

Self-concealment of the Origin: Lao Tzu's Tao and Heraclitus' Logos

Frank Stevenson

"Tao is hidden with no name" (道隱無名), Lao Tzu says in Chapter 41 of the *Tao Te Ching*.¹ "Nature likes to hide itself" (*physis kryptesthai philei*) says Heraclitus, the sixth-fifth century B.C. Greek philosopher, in Fragment 211.² Here I will interpret Lao Tzu's Tao 道 ("Way," "Saying") and Heraclitus' Logos (λογος, "Order," "Word") – whose development I trace from Hesiod's "Chaos" and Anaximander's "Unlimited" – as (cosmic) Origin, return-to-Origin, and self-concealment of or at the Origin. Thus in effect I will suggest a parallel between these central concepts of early Greek and Chinese thinking.

The *Tao Te Ching* opens with the famous lines:

The way that can be spoken of is not the constant way,
The name that can be named is not the constant name.
Nameless (nothing names), heaven-earth's origin,
Named (being names), the ten thousand things' mother. (Lau)³

道可道非常道，名可名非常名。
無名天地之始 有名萬物之母。

Why can the "constant Tao" not be "spoken of," according to the standard translation of this line?⁴ It lies beyond the power of words or naming, thought or human thinking, according to the usual interpretation. The "constant Name" (常名) of constant or cosmic Tao cannot be named, and so "Tao is hidden with no name" . . . beyond or behind the (merely human) "name that can be named." The "nameless origin" of heaven-earth clearly precedes the "named mother" of manifested Being or beings; we may easily suppose the nameless origin to be the constant Tao whose name is the

(unnameable) constant Name, the named mother to be the way that can be spoken of, name that can be named.

The next lines of Chapter 1 go like this:

Therefore let there always be non-being so we may see their subtlety,
And let there always be being so we may see their outcome.
These two are the same,
But after they are produced, they have different names. (Chan)⁵

故常無欲以觀其妙，常有欲以觀其微
此兩者同出而異名。

Now if we take the “secret” (“essence,” “subtlety,” 妙) as origin (始) and the “outcome” (微) as named mother or manifestation (of beings, “ten thousand things”), then two views of the relation between origin and manifestation may be seen to emerge in Chapter 1. According to the first view, the cosmogony of Tao is vertical or linear: that is, Tao as nameless origin generates heaven-earth (or named mother, or mother named by Being), which in turn generate(s) the plurality of beings. According to the second view, the origin (secret, interior, nameless) is the same as the outcome (manifestation); that is, there is a kind of horizontal identity between the Non-being of the origin – which is either itself Nothing or a nameless Something (無名) – and the Being of the manifested beings. These are of course two aspects of the same thing, two sides of the same Tao. Or perhaps this sameness of Tao’s secret and Tao’s outcome (or “name”) is better understood as itself the interaction or interpenetration of the vertical and horizontal modalities of Tao.

This horizontal modality, which is the identity or mutual production of Being and Non-being, is clearer in Chapter 2:

When the people of the world know beauty as beauty
There arises the recognition of ugliness.
When the people of the world know the good as good,
There arises the recognition of evil. (Lin)⁶

Therefore: Being and non-being
“interdepend in growth” (Lin), “produce each other” (Chan),
“mutually arise” (Watts),⁷ “are mutually posited in their
emergence” (Chang)⁸

天下皆知美之爲美斯惡已。
皆知善之爲善斯不善已。
有無相生。

Thus when I name something “beautiful” or “good” I am in that very act of naming already creating the possibility of the idea of “not beautiful” or “not good,” and so conversely when I name something “not x” I create already the ground (of possibility of meaning) for its “being x.” This is a horizontal dialectic of opposites – opposite things or at least opposite terms – based on the relativity of meaning.⁹ This dialectic of mutual creation of Being and Non-being is both an opposition and return to identity of the relative opposites. But can we not see, hiding behind this on-going process of “mutual arising” or perhaps indistinguishable from the process itself, constant Tao?

The vertical modality of Tao as primordial Nothing that gives birth to Being (Unity) is clear in Chapter 40:

*Fan-reversal is Tao's motion,
Jo-weakness is Tao's use. (Lau)
The heaven-under's ten thousand things
are born from Being,
Being is born from Non-being.*

反者道之動，弱者道之用。
天下之物生於有，有生於無。

Here, in the last two lines, we have the Tao-Origin as *wu* 無 -Nothing generating *yu* 有 -Being (Unity, named mother); this Being then generates the differentiated creation of things, (beings), differentiated by the horizontal ordering of names, relative opposites, distinctions made by the (logical) human mind. According to this vertical model, Nothing creates Being but not, as in the horizontal model, the other way as well. However, in this cosmogonic model of Tao the manifested Being returns to its origin in Non-being which is perhaps the same as Being's “creation” of Non-being viewed from another perspective. We get this return-to-Origin in Chapter 16:

Contemplate the ultimate void.
Remain truly in quiescence.
All things are together in action,
But I look into their non-action (I see them return).

Things are unceasingly moving and restless,
Yes each one is proceeding back to the origin (returning
to the root).
Proceeding back to the origin is quiescence.
To be in quiescence is to return to the destiny of being. (Chang)

致虛極守靜篤。
萬物並作，吾以觀其復。
夫物芸芸各歸其根。
歸根曰靜，靜曰復命。

Here the cosmological dimension of Tao is interwoven with the psychological. The sage watches the "return" of all things to their "root," to their identity at the Origin, in the quiescence of the void (極). (In Chapter 28 the sage "returns to primordial nothingness" [復...無極].) It may be that when the sage contemplates the "togetherness in action" (並作), the differentiation (as beings, names) of manifestation and sees it as unity or identity (on the horizontal plane), this is too his (vertical) falling into the deeper returning flow of all things (of Tao as outcome) to the origin (Tao as secret or root).

This "return," thus psychologically (or sociopolitically, or ethically) considered, thus becomes "pragmatic" for Lao Tzu. We remember the first two lines of Chapter 40: Reversal (反) is Tao's movement, Weakness (弱) is Tao's use (用)." This return-to-origin may give the sage his *te*, 德, virtue or power, by which he becomes model (式) of the empire (天下). In Chapter 28 he becomes "ravine" (谿, Chang: "abyss") of the empire, and so has the *ch'ang te* 常德, constant virtue which "always suffices," wells up in him as at the bottom of the valley. Weakness suggests the pragmatism of the sage who conquers by putting himself in the low position. "The female (牝) overcomes the male by stillness (靜)./Being still, she takes the lower position" (61, Lin). If we could take *fan* 反-reversal as reversal-to-identity on the horizontal, and *fu* 復-return as return-to-origin in the vertical model, then perhaps Tao's "motion" is its "contemplative" side, its "use," its pragmatic side. Creel says Lao Tzu's Tao is ambiguously "contemplative" and "purposive."¹⁰ But following Needham's interpretation of Tao, in its oracle bone form, as a head (首) and foot (趾),¹¹ perhaps this ambiguity could be reduced to univocity or organic unity.

