

Contextualizing the *Zhuāngzǐ* “Heaven” *Piān*

Chris Fraser

Lee Chair in Chinese Thought and Culture
University of Toronto

March 2023

I want to introduce a non-traditional approach to reading the *Zhuāngzǐ* that I’ve been advocating for about twenty years. Many people attending this workshop may already be applying an approach along these lines. If so, my contribution may be simply to help articulate it explicitly. This particular workshop is an excellent setting to do so, as the advantages of this approach are illustrated especially well by applying it to the three *Zhuāngzǐ* “Heaven” *piān*, 12, 13, and 14, or “Heaven and Earth,” “Heaven’s Way,” and “Heaven Revolves.”

Let me first thank Esther Klein for teaching me a word I didn’t know until last year, which perhaps she learned in turn from Stephan Bumbacher or William Boltz. The word is “pericope” (pur-RICK-opee), taken from the Christian liturgical tradition. It refers to a single coherent section of text suitable for reading on its own, such as a Gospel reading selected for a mass. “Pericope” is a convenient counterpart to the Chinese word 章 and is more precise than English terms such as “section” or “passage.”

A cornerstone of the approach I advocate is to take the basic unit of study in working with the *Zhuāngzǐ* to be the pericope, not the *piān*, nor groups of *piān*, nor the entire *Zhuāngzǐ* anthology. The pericope was most likely the primary literary unit of production and transmission of the *Zhuāngzǐ* materials. The *piān* was originally a physical unit, referring to the material the texts were written on, not a literary unit, referring to the organization of their content. There are numerous uncontroversial examples of *piān* that are not coherent literary units—within the *Zhuāngzǐ*, “Autumn Waters,” “Gēngsāng Chǔ,” and “Robber Zhí” are obvious examples, while outside the *Zhuāngzǐ*, the “Against Physiognomy” or “Correct Names” *piān* of *Xúnzǐ* are. Hence there are good reasons not to assume, in advance of interpretation, that *piān* form literarily coherent units. Perhaps in some cases they do, but this status must be argued for, not assumed.

(The pericope may not have always been the basic compositional building block. Several “ragbag” or “rough notes” sections of the *Zhuāngzǐ*, such as §6.2, §15.2, and §23.2, hint at the possibility that writers sometimes first composed short remarks and then later worked them into longer pericopes.)

I suggest that we understand and explain the *Zhuāngzǐ* corpus more fully when we work from the level of the pericope. Any insights stemming from relations between pericopes and the groups of them collected into the same *piān* or between groups in different *piān* must first be grounded in interpretation and explanation of individual pericopes. This point may seem

simple, but note that it vitiates several prominent previous attempts to explain the content or formation of the *Zhuāngzǐ*. Well-known work by both A. C. Graham and Liu Xiaogan is based on taking *piān* as basic units. For example, the usage analysis in Graham's "How Much of *Chuang Tzu* Did *Chuang Tzu* Write?" and Liu's claims in *Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters* about the implications of the occurrence of certain binomes in the text both rely on taking *piān* as basic units.

Of course, there will be instances where the boundaries of individual pericopes are unclear or disputable. Such instances are not a problem, I suggest, but simply a subject for discussion on a case by case basis.

A second feature of the approach I advocate is that from what we know of the nature of the *Zhuāngzǐ* writings and the process by which they were produced and transmitted, authorship is largely irrelevant to their interpretation. It doesn't really matter who wrote the material. What matters is that it comprises hundreds of short pericopes produced at different times, for different purposes, that have apparently been mixed and matched by various editors, collectors, or curators. These pericopes are each discrete "works" and must be interpreted as such. Perhaps in some cases they fit together as composite works; for example, someone might argue that the different parts of *piān* 2, "Discourse on Evening Things Out," have been edited to form a composite whole. But even in such cases, interpretation must start from the level of the discrete pericope, and for the purpose of interpretation, it doesn't matter much who wrote them or how many people were involved—whether it was one person writing at different times, in different moods, or a variety of people. The identity of the authors of the material may or may not be an intriguing historical question—I expect that it is an intractable one—but it has little relevance to interpretation of the content.

