

Philosophy East and West

A Quarterly of Asian and Comparative Thought

Volume XXXVII, No. 4 October 1987

Articles

The "Four-Seven Debate" and the School of Principle in Korea *Xi-de Jin* 347

Where words fail: The limits of scriptural authority in the hermeneutics of a contemporary Advaitin *Anantanand Rambachan* 361

Three models of self-integration (*tzu te*) in early China *James D. Sellmann* 372

The svabhāvahetu in Dharmakīrti's logic *Kisor Kumar Chakrabarti* 392

Fan Chen's *Treatise on the Destructibility of the the Spirit* and Its Buddhist Critics *Ming-Wood Liu* 402

Comment and Discussion

"Ethics, Practical Reasoning, and Political Philosophy in Antiquity and in Christian, Jewish, and Islamic Philosophy": A Joint Conference of The Society for the Study of Islamic Philosophy and Science (SSIPS), The Society for Ancient Greek Philosophy (SAGP), and The International Society for Neoplatonic Studies (ISNS)—A Report *George Rudebusch* 429

Reply to Jeffrey Hopkins *Matthew Kapstein* 434

Feature Book Review

Dōgen/Heidegger/Dōgen—A Review of *Dōgen Studies*, edited by William R. LaFleur, and *Existential and Ontological Dimensions of Time in Heidegger and Dōgen*, by Steven Heine *Graham Parkes* 437

Book Reviews 455

Anindita N. Balslev, *A Study of Time in Indian Philosophy*, reviewed by *J. N. Mohanty*
David E. Mungello, *Curious Land: Jesuit Accommodation and the Origins of Sinology*, reviewed by *Paul A. Cohen*

Keiji Nishitani, *Religion and Nothingness*, reviewed by *David Edward Shaner*

Anand Amaladass, S. J., *Philosophical Implications of Dhvani: Experience of Symbol Language in Indian Aesthetics*, reviewed by *John A. Taber*

Hee-Jin Kim, *Flowers of Emptiness: Selections from Dōgen's Shōbōgenzō*, reviewed by *Shigenori Nagatomo*

Susan Bush and Hsio-yen Shih, *Early Chinese Texts on Painting*, reviewed by *Charles Lachman*
Ronald Newfeldt, *Karma and Rebirth: Post Classical Development*, reviewed by *Ashok Malhotra*

Published quarterly in January, April, July, and October by The University of Hawaii Press, 2840 Kolowalu Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822, U.S.A. Second-class postage paid at Honolulu, Hawaii and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes to The University of Hawaii Press, Journals, 2840 Kolowalu Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822.

Rates: to institutions, \$21.00 a year, \$7.00 per issue; to individuals, \$16.00 a year, \$5.00 per issue. Payment in U.S. currency by check, money order, or dollar draft preferred. Copyright © 1987 by The University Press of Hawaii.

ISSN: 0031-8221.

Composition by Asco Trade Typesetting Limited, Hong Kong.

James D. Sellmann Three models of self-integration (*tzu te*) in early China

It has been well demonstrated that the concept *tzu te*^a ("self-integration") plays an important role in Neo-Confucian thought.¹ It is a serious oversight that the classical uses of *tzu te*, however, have not yet been explicated. Even the novice is aware of the importance of the term, *tzu jan*^b, ("self-so-ing" or "spontaneity"), though it only occurs five times in the *Lao tzu* and seven in the *Chuang tzu*. By contrast, little has been said about *tzu te* despite its wide usage and importance in the early corpus.

This article will analyze the *Fa chia*^c (conventionally translated as Legalist), Confucian, and Taoist models of consummate person. I will not focus on the various terms used to label their respective models, for example, sage ruler, *chün tzu*^d, or *chen jen*^e, but will rather concern myself with the shared locution, *tzu te*. According to the *Chung-wen ta-ts'u-tien*^f (a contemporary encyclopedic dictionary), the binome *tzu te* is defined as a contraction of one of three phrases, namely, *tzu te ch'i le*^g, "to self-realize one's enjoyment"; or *tzu chüeh te yi*^h, "to perceive and realize one's own intention"; or *tzu te ch'i tao*ⁱ, "personal integration with the *tao*^j." Since one's personal integration with the *tao* would entail the "enjoyment" of one's life and the realization of one's intentions and desires, the third sense of *tzu te* contains the other two. For this reason, it is this third and more comprehensive meaning of *tzu te* to which I will direct my attention in this article.

I

When I refer to one's "personal integration with the *tao*," I intend to invoke the notion of *integrity*, or integralness, that is, completion in the sense of *becoming* a consummate person or sage by integrating with each and every other particular and, conversely, other particulars realizing their integrity by integrating with the consummate person. In this sense "integration" entails a dialectical tension obtaining among particulars in which the completeness of each particular is dependent on each and every other thing. Integration is a mutuality in which the particular adapts to its context, and the context is adapted to the particular. The *particular* is a *part* of a context, but importantly, the whole context is never greater than the sum of its parts—remove one part and the whole is different. The whole is nothing more than the fullest integration of parts. Chinese organicism, then, is different from standard forms of biological organicism which generally hold that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. It is not that the Chinese system is illogical, but rather it is a-logical, that is, nonlogical from the traditional Aristotelian-Boolean view of logic.

The same expression or locution, *tzu te*, is used in *Fa chia*, Confucian, and Taoist contexts to describe their widely different models of consummate person. This is accounted for by the fact that these three schools of thought actually share

James D. Sellmann is a doctoral candidate in Philosophy at the University of Hawaii.

AUTHOR'S NOTE: This article was first presented as a paper at the Fourth International Congress of Chinese Philosophy, State University of New York at Stony Brook, July 15–18, 1985.

Philosophy East and West, volume 37, no. 4 (October 1987). © by the University of Hawaii Press. All rights reserved.

a number of key philosophical terms or locutions, for example, *tao*, *te*^k, *yin-yang*^l, and *t'ien*^m, but each of these expressions is used with different conceptual content. *Fa chia* differs fundamentally from Confucianism and Taoism in that it is primarily directed toward maintaining the ruler in office. Confucianism and Taoism are not simply directed at the interests of the ruler, but they also have a concern for the cultivation and integration of *others*. Since *Fa chia* lacks a position on self-cultivation which is so basic to both Confucianism and Taoism, it can be said that the difference between *Fa chia* and the other two schools is a difference of *kind*. The differences between Confucianism and Taoism, then, are differences of *degree*. Consider the number of philosophical positions which the Confucians and Taoists share, but which the *Fa chia* does not, for example, the unity of humanity and nature, the unity of knowing and acting, and the difference between the consummate person and the petty person or narrow-minded erudite. Moreover, Confucianism and Taoism should be seen as organic philosophies in the fullest sense. Their systems are organic in the interconnectedness of the terminology used to express them and in their basic world view, that is, all things arise within a natural field (*tao*) of interdependency and interrelatedness. As organic philosophies, both Confucianism and Taoism hold that sociopolitical man is a natural condition. This contrasts starkly with the *Fa chia*, who hold that society was contrived and established by man. Because of the "contemplative" and "quietistic" interpretation of Taoism which is so popular these days, it perhaps sounds peculiar to speak of Taoism as a sociopolitical philosophy. Recent archaeological finds and scholarly analysis have demonstrated clearly that the Huang-Laoⁿ school of Taoism was primarily concerned with political philosophy.² Further, recall that the *Lao tzu* seeks to give advice to the ruler on the presupposition that society will always have rulers. The eightieth chapter of *Lao tzu* describes an ideal Taoist society as having both a state and a ruler, with a simple system of administration and a military. The full circumstances of the Taoist utopia need not be examined here; one need simply allow that the *Lao tzu*, at least, assumes that a ruler is a natural condition of any human society.³ The *Chuang tzu*, too, is directed at the self-actualizing person in society. Thus, Huang-Lao Taoism was not the only school of Taoism which advocated a sociopolitical philosophy; the Lao-Chuang school did so also.

