followers and servants are not content with their responsibilities, then there is failure. Therefore the positions of lord and follower, upper and lower, hand and foot, inside and outside are all self-generated by the principle of nature, how could it truly be due to human action?
GX note 11 (p. 58): Followers and servants each merely fulfill their proper role, and none will fail to be sufficient to govern each other. The roles mutually governing each other is like the various parts of the body each having its own function and at the same time employing and utilizing each other.

GX note 12 (p. 59): The men considered worthy in each time become rulers. Those whose abilities do not accord with their times become subjects. If heaven makes itself lofty and earth makes itself low, the head places itself high and the foot places itself low, how could there be any taking turns? Although there is no one who places them in their proper role, still they necessarily fulfill their proper role.

GX note 14 (p. 59): All those who attain their true natures act in accordance with themselves. Even if they become slaves, they will not be concerned with the destruction of their reputation, but be at ease with their position. Therefore knowing and not knowing are both the same [to them]. If you exploit the road to fortune, from the lower [position] you will offend the higher, things will lose their truth, and people will lose their nature. The [proper ordering] between good and bad reputations will be lost in the blink of an eye.

GX note 15 (p. 59): This is saying each nature has its proper role. Therefore the knowledgeable keep their knowledge while they await the end, while the ignorant keep their ignorance until death. How could it be possible to change one’s nature in the middle of life?

GX note 16 (p. 60): The totality of things is varied and numerous. They move along and against each other, and each believes in its own perspective and pursues that which it desires. None are able to recover [their nature] by themselves. This is what people feel sad about, and [this situation] is sad. But that people do not yet feel this is sad, is because of their nature. Each thing is naturally so, so how can there be anything to be sad about?
GX note 17 (p. 60): People’s desires have no limit, and those who know satisfaction are few. Therefore when they obtain “this”, they do not stop, but again chase after “that”. They are all tired from toiling to the limits of their bodies, but in their minds they are not yet satisfied. Thus they toil until death. Therefore at no time can we see any who are successful.

GX note 18 (p. 60): All people exhaust their bodies to obtain what they like, working until they are tired and worn out. They do not know why they live like this, nor where these intentions will lead them.

GX note 19 (p. 60): This is saying that real life and death are the same.

GX note 20 (p. 61): This is saying that the mind and body both struggle, become tired and do not rejuvenate. Compared to what most people are sad about, this is truly the great sadness. But for all those who do not regard this as sad, then of all the things which could make them sad, none will be worthy of sadness.

GX note 21 (p. 61): In all of the above matters, people do not know why things are as they are, so [Zhuangzi] calls them stupid. Now, the knowledgeable are all unaware of the reason for knowing, but they know of themselves. Living things are all unaware of the reason for living, but live of themselves. Although [knowledge of] the myriad things are different, but as life does not come from knowledge, there are none who not the same, therefore in the world there are none who are not stupid.

GX note 22 (p. 61): This mind which is sufficient to control all the uses of the body is called the fully-formed mind. If people follow their own fully-formed mind, then each person will have his own guide. If each person has his own guide, therefore they rely on it and take on their proper role.

---

6 Reading wei 未知 as fu 未知.
7 In the sense of “spontaneously produce knowledge out of themselves”; and below: “spontaneously produce life out of themselves.”
GX note 23 (p. 61): This replacing the fully-formed with what is not fully-formed is not wise, it is merely satisfying one’s own desires. Therefore the foolish follow their fully-formed mind. They are not willing to use their so-called shortcomings or give up their so-called strengths.

GX note 24 (p. 62): If you go to Yue today, how did you arrive yesterday? If one’s mind is not fully-formed, from where can right and wrong arise? To clarify right and wrong is something no one can lack, therefore the fully enlightened make the two [right and wrong] follow it [nature].

GX note 25 (p. 62): Principle has neither right nor wrong, but the confused believe it does. This is to make something out of nothing. Once the minds of the confused are already fully-formed, even a sage cannot understand [this principle]. Therefore [the confused] follow [their minds] and think [they] are right, while [the sage] does not force [the idea that] he knows.

ZZ text (p. 63): Speech is not blowing breath, saying says something [1]; what it says is never fixed [2]. Do we really say something [3]? Or have we never said anything [4]? You may think it is different from the chirping of hatchlings, but is there any distinction, or is there no distinction [5]? How has the Way become so obscured that there are true and false? How has speech become so obscured that there is right and wrong [7]? How can the Way go away and not exist [8]? How can speech exist but not be acceptable [9]? The Way is hidden in small achievements, [the meaning of] speech is hidden by foliage and flowers [11]. Therefore there is the right and wrong of Confucians and Mohists, using right to prove wrong and wrong to prove right [13]. If you want to prove right is wrong and wrong is right, then nothing is as good as using illumination [14].