There are then two ways to understand why Tao is "hidden with no

name.” In its vertical mode it is the primordial Nothing (無極) of the Origin, from which all Being is manifested and to which it returns. Only this manifest Being – the “appearance” of reality – is named, that is, ordered, differentiated by names, ideas, human thinking; the Tao-Origin is either Nothing or a nameless Something, and so concealed. In its horizontal mode, Tao is the process of mutual production of Being and Non-being, that is, their Sameness, interchangeability. On this view we may say Tao is “hidden with no name” because it hides behind the dialectical opposition-and-identity, or because it is indistinguishable from the process itself. This immanence of Tao to (its own) manifestation might be its “self-so-ness.” Chapter 25 says:

Man follows (is modelled after) earth,
 Earth follows heaven,
 Heaven follows Tao,
 Tao follows the self-so (“natural,” “spontaneous”).

人法地，地法天，
 天法道，道法自然。

A key point in understanding Tao is that “straight words are reversed” (正言若反), 78. That is, Tao is paradoxical. Thus the origin and manifestation of Tao in the vertical model may be reducible to identity in the horizontal model, just as the identity of Being and Non-being on the horizontal may be viewed as the return of Being to Non-being (and the other way?) on the vertical. This is perhaps the clearest way to understand those cryptic and mysterious (玄) lines of Chapter 1:

These two (subtlety and outcome) are the same,
 But after they are produced, they have different names.
 They both may be called deep and profound. (Chan)

此兩者同出而異名，
 同謂之玄。

We remember the third line of the *Tao Te Ching*: “Nameless (無名, nothing names), heaven-earth’s origin.” The Tao-Origin may be the prior origin of the manifested dialectic, heaven-earth, or just that dialectic itself, the “space” between heaven and earth rather than that in which they first “appear.” That is, it may be indistinguishable from the *wu-yu* 無有，

yin-yang terms of ordering. Surely heaven-earth, though often translated by the unified term "Nature" or "Universe," has a sense of the *yin-yang* balance of opposites. Or are we to see heaven and earth (or earth and heaven) appearing in succession in a linear cosmogony, as Chapter 25 – "Earth follows heaven,/Heaven follows Tao" – might suggest?

Needham takes the origin (始) as woman on the left and embryo on the right, and so "mother in mother," suggesting the concealment of the origin (as subtlety or secret (妙), woman on the left again) in her own creation.¹² Is it the seed of *yin* in the womb of *yin* ("Tao *yin* 隱, dark, hidden with no name"), or the seed of *yang* in the womb of *yin* (Hexagram 24 of the *I Ching* 復, "Thunder in the Earth"¹³), or *yin* in the womb of *yang*? The heaven-earth (天地) is, as unity, apparently "named mother," though itself a *yang-yin* dialectic. The picture of seed in womb, or mother in mother, suggests in any case the *ch'ang* 常-constancy of the process of generation, and perhaps too its cyclic nature.

Let us turn now to early Greek cosmogony. Before seeking a parallel to Lao Tzu's Tao directly in Heraclitus' Logos, where we find a similar interpenetration of cosmological and psychological (or "human") dimensions, we will briefly consider Hesiod's "Chaos" and "Anaximander's "Unlimited." These not only serve as developmental stages in the conception of Logos; they also appear in themselves to be useful analogues of Tao, viewed purely in its cosmological or cosmogonic dimension.

Hesiod gives us the first systematic cosmogony of the Greeks, a cosmogony whose central terms are chaos, heaven and earth. His *Theogony* is a mythopoetic epic which stands somewhere between Homer's story-telling and the more purely conceptual thinking of the first Milesian philosophers.¹⁴ That is, Hesiod still personalizes abstract concepts as gods and goddesses, but he is concerned primarily with these gods and goddesses (or concepts), not with the affairs of mortal men. The famous cosmogonic passage of the *Theogony* begins:

Hoi toi men protista xaos genet . . . Verily first of all did Chaos come into being, and then broad-bosomed Gaia (earth), a firm seat of all things for ever, and misty Tartaros in a recess of broad-wayed earth, and Eros, who is fairest among immortal gods . . . Earth first of all brought forth starry Ouranos (sky), equal to herself, to cover her completely round about, to be a firm seat for the blessed gods (theois) for ever. Then she brought forth tall Mountains . . . the unharvested sea . . . Pontos,

without delightful love (*Eros*); and then having lain with *Ouranos* she bore deep-eddying *Okeanos*, and *Koios* and *Hyperion* and *Iapetos*¹⁵

This *Ouranos* (Heaven) plays a double role: first it appears as the offspring of Earth in what Voegelin calls her “pre-erotic” stage,¹⁶ and then as Earth’s mate, reunited with her by *Eros* in that first hierogamy of Eliade’s “sacred time,”¹⁷ in the “sacred rain” of Aeschylus.¹⁸ This rain recalls Lao-Tzu’s Chapter 32: “Heaven and earth will unite and sweet dew will fall, / And the people will be equitable, though no one so decrees (令, orders)” (Lau). This heaven-and-earth are thus related first as mother (earth) to offspring, and then as (reunited) cosmogonic couple. Chaos itself can be taken both as the primordial opening or Nothing in which earth first appears – “first of all did Chaos come into being” – and, following Cornford, as the original *xa*, “gap” that yawns between heaven and earth, separating them.¹⁹

In Chang’s translation of Lao-Tzu’s Chapter 25, “chaos” appears explicitly:

Before the Heaven and Earth existed

(Lau: “Born before heaven and earth”)

There was something nebulous Lau:

“confusedly formed”, Chang: “a gathering chaos”). (Lin)

有物混成先天地生。

But was Tao itself “born” (Lau’s interpretation) or “was” (*yu* 有) it simply there (Lin)? This description of the Origin-Tao as “*wu*-thing confusedly formed,” “nebulous” and “chaotic” hints at a coming-to-be, perhaps Tao’s very self-transformation (自化), often correlated with its self-oneness (自然) and self-ordering (自令). This nebulous picture of Tao echoes the opening image of Chapter 21: “The *wu* 物-thing that is called Tao/Is elusive, evasive/ Yet latent in it are forms (象)” We recall too that Chuang Tzu often refers to Tao as the “great clod” (大塊).²⁰

All of this suggests to me the parallel with Hesiod’s Chaos as origin of heaven-earth. In another passage of the *Theogony* we hear:

There of murky earth and misty Tartaros and unharvested sea and starry sky, of all of them, are the springs in a row and the grievous, dank limits which even the gods detest There are the gleaming gates, and brazen thresh old unshaken, fixed with continuous roots, self-grown; and in front,

far from all the gods dwell the Titans, across murky Chaos.

Here we get a picture of Earth and Tartaros (the earth-under) as the "dank limits" of the origin, a kind of polar Non-being (無極). "Murky Chaos" appears here as a great chasm or gulf, in close proximity to the earth-center, thus taking a kind of "geocentric" form or shape, and a sense too of self-concealment within or beneath the obscurity of the Origin. Lao Tzu's Tao can also be seen to have a geocentric shape or priority: "Tao hidden (*yin* dark) with no name." "Continuous roots self-grown" might suggest Lao Tzu's Tao as "root" and as self-ordering or self-transforming.