As organic philosophies, Confucianism and Taoism share another common characteristic. They both insist that a person and one's society are not in any sense independent, but are interconnected and codependent. This view of society, however, differs from that of Aristotle, with which it might be confounded on at least two points: first, Aristotle argues for the priority of the state over the individual;⁴ and second, he assumes the concept of an "atomic individual" for ontological reasons. For the Confucians and Taoists, at least, society is *not* greater than the sum of its parts—"society" is not prior to the person. The "person" within the Confucian and Taoist organic scheme manifests "society" through self-cultivation. Furthermore, the operative concept of "person" is

radically different from that of “atomic individuality” so prevalent in social contract theory in that it is grounded in an organic field ontology as opposed to a substance ontology. Substance ontologies in general advance some form of individual independence and self-sufficiency. For the classical Confucians and Taoists, a “person” is defined in terms of the social and environmental context—who and what one *is* is dependent on one’s interrelationships with others. Contra the “atomic individual” metaphor, this view could be called the “integrated person.”

Another common point of departure for the Confucians and the Taoists is that they begin with personal development, and extend it cosmically. The Confucian formula is most clearly presented in the *Ta hsüeh*^o. The *Ta hsüeh* tells us to begin the work of unifying the empire by cultivating our own personal interrelationships, especially those of the family. In so doing, the *chiün tzu*, the consummate person, sets a moral example for sociopolitical order which will have cosmic influence. The *Chung yung*^p makes a similar point when it gives cosmic significance to “authenticity” (*ch’eng*^a) as the function of nature (*t’ien*) and the means by which self-completion (*tzu ch’eng*^r) is effected (25/1). The Confucian concept of “authenticity” (*ch’eng*) is similar to the Taoist concept of “genuineness” (*chen*^a). In fact, chapter 31 of the *Chuang tzu* defines “genuineness” in terms of “authenticity”:

The genuine (*chen*) is the complete integration of the life-powers and authenticity (*ch’eng*). . . .⁵

The Taoist “genuine person” (*chen jen*) is one who is socially integrated, but he is not limited by social conventions. The *chen jen* does what is natural as a member of society and as a manifestation of the *tao*. The Taoist writings are also directed at developing consummate persons, but ultimately the Taoist seeks to go beyond the distinction between the human and the nonhuman.

This, then, brings us to some important differences between Confucianism and Taoism. Of course, there are more differences between them than can be discussed here. I would, however, like to focus on just two important distinguishing features which have a bearing on my topic. First, the opening passage of chapter 7 of the *Chuang tzu* provides one important difference:

. . . The clansman Yu-yü [that is, Shun the Confucian model] was no match for the clansman T’ai [the Taoist model]. The clansman Yu-yü still held on to humankindness and worked to win men over. He won men over all right, but he never got out of it into the realm of the nonhuman. The clansman T’ai, now—he lay down peaceful and easy; he woke up wide-eyed and blank. Sometimes he thought he was a horse; sometimes he thought he was a cow. His understanding was reliable; his instantiated potency (*te*) was very genuine (*chen*). He never entered into the realm of the nonhuman.⁶

Taoists never enter the realm of the nonhuman because they do not differentiate between the human and the nonhuman. They take a transhuman perspective which is beyond that distinction altogether. The Confucians focus on the human

element, while the Taoists focus on the instantiated particular (*te*), whether it be human or not.

The second difference of concern in this article is generated out of the first. Since the Confucians emphasize the human realm, they anthropomorphize the world and take "man as the measure." The transhuman perspective of the Taoists, on the other hand, naturalizes mankind and takes the "self-so-ing" of nature as the *creative* measure of all things. This second point is well illustrated in the following passage from the *Chuang tzu*:

Rites are something created by the vulgar men of the world; genuineness (*chen*) is received from nature (*t'ien*). Its self-so-ing (*tzu jan*) cannot be changed. Therefore, the sage models himself on nature and venerates genuineness. He is not cramped by vulgar customs. The stupid one does the opposite of this. He does not model himself on nature but frets over human concerns. He does not understand how to venerate the genuine, but instead he plods along with the crowd, being changed by the vulgar customs. So he is never content.⁷

The differences must be recognized from within the respective frames of reference of the Confucians, who see the Taoists as overlooking the sociospiritual needs of man, and the Taoists, who perceive the Confucians as undermining the natural basis of society with contrived ritual-action (*li'*). Despite this difference of emphasis between Confucian humanism and Taoist naturalism, both schools are in agreement that the process of human development starts with the particular person in context and extends outward as patterns of integration in society and nature, respectively. Both schools would agree with the *Chuang tzu*, chapter 33: it is the narrow-minded and one-sided approach which occasions the downfall of "... the way which is sagely within and kingly without..."⁸

II

Before turning to the sources in which the binome *tzu te* occurs, I would first like to analyze the individual components of the binome. *Tzu* can function as a reflexive pronoun, or as an adverb "from," and combining these two forms, *tzu* can serve as a reflexive prefix meaning "deriving from," or "occasioned by." *Tzu te*, then, is the *te* ("obtaining," "achieving," "getting") occasioned by oneself being authentic or genuine. It is self-deriving integration with the *tao*. On this point, it is important to recall that the classical Confucian and Taoist concept of person is an organic model in which each and every focus is interdependent with every other focus in the field (*tao*). The field ontology of both Confucianism and Taoism recognizes the interpenetration and organic unity of the myriad things; in the totality of *tao* all things are interrelated. The common tension in the West between individual liberty and collective will or private and public interests does not get much attention in traditional Chinese social thought. The general Chinese concept of "self" should be understood as the *extended*, interrelated, and integrated social person.

The character *te* in the binome *tzu te* has two basic meanings. It can mean "to get," "to obtain," or "to grasp," something like *ch'ü*. It can also mean "can,"

“may,” or “to be able to do” in the sense of *k'o*^w or *neng*^x. In the expression “one who gets the *tao*” (*te tao che*^y), we must not commit the fallacy of reification by taking the *tao* as a “thing” to be gained or obtained. The process of *te tao* is active and bi-relational; context and particular act upon each other. Historically speaking, the person or thing is born into an ongoing process—the *tao* as tradition. As an ongoing process, it is *not* a model of perfection or completion. Rather *tao* is the field in which things mature and achieve full integration. But the insistent particular must also play its own role, actively transforming yet maintaining its authenticity or genuineness as an instantiation of *tao*. The particular carries on the *tao*, and the *tao* never achieves a higher completion over and above that of its instantiated particular. We can see the *te tao* (integrating with *tao*) process as the methodological reversal of the ontologically creative process of *tao te*^z (the unfolding of particulars within *tao*) as it is developed, for example, in the *Tao te ching*^{aa}. Ontologically it is within the context of other things, that is, within the *tao*, that the particular arises and develops. This is a cosmological relationship of foci to field in which all foci are interrelated, and the whole field is not something greater than the sum of the foci. Importantly, it is *not* a cosmogonic relationship. The interpretation of *te tao* and *tao te* as a reciprocal relationship is strengthened by the homophonic similarity between *te*^k and *te*^u. Dubs and Watson have respectively noted that these two characters are used synonymously in the *Hsün tzu* and the *Chuang tzu*. And Munro has discussed at length how *te* meaning “to bestow favor or kindness” became intertwined with *te* “to get.”⁹ When one shows favor to the people (*te*) one wins them over (*te*)—giving is a getting.