GX note 1 (p. 63): Each person has something they want to say, therefore it is different from blowing breath.
GX note 2 (p. 63): That which I think is right others think is wrong, and that which others think is right I think is wrong. Therefore there is no certainty. There being no certainty comes from emotional bias of [the division into] “others” and “I”.

GX note 3 (p. 63): Do you think you are saying something? Yet it could not be sufficient to be certain.

GX note 4 (p. 63): Do you think you are not saying anything? Then this is based on what you already said.

GX note 5 (p. 63): [People’s] words and bird’s chirping are the same; whether there is a distinction or no distinction, this cannot really be decided. In the world [people’s] feelings are not necessarily the same, but what is said cannot be different, so right and wrong have become mixed up. No one can decide this.

GX note 7 (p. 64): The Way does not exist in the world! How have words obscured [the Way] and produced true and false? How have the names “right” and “wrong” chaotically arisen?

GX note 11 (p. 64): These small achievements and flowery [speech] are spontaneously hidden within the Way, but the Way cannot be hidden. Thus these [categories of] true and false, right and wrong, are activated within flowery [speech] but stop in truth and propriety. They appear in small achievements, but disappear within the great completeness.

GX note 13 (p. 65): The Confucians and Mohists are more and more opposed over right and wrong. But all the world is either Confucian or Mohist. Therefore the hundred schools developed together, each partial to its own view and none beginning to come out from their position.
GX note 14 (p. 65): That there is right and wrong, this is what Confucians and Mohists think is right. That there is no right or wrong, this is what Confucians and Mohists think is wrong. Now, those who wish to affirm what the Confucians and Mohists deny and deny what the Confucians and Mohists affirm, want to clarify that there is no right or wrong. If you want to clarify that there is no right or wrong, nothing is better than going back to the way Confucians and Mohists repeatedly oppose each others clarifications. Since they repeatedly oppose each others clarifications, then what is right is not right and what is wrong is not wrong. It is not wrong so there is no wrong. It is not right so there is no right.

ZZ text (p. 66): No thing is not “that,” no thing is not “this” [1]. If you treat yourself as “that” then it cannot be seen; if you know yourself you know them [2]. Therefore it is said that “that” comes from “this”, and “this” is relies on “that” [3]. This is the way of speaking of the simultaneous production of “this” and “that”. Even though this is so, simultaneously with living one dies, simultaneously with being acceptable things are not acceptable, and simultaneously with being not acceptable things are acceptable. [Wrong] relies on right and [right] relies on wrong; [right] relies on wrong and [wrong] relies on right [4]. For this reason the sage does not ascribe [to these viewpoints], but illuminates things by the light of nature, also relying on what is right [5]...

GX note 1 (p. 66): Things all regard themselves as “this”, therefore there is nothing which is not “this.” All things regard each other as “that”, therefore there is nothing which is not “that”. If there is nothing which is not “that”, then the world can have no “this”. If there is nothing which is not “this”, then the world can have no “that”. There is no “that” or “this”, therefore all things are mysteriously united.

GX note 3 (p. 66): This is the partiality of things. None can see what others see, and only know what they know. [Only] knowing what they know, they then regard it to be true. Regarding it to be true, they then regard others as false. Therefore we say that “that” comes from “this” and “this” from “that”. “This” and “that” are mutually dependent and arise from each other.
GX note 4 (p. 67): The transformation between death and life is similar to the progression of the four seasons of spring, fall, winter, and summer. Therefore although the condition of life and death are different, as each feels comfortable where they are, [they can be considered] the same. Now, if the living just call their lives being alive, and the dead just call their lives being dead, then there is no [thing that can be called] life. If the living just call their death being dead, and the dead just call their death being alive, then there is no [thing that can be called] death. There is no life, no death, no permissible, no impermissible. Therefore I cannot agree with the argument between the Confucians and the Mohists. Because they each cloud their position, I cannot regard them as different.

GX note 5 (p. 67): These clear-minded people, comply with the right and wrong of the world, but they do not have their own [concept of] right and wrong. Therefore they do not follow the path of [their own] right and wrong, and the right and wrong [of the world] has no worry of being inappropriate. Therefore they directly illuminate their nature and have no conflict.