But if we give this Chaos a primitive geocentric shape, does its indeterminate "thingness" precede, as a kind of Nothing or No-name, its manifestation into unity (earth) or duality (earth-heaven dialectic)? Perhaps this primordial thingness is a disorder as pre-order, or as obscurity that conceals its own order, just as the "named mother" conceals the nameless embryo-origin. For Lao Tzu, who says "Out of Tao, one," we have the same question. Is this Tao just Nothing or a Something which nonetheless precedes the order of Unity (Being)? To say that Tao or Chaos is the gap between heaven-earth or *yang-yin* seems to presuppose it already as a kind of (horizontal dialectical) order; yet in truth the order is latent in it, like the "forms" of heaven and earth which appear in the opening or clearing of Chaos. "The *wu*-thing that is called Tao/Is elusive, evasive/ . . . Yet latent in it are forms . . ." These forms may be latent in Tao or Chaos, again, as the seeds (*yang*, or *yang* and *yin*?) in the womb of *yin*. "Tao is *yin* with no name (nothing names)."

Tao and Chaos may both be seen as a pre-order which will order itself from within. We remember Lao Tzu says: "Man follows earth,/Earth follows heaven,/Heaven follows Tao,/Tao follows the self-so (自然)." Here Tao may be a higher ordering principle with respect to heaven, heaven with respect to earth, and so on. But Tao follows its own self-so-ness or internal order.²¹ As for Hesiod, after heaven and earth successively appear in the void of Chaos, or after their separation by the gap of Chaos, they are reunited by Eros. From this first hierogamy they generate Kronos, father of Zeus who, as Order itself, is the telos of the progressive overcoming of disorder. This Eros is, in Jaeger's term, an "all-engendering primitive force" which works, with Chaos, from *within* the system to generate the cosmogonic dialectic of heaven-earth (*yang-yin*, light-dark, ordering-ordered) and, through

it, the gods of natural and human orders.²² This immanence of the generative principle(s) is contrasted, by Jaeger, with the “externality” of the Hebrew Yahweh or Logos (Word, Saying) to the cosmos (order) which he creates or orders.²³

But any comparison of Tao as heaven-earth dialectic with Hesiod’s cosmogonic fourfold, generated from within, of Chaos-Eros-Earth-Heaven — perhaps Tao-te - earth-heaven? — breaks down once we see that for Hesiod the movement of the dialectic is linear and teleological. It proceeds from the disorder of Chaos-Earth-Tartaros to its outcome and destiny in Zeus, father of *Irene*, “peace,” *Eunomia*, “good order” and *Dike*, “justice.” This Zeus thus dwells beyond the law (of ordering) for he is the law, the telos external to the system which evolves toward or into it. Tao is of course not simply linear in this way but cyclical, generating itself from within but also returning to/upon itself: its telos is its origin, its origin its telos.

Zeus as absolute law-giver or standard might suggest the Chou *T’ien* 天, Heaven and *T’ien Ming* 天命, “Decree of Heaven,” against which — as against many aspects of Confucianism and the Confucian *jen tao* 人道, “way of man” — Lao Tzu was reacting.²⁴ Indeed, for Lao Tzu the linear or teleological order of history begins only “after Tao was lost” . . . and the Confucian virtues toward which this order moves represent, paradoxically perhaps, increasing disorder. Chapter 38 says:

After Tao was lost there was *te* (virtue, power).
After *te* . . . *jen* (humanity).
After *jen* . . . *i* (justice).
After *i* . . . *li* (propriety).
Now *li* is the thinning out of loyalty
and of honesty of heart (evidence),
And the beginning of chaos.
Fore-knowledge is the expression (flowering,
superficiality) of Tao and the origin of folly. (Lin)
失道而後德。失德而後仁。
失仁而後義。失義而後禮。
夫禮者忠信之薄而亂之首。
前識者道之華而愚之始。

Lao Tzu’s sage wants to return to that original nature or original Tao which has been lost; this is one aspect of the return to origin or return to destiny. Still, viewed as an historical move back to a “lost” or hidden Tao,

this return may be part of a larger cyclical pattern of (historical-cosmic) Tao itself. The manifestation as dialectical opposition is also the decay from original unity, the carving up of the surface of the Uncarved Block of original nature into names, virtues, distinctions which obscure or conceal the pristine smooth surface of Tao. The reversal to identity of relative opposites and the return to origin are an erasing of names (of thoughts, ideas, virtues, differentiations) which thus unconceals what was concealed. But it is the internal, self-directed movement of Tao to lose or conceal itself, and so to turn back upon, return to, seek and find itself. "Reversal (*fan*) is Tao's movement." The Tao-Origin is a *wu* (無or物) – Chaos and its manifestation an order (of names, beings); yet too the manifestation is "chaos" and the Origin perfect order (harmony, quiescence). "Straight words are *fan* – reversed."

In Anaximander – whose *apeiron*, "Unlimited" is thought by Cornford and Jaeger to be a kind of hypostasis of Hesiod's *chaos*²⁵ – we find the essential Greek expression of cosmic manifestation-and-return and thus clearer ground, perhaps, for comparison with Lao Tzu's Tao. Heidegger says the Anaximander fragment is "considered the oldest fragment of Western thinking . . ." ²⁶ This is because Western "thinking" supposedly began when the Milesian thinkers de-personalized and hypostasized the gods and world-ordering forces of Homer and Hesiod, and thus let emerge, from the womb of *mythos*, the seed of *logos*.

We have the extant fragment of Anaximander in Simplicius:

. . . some other *apeiron* nature (*physin apeiron*), from which come into being all the heavens (*ouranos*) and the worlds (*kosmous*) in them. And the source of coming-to-be (*genesis*) for existing things is that into which destruction (*phthoran*), too, happens, "according to necessity (*kata to xreon*); for they pay penalty (*diken*, Heidegger: "they let order belong"²⁷) and retribution (*tisin*, Heidegger: "and thereby also reckon") to one another (*allelois*) for their injustice (*tes adikias*, Heidegger: "in the surmounting of disorder") according to the assessment of Time (*kata ten to xronou tazin*)," as he describes it in these rather poetical terms (Fragment 112)²⁷

The striking point here is that the *apeiron* is both origin and telos: the origin of genesis (manifestation) of existing things (*stoixeion*, elements) is the same as the end of passing away, *phthoran*, return-to-origin. But we remember that for Lao Tzu not only is Tao-Origin also Tao-Telos, but "these

two (secret and manifestation) are the same," the Origin is identified even with the Being (or beings) generated from it. The mystery (玄), or mysticism, of this hidden identity lies perhaps deeper than the thinking of the Greek might venture.

But Anaximander's *apeiron* as "unlimited" or "indefinite" offers a rich parallel with Lao Tzu's Tao. Its kinship with Hesiod's Chaos is clear enough. Aristotle analyzes dialectically the possible senses of *apeiron* as spatio-temporal infinity, spatio-temporal indefiniteness, indefiniteness in kind — a mixture from which the *stoixion* emerge as from a kind of Chaos — and as the dialectical mediation and interaction, the self-opposing of the existing thing.²⁸ These things are opposed as principles of hot and cold, wet and dry — that is, as a dialectic of "hot" and "not hot," "wet" and "not wet" — from which *physis*, nature is somehow generated. Thus we see in this generation from and return to the *apeiron* a horizontal dialectic of being and not-being which, as manifestation ("letting order belong"), occurs within a larger, encompassing cycle of (vertical) generation and return. This is close to our interpretation of the Tao of Lao Tzu.