This point is important for understanding the Confucian and Taoist concepts of *tzu te* as self-integration with *tao*. Although the two schools differ in their interpretations of *tao* and *te*^k, nevertheless, for both, the way to manifest *tao* is by cultivating one's *te*. Thus, the concept *tzu te* (self-integration) is an implication of the concept cluster, *tao* and *te*: to manifest the *tao* one cultivates *te*; by self-integration with one's *te*, one is integrated with the myriad things—*tao*. To integrate chiefly by sociopolitical means with others is to cultivate one's Confucian *te*. In Taoist terms, to integrate not only with other people, but also to unite with all other things is to cultivate one's instantiating potency (*te*) and to become one with *tao*.

Since both Confucians and Taoists accept that full integration begins with the development of the person, the process of *tzu te* forms the core around which full integration with *tao* occurs. Although there are indeed similarities between the two schools concerning the starting point of integration and the union of self and others, “. . . especially in the Confucian discussion of ‘integrity’ (*ch'eng*). . .,” nevertheless there are important differences.¹⁰

III

The *Fa chia* philosophers (perhaps more appropriately rendered “Systematizers” than “Legalists”) do not share the organic perspective which underlies Con-

fucian and Taoist thought, nor do they accept the particular person as the starting point of sociopolitical order. It is rather the self-interest of the ruler that is the starting point for the *Fa chia* thinkers. As such, these Systematizers limit themselves to the political arena.

When *tzu te* occurs in the *Book of Lord Shang*, it refers specifically to the process of obtaining the empire (*te t'ien hsia*^{ab}). The *Book of Lord Shang* states:

Whoever relies on the empire is rejected by the empire; whoever relies on himself obtains the empire (*te t'ien hsia*). The one who obtains the empire is one who has *tzu te* first. The one who is able to gain victory over a strong enemy is one who has gained victory over himself.¹¹

This passage appears to have strong resemblances to both Confucian and Taoist passages. In the *Analects* we are told:

Confucius said: "The *chün tzu* seeks for it from within himself, while the petty man seeks for it from others." (32/15/21)

The basic starting point lies with oneself. And chapter 33 of the *Lao tzu* contains a passage similar to the conclusion of this citation from *Lord Shang*: "The one who gains victory over himself is truly strong."

The chapter "Priority on Oneself" ("Hsien chi"^{ac}) of the *Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu* begins with the founder of the Shang dynasty, King T'ang (a Confucian favorite), asking his Taoistic minister Yi Yin about the means to obtain or take (*ch'ü*) the empire. The passage continues:

Yi Yin replied, "If you desire to take (*ch'ü*) the empire, then the empire cannot be obtained. To obtain it, you yourself must first be obtained."

The root of all affairs must begin with governing one's own self. . . . [T]he one who can daily renew his vital force and life-breath, completely expel the depraved life-breath in order to live out his natural years, is called a *chen jen*. . . . Therefore, the one who desires to gain victory over others must first gain victory over himself. The one who wishes to discuss others must first discuss himself. The one who intends to know others must first know himself.¹²

This synthetic view of *tzu te* as the means for obtaining the empire will reappear when we examine the *tzu te* process presented in the *Huai nan tzu*. It is important only to note here that the *Fa chia* concept of *tzu te* is primarily confined to the political attainments of a ruler.

IV

As we saw above, Confucius advocated that, in the project of cultivation, one start with oneself and one's most immediate relations. Self-cultivation and self-integration begin by working on oneself. The *Ta hsüeh* formula which makes self-cultivation the basis for establishing sociospiritual order and illuminating the enlightened virtue (*ming te*^{ad}) is also expressed in the *I ching*. Hexagram 35 describes a similar achievement in its "Image" where it says: ". . . The *chün tzu* (ruler) applies himself to illuminating the enlightened virtues" (22/35/*hsiang*). *Tzu te* occurs in the *Mencius*, the *Hsün tzu*, the *Chung yung*, and in Tung Chung-

shu's *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu*. Thus, the Confucians developed the theory of *tzu te*, which would later influence the Neo-Confucian teachings on self-cultivation. In part VI following, I conclude that *tzu te* might be rendered as "self-realization," in the sense of social integration, in the Confucian context based on an analysis of the following passages.

1. *Tzu te in the Mencius*

The *Mencius* provides one of the clearest Confucian statements on *tzu te* as the process of self-integrating with the sociospiritual Way (*tao*). For the *Mencius*, self-integration is *tao*-integration. The *Mencius* states:

The *chün tzu* profoundly transforms himself with the Way (*tao*), desiring to *tzu te* it. When he has *tzu te*, he dwells at ease. When he dwells at ease, he can draw deeply upon it. When he can draw deeply upon it, he grasps its source anywhere he turns. Therefore, the *chün tzu* desires himself to *tzu te* the Way (*tao*).¹³

I believe it is this passage which led most of the Neo-Confucian commentators on the *Four Books* to interpret *tzu te* as "self-realizing the Way" (*tzu te ch'i tao*). Furthermore, this passage clearly associates *tzu te* within the concept cluster, *tao te*², the Way (*tao*) and its virtue/power (*te*).

In a second occurrence of the binome *tzu te* in the *Mencius*, it is suggested that the model emperor extends the process of self-integration of *tao* to the common people. This passage is attributed to Fang Hsün or the emperor Yao:

Glorify and encourage them,
Arrange and correct them,
Assist and aid them,
Cause *tzu te* in them,
And they will follow when favors are given them.¹⁴

Chu Hsi's commentary on this passage elucidates *tzu te* in saying: "... cause them to self-realize (*tzu te*) their inner tendencies (*hsing*^{ae})."¹⁵ It is clear from these two passages that Mencius understands *tzu te* as a process of self-cultivation in which the *chün tzu* realizes the Way, and as a process which should be extended to the people.

2. *Tzu te in the Hsün tzu and the Chung yung*

Tzu te occurs once in the *Hsün tzu* as a description of the sage. In the chapter on "Encouraging Learning," the *Hsün tzu* associates the process of *tzu te* with the attainment of spiritual enlightenment. It states:

Pile up earth to make a mountain, and wind and rain will rise up from it. Pile up water to make a deep pool, and dragons will appear. Pile up good deeds to develop virtue, and spiritually extended enlightenment will be self-realized (*shen ming tzu te*^{af}); there the heart-mind of the sage is realized.¹⁶

From this vague description of the sage, it would appear that the *Hsün tzu* attributes the process of self-realization to a high stage of personal cultivation.