ZZ text (p. 69): [Something] is permissible by being permissible [1], and is not permissible by being not permissible [2]. A road is made by people walking on it [3], things are so because they are called so [4]. How is this so? It is so by being so. How is this not so? It is not so by being not so. Things intrinsically have that which is so; things intrinsically have that which is permissible [6]. No thing is not so; no thing is not permissible. For this reason, whether you take [as an example] a stalk or a pillar, a leper or Xi Shi, [things no matter how] peculiar or diverse, their ways connect to become one [8]. Their dividing is formation [9]; their formation is dissolution [10]. No thing is either complete or dissolve; they return to connect and become one [11]. Only the perceptive reach the understanding that things connect to become one. For this reason they do not use [things], but take the usual as a metaphor [12]. The usual is the usable; the usable is that which connects; that which connects obtains [13]; and once you obtain you are almost there [14]. Rely on this alone [15]. [Relying] only [on this] but not knowing why it is so is called the Way [16]. To weary the spirit and understanding trying to make things one but not understanding they are the same, we call this “three in the morning”. Why is this called “three in the morning”? A monkey trainer handing out nuts said: “[I’ll give you] three in the morning and four in the evening.” The monkeys were all angry. The monkey trainer said: “So then [I’ll give you] four in the
morning and three in the evening." The monkeys were all happy. Neither name nor reality suffered, but [the monkeys’] happiness and anger were put to use, also relying on this [principle that things are the same] [19]. For this reason the sage harmonizes things by [his concept of] right and wrong and rests on the heavenly potter’s wheel [20]. It is this that is called “dual procession” [21].

GX note 8 (p. 71): The stalk is horizontal while the pillar is vertical, the leper is ugly while Xi Shi is beautiful. To make them even, why should it be necessary to make their appearance even or have a single standard? Therefore to take as an example the vertical and the horizontal, the ugly and the beautiful, no matter how peculiar or fantastic, each is so in the way it is so; each is permissible in the way it is permissible. So while principle has many different forms, nature is equally obtained, therefore we say their ways connect to become one.

GX note 9 (p. 72): For some things, they are scattered in “this” sense, but formed in “that” sense.

GX note 10 (p. 72): That which I called formed, can in “that” sense sometimes be called dissolve.

GX note 11 (p. 72): [The concept of] formed and dissolve things comes from what we see, but we don’t see the other [side]. Therefore there is no formation and dissolution, just like there is no right and wrong.

GX note 13 (p. 72): The perceptive are not attached to one perspective, therefore spontaneously they forget themselves, and rely on appropriateness according to their own use [of each thing]. Their own use [of each thing], is in every case selective and [according to] self-attainment.

GX note 14 (p. 72): To be almost there means to reach. The ultimate principle is reached by [those who are] self-attained.
GX note 15 (p. 72): The perceptive follow [nature] but do not manipulate [it].

GX note 16 (p. 73): That the perceptive follow this, how do you know they follow it because it is good? They do not know the reason for which they follow it—they just follow their nature, therefore we call it the Way.

GX note 19 (p. 73): The perceptive, as for [the concept of] “one”, how could they weary their spirit [over it]? If they weary their spirit and understanding to make things “one”, it will not be sufficient to rely on, there would be no difference from some other [person] who was not trying to make things “one”. It is the same with the monkeys’ confusion. They take what they like to be what is right.

GX note 20 (p. 74): None of them are partial [to one way of looking at things], therefore they give it over to equality and stop.

GX note 21 (p. 74): Follow the right and wrong of the world.

… ZZ text (p. 79): Now I have something to say here. I do not know if it is in the same category as “this,” or a different category from “this.” Being of a category and not of a category make a category with each other, so there is no way to differentiate them from “that” [1]. Although this is so, let me try to explain this [2]. There is beginning [3]. There is not yet beginning to have beginning [4]. There is not yet beginning to have this not yet beginning to have beginning [5]. There is being [6]. There is nonbeing[7]. There is not yet beginning to have nonbeing [8]. There is not yet beginning to have this not yet beginning to have nonbeing. Suddenly there is nonbeing, but I do not know which is really being and which is nonbeing [10]. Now I have just said something [11], but I don’t know if what I have said is really saying, or is really not saying [12]. Nothing in the world is larger than the tip of an autumn hair and Mount Tai is small. No one lives longer than a stillborn child, and Peng Zu died young. The world was produced with me and the myriad things are one with me [13]. Already being one, can I still say something [14]? Already saying that we are one, is it possible not to say anything [15]? One and speech makes two, two and one makes three. Continuing on from here, even the cleverest
mathematician could not get to the end of it, how much less an ordinary person [16]! Therefore if in proceeding from nonbeing to being we arrive at three, how much further will we arrive proceeding from being to being [17]! Do not proceed, and relying on “this” will come to an end [18].

GX note 1 (p. 79): Now, if you say there is no right and wrong, then it is not possible to know if that [idea] is of the same category or a different category from saying that there is [right and wrong]. If you want to say they are the same category, then I could take “there is no [right and wrong]” to be right, and someone else could take “there is no [right and wrong]” to be wrong, so in the end there are different categories. In this way, although right and wrong are different, it is intrinsically impossible to avoid having right and wrong, so [this question] is of the same category as “that”. Therefore [Zhuangzi] says that being of a category and not of a category make a category with each other, so there is no way to differentiate them from “that”. So if we take having no categories to the utmost, nothing is better than no-mind. Just forget right and wrong, and further forget that you have forgotten. If you continue this process of forgetting until you reach a point where there is no forgetting, then [the questions of] forgetting and not forgetting or right and wrong will go away by themselves.