In Anaximander's horizontal dialectic, the opposites "compensate" one another for their *pleonexy*, mutual encroachment or mutual consumption (as in fire boiling water, water swallowing fire.) This seems a kind of balance or -equilibrium, for the *diken*, "penalty" (or "letting order belong") which the opposites pay to one another is after all only *Dike*, justice, in Anaximander's "rather poetical" (or still mythical, anthropomorphic) terms. This calls to mind the *Dike* of Lao Tzu's "bow of T'ien Tao (天道)" in Chapter 77:

Is not the way of heaven like the stretching of a bow?
The high it presses down,
The low it lifts up;
The excessive it takes from,
The deficient it gives to. (Lau)

天之道其猶張弓與
高者抑之，下者舉之，
有餘者損之，不足者與之。

But Lao Tzu's bow is soft and supple; it gives buoyancy and lift to the *jo* 弱-weak that overcomes the strong, the *p'in* 牝-female that overcomes the male. Inasmuch as this priority to the "low" has a pragmatic ground —

for the sage becomes the "abyss of the empire" and the *ch'ang te*, wells up in him: inexhaustibly — there is no comparison with Anaximander, the pure cosmologist. However, Lao Tzu's ethical-political reversals/returns flow into the larger cosmic return: it is by attuning himself to this return that the sage "returns" the empire to its original nature or harmony. In this sense, the priority to the low, weak and female is really a priority to the return, to the Origin itself, the mother-in-mother, seed of nameless in womb of named, the infinite well of Nothing filled (inexhaustibly) with Being.

I see, then, a kind of geocentric (or *yin*-centric) bias in Lao Tzu's Tao-Origin, just as in Hesiod's Chaos-Origin; though Lao Tzu's earth may not carry the inevitable association with female that it does in Hesiod, it nonetheless seems to take a "lowly" place, near man, in Chapter 25: "Man follows earth,/Earth . . . heaven,/Heaven . . . Tao." In Hesiod it is a priority to Earth which lies near the Chaos-Origin; in Lao Tzu it is a priority to "female" (*yin*, *p'ín*) which — most notably in the 始 and 妙 — lies near or at the origin. In Anaximander it is simply a priority to the Origin itself: his "justice" of the return is especially clear when we consider another extant fragment which lacks the *allelois*, "to one another." Nietzsche translated this fragment and thus gives us the older (and now uncommon) interpretation: "Whence things have their origin, there they must also pass away according to necessity; for they must pay penalty and be judged for their injustice, according to the ordinance of time."²⁹

Jaeger comments:

Nietzsche and Rohde have explained Anaximander's reference to the penalty which things must undergo for the injustice of their existence by supposing that he sees in the very individuation of things an offence for which they must atone. This offence would therefore consist in the emergence of individuals themselves, which would be an "apostasy from the primordial unity."³⁰

Lacking the *allelois*, then, Nietzsche' quite reasonably takes Anaximander's "recompense" not as a horizontal relation between opposites but as a vertical relation between existing things themselves and the Origin from which they became individuated, to which they owe their existence. ("Exist" in the original Greek sense is "standing out from," individuation.) Here Origin is conceived as the "primordial unity" (Being) of manifested (individuated) beings. Or is this Being grounded in the abyss of Non-being? For

Lao Tzu, "Being is born from Non-being," and "Out of Tao, One."

But what of the necessity of return in Anaximander? The *allelois* fragment has the existing opposites paying penalty to one another "according to the assessment of time"; Nietzsche's fragment has them paying penalty to the origin "according to the assessment of time." In either case the return-to-origin is necessary and inexorable: "the source of *genesis* of existing things is that into which *phthoran*, too, happens, according to necessity (*kata to xreon*)"

We remember Lao Tzu's *ming* 命 -destiny in Chapter 16:

All things together rise,
I watch them return . . . to the root.
Return to the root is quiescence,
It is called *fu ming*, return to destiny.
The return to destiny is *ch'ang*, constant. (Lau)

萬物並作，吾以觀其復。
夫物芸芸各歸其根。
歸根曰靜。靜曰復命。復命曰常。

The sense of Anaximander's *xreon* (necessity), like Hesiod's *Zēus* as supreme standard, is probably closer to that of the Chou *T'ien Ming* ("Decree of Heaven") than to that of Lao Tzu's *ming* 命. The latter may be just the telos of the origin itself — "return to root is return to destiny" — rather than "judgment" or "justice" or "necessity" in any moralistic sense. For Lao Tzu, after all, *i* 義 -justice is one stage in the decay of Tao, or the decline which commenced after "Tao was lost," forgotten, concealed behind the names of virtues carved on its smooth surface.

Heidegger comments on Anaximander's *xreon*:

We are accustomed to translate the word *xreon* by "necessity" Yet we err if we adhere to this derived meaning exclusively. *Xreon* is derived from *xrao*, *xraomai*. It suggests *he xeir*, the hand; *xrao* means: I get involved with something, I reach for it *To xreon* is thus the handing over of presence which presencing delivers to what is present We will dare a translation which sounds strange . . . : *to xreon*, usage (*der Brauch*).³¹

This taking of *xreon* as "usage" is striking, pulling as it does away from the (moralistic) sense of "necessity" toward the common and every-

day. It might even call to mind Lao Tzu's Chapter 40: "Tao's movement is reversal, / Tao's use (用) is weakness." We interpreted this 用 as Tao's vertical (and "pragmatic") self-return to Origin. Seen this way, it might be close to (Heidegger's view of) the "necessity" of Anaximander's return.

The everydayness of this "usage" suggests too Lao Tzu's *ch'ang* 常-constancy of the return to root (or destiny). "The return to destiny (命) is constant." I think the 常 is closely tied to the sense of destiny itself, as well as to the sense of the return. Here the idea of *xronos*, time – though not of *xronou tazin*, time's "ordinance" or "assessment" – seems to creep in. The 常 here can mean that the return is repeated again and again in time, inexorably, perhaps eternally or timelessly; perhaps it can mean we are returning always, at each moment, and so again timelessly, out of time. This 常 can also mean "common" or "ordinary," and so perhaps the everydayness, the "usage" of the return. Our destiny is a "common" destiny, as well as a "constant" one. This destiny or root to which we, and all beings, return might also be a timelessness, or between-ness of time, as in Hexagram 24 of the *I Ching*, the seed of *yang* in the womb of *yin*. For is not time itself concealed at the origin, "hidden (*yin*) with no name," waiting to spring into manifestation? Might this not be the darkest and deepest face of Tao's self-hiddenness?

This talk of time and concealment beckons us toward Heidegger's interpretation of the Anaximander fragment. Heidegger, in *Being and Time*, has seen time as the "horizon" (of possibility of meaning) of Being, and "human being" (*Dasein*) as that being-there of Being which is conscious of its own finitude, its own ex-istence (standing outside itself, projection) in time.³² In his later works Heidegger continues his central thought: that Being has been concealed, obscured and so forgotten in (and through) the history of Western metaphysics – *Vergessenheit des Seins* – and that Truth (*aletheia*), in its original sense, means "Unconcealment."³³ Here we may think of Lao Tzu's Tao that was "lost," Hesiod's "murky Chaos," Anaximander's *apeiron*, which are now so hard to think in their "old" or original sense. This is Heidegger's task.