Tzu te is still associated with the sociospiritual consummate person of Confucianism.

Tzu te also occurs in chapter 14 of the *Chung yung*. Again it is associated with the self-cultivation of the *chün tzu*. The *Chung yung* passage reads as follows:

The *chün tzu* does what is fitting to his position at any given time, and he does not wish to go beyond it. In a position of wealth and honor, he does what is fitting to a position of wealth and honor. In a poor and mean position, he does what is fitting to a poor and mean position. When he is among the tribal peoples, he does what is fitting among the tribes. In a position of sorrow and hardship, he does what is fitting in a position of sorrow and hardship. The *chün tzu* never enters a situation in which he cannot *tzu te*.¹⁷

The *chün tzu* is always applying himself to self-cultivation by doing what is morally fitting in whatever social position he finds himself. The *chün tzu*, like the Taoist *chen jen*, must move along with the natural course of things and adapt to the context. Significantly, the *chün tzu*'s context is limited to the sociospiritual setting.

3. *Tzu te* in the *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu*

In the *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu*, the early Han dynasty Confucian, Tung Chung-shu, defines *tzu te* or self-integration in terms of the personal expression of appropriate sociospiritual conduct (*yi*²⁸):

Yi means appropriate to one's own person. Only once one is appropriate to one's own person can it be called *yi*. So the expression *yi* combines the notions of "appropriateness" and "personal self" in one term. If we hold on to this insight, *yi* as an expression refers to personal self. Thus, it is said that to realize *yi* (*te yi*^{28b}) in one's actions is called *tzu te*; to neglect *yi* in one's actions is called self-negating.¹⁸

Quoting this passage in their paper on *yi*, Hall and Ames point out that: "[T]he expression self-realizing (*tzu te*) which occurs in this passage and is equated with 'realizing *yi*' (*te yi*) appears frequently in the corpus of early Chinese literature in discussions that center on the achievement of personal identity and the uniqueness of that achievement."¹⁹ However, it should be emphasized that on this Confucian understanding of *tzu te* only humans participate in the unique achievement of personal identity. This is because Tung Chung-shu follows Hsün Tzu and others in insisting that only humans possess *yi*.²⁰ Thus, only human realization is "significant." In this sense Tung has championed the early Confucian position by limiting his concept of *tzu te*, as sociospiritual self-realizing, to the human perspective. Of course, this is only natural in an ethic of self-realization where it is widely held that only people have a self-conscious sociospiritual tendency.

v

Both the Systematizers and the Confucians describe *tzu te* as a specifically human project, but where the Systematizers restrict *tzu te* to the political arena, the

Confucians have a broader interpretation that extends it as a sociospiritual concern. Although some of the Taoist material on *tzu te* takes the self-cultivation process beyond the human realm, nevertheless much of the Taoist discussion of *tzu te* is confined to the sociopolitical arena. In fact, many of the positive statements of *tzu te* occur in the more politically orientated Taoism of the *Kuan tzu* and *Huai nan tzu*. In the political Taoist context, the *tzu te* process is seen as culminating in obtaining the empire. This suggests that the political Taoists and the Systematizers actually have a number of congruent ideas and, like the other schools of thought, these were probably not clearly distinguished during the Warring States Period (479–221 B.C.). In part VI following, I conclude that *tzu te* in the Taoist context might be rendered as self-actualizing, in the sense of self-so-ing integration with nature.

1. *Tzu te in Lao-Chuang Thought*

Either the concept *tzu te* was not available to the writers of the *Lao tzu* and the inner chapters of the *Chuang tzu* as a term for actualizing the *tao*, or more likely they choose not to use it—possibly because it sounded too aggressive and selfish. Thus, we find chapter 33 of the *Lao tzu* advising the king to have self-knowledge, and thereby gain victory over himself. As we saw already in part III, the Systematizers and the syncretic position of *Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu* associated these ideas with *tzu te*, but the *Lao tzu* does not. Chapter 2 of the *Chuang tzu* also advocates self-knowledge (4/2/27), but the only reference to *tzu te* in the inner chapters is expressed as a negative in typical *Chuang tzu* style. In describing the *chen jen* at the opening of chapter 6, we are told that a genuine person (*chen jen*) would not participate in *tzu te* in its literal sense of “self-achievement.” The notion of *chen jen* does not permit anthropocentric and egocentric limitations on the process of self-actualization, which I have identified as a Confucian position. *Chuang tzu* chapter 6 states:

The *chen jen* of antiquity did not rebel against want, did not grow proud in plenty, and did not plan their affairs. A person like this could commit an error and not regret it; or such a person could do it appropriately and not have any notion of self-achievement (*pu tzu te^{ai}*).²¹

The outer chapters of the *Chuang tzu* use the expression *tzu te*, but it has a general usage beyond the process of self-cultivation. For example, it is used twice to describe one who has been baffled and “. . . cannot get a hold of himself (*pu tzu te*) (31/12/61 and 37/14/15); and it is used once in the sense that the people will “. . . gain no self benefit. . .” in living (25/11/6). In chapter 17 the binome takes on a positive expression as a self-cultivation term:

. . . Man takes the smallest thing and tries to exhaust the dimensions of the largest. Hence, he is muddled and confused, and he cannot *tzu te*. (42/17/19)

Chapter 8 gives the last and the most positive expression of *tzu te* in the *Chuang tzu* as a self-cultivation concept:

He who applies his inner tendencies (*hsing*^{ae}) to humankindness and appropriateness (*jen yi*) . . . I would not call him an expert. . . My definition of expertness has nothing to do with humankindness and appropriateness; it means being expert in regards to your instantiating potency (*te*), and that is all. What I call expertness . . . is to be responsible for the actual conditions of your inner tendencies and natural course (*hsing ming chih ch'ing*^{aj}), and that is all. . . He who does not look for himself but has others look for him, or he who does not achieve for himself (*tzu te*) but has others obtain for him, he is one who is obtaining from others, but he is not actualizing his own achievements.²²

When *tzu te* is given a positive expression in the *Chuang tzu*, it is used to reject the narrow limits of the Confucian principles of *jen* and *yi*. This rejection is important for the Taoist scheme in that the limitations of human ethical concepts are rejected as an inappropriate terminology for discussing self-integration. The Taoist process of self-cultivation is transhuman and not limited by what they consider to be the contrived conventions of Confucianism. The Lao-Chuang school discusses self-integration in cosmic terms—to integrate with the *tao*, the particular manifests what is uniquely creative to it, its self-so-ing (*tzu jan*). This helps explain why *tzu te* does not hold a key position in the Lao-Chuang school; they had their own special term for spontaneous integration—*tzu jan*.

Tzu te also occurs in the *Lieh tzu* with implications generally in keeping with those of the *Chuang tzu*:

When the Yellow Emperor awoke, he would happily *tzu te*. . .

(After life is wasted away) . . . the amount of time spent being at ease and being able to *tzu te* without a bit of worry about it won't amount to one hour!²³

From the *Lieh tzu* we see that a sage-ruler like the Yellow Emperor can self-actualize as easily as he awakes; but the common people rarely achieve self-actualization at all.