GX note 2 (p. 79): The ultimate principle cannot be expressed in words, since once an idea is expressed in words then it is of a category, so [all you can do is] try to entrust words to say something.

GX note 3 (p. 80): If there is a beginning then there is an end.

GX note 4 (p. 80): If you say there is no end or beginning, then death and life are the same.

GX note 5 (p. 80): This unifying [principle] is not like a duality which has evened itself out. It further forgets its own oneness.
GX note 6 (p. 80): When there is being then you have all [the categories of] beautiful and ugly, right and wrong.

GX note 7 (p. 80): If there is nonbeing but no knowledge of the absence of nonbeing, then [the categories of] right and wrong, good and bad, are still not separated from perception.

GX note 8 (p. 80): [It is possible] to know about the absence of nonbeing, but it is still not possible to have no knowledge.

GX note 10 (p. 80): This is all about losing one’s knowledge, and in this way to suddenly begin to understand nonbeing. Once one understands nonbeing, then the world and the myriad things, “other” and “I”, right and wrong, clearly are truly this way.

GX note 11 (p. 81): To say that there is no right or wrong is still saying something.

GX note 12 (p. 81): Further, if one does not know [to question] the being or nonbeing of saying, then clearly there is not the slightest thing in the mind.

GX note 13 (p. 81): Using form to compare, then Mount Tai is larger than an autumn hair. [But] if each thing is in accord with its natural role, it is secretly in accord with its ultimate [nature], so having a large form does not mean it has excess, and having a small form does not mean it is insufficient. If each thing fulfills its nature, then the autumn hair should not merely regard its smallness to be small, and Mount Tai should not merely regard its largeness to be large. If whatever fulfills its nature is considered large, then nothing in the world surpasses an autumn hair; if whatever is sufficient in nature is considered small, then even Mount Tai can be called small. Therefore we can say that nothing in the world is larger than an autumn hair and Mount Tai is small. If Mount Tai is small, then there are no large things in the world. If an autumn hair is large, then there are no small things in the world. There is no small and no large, no long- or short-lived, therefore the cicada does not envy the cederla tree, but is happy and satisfied with what it has. The quail does not value
the Lake of Heaven, and its desire for glory is thus satisfied. If things are contented with their natural identity and satisfied with their nature and destiny, then even the world should not be considered to be long-lasting but [rather as] coexisting with me, the myriad things should not be considered different but [rather as] having the same attributes as I. So why can’t the generation of the world [be seen as] coexisting [with mine], and the attributes of all things be [seen as] one [with mine]?

GX note 14 (p. 82): The myriad things and myriad forms come together in self-attainment, and [the way] they attain is the same. Already spontaneously being the same, this principle cannot be expressed in words.

GX note 15 (p. 82): Naming things is produced from ignorance. Things are confused and cannot understand for themselves their unity [with everything else], so they use “this” to chase after “that”, therefore “one” is said to correct them. [But] since “one” is already said, then something has been said.

GX note 16 (p. 82): This is to use words to express [the idea of one], but the one is not the same as the words, so one and the words make two. Since one is [only] one, words [have had the effect of] making it two. To have one [entails] having two, so how could you not [proceed] to call it three? You use one word to talk about [the idea of] one, yet still it becomes three. Moreover if you seek its source, all things will call it something different. Although there are good mathematicians, none will be able to record [all the answers]. Therefore those who [talk about] “one” are no different from others [who don’t talk about “one”], while those who forget “one” do not use words and [simply] make themselves “one.”

GX note 17 (p. 82): This one has no words [which can express its meaning], and to speak of it results in three. Moreover, in searching for its final number, how could there be any end?
GX note 18 (p. 83): Each stops at the point where it is able to stop, therefore it is just this [principle].

… ZZ text (p. 89): Long ago, Yao inquired of Shun: “I want to attack [Princes] Zong, Kuai, and Xu Ao. I sit on the south-facing throne⁸ and am not at ease. What is the reason for this [1]?” Shun answered: “These three rulers are still living among brambles and bushes [2]. Why are you not at ease? Formerly ten suns appeared [4], and the myriad things were all illuminated, how much greater is virtue than these suns [5]?"

GX note 1 (p. 89): The Way of comfort and following has not yet spread [throughout the land], therefore holding audience in court Yao is not happy. He wants entrust his understanding of the principle of making things one to a great sage, therefore he asks the question about his feeling strange in order to provoke a response [from Shun].

GX note 2 (p. 90): The place where things feel comfortable has nothing vulgar about it, the brambles and bushes are a fine place for these three rulers.