Although he translates the version of the Anaximander fragment containing the *allelois*, Heidegger follows Nietzsche in seeing the manifestation and return as encompassed by the larger *physis* or *physis apeiron*:

... *genesis* and *phthora* are to be thought from *physis*, and within it, as ways of luminous rising and decline. Certainly we must translate *genesis*

as origination; but we must think this origination as a movement which lets every emerging being abandon concealment and go forward into unconcealment. Certainly we must translate *phthoran* as passing away; but we must think this passing away as a going which in its turn abandons unconcealment, departing and withdrawing into concealment The coming forward into . . . and the departure to . . . *become present within unconcealment between what is concealed and what is unconcealed.*³⁴

Here Heidegger is speaking of a gap or "between-ness" of genesis and return, which "become present within unconcealment between what is concealed and what is unconcealed." This between-ness carries the sense of the moment of unconcealing, of presencing (between origin and destiny, past and future), and so of the imminence of concealment as departure to. That presencing and unconcealment already are return is perhaps more clear with Lao Tzu's Tao, whose 自然, 自令, and 自化 are presencing as (self-) overcoming of disorder, precisely because Tao is already returning to the pristine order and harmony of the Origin.

The temporality of this presencing is crucial for Heidegger, and it breathes through his interpretation of the Anaximander fragment like the cool winds of human finitude, lingering and *Schicksal*, destiny:

That which lingers awhile in presence becomes present as it surmounts reckless disorder, *adikia*, which haunts lingering itself as an essential possibility. The presencing of what is present is such a surmounting. It is accomplished when beings which linger awhile let order belong, and thereby also reckon, among one another . . . order belongs to that which comes to presence by way of presencing and that means by way of a surmounting.³⁵

Thus the *adikia*, disorder which is overcome by presencing "haunts lingering itself as an essential possibility," for what has become present (in manifestation) is already a waiting for the return to "disorder." Heidegger may be taking the *apeiron* as the Chaos of disorder and too the Chaos of the *abgrund*, abyss or primordial Nothing; thus the Nietzschean payment of retribution by existing things to the Origin for the "injustice" of their individuation has become a "letting order belong in the surmounting of disorder" which nonetheless "haunts them." This is death, or Nothingness, as ground or horizon of finite being. Heidegger has thus carried Anaximander over into the zone of human finite existence and destiny, and thus brought him

closer, perhaps, to Heraclitus and Lao Tzu.

We remember the first line of the *Tao Te Ching*: "The way that can be spoken of is not the constant way." We can take this to mean that the "constant" (cosmic) Tao lies beyond the possibility of human naming or thinking, as something concealed by its very *yin* and *hsüan* 玄 darkness and mystery – the remoteness and obscurity of the cosmic origin – or by our own attempts to name it. If we think of this *ch'ang Tao* 常道 as human origin, that is, original nature, then we can say it is concealed from us precisely in our moment of saying or naming it, for in this moment we objectify it and so separate it from ourselves. The Origin thus "haunts" those who are individuated from it not only as the cosmic end haunts all beings, not only as death haunts living beings, but as our own original (and too cosmic) nature haunts us after we have tried to "think" or "name" it and so removed ourselves from it. But to see in Lao Tzu a human *sophos*, wisdom concealed within the larger wisdom of Tao brings us, finally, to Heraclitus, who offers perhaps the closest parallel to Tao in early Greek thinking.

In Fragment 231 the *skoteinos*, "obscure" Heraclitus – can his obscurity match Lao Tzu's *hsüan* 玄 -mysteriousness? – tells us: "One thing, the only truly wise, does not and does consent to be called (*legesthai*) by the name of Zeus (*Zenos onoma*)."³⁶ In Fragment 199 he says: "Listening not to me but to the Logos it is wise (*sophon*) to agree (*homologeîn*) that all things are one (*hen panta einai*)." But this is a compression of two statements: (a) Logos (Word) speaks, saying "*hen panta einai*," and (b) man hears Logos and, if wise, agrees (*homologeîn*, same-saying, echoing). Perhaps this Logos, like "the only truly wise" which can and cannot be named "Zeus," and like Tao, has two names: the *tao ke tao* 道可道 and the *ch'ang Tao* 常道, the logos which man knows or speaks and the divine Logos to which man – if wise, properly attuned – only listens. But this Logos may not really be transcendent at all; it may be hidden from man, and he from it, because it is so close, so immanent, that he cannot see (or hear) it.

To see the nearness of this cosmic Logos to him, man must lose "himself" – his individuated being, unity, existence or self-identity – in the larger sea, the commonality of Logos (Tao). Thus Heraclitus says: "Therefore it is necessary to follow the common (*zuno*); but although the Logos is common the many live as though they had a private understanding (*phronesin*)" (198). The Logos is common, immanent to man because it

surrounds and encompasses him, flowing through him like a river. But man's individual self, his self-conscious *phronesin* intrudes into this river or sea of Logos (Tao), parting its waters and, by separating himself from it as (objectified) "Being," conceals it. We get the *zuno* again in Fragment 253:

Those who speak with sense must rely on what is common to all, as a city must rely on its law, and with much greater reliance. For all the laws of men are nourished by one law (*nomos*), the divine law (*tou theiou*); for it has as much power as it wishes and is sufficient for all and is still left over.

This "divine law" which is "sufficient for all and . . . still left over" has a Taoist ring. Lao Tzu says:

Tao is a hollow vessel,
And its use is inexhaustible!
Fathomless!
Like the fountain head (ancestor, principle) of all things. (4, Lau)
道沖而用之又不足，淵兮似萬物之宗。

He also says:

Being the valley (abyss) of the world
He has an eternal power (*ch'ang te* 常德) which always suffices,
And returns again to uncarved wood. (28, Lau)
爲天下谷，常德乃足復歸於樸。

This *ch'ang*, "constant" is taken by Lin in Chapter 16 as "eternal law": "Return to destiny is the Eternal Law, 常./To know (知) the Eternal Law is understanding (*ming* 明, enlightenment)."

Taken as "law of constancy," perhaps this 常 echoes Heraclitus' *nomos zuno*, "common law." As we noted above, the modern sense of 常 is "common" or "ordinary" as well as "constant." Is this the secret sense of 常在 Lao Tzu's opening line: "Tao that can be tao-ed is no common Tao"? Read this way, the line reveals Heraclitus' meaning. ". . . although the Logos is common, the many live as though they had a private understanding . . ." The sage who truly knows himself as a "no self" — as "nothing" other than Tao-Logos — has "fallen," has entered the "mind" of the people, the

“common mind” perhaps. But paradoxically he has lost his (individual)

The sage has no constant mind (*ch'ang hsin*),
But regards the people's *hsin* (mind, heart) as his own. (49, Lau).