2. *Tzu te* in the Taoist Chapters of the *Kuan tzu*

Tzu te occurs five times in the *Kuan tzu*, but the last two occurrences are not of philosophical significance.²⁴ The other three references are found in the distinctly Taoist chapters "Hsin shu shang^{ak}" and "Hsin shu hsia^{al}"—"The Art of Controlling the Heart-mind," parts one and two. These two chapters are interesting in that they provide us with some of the earliest Chinese speculations in psychology and meditation. *Hsin shu*^{am} means "methods for controlling the heart-mind." It is not too surprising to find that these Taoist chapters of the *Kuan tzu* find a place for *tzu te* within their psychology of "self-cultivation by self-control."

The "Hsin shu shang" chapter is divided into two parts: the first part is believed to be the original text dating to the early third century B.C.; and the second part is a commentary-elaboration of the first part. *Tzu te* occurs in both sections. Since the passages are not only interesting, but also rather involved, I will cite a large portion from the opening section of the "Hsin shu shang" chapter

in order to keep the expression *tzu te* in its full context:

The heart-mind dwells in the ruler's position within the body. The Nine Orifices have their respective functions and sense organs [literally, offices]. When the heart-mind dwells in its *tao*, the Nine Orifices comply with their principles. When lust develops and desires increase, the eyes cannot distinguish colors; the ears cannot hear sounds.

So there is the old saying: if the superior (*shang*^{an}) deviates from his *tao*, the subjects (*hsia*^{an}) will deviate from their affairs. [Thus, the art of controlling the heart-mind consists in controlling the Orifices by nonpurposive action (*wu wei*^{ap}).]

Never substitute for a horse in running, make it exhaust its strength; never substitute for a bird in flying, make it fatigue its wings. Never be first to make a move so as to observe the pattern things follow. If you move, then you will lose your position (of integration). Then, by nonaggression (*ching*^{aq}), one can *tzu te*.

The *tao* is not far away, but difficult to reach. Dwelling with people, it is difficult to comply with. Become empty of desires, then the spirit (*shen*^{ar}) will enter its dwelling [that is, the body]. If you try to remove the desires but cannot clean them out, then the spirit will be restrained from dwelling within you.²⁵

The passage opens with an analogy between the body and the state. The heart-mind is like the ruler and the sense organs are like the ministers.²⁶ The Taoist principle of nonpurposive action (*wu-wei*) or acting naturally and spontaneously in accordance with the *tao* is used to control the sense organs. Analogously, the ruler observes the function of things to put them to work for the state. But the ruler himself does not move; rather he "acts" in a way appropriate to himself qua ruler. The term "*ching*" (rendered here as "nonaggression") should be understood as a positive expression of *wu-wei*. Furthermore, *ching* is not merely nonaction contrasted with ordinary action. Here *ching* should be seen as a higher-level action; it is the *yin*^{as} mode of activity. In this sense, *ching* is the unity of relative motion and nonmotion. As *yin* activity, *ching* is the apparently quiet, passive, subtle origin of all cosmic activity. Thus, in harmonizing with the *yin* activity of *wu-wei* or *ching*, the action of nonpurposive action, one can self-actualize.

The second occurrence of *tzu te* is in the commentary section of the "Hsin shu shang" chapter of the *Kuan tzu*:

So it is said that the ruler won't replace a horse in running or a bird in flying. This means that he does not attempt to snatch the abilities of others. . . .

Concerning the phrase "never be first to make a move": what is agitated is not settled; what is easily provoked is not nonaggressive/tranquil (*ching*). . . . This means that there is a way to be established. The one who rules others is established by complying with *yin* activity. The process of *yin* is nonaggression/tranquility (*ching*).

So it is said that if he moves, he will lose his position.

If one complies with *yin*, then he can regulate *yang*. If one complies with nonaggression/tranquility (*ching*), then he can regulate relative movement.

So it is said that if he complies with nonaggression (*ching*), then he will *tzu te*.²⁷

The *Kuan tzu*'s process of self-cultivation requires one to self-actualize by complying with the *yin* forces of the universe. This complying with the *yin* forces is

very much in keeping with the Lao-Chuang teachings of *wu-wei* and *ching* and their nonaggressive, somewhat feminine, character. Moreover, these two passages make it clear that Taoists are not quietistic or passively withdrawn, for it must be kept in mind that *yin* is a force and an activity just as much as *yang* is a force and an activity. Thus, Taoist self-cultivation focuses on the nonaggressive way to self-actualize which does not attempt to substitute for or coerce another thing. Taoist self-cultivation entails being exactly what one *is*. This entails manifesting one's instantiating power (*te*), and being fully integrated with all other things such that the self-integration becomes interpenetrating among all cultivators of *te*. When the interpenetration of self-actualization occurs, then the ruler as self-actualizing person allows each thing to be what it is by its self-so nature. Thus, in their interrelatedness, things self-actualize together.

The "Hsin shu hsia" chapter also provides advice on self-cultivation to the ruler as a guide for becoming a sage ruler. It opens with a discussion of the cultivation necessary to develop one's instantiating power (*te*). *Te* is defined in terms of "... not allowing things to confuse the sense organs, and not allowing the sense organs to confuse the heart-mind." The discussion continues on self-cultivation and the life-breath (*ch'i*²⁸):

The life-breath (*ch'i*) is what fills the body. . . . If what fills the body is not fine, then the heart-mind will not actualize (*te*^u).²⁸

After briefly discussing the sage's role in ordering the world and the empire, the chapter continues with some challenges to the aspiring sage as regards self-integration:

If a person concentrates his intention and unifies his heart-mind, if his eyes and ears are appropriately disposed, then he may come to know the far away as if it were near.

Can you concentrate? Can you unify your heart-mind? Can you know good fortune and bad without divining? Can you stop when you ought to? Can you judge when you have already had enough? Can you *tzu te* by yourself without asking of others?²⁹

The concluding line suggests that the process of self-actualization through integration is activated from one's own unique instantiating potency (*te*) or personal identity. Given the political emphasis of the *Kuan tzu* as a whole, these Taoist chapters from the *Kuan tzu* present *tzu te* in a sociopolitical context.

3. *Tzu te* in the *Huai nan tzu*

Since the *Huai nan tzu* is a composite text, it is not surprising that its position on *tzu te* represents a synthetic outlook. *Tzu te* occurs within two different contexts in the *Huai nan tzu*. First, it is discussed and defined in the first chapter, which is basically Lao-Chuang thought revitalized in the early Han. Second, it occurs once each in chapters 14 and 20 in a highly developed synthetic form as a sociopolitical concept based on Confucian, Taoist, and *Fa chia* thought. It is very similar to the position held by the *Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu* discussed already in part

III. However, the Taoist and synthetic contexts are not totally unrelated in that the *Huai nan tzu*'s form of Taoism is generally a practicable political Taoism. Thus, even within the predominately Taoist chapter, *tzu te* is still associated with obtaining the empire. This sociopolitical emphasis may have been influenced by the *Kuan tzu*'s position on *tzu te*.³⁰ In fact a careful reading of the *Kuan tzu*'s Taoist chapters and the first chapter of the *Huai nan tzu* will show that the *Huai nan tzu*'s psychology is similar to that of the *Kuan tzu*.