GX note 5 (p. 90): Although the sun and moon are not partial in what they illuminate, still there are places their light does not reach, as for virtue, there is nothing it does not reach. So now [Yao] wishes to seize the place of brambles and bushes, and attack to make [their lords] follow him. How could this attain [his goal of] spreading the Way [throughout the land]? Therefore he is uneasy and his spirit is scattered. If he would just let things fulfill their natures, each being comfortable in the place it is comfortable, there would be no place far, near, remote or deep. If he would let things be the way they are, everything would reach its ultimate potential, everything would be where it should be, and he would not be unhappy.

ZZ text (p. 91): Nie Que inquired of Wang Ni: “Do you know what all things agree to be right?” Wang Ni answered: “How could I know that [1]?”

------------------------------
⁸ The king’s throne faced south. To sit on the south-facing throne denotes being a king.
GX note 1 (p. 91): When (people) agree they are not necessarily right, when they disagree one is not necessarily wrong. Therefore “others” and “I” are not able to correct each other. Therefore there is no occasion on which to use your knowledge.

ZZ text (p. 91) Nie Que asked: “Do you know what you don’t know?” Wang Ni answered: “How could I know that [1]?”

GX note 1 (p. 92): If you knew what you do not know, then you do have knowledge. If you have knowledge, then you cannot simply let things be as they should be.

ZZ text (p. 92) Nie Que asked: “Then does nothing know anything?” Wang Ni answered: “How could I know that [1]?”

GX note 1 (p. 92): All things do not know, thus in clarity and openness they all follow [their natures].

ZZ text (p. 92): Even though it is so, I’ll try to say something about it [1]. How can we know that what I call knowledge is not really ignorance [2]? How can we know that what I call ignorance is not really knowledge [3]?

GX note 1 (p. 92): Since he does not know, he does not claim to speak correctly, but merely tries to say something.

GX note 2 (p. 92): Fish swim in the water, so the water is what things [like fish] agree on. They all call this knowledge. But from a bird’s point of view, what these [fish] call knowledge again becomes ignorance. The knowledge of a dung beetle is rolled up in a ball, and those who laugh at them take gathering grass to be valuable. Therefore what can be agreed upon as knowledge cannot be proven.
GX note 3 (p. 93): What is called ignorance is merely not agreeing. It is still from the same family of knowledge.

… ZZ text (p. 97): Master Ju Que inquired of Master Chang Wu: “I have heard from the master that the sage does not involve himself in worldly affairs [1]. He does not pursue benefit, nor does he avoid harm [2]. He does not delight in seeking [3], nor does he follow the Way [4]. In saying nothing he says something, in saying something he says nothing [5]. He wanders beyond the dust and grime [6]. The master regarded this as a wild and flippant description, but I regard it as the practice of the wondrous Way. What do you think, my master [7]?“

GX note 1 (p. 97): Affairs arise of themselves and principle responds of itself, and that’s all. It is not for [the sage] to involve [himself] and do things.

GX note 2 (p. 98): Following [nature] and going straight ahead, there is nowhere to hide or go after.

GX note 3 (p. 98): If you seek something you will not be happy. If you take it directly [according to its nature] you will not become angry.

GX note 5 (p. 98): Of all that is called “something to say,” none is what I would say, but each regards itself as having something to say. Therefore there is no “that” which is saying something, but “this” which is saying nothing.

GX note 6 (p. 99): All that is not true nature is dust.

ZZ text (p.99): Master Chang Wu said: “Even the Yellow Emperor would be confused by these things, how could Confucius be able to understand them? Moreover you are counting [your winnings] too soon. You see an egg and expect a rooster, you see a crossbow pellet and expect a roast owl [2].
GX note 2 (p. 99): Things all have their nature, and principle has its ultimate. When you follow it and go straight ahead, then mysteriously things come together. This cannot be described in words. Therefore the description will be wild and flippant and the listener will be confused. Even if you go back to the Yellow Emperor, you will still not be able to make the myriad things without thought, or help the confused listeners arrive at the final stage. Therefore the sage hands over [things that] should be outside the dust and grime, and mysteriously unites [things] in the appearance of what we can see and hear. He illuminates things by heaven and does not plan in opposition [to nature]. He releases things to be as they are and does not push for clarification. Now Master Ju Que has just heard this wild and flippant description and immediately believes it describes the practice of the wondrous Way. This is no different from seeing an egg and admonishing the action of a rooster, or seeing a crossbow pellet and expecting the appearance of a roast owl. In this manner you are never comfortable where you are and always looking for change, you seek life and fear death, you are attached to right and distinguish it from wrong. These are all ways in which you plan in opposition [to nature].

ZZ text (p. 100): I will try to say a few reckless words to you [1] and you listen recklessly:
How can [the sage] lean against the sun and moon and hold the universe under his arm [3]? He merges with them, places himself in the chaos, to treat baseness and honor with mutual respect [4]. Ordinary people seem to struggle and strive [5], the sage seems foolish and stupid [6]. He combines myriad years into a single purity [7]. The myriad things are completely as they are [8], and thereby enfold each other [9].