聖人無常心，以百姓之心爲心。

Heraclitus' Logos, like Lao Tzu's Tao, seems to interweave the psychological and cosmic dimensions. Thus it is not only a Saying (to which the wise man listens) but also a balanced Order, the on-going (self-transforming) order of Nature. We hear the *metra* (measure) of Logos in 220: “This *kosmon*, world-order (the same of all) did none of gods or men make, but it always was and is and shall be: an ever-living fire (*pyr aeizoon*), kindling in measures (*metra*) and going out in measures.” This ever-living (constant) fire is Logos itself — or perhaps its *te*, manifest presence, power or efficacy — which consumes the world in a measured pattern, and thereby orders it. But the order, ratio or logos of measured change is a surface ripple on pure *re*, “flowing.” (*Panta re*, Heraclitus says, “All flows.”) As in Lao Tzu, this flowing (burning) Logos rests finally not in the measured opposition of (horizontal) opposites but in their identity: “The path up and down is one and the same” (*Hodos ano kato mia kai houte*) (203). Furthermore, the identity of opposites on the horizontal plane is a kind of *hsiang sheng* 相生, or “mutual arising,” since the opposites become one another:

And as the same thing there exists in us living and dead and the waking
and the sleeping and young and old: for these things having changed round
(*metapesonta palin*) are those, and those having changed round are these.
(205)

In Heraclitus then the “mutual positing” or “mutual production” of opposites is really their “mutual becoming.” But the emphasis is on the human experience: life becomes death and death life, youth becomes age and age youth. This is the heart of Heraclitus' mysticism, this “interchangeability” of life and death, and seems to imply the *metra*, measure or balance of manifestation (Being, living, waking, young) and return (Non-being, dead, sleeping, old), a balanced opposition which reverses to the identity of manifestation and return (Origin). This recalls Lao Tzu: “These two (secret and

manifestation) are the same.” This sameness is really a question of seeing that Origin (Non-being or Being) and manifestation (beings) are the same thing viewed (named) differently. Heraclitus is close to this idea in 206:

Things taken together (*sullapsies*) are whole and not whole, something which is being brought together (*sumpheromenon*) and brought apart (*diapheromenon*), which is in tune and out of tune (*sunadon diadon*); out of all things there comes a unity, and out of a unity all things (*ek panton hen kai ez henos panta*).

Taken or seen all together, things (beings) can be seen (taken) as the Being or Unity of the Origin, or as the plurality of manifested beings. The “out of all things unity, out of unity all things” suggests the great cycle of generation-and-return. And if we could take the *sunadon*, “in tune” as applied to the “things taken together” and Origin, we would have Lao Tzu’s priority to the Tao-Origin as original harmony and order. There may be, after all, a kind of “geocentric” priority in Heraclitus to the “path down” as “path back-bending,” that is, returning path. For he too has a bow:

They do not apprehend how being at variance it agrees with itself (how being brought apart, *diapheromenon*, it is brought together with itself, *zumpheretai*): there is a back-stretched connexion (*palintonos harmonie*), as in the bow and the lyre . . . (212)

Here it is not just that the sage who can clearly see (or “apprehend”) sees the identity of cosmos as unity and cosmos as plurality. He sees how the opposition, the “being brought apart” of things returns to unity, which might be taken either as the reversal to identity on the horizontal plane or as the return of manifested beings to the Origin (Being, Unity or Non-being) in the vertical model. This echoes Lao Tzu, who as we know takes it both ways: “These two (essence and outcome) are the same.” But only the wise man, with no “private understanding,” can “see” (觀) this sameness.

Heraclitus’ *palintonos harmonie* echoes too the “backward-turning path of all things” of Parmenides’ Way of Seeming. By strictly differentiating Being and Non-being (which can be “neither known nor uttered,” *oute gar an gnoeis to ge me eon . . . oute phrasais*, 344³⁷), Parmenides parts ways with those *Brottoi*, mortals, who “wander knowing nothing, two-headed,” those helpless fools “altogether dazed . . . persuaded that to be and to be-not are

the same, yet not the same, and for whom the path of all things is backward-turning (*palintropos*)” (345). Is not Heraclitus’ paradoxical fusion of the opposites “altogether dazed” from Parmenides’ point of view? And yet, perhaps from the depths of this dazedness itself, as from sleep, something of the immanence of Logos calls to us. In 236 Heraclitus says: “A man . . . is in contact with the dead, when asleep, and with the sleeper, when awake.” Perhaps here there is not just the fusion of opposites but the hint of a priority to the “back-stretched connexion,” the “geocentric” confusion and dark obscurity of the Origin as sleep and death.

In 237 we hear:

For in sleep, when the channels of perception are shut, our mind is sun-
dered from its kinship with the surrounding, and breathing is the only
point of attachment to be preserved, like a kind of root

Here sleep — whose sense is perhaps not so far from that of Lao Tzu’s Uncarved Block of original nature, his Origin as quiescence (靜), destiny (命) and “root” (根) — may be implicitly tied to the commonality of Logos, and waking life to that private *phronesis* which conceals it. For man’s *psuxē*, soul must listen “not to me, but to the Logos” And yet, “Evil witnesses are eyes and ears for men, if they have souls (*psuxas*) that do not understand their language” (201). Our soul must understand the “language” of this Logos when it speaks to man, but to do so it must be deeper even than the depths of sleep: “Yet you would not find out the boundaries of soul, even by traveling along every path (*hodon*) so deep a measure (bathun logon) does it have” (235).

Here the rendering of logon as “measure” may be misleading. It is the logos of the soul which is “so deep,” for the (cosmic) Logos is concealed within the depths of the soul, running so deep that we can never “find out the boundaries.” This logos of the Logos, like the atman of Atman or the tao (可道) of (常) Tao, listens to and hears the Logos as its own echo — if it “understands the language of eyes and ears” — and feels their identity or commonality as interiority, immanence, presence.

Heidegger interprets Heraclitus’ logos like this: “*Legem* is to lay. Laying is the letting-lie-before — which is gathered into itself — of that which comes together into presence.”³⁸ This is rather striking since here Heidegger, in his quest for the root meaning, gets beneath the standard (or later, derived)

senses of logos as “ratio” (order) and “word” or “saying” . . . though he still presupposes this latter meaning, and its correlate, “hearing.” He translates Fragment 199:

Ouk emou alla tou logou akousantas. “When you have listened, not merely to me (the speaker), but rather when you maintain yourself in hearkening attunement (*Gehören*, belonging), then there is proper hearing. Therefore this hearing is itself a *legein*. As such, the proper hearing of mortals is in a certain way the Same as the logos *homologeïn* (“to agree,” “within the same meaning to say”) remains a *legein* which always and only lays or lets lie whatever is already, as *homon*, gathered together and lying before us; this lying never springs from the *homologeïn* but rather rests in the Laying that gathers, i.e. in the Logos.³⁹

Heidegger again seeks for a very concrete, physical sense as the root meaning: just as Anaximander’s *xreon*, necessity was a hand reaching or giving, Heraclitus’ Logos is *legein* “which always and only lays or lets lie whatever is already . . . gathered together and lying before us” Our agreement (*homologeïn*) with Logos that “All is one” has the sense here of radical nearness or immanence: we have in a sense *already* agreed. Logos is listening and proper hearing but also “letting lie before”: one thinks again of Lao Tzu’s sage who, in contemplative or *yin*-receptive attunement to Tao, follows the “together gathering” or “in-gathering” returning flow to the Origin, and so, through his quiescence and *wu wei*, “non-action”, becomes a model for the empire.