The first reference to *tzu te* in the *Huai nan tzu*'s chapter on "Tracing the *tao*" is placed within a discussion of the natural integration of an echo and a shadow:

When a mirror or water comes in contact with any form, it is because they do not establish some petty framework of knowing that the forms of squareness, roundness, curves, and straight cannot escape them. So an echo won't arbitrarily respond, and a shadow won't be formed in only one shape. The echo and the shadow resemble the sound and object. They silently *tzu te*.³¹

Even an echo and a shadow have some unique instantiating potency which allows them to *tzu te*. This passage is important in that it shows that even the early Han Taoists with their strong sociopolitical concerns were speaking from the transhuman perspective of Lao-Chuang thought.

The first chapter moves from general abstract discussion to a practicable human form of self-cultivation, developing it as a means by which the emperor can govern the empire properly. In the following quote we can see a similarity with the *Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu*'s idea of obtaining the empire by obtaining oneself, and the *Kuan tzu*'s influence in the expression *hsin shu*. The passage begins with a reference to a well-known Taoist story of Emperor Yao trying to give up the empire to the sage Hsü Yu. The *Chuang tzu* and the *Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu* note that Hsü would not take the empire because he valued his health and self-cultivation more than the empire. In this sense the Taoist is not supposed to allow the artificial situation of court politics to interfere with self-integration. Like Yang Chu, the Taoist sage will not save the empire if it will cause his own person harm. For the Taoist, the whole cannot be saved by destroying a part. The *Huai nan tzu* states:

Hsü Yu belittled the empire, and he himself refused to supersede Yao because of his determination to expel all thought of the empire from his mind. Why was he like this? It is because Hsü Yu believed that the empire should be ruled in accordance with itself. The important affairs of the empire do not lie within another, but they lie in oneself. They do not lie in others, but they lie within one's own self. *If one's own self is integrated (shen te^{au}), then the myriad things will be complete.* If one can penetrate into the art of controlling the heart-mind (*hsin shu*), then lust, desires, likes, and dislikes will reside externally. . . . The myriad things are an abstruse unity. . . .

Indeed the empire possesses me, and I possess it. What is the difference between what is the empire's and what is mine? Why must "possessing the empire" mean collecting authority in one's own person, to control the strategic places, to manage the authority of executions and pardons in order to carry out one's ordinances and commands?

What I mean by "possessing the empire" is not that! What I mean by it is only *tzu te*. If I am *tzu te* (self-actualizing), then the empire obtains (*te*) me. When the empire and I are mutually obtaining, then we are always mutually possessing. Again, how could there be any difference between us?

That which is called *tzu te* is the one who preserves whole his person. If one preserves whole his person, he becomes one with *tao*.³²

It is interesting to note that this passage also supports the Taoist view that self-actualization is an interpenetrating process such that when the sage practices *tzu te* (self-actualizing), the myriad things are completed of themselves—ultimately, from the fully integrated perspective, there is no self/other dichotomy. The passage is quick to maintain the sociopolitical achievement of self-integration by defining it in terms of possessing the empire. However, it is important to note that for the Taoist, "possessing the empire" does not necessarily require one to sit on the throne—the sage possesses the empire from whatever social position he abides in. In the *tzu te* process, the person extends personal identity beyond the social ego to unify with the empire, the world, and the myriad things. Finally, the passage comes full circle and redefines *tzu te* in terms of "personal identity" and preserving one's person complete. Unity with *tao* is achieved by this preserving of one's person. Here "person" serves as a symbol for the tradition or the *tao*, a reference to the radical immanence of *tao*.

The chapter continues:

Therefore, when one's integration with *tao* has been consolidated, one does not depend on the influences of the myriad things. When one does not change and transform by happenstance, then he has consolidated what I consider to be *tzu te*. What I mean by the process of actualizing (*te*) here is the reality of one's inner tendencies and natural course (*hsing ming chih ch'ing^{aj}*), dwelling in a place of fixedness.³³

The self-actualizing process of *tzu te*, in a sense, frees one from the limitations of the real world because this process allows for complete creativity over one's life (*hsing ming^{av}*), and all of the natural and environmental conditions of one's existence. The *Huai nan tzu*'s view of self-cultivation is a rather highly developed one in which self-actualizing is the process of settling the contextual character of one's inner tendencies (*hsing*) and one's attendant possibilities (*ming^{aw}*). *Tzu te* plays an important role in the *Huai nan tzu*'s description of the self-cultivation process.

Although the *Huai nan tzu* opens with two definitely Taoist chapters, nevertheless the character of the text in general is synthetic in its approach. Coming after the great flourishing of ancient Chinese thought, the writers of the *Huai nan tzu* had a wealth of valuable and practical material to draw upon. Thus, they attempted to synthesize the best of the various schools of thought into their own text. When *tzu te* occurs in the later chapters, it displays this synthetic character of uniting Confucian, Taoist, and Systematizer thought.³⁴ The synthetic position lends a practicable application to the Taoist process of self-actualizing and the Confucian process of self-realization by highlighting their role in political

achievement. However, as we saw above, this position is not unique to the *Huanan tzu*, but rather it pervades the three schools.

VI

Since the position of the Systematizers (*Fa chia*) on the relationship between the person and the state differs from the organic view of Confucianism and Taoism, and because of the difference of focus between Confucianism and Taoism, I would, thus, propose three different definitions and translations of *tzu te* for its *Fa chia*, Confucian, and Taoist uses.

The *Fa chia* writers do not see an organic unity of person and state; rather they see a tension between individuals, especially the ministers and the ruler. *Fa chia* is primarily concerned with keeping the ruler on the throne, and all of its theories are geared to serve this purpose, including its position on human nature. The *Fa chia* writers were not concerned with self-cultivation, but they did hold a theory of human nature and motivation. The *Han fei tzu* expresses this position rather succinctly in the following:

Indeed to choose safety and profit and leave danger and trouble, this is human nature.³⁵

The *Han fei tzu* gives many examples of selfish human nature, especially where officials seek rank and salary without the merit of earning it. The *Fa chia* writers held, at least, an implicit drive-motivation psychology based on a self-seeking egoism. This is the basis on which the ruler employs rewards and punishments and keeps the people in order. The goal of the *tzu te* process in the *Fa chia* context is to gain political control of the empire. It is justifiable to render *tzu te* in the *Fa chia* context as "self-achievement" or "self-attainment" with egoistic tendencies. Of course, this element of gaining the empire also plays a role in the Confucian and Taoist concept of *tzu te* because of the fundamental sociopolitical basis of Chinese thought. The Confucian and Taoist positions differ from the *Fa chia* in that their goals are beyond political manipulation of the masses. The Confucians seek a universal sociospiritual influence; and the Taoists seek harmony with the cosmos.

Given the organic and sociospiritual integration of the person in Confucianism, it seems that "self-realization" is an adequate translation of *tzu te* in the Confucian context. The concept of "self-realization" has a social-moral connotation in the history of Western thought also, starting with the Greek dictum, "Know thyself," and being revived in Renaissance humanism with the "perfectibility of man." For example, the Neo-Hegelian T. H. Green held a seemingly compatible view on self-realization ethics:

Green did not . . . teach the identity of finite minds in the infinite: he taught that the manifestations of the infinite in the finite constitute an ontological bond among men. The self is essentially social, and in Green's ethic of self-realization its own good is realized only in relations with others in a community having common laws, customs, and institutions.³⁶

This passage illustrates three important commonalities between Green's view and that of the classical Confucian. First, both accept an organic and an ontological unity of man and society. Second, both hold that the self is basically the social self, and third, self-realization is a sociospiritual process of moral man in a homogeneous society. There are of course many differences, like the infinite imposing manifestations on the finite, but the basic social-moral context would make "self-realization" an adequate translation of *tzu te* in the Confucian context. However, "self-realization" is a conceptually loaded term, and in the Confucian context it would be synonymous with social integration.