GX note 1 (p. 100): The words are wild and flippant, therefore he tries to speak them carelessly.

GX note 2 (p. 100): If you listen carefully to careless words, then again you are counting [your winnings] too soon. Therefore why not also listen carelessly?
GX note 3 (p. 101): The metaphor of leaning on the sun and moon is [an illustration of] treating life and death as day and night. The example of holding the universe under his arm is [an illustration of] uniting the myriad things into one.

GX note 4 (p. 101): Because there are things which are not valued, the [concepts of] worthy and worthless arise. As for [the resulting] chaos and disorder, no one can rectify it. Each thing is right from one direction. Therefore to practice the Way of merging the self [with the universe], there is nothing better than to leave things and say nothing, entrusting things to themselves as they are. Chaotically, there is no way of talking about the boundary of [any particular] wave.

GX note 5 (p. 102): Running around within the limits of right and wrong.

GX note 6 (p. 102): This refers to the image of foolishly ignorant and [stuck] moving ahead.

GX note 7 (p. 102): What is pure is not mixed. [The sage] takes myriad years and participates in their transformation, however ordinary people call this mixed up. Therefore they desperately tire their bodies and disturb their minds, discarding “that” and pursuing “this”. Only the great sage does not grasp [onto one view]. Therefore [it seems that] he foolishly moves straight ahead and becomes one with transformation. Once his transformation is complete, he roams constantly in loneliness. Therefore although [the myriad things] combine and mix for millions of years, [and exhibit] great diversity and infinite variation, the Way revolves them into completion, so from ancient times to now is all one completion. Things call [themselves] something and are so, and the myriad things are this single way. All things are this way, and no time is not complete. This can be called purity.

GX note 9 (p. 103): This [Way] has been gathering for myriad years, so the myriad years are this one [Way]. It enfolds the myriad things, so the myriad things are completely
enfolded. Therefore we don’t know how to distinguish life and death, or first and last. We
don’t know the identity of “other” and “I”, or winning and losing.

ZZ text (p. 103): How do I know life is not a delusion [1]? How do I know hating death is not like a homeless
child who does not know to return home [2]? A lady of Li was the daughter of a border guard at Ai. When the
state of Jin first took her, she cried until tears soaked her robe. Only after she arrived at the king’s residence,
shared the King’s square couch, ate the meat of hay-fed and grain-fed beasts, did she regret her tears [3].
How do I know the dead do not [likewise] regret their former longing for life [4]?

GX note 1 (p. 103): Death and life are one, but [ordinary people] only speak of life, and
want to transform [only] with [life], and be in opposition [to death]. Therefore they do not
yet realize this view is not a delusion.

GX note 2 (p. 103): A child who has lost his former home is called ruo sang弱喪 (a
homeless child). This homeless child is consequently comfortable wherever he is, and does
not know to return to his former home. How do we know life is not like this homeless
child? How do we know death is not [simply] returning and we hate it [for no reason]?

GX note 3 (p. 104): Within a life, emotions change like this. At “this” time, you don’t know
about “that” time. How much less do you know the transformation between life and death?
How is it possible [for such different situations] to know each other?

ZZ text (p. 104-5): Some who dreams of feasting cries and wails in the morning; someone who dreams of
crying and wailing goes to hunt in the morning [1]. While we dream we do not know that we are dreaming [2],
and in the middle of a dream we interpret the dream within it [3], only after we awake do we realize it was a
dream [4]. Only after the great awakening will we realize that this is the great dream [5], while the foolish
believe themselves to be awake and presumptuously know things. They call one man ruler, another shepherd,
how stubborn [6]! You and Confucius are both dreaming [7], and when I say you are dreaming I am also
dreaming [8]. This description of his, I call it the enigmatic swindle [9]. Only after myriad generations will there
appear a great sage who will know how to resolve it, and it will seem as though he appeared overnight [10].
GX note 1 (p. 105): This is the transformation of states between being asleep and awake. If states transform, perceptions will be different. Then the desires of being alive and being dead cannot be the same. Therefore while alive enjoy being alive, and while dead enjoy being dead. Although life and death are different, insofar as each wants to attain its hope they are the same, so why be tied down [to only enjoying life]?

GX note 2 (p. 105): From this point of view, while we are dead we don’t know we are dead, and we enjoy ourselves [according to] our will.

GX note 3 (p. 105): This dreamer interprets his dream-within-the-dream while dreaming, so he is no different from someone who is awake.

GX note 4 (p. 105): When we encounter something, [the encounter] is never lacking [it seems the same whether we are awake or dreaming], so while you are alive, why are you worried about death?

GX note 5 (p. 105): This greatly awakened person is the sage. This greatly awakened person knows that worries in one's mind are [the result of] not yet being awake.