Heidegger, taking Heraclitus’ *sophon*, “wise” as *geschicklich*, “fateful,” goes on: “When proper hearing, as *homologeïn*, is, then the fateful comes to pass, and mortal *legein* is dispatched to the Logos”⁴⁰ This echoes not only Nietzsche’s and Heidegger’s interpretations of Anaximander’s “haunting of the Origin” but also Lao Tzu: “The return to root/Is return to destiny./ Return to destiny is constant (common) /Knowing the constant (common) is understanding (*ming*, enlightenment.) The return of self in the returning flow of Tao to the destiny of the Origin is too a kind of “dispatching of mortal *legein* (logos, hearing, *tao ke tao*) to the Logos.”

This character 明, *ming* is a sun on the left and moon on the right, suggesting great “brightness”, perhaps “seeing.” The sage sees (觀) the return of all things to root-origin, to destiny, but this seeing is already a “returning with” which, seen 明, is “enlightenment.” For this returning

- with is the commonality 常 of self and Tao. It is not that the sage sees him-self but he sees Tao concealed at his core 中 . Thus Chapter 22:

The sage doesn't see himself (Lin:

“does not reveal himself”).

Therefore ming, enlightenment (Lin:

“and is therefore luminous”).

不自見故明。

Chang renders these lines, echoing Heidegger: “He remains in concealment and spontaneously is unconcealed.” Not seeing himself, he remains hidden from himself, and yet this self-hiddenness is the very unconcealing (*ming*-seeing), within himself, of Tao . . . the *lichtung*, “clearing” of Tao.⁴¹ Heraclitus says (D.K. 16): *To me dunon potepos an tis lathoi*, “How can one hide himself before that which never sets?”⁴² Heidegger comments:

Heraclitus' saying is a question The word into which the question ascends is *lathoi* *lanthano*, aorist *elathon*, means “I am hidden” *Lanthanomai* says: “I am — with respect to my relation to something usually unconcealed — concealed from myself.” The unconcealed, for its own part, is thereby concealed — even as I am concealed from myself in relation to it.⁴³

In Chapter 41 Lao Tzu says: “The way that is bright seems dull” (Lau) (明道若昧), “Who understands Tao seems dull of comprehension” (Lin) . . . or, “Bright Tao like dark.” While 明 is a sun and a moon, 昧 is a sun and a “not yet,” and might thus mean: “sun not yet.” Then: “Sun-and-moon Tao is like sun-not-yet.” And so we ask, with Heraclitus: “How can one hide before that which never sets?” Is the sun “not yet” because it never rises, or because it never sets? Perhaps we do not see the sun because, like Tao or Logos, it is too close to us. It may be like the “light of heaven” of the Secret of the Golden Flower: “The light of heaven cannot be seen. It is contained in the two eyes.”⁴⁴

Heidegger comments on Heraclitus' *to dunon*, “(that which) sets”:

The key is *to dunon*. It is related to *duo*, which means to envelop, to submerge. *Duein* says: to go into something — the sun goes into the sea, is lost in it Setting, as the Greeks thought of it, takes place as a

going into concealment "the never-setting" urges us to consider how *physis* is experienced as the ever-rising The phrase *to me dunon pote*, the not setting ever, means both revealing and concealing . . . as one and the Same . . . Self-revealing loves self-concealing⁴⁵

"Self-revealing loves self-concealing" because *physis*, nature, Tao as "ever-rising", as constant manifestation, is always and already a self-reversal, self-returning to concealment, an "ever-setting." This is what we have seen as the "geocentric" priority, in Lao Tzu and Heraclitus, to earth, setting, return. And yet, paradoxically, the (constant) return is already present in the (constant) presencing, the ever-rising. We can hide from that which "never sets" no more than we can hide from "heaven's net." Lao Tzu says:

Heaven's net is broad and wide,
With big meshes, yet letting nothing slip through. (73, Lin)

Thus the "that which never sets" of Heraclitus' Logos may summon us back to Lao Tzu's Tao. This Tao too is concealed by our thinking or naming it, and unconcealed — for how can we hide from that which lies so close that we are blinded by its light? — through our opening to it. Is this unconcealing of Tao-Logos to be also its "releasement?" In his *Gelassenheit* essay, Heidegger bids us listen to this conversation:

Scholar: . . . If this were so, then man, *as* in-dwelling in releasement to that-which-regions, would abide in the origin of his nature. . . man . . . is made use of for the nature of truth.

Scientist: . . . the in-dwelling of releasement has been thought of as waiting

Scholar: . . . The self of that-which-regions is presumably its nature and identical with itself.

Teacher: . . . we are coming near to and so at the same time remaining distant from that-which-regions; although such remaining is, to be sure, a returning.

Scientist: . . . Then what is that nearness and distance within which that-which-regions opens up and veils itself, approaches and withdraws?

Scholar: . . . This word is Heraclitus' word . . . which, all by itself, constitutes Fragment 122 . . . *Agxibasis* . . . "going toward" . . . "going near" . . . "moving-into-nearness". The word could rather, so it seems to me now, be the name for our walk today along this country path Then wonder can open what is locked?

Scientist: . . . By way of waiting . . .

Teacher: . . . if this is released . . .

Scholar: . . . and human nature remains *appropriated* to that . . .

Teacher: . . . from whence we are called.⁴⁶

Here the common ground of Heidegger and Lao Tzu opens before us in its richness, and this “country path” points the way, perhaps, toward future inquiries which, in their wonder, may “open what is locked.” For what we have called the “geocentric” nature or priority of Lao Tzu’s Tao betokens something of the “region” or “regionalizing” of Tao, the self-gathering into interiority, into the fertile void of the core 中 where the “self” of Tao is concealed, and so reveals itself. This in-gathering is both the Logos, “saying” and the logos, “hearing” of the head-and-foot of Tao, it is the waiting of the “indwelling in releasement” to which Tao is returning, or released.

Lao Tzu says: “Tao that can be tao-ed is no常 Tao.” Here *ch’ang* can be “constant” and perhaps also “common.” But perhaps it also hides within it another meaning, that of “waiting.” “The tao that can be tao-ed is not the waiting Tao . . .;” “. . . is not the Tao for (in) which we wait . . .;” or, “. . . is not the Tao that waits . . .” For what? For us to tao it? Or for our releasement to it? Heraclitus says (247): “The lord (*ho anax*) whose oracle is in Delphi neither speaks out (*legei*) nor conceals (*kryptei*), but gives a sign (*semainei*).”

We may then say that Lao Tzu’s Tao as hidden cosmic/human Origin has two modalities: the horizontal opposition-and-identity of Being and Non-being, self and Tao, and the vertical return of manifestation to the origin, of beings to Being, or Being to Non-being, or self to Tao. We have found analogues for the cosmic side or dimension of this Tao in the internal ordering (self-transformation) of Hesiod’s Chaos and in the double modality – manifestation as opposition within the larger cyclic return – of Anaximander’s *apeiron*.

But in Heraclitus’ Logos we have found an analogue for Tao, not only in the double modality of cosmic manifestation-and-return but, perhaps more strikingly, in the double pattern of self-concealment (of tao in Tao, logos in Logos) and unconcealment (of Logos, Tao). The Tao-Logos parallel is more complete, since it sees the Origin not just as (self-concealing) cosmic Origin, but also as (self-concealing) human Origin, that is, as (our) original

nature.