Since the Taoist consummate person assumes a transhuman perspective, to pursue unity with the myriad things, nature, it is necessary to distinguish the Confucian process of self-realization from the Taoist process of integration with nature. The Taoists describe their consummate persons as direct and simple in their activities, and as unconstrained by social conventions. The Taoist consummate person is antinomian—free from Confucian moral formalism. The simple (*p'u*²²) character of the Taoists is *not* a negative quality of blankness. Chan describes it "as a state of mind . . . characterized by care, openness, the balance of tranquility and activity, and other positive qualities."³⁷ It is difficult to find a term which captures even these two basic characteristics of the Taoist consummate person, but one possibility would be Maslow's term "self-actualizing person." Maslow's description of the self-actualizing person sounds Taoist-like: ". . . their behavior is marked by simplicity and naturalness, and by a lack of artificiality or straining for effect."³⁸ And as Maslow points out, self-actualizing people have a ". . . resistance to enculturation."³⁹ Thus, I tentatively employ Maslow's term "self-actualizing" to translate the Taoist *tzu te* process. Again, there are important differences between Maslow and the Taoists despite the fact that Maslow did study some Taoism and Ch'an Buddhism. The major difference is that Maslow saw his project as establishing the groundwork to build a science of morality—a morality which would be based in mankind's natural capacities. Since Maslow is still locked into an anthropocentric perspective, we must understand Taoist "self-actualizing" as a more than human integration with nature, that is, self-so-ing integration.

A word must be said about the antinomian or apparent anticultural movement in Taoism. This removed character of the Taoist has been labeled incorrectly as a passivism or a quietism by scholars such as Creel and Welch. It is not that Taoists are quietistic in the sense that they do absolutely nothing. The Taoist might appear quietistic to others because they cannot understand Taoist aloofness. In this respect a comparative study with Maslow's research on self-actualizing people is somewhat illuminating. Maslow has discovered that in self-actualizing people there is a ". . . quality of detachment . . ." and a strong personal autonomy.⁴⁰ "They find it easy to be aloof, reserved, and also calm and serene. . . ."⁴¹ Although such people have the same basic needs as others, nevertheless once those basic needs are met, the self-actualizing person is internally motivated. As

Maslow put it: "... self-actualizing people are not dependent for their main satisfaction on the real world, or other people or culture or means to ends or, in general, on extrinsic satisfactions."⁴² Since self-actualizing people are motivated by their inner growth, others find it difficult to understand their ways. The term "self-actualizing," as self-so-ing integration, might be employed to distinguish the Taoist process of *tzu te* from the Confucian *tzu te* process of self-realization.

In his Chien Mu Lectures, de Bary discussed *tzu te* and translated it as "getting it oneself."⁴³ It is clear from his analysis that the Neo-Confucians considered "*tzu te*" to be a crucial element in the process of self-cultivation. Following the teachings of the Ch'eng brothers and Chu Hsi, the Neo-Confucian tradition emphasized the *Four Books*, and the *tzu te* process contained therein, developing the *tzu te* process into a method for learning the Way which is primarily social and moral. Although de Bary's contribution is important in demonstrating how the Neo-Confucians articulated the *tzu te* process, his terminology tends to be essentialistic and substantialistic in tone.⁴⁴ In his elaboration on the Neo-Confucian conception of person, his use of the terms "individual" and "individualism" conjure up the Western substantialistic metaphysical commitments which developed the notion of "atomic individual." Since Neo-Confucians are the champions of organic philosophy, the "atomic individual" of Western individualism, with interests (goods and liberties) separate and distinct from the sociopolitical context, would appear to be inappropriate terminology. *Tzu te* is not just a getting for oneself; it is a full self-realization through integration, a getting and a giving, in which the person and the way are fully integrated. The *tzu te* process provides a way for one's integration in sociopolitical and cosmic order.

NOTES

1. Wm. Theodore de Bary, *The Liberal Tradition in China* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1983), pp. 58–59. *Tzu te* was a common expression used by Neo-Confucian poets. Ch'en Pai-sha was particularly fond of using it. See Paul Yun-ming Jiang, *The Search for Mind: Ch'en Pai-sha Philosopher-Poet* (Singapore: Singapore University Press, 1980).

2. Although "Taoism" is popular in the West, the Yellow Emperor sociopolitical brand of "Taoism" that was popular during the pre-Ch'in (221–206 B.C.) and early Han (206 B.C.–9 A.D.) is only recently being made available to the nonspecialist audience.

3. Roger T. Ames, "Is Political Taoism Anarchism?" *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 10, no. 1 (1983): 37. Although A. C. Graham likes Arthur Waley's view that chapter 80 is a description of a *Nung chia* (Agriculturalist) utopia, still the *Lao tzu* as a whole is directed at a ruler. See A. C. Graham, "The Nung-chia 'School of Tillers' and the Origins of Peasant Utopianism in China," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 42, part 1 (1979): 77.

4. See Aristotle's *Politics*, in *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, ed. by Richard McKeon (New York: Random House, 1941), p. 1129, where he argues: "... the state is by nature prior to the family and to the individual, since the whole is of necessity prior to the part..."

5. *A Concordance to Chuang tzu*, Harvard-Yenching Index Series no. 20 (Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1956), 87/31/32; hereafter cited as *CT*. See also Burton Watson, *The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968), p. 349. The translations are my own.

6. CT, 19/7/2-4; Watson, *The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu*, p. 92 n. 1. Also see the *Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu*, ed. Yang Chia-lo (Taipei: Ting Wen Publishing Co., 1977), p. 77 or 1/16a, which illustrates this same point with a story:

When a person from the state of Ching [= Ch'u] lost his bow, he would not bother to look for it. When he was asked why, he said that a person from the state of Ching would find it, and that was all right. When Confucius heard this he said that if the person would omit the phrase "from the state of Ching," then his comment would be acceptable. When Lao Tan [that is, Lao Tzu] heard this, he said that if the person would omit the phrase "a person" from his statement, then it would be acceptable.

Where Confucius would like to do away with the distinction of the states and unite all people, the Taoist wishes to escape the human realm totally and unite all in nature.

7. CT, 87/31/37-38; Watson, *Complete Works of Chuang Tzu*, p. 350.

8. CT, 91/32/14; Watson, *Complete Works of Chuang Tzu*, p. 364.

9. Donald J. Munro, *The Concept of Man in Early China* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1969), pp. 125-126, 225-226, and Appendix.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 159.

11. *Shang-chün-shu chieh-ku ting-pen*, ed. Yang Chia-lo (Taipei: Ting Wen Publishing Co., 1979), p. 63; Duyvendak, trans., *The Book of Lord Shang* (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1928), p. 292.

12. *Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu*, pp. 143-144, 149. *Tzu te* occurs elsewhere in this text; for example: "Since King Yü understood his own insufficiencies, he did not contend with others. He made himself happy, easygoing, settled, and peaceful in order to deal with others, causing them to *tzu te*" (p. 508).