GX note 6 (p. 105): The ignorant are greatly dreaming but believe themselves to be awake. Therefore they presumptuously take what they like to be lord, and what they dislike to be shepherd, happily believing the prejudice of a single school. This can be called stubborn and base.

GX note 7 (p. 106): They have not yet forgotten words and released their spirit, therefore they are not greatly awakened.

GX note 8 (p. 106): This refers to interpreting the dream-within-a-dream while dreaming. To believe that you are dreaming is still not to be awake. How much more presumptuous to
believe that you have awakened!

GX note 9 (p. 106): This is not an ordinary way of speaking, so it is not what ordinary people would understand, therefore it is called the most enigmatic swindle, and we cannot know its final resolution.

GX note 10 (p. 106): This is saying that someone who is able to shed all attachment and mysteriously unite death and life is extremely rare.

ZZ text (p. 107): Suppose that you and I have a dispute. If you beat me and I lose to you [does that mean] you are really right and I am really wrong? If I beat you and you lose to me [does that mean] I am really right and you are really wrong? Is someone [necessarily] right and someone [necessarily] wrong [2]? Are both of us right? Are both of us wrong? If you and I cannot decide between ourselves, then other people are certainly even more in the dark. Whom shall we call in to decide it [5]? Shall we call someone who agrees with you to decide it? If he already agrees with you, how can he decide it? Shall we call someone who agrees with me to decide it? If he already agrees with me, how can he decide it [7]? Shall we call someone who disagrees with both of us to decide it? If he already disagrees with both of us, how can he decide it [8]? Shall we call someone who agrees with both of us to decide it? If he already agrees with both of us, how can he decide it [9]? Then since of you, I and others, none of us can know decide between ourselves, do we wait for still another [10]?

GX note 5 (p. 107): If you don’t know, then you guess; if you don’t see, then you argue. If you are arguing something, then you do not know enough to convince yourself. Arguing like this is not enough even to make yourself believe, and for this reason you oppose others. When you argue in opposition you will end up in the dark, in the end no one will be able to prove anything. Therefore you should give the argument over to proving itself.

GX note 7 (p. 108): You both assert it for the same reasons, [but] this is still not reliable.
GX note 8 (p. 108): Different reasons discount each other, [but] this is also not dependable.

GX note 9 (p. 108): If true were really true, then the world would have no false things in it. If false were really false, then the world would have no true things in it. Now, truth is what brings things together and false is what separates things, [but since] coming together and being separate are already [one] complete [entity], then true and false have no master. Therefore this idea of true and false arises from love of argument and stops in celestial equality. Hand the problem over to “dual procession” and rest in [letting things] prove themselves.

GX note 10 (p.108): Each thing decides for itself, and that is all. To depend on “that” is not good enough to decide on “this”, so no one in the world is able to decide for someone else. Therefore give things over to deciding for themselves and [thereby] attain the ultimate.

ZZ text (p. 109): That the voices of transformation depend on each other is the same as that they do not depend on each other [3]. Harmonize them in the framework of heaven, rely on them through limitless transformation, so they may live out their years [4]. What is called harmonizing within the framework of heaven [1]? Right is not right, so is not so. If right were really right, then it would differ [clearly] from not right and there would be no dispute. If so were really so, it would differ [clearly] from not so and there would be no dispute [2]. Forget the years, forget righteousness. Be shaken into the limitless, then you will reside in the limitless [5].

GX note 1 (p. 109): The framework of heaven is the natural role [for each thing].

GX note 2 (p. 109): Right and wrong, so and not so, “other” and “I”, [can all] change into their opposites, therefore there is no distinction. There is no distinction, therefore they are harmonized within the framework of heaven. They are comfortable in their natural roles and that is all. They do not need to wait for something else to correct them.

---

9 This paragraph is rearranged [5th and 6th sentences placed 1st and 2nd] as in Graham, Watson, and Mair.
GX note 3 (p. 109): The distinction between right and wrong makes up the alternating voices. These alternating voices depend on each other, [but] they are entirely incapable of correcting each other, therefore it is the same as if they did not depend on each other.

GX note 4 (p. 109): Harmonize things within their natural roles, follow their limitless transformations, and seek where this [process] comes from. Then the boundaries of right and wrong will disappear by themselves, and the ultimate destination of life will fulfill itself.

GX note 5 (p. 110): He forgets age, therefore mysteriously life and death are united. He forgets righteousness, therefore he has a fuller understanding of right and wrong. Right and wrong, life and death, [all] clarify and become one, this is the ultimate principle. The ultimate principle opens into infinity, therefore those who entrust themselves to it will never be exhausted.

ZZ text (p. 110): Outline asked Shadow: “A little while ago you were walking, now you are standing still. A little while ago you were sitting, now you are standing up. How is it that you have no independent action [1]?”

GX note 1 (p. 110): The outline is the small outer layer of the shadow.