It may be that, just as Lao Tzu is reacting against certain Chou-Confucian moral absolutes, against the model of society (rather than nature) as final norm and telos, and against a kind of "linear" logic, so too Heraclitus is reacting against the Olympian moral absolutes (Zeus, *Dike*) – though they still play a part in his thinking – against society as a collection of "private understandings," and, most forcefully perhaps, against the differentiating "scientific" logic of his philosophical predecessors. But this sort of comparison or parallel, more fully developed than the one here attempted, would have to be, like deeper parallels between Lao Tzu and the later Heidegger, the subject of a future investigation.

Notes

1. In this investigation we shall assume that there was one author of the *Tao Te Ching*, Lao Tzu, who lived sometime after Confucius, perhaps as late as the third century B.C.
2. Kirk and Raven, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (Cambridge: University Press, 1963), p. 193.
3. D.C. Lau's translation in *Lao Tzu, Tao Te Ching* (London: Penguin Books, 1963). From now on the translator's name follows the translated lines, and no name means it's my translation, which usually roughly follows Lao or Lin.
4. Duyvendak perhaps gets furthest from this "standard" with his rendering: "The way that may truly be regarded as a way is other than a permanent way." That is, he completely reverses the sense of the first line by giving the changing *tao ke tao* a higher status than the unchanging *ch'ang tao*.
5. Wing-Tsit Chan, "Chapter 7 The Natural Way of Lao Tzu," *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton: University Press, 1963), p. 139. Chan's Note 11 is noteworthy: "Ho-shang Kung and Wang Pi punctuated the sentences to mean 'have desires' and 'have no desires.' This interrupts the thought of the chapter. Beginning with Wang An-shih's (1021–1086) *Lao Tzu chu* . . . some scholars have punctuated the two sentences after *wu* (no) and *yu* (to be) . . . I prefer Wang's punctuation."
6. Lin Yu-T'ang, *The Sayings of Lao Tzu* (Taipei: Confucius Publishing Company), Chinese text with English translation.
7. Alan Watts, *Tao: The Watercourse Way* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1975), p. 44. (This is where I read the reference to Duyvendak – v. note 4 – on p. 39.)
8. Chung-Yuan Chang, *Tao: A New Way of Thinking* (Taipei, 1975). Chang often, though here not so much, shows in his translation the influence of Heidegger.
9. Jung, *Psyche and Symbol* (Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, 1958), trans.

- Baynes and Hull. In his "Synchronicity" essay, Jung discusses Wilhelm's interpretation of Tao as Meaning.
10. Herlee Creel, *What is Taoism? And Other Essays* (Chicago: University Press, 1970), Chapter 1, pp. 1-5; Chapter 3, pp. 43-45.
 11. Joseph Needham, *Science and Civilization in China* Vol. II of *History of Scientific Thought* (Cambridge: University Press, 1954), p. 228.
 12. Ibid.
 13. Richard Wilhelm, *I Ching*, Bollingen, 19 (N.Y.: Bollingen Foundation, 1950), trans. C. F. Baynes, Book I, "The Text," p. 97.
 14. See, for example, Jaeger, *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947). Needham points out that "de-personalization" of the concept of "supreme being" occurred "earlier and more completely" in China than in Greece (Op. Cit.), a crucial starting point for any comparison of early Greek and Chinese metaphysics.
 15. Kirk and Raven, Op. Cit., Chapter 1, "The Forerunners of Philosophical Cosmogony," pp. 24-25.
 16. Eric Voegelin, *Order and History* (L.S.U. Press, 1957), Vol. II of *The World of the Polis*, p. 134: "Within the realm of the myth itself the trinity of Chaos-Gaea-Eros is set off as the *arche* of the gods in the same manner as one of the elements is posited as the *arche* of things in the Ionian speculation Hesiod took great pains to distinguish the pre-erotic 'came to be' (*geneto*) from the erotic generation."
 17. Mircea Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (N.Y.: World Publishing Company, 1966), pp. 388 ff.
 18. Kirk and Raven, Op. Cit., Fragment 26, p. 29.
 19. Ibid., pp. 27-28.
 20. Burton Watson, *Chuang Tzu, Basic Writings* (N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1964).
 21. Needham, Op. Cit., makes much of this "internal ordering" of Tao, which is to be correlated with its de-personalization.
 22. Werner Jaeger, *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947), p. 16.
 23. Ibid.
 24. This subject is too broad for the present investigation. One wouldn't want to overstate the case for Lao Tzu's "reaction," since the common ground of Confucius and Lao Tzu, or of their Tao's, may be seen to underlie the latter's departure . . . perhaps his "return" to a more "original" Tao?
 25. Francis Cornford, *Principium Sapientiae* (N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1965), Chapter 11. Cornford sees the *apeiron* as suggestive less of Chaos itself than of the heaven-earth unity that "preceded" it Jaeger, op. cit., Chapter 2: Anaximander's *apeiron* is (still) "divine."
 26. Martin Heidegger, *Early Greek Thinking* (N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1975), p. 13. As for *mythos* to *logos*, see Jaeger, op. cit., and Voegelin, op. cit.
 27. Kirk and Raven, op. cit., Chapter III, "Anaximander of Miletus", Fragment 112, p. 117.

28. Ibid., pp. 108–16.
29. Cited by Heidegger, *op. cit.*, p. 13.
30. Jaeger, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
31. Heidegger, *op. cit.*, pp. 51–52.
32. This is the “existential analysis of *dasein*,” approached through the phenomenological method which Heidegger gained from Husserl.
33. This “forgetfulness of Being” already underlies the *dasein*-analysis of *Being and Time*, which is why *dasein* “stands out” from Being in this way. In “Summary of a Seminar,” *On Time and Being* (N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1972), we hear: “The fundamental experience of *Being and Time* is that of the oblivion of Being. But oblivion means here in the Greek sense: concealment and self-concealing,” p. 29. Further: “. . . this (more original) thinking . . . has the character of return. That is the step back.” (pp. 27–28).
34. Heidegger, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
35. Ibid., p. 49.
36. Kirk and Raven, *op. cit.*, Chapter VI, “Heraclitus of Ephesus,” Fragment 231, p. 204. From now on, Fragment numbers refer to this text.
37. Ibid., Chapter X, “Parmenides of Elea,” Fragment 344, p. 269.
38. Heidegger, *op. cit.*, “Logos (Heraclitus, Fragment B 50),” p. 63.
39. Ibid., p. 67
40. Ibid., p. 68
41. Chang Chung-Yuan, in his “Reflections” (*Errinerungen an Martin Heidegger*, Neske), says to Heidegger: “*Lichtung* is the opening and clearing from which illumination derives. This *lichtung* in the Taoist sense is *Ming* . . .,” and Heidegger answers, “That is correct.” The *lichtung* can be found in *On Time and Being* (*op. cit.*) and other later works.
42. Heidegger, *Early Greek Thinking*, *op. cit.*, Chapter 4, “Aletheia (Heraclitus, Fragment B 16),” p. 104.
43. Ibid., pp. 106, 108.
44. Richard Wilhelm, *The Secret of the Golden Flower*, (N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1931), trans. C. F. Baynes, p. 21.
45. Heidegger, *op. cit.*, pp. 110–14.
46. Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking* (N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1966), pp. 84–90.