13. *Meng tzu yin-te*, in *Shih-san ching yin-te* (Taipei: Yen-ching Shu-she, preface dated 1941), 31/4B/14f; D. C. Lau, trans., *Mencius* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Press, 1968), p. 130. I have followed my own translation.

14. *Meng tzu yin-te*, 31/3A/4; Lau, *Mencius*, p. 102. Lau does not link the two passages and here he takes *tzu te* as *tzu le* (self-enjoyment). I have also attempted to retain the rhyme.

15. *Ssu-shu kuang-chieh*, ed. Chen Chi-cheng (Taiwan: Tsung Ho Publishing Co., 1981), p. 408 n. 51.

16. *Hsün tzu tu-pen*, ed. Wang Chung-lin (Taipei: San Min Publishing Co., 1981), p. 58; Burton Watson, *The Basic Writings of Motzu, Hsün Tzu, and Han Feitzu* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), pp. 17-18; and Homer H. Dubs, *The Works of Hsüntze* (Taipei: Ch'eng Wen Publishing Co., 1966 reprint), p. 34.

17. *Chung yung*, chap. 14 in *Ssu-shu kuang-chieh*, p. 32; Wing-tsit Chan, *Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963), p. 101; James Legge, *The Four Books*, p. 395 n. 2. Legge discusses *tzu te* as "self-possessing" or as the *chün tzu*'s doctrine of the mean.

18. Tung Chung-shu, *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu*, *Ssu-pu pei-yao*, 8/8b; David L. Hall, and Roger T. Ames, "Getting It Right: On Saving Confucius from the Confucians," *Philosophy East and West* 34, no. 1 (January 1984): 5.

19. Hall and Ames, "Getting It Right," p. 6. This article seeks to support this claim by explicating those references to *tzu te* in the early corpus.

20. *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

21. CT, 15/6/4-5; Watson, *Complete Works of Chuang Tzu*, p. 77.

22. CT, 22/8/29-32; Watson, *Complete Works of Chuang Tzu*, p. 103. Although A. C. Graham's division of the *Chuang tzu* into different categories or schools of thought can be helpful in generally sorting out the *Chuang tzu* material, his system has no application here. For example, of these two most positive expressions of *tzu te* as a self-cultivation concept, the passage from chapter 8 is classified as a Primitivist selection, and the chapter 17 passage is classed as "Rationalizing the Way" material; see A. C. Graham, *Chuang-tzu: The Seven Inner Chapters and Other Writings from the Book Chuang-tzu* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981), pp. 38-39.

23. *Lieh tzu yin-te*, 6/8 & 35/1; A. C. Graham, *The Lieh-tzu* (London: John Murray, 1960), pp. 34 and 139.

24. *Kuan tzu*, *Ssu-pu pei-yao*, 24/17/19a; here *tzu te* is used in the context of obtaining agricultural produce for oneself.

25. *Kuan tzu*, 13/36/1a-b; see D. C. Lau's "Review of A. Rickett, *Kuan tzu: A Repository of Early Chinese Thought* (Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong Press, 1965)," in *Bulletin of the School of*

Oriental and African Studies 31, no. 1 (1968): 175–177. The last sentence of the second paragraph, which occurs in brackets, appears in the second part of the chapter and seems to have been deleted from the first part.

26. A similar analogy is made in the “Kuei sheng” chapter of the *Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu*.

27. *Kuan tzu*, 13/36/3a.

28. *Ibid.*, 13/37/6a–b; there is a similar passage in the *Huai nan tzu* (Taipei: World Books Publishing Co. 1974), p. 17.

29. *Kuan tzu*, 13/37/6a–b. The “Nei yeh” chapter of the *Kuan tzu* paraphrases this same passage, but it omits the “*tzu*” in the final phrase.

30. See the passage to note 28 preceding. Both the Taoist chapters of the *Kuan tzu* and the opening chapter of *Huai nan tzu* discuss some of the same terms, e.g., *hsin shu, ch'i*, and *tzu te*.

31. *Huai nan tzu*, p. 4. *Tzu te* occurs in the fragments of Shen Pu-hai in a similar passage. See Herrlee G. Creel, *Shen Pu-hai: A Chinese Political Philosopher* (Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1974), pp. 178 and 352.

32. *Huai nan tzu*, p. 15. The *Han fei tzu* uses the notion of *shen te* in its commentary section on the *Lao tzu*; see W. K. Liao, trans., *The Complete Works of Han Fei Tzu* (London: A. Probsthian, 1939–), vol. 1, p. 388.

33. *Huai nan tzu*, p. 16.

34. The final references to *tzu te* in the *Huai nan tzu* occur within the same context; that is, both passages are almost exactly the same.

The one who intends to complete the affairs of a leading feudal lord or a king is one who must be able to gain victories. One who is able to gain victories over the enemy must be one who is strong. One who is strong is certainly one who can utilize others' strength. One who is able to utilize others' strength must be one who can obtain others' hearts. One who can obtain others' hearts is necessarily one who is *tzu te* [self-actualizing by integrating].

And in chapter 14 the passage goes on to say:

The one who is able to *tzu te* must be one who is soft and weak [i.e., modeling *yin*, being flexible and able to fit into context]. (*ibid.*, pp. 237 and 360)

35. Liao, *The Complete Works of Han Fei Tzu*, p. 118.

36. Stephen D. Crites, “Hegelianism,” in *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Paul Edwards, vol. 3, p. 457.

37. Wing-tsit Chan, *The Way of Lao Tzu* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1963), p. 457. See my M.A. thesis, “*Tao Shih*: Religion, Philosophy, and Self-actualization,” University of Hawaii at Manoa, May 1981.

38. Abraham H. Maslow, *Motivation and Personality* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954), p. 208.

39. *Ibid.*, p. 224.

40. *Ibid.*, pp. 212–213.

41. *Ibid.*, p. 212.

42. *Ibid.*, pp. 213–214.

43. Wm. Theodore de Bary, *The Liberal Tradition in China*, pp. 58–79.

44. De Bary's historiographic approach has been discussed by Paul Cohen, “The Quest for Liberalism in the Chinese Past: Stepping Stone to a Cosmopolitan World or the Last Stand of Western Parochialism?” *Philosophy East West* 35, no. 3 (July 1985): 305–310. See de Bary's response with Cohen's rejoinder in vol. 35, no. 4 (October 1985): 399–412 and 413–417.

^a 自得

^b 自然

^c 法家

^d 君子

^e 真人

^f 中文大辭典

^g 自得其樂

^h 自覺得意

ⁱ 自得其道

^j 道

^k 德

^l 陰陽

m 天
 n 黃老
 o 大學
 p 中庸
 q 誠
 r 自誠
 s 真
 t 禮
 u 得
 v 取
 w 可
 x 能
 y 得道者
 z 道德
 aa 道德經
 ab 得天下
 ac 先己
 ad 明德
 ae 性

af 神明自得
 ag 義
 ah 得義
 ai 不自得
 aj 性命之情
 ak 心術上
 al 心術下
 am 心術
 an 上
 ao 下
 ap 無爲
 aq 靜
 ar 神
 as 陰
 at 氣
 au 身得
 av 性命
 aw 命
 ax 樸