ZZ text (p. 111): Shadow answered: “Must I depend on something to be as I am [1]? Must what I depend on also depend on something to be as it is [2]? Must I depend on the scales of a snake or the wings of a cicada [3]? How can I know the reasons for which things are not so [4]?”

GX note 1 (p. 111): This is saying heavenly structure is the way it is, so sitting and standing do not depend on anything. That things do not depend on anything and simply attain [what they attain], who could know the reason for this, or insist on it being the way it is?

GX note 2 (p. 111): If you ask about what things depend on and seek their ultimate cause, then this seeking and asking will be without limit. Finally you will arrive at the state of
non-dependence, and then the principle of self-transformation will be clear.

**GX note 3** (p. 111): If you depend on things like snake scales or cicada wings, then there is no particular reason to be in charge of yourself. This is not difficult to understand. Now, the reason we don’t understand is just that we don’t depend on these types of things but instead transform ourselves and that is all.

**GX note 4** (p. 111): Some in the world say that the outline depends on the shadow, the shadow depends on form, and form depends on the creator. But let me ask: “Is there a creator or not?” If not, then how are things able to be created? If there is, he is insufficient to make the multitude of forms. Therefore we must first understand that the multitude of forms produce themselves, and only after can we speak of creation. In this way we can go through the entire realm of existence, so even if we return to the outline of a shadow, we will see there is nothing which is not self-generated in profound mystery. Therefore the process of creating things has no master, and each thing creates itself. Each thing creates itself and there is nothing it depends on to do so. This is the right [principle] of the world. Therefore “other” and “I” are mutually reliant, form and shadow arise together. Although they return to the mysterious harmony, they are not dependent [on each other]. When we understand this principle, we can make each thing return to being based on something within itself and not depend on anything outside. Outside there is nothing to feel thankful towards, and inside there is no [reason to be] arrogant. In this way things are drawn in to arising, but do not know the reason for which they arise. Similarly, things all obtain [their own nature], but they don’t know the reason they attain [it].

Now [while we know] that the outline follows the shadow, we still say they arise together and do not depend [on each other]. So although the myriad things gather and are all formed according to [the principle of] heaven, they all clearly and in every case appear separately. Therefore the outline is not controlled by the shadow, and the shadow is not made by form, and form is not that which is transformed out of nothingness. So transformation and non-transformation, so and not so, following others in relation to following yourself, in every case these arise from themselves. How can I know this is the
reason [things are so]? Therefore follow and do not assist, then the beginning, the end, the inner, the outer, without obstruction they attain everything, and disappear without a trace. If you [keep] asking what things depend on and forget that they arise from themselves; if you follow external things, and lose your internal master, then preferences will still arise. Although you want to push and even it out, still it exists as itself somewhere in your heart. How could you [try to] even it out and [thereby] gain existence?

ZZ text (p. 112): Once Zhuang Zhou dreamt he was a butterfly, a butterfly flitting about, aware that he is enjoying himself [1]. He didn't know about Zhou [2]. Suddenly he awoke and was surprised to find that he was palpably Zhou [3]. He did not know if he was Zhou who had dreamt of being a butterfly, or a butterfly dreaming he is Zhou [4]. Between being Zhou and being a butterfly, there is certainly a distinction [5]. This is called the transformation of things [6].

GX note 1 (p. 112): Happy and satisfied, he moves joyfully and comfortably.

GX note 2 (p. 113): When he is dreaming he is a butterfly and does not know he is Zhou, there is no distinction between [this situation] and a different type of death. Anyway, he is happy wherever he is. So when you are alive be concerned about being alive, and when you are dead care about being dead. From this point of view, those who know they are alive but feel sad about death are mistaken.

GX note 3 (p. 113): This is said from Zhou’s perspective, therefore it is called being awake. [But] it is not necessarily not dreaming.

GX note 4 (p. 113): Now [he is in the state] of not knowing he is a butterfly; there is no difference from the dream when he did not know he was Zhou. Each enjoys a short period of happiness, so there is no way to know that [the current state] is not the butterfly dreaming he is Zhou. In the world there is false sleep and dreams that span a hundred years, so there is no way to know that the current span of a hundred years is not the dream of a false sleep.
GX note 5 (p. 113): The distinction between being awake and being asleep is no different from that of being alive and being dead. What makes us happy now is determined by our role, it does not come from not having a role.

GX note 6 (p. 113): Time does not stop even temporarily, and now will not exist again. Therefore yesterday’s dream is today’s transformation. The distinction between life and death could not be any different from this, yet how people exhaust their minds [worrying] about these [problems]! Having just become “this” we do not know “that”, this is the butterfly dream. Chosen to be a person, within this life not knowing what will come after, this is [the story of] Ji of the state of Li. But fools presumptuously believe that they know the joys of life and the suffering of death, because they have never heard the explanation of transformation of things.