A third major feature of this approach is how it proposes to contextualize the various pericopes we study. All interpretation proceeds by drawing on contextual clues and by appealing to a wider context for guidance and justification. In much interpretation, the immediate context we look to in interpreting brief units of text is the coherent whole of which they are parts and the subdivisions of that whole. In the case of the *Zhuāngzǐ* materials, we cannot assume, in advance of interpreting the pericopes, that either the *piān* in which they appear, groups of *piān*, or the entire corpus constitute a literarily or doctrinally coherent whole. So what provides the context for us to work from in interpreting individual pericopes? My suggestion is the "discourse" or "conversation," by which I mean groupings of pericopes that overlap with respect to the topics, issues, themes, motifs, values, and so on that they treat or respond to. As this loose characterization suggests, pericopes can be treated as part of multiple discourses or conversations, which may intersect or overlap. Contributions to a discourse need not present the same doctrinal stance and may well disagree, but to be part of the same discourse, they will share certain topics, concerns, concepts, or assumptions and relate to each other in explicable ways.

A quick, familiar example of what I have in mind is that we can treat the various *Zhuāngzǐ* pericopes touching on the motifs of use and uselessness as forming a discourse. Another

example is to think of the many pericopes in the pre-Hàn literature that mention the correctness of names as forming a discourse. Discourses may be framed narrowly or broadly. At a very broad level, for example, we can treat much of the content of the pre-Hàn “various masters” texts as part of a general discourse about the best way to live.

*

Piān 11–16 offer several examples of the value of this alternative approach. It allows us to better understand the range of material in these *piān* and how it relates to other parts of *Zz*.

Before offering evidence to support this claim, let me first introduce some terminology for prominent doctrinal orientations or themes that I suggest help us identify discourses or conversations in the pericopes of *piān* 12–14 that tie them to other, related *Zhuāngzǐ* writings.

“Syncretic”: As I will use it, “syncretic” or “syncretism” refers to standpoints that combine a positive view of prevailing values such as benevolence and righteousness with an emphasis on *dào* 道 and *dé* 德, among other motifs. Syncretic views generally do *not* emphasize people’s inherent nature (*xìng* 性), the figure of the “ultimate person” (至人) or “genuineness” (真).

“Bureaucratic Laoism”: I’ll use this as a label for views on which the ruler is to practice *wúwéi* 無為 (non-action) while his subordinates practice *yǒuwéi* (有為), the *dào* is seen as settling the divisions of names and associated roles and duties (名分、義), attention is devoted to “forms and names” (形/刑名) and rewards and punishments (賞罰) are endorsed. This family of views generally does *not* mention *xìng* 性 or genuineness (真). Bureaucratic Laoism may be combined with syncretism but need not be.

“*Xìng* ethics”: This family of views reject prevailing moral values such as benevolence and righteousness. They deprecate the sages of the three dynasties and sometimes present a regressive view of history as a steady decline in *dé* 德. They value people’s inherent nature (*xìng*) and *dé* as basic goods. These views overlap what Graham dubbed “Primitivism,” but I want to move beyond that label, if possible, as not all *xìng* ethics may endorse a return to a simple, primitive lifestyle.

“Stillness discourse”: This is a label for discussions that advocate attaining emptiness, stillness, and non-action (*wúwéi*), such that one acts only when moved by things. This discourse may or may not be combined with bureaucratic Laoism.

“Genuineness discourse”: This is a label for pericopes that value *zhēn* 真, maintaining or fulfilling what one really is.

“Heaven discourse”: Pericopes that treat the relation between *tiān* 天 and humanity, usually valuing our maintaining an appropriate relation to *tiān*. Heaven discourse often overlaps with genuineness discourse.

Let me underscore two key differences between these sets of views: *xìng* ethics is generally *not* compatible with syncretism or bureaucratic Laoism. Also, it is usually *not* associated with stillness discussions or with preserving “genuineness.”

It’s also worth briefly explaining how this terminology relates to that of A. C. Graham and Liu Xiaogan.

Graham dubbed parts of *piān* 11–15 “syncretistic.” He noted that this label applies to only

portions of the material, as the *piān* actually contain “all kinds of miscellaneous material” (1981, 28). He noted that §12.15 is “Primitivist,” for example. He proposed that the “syncretist” pericopes are §§11.7, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3, 13.4, 13.7, and 14.1 (p. 259ff.). (Graham also includes Zz 33, “All the World,” which I believe calls for different treatment. For brevity, I will omit it here.)

I will suggest below that even the group of pericopes Graham considers syncretist should be subdivided into different discourses.

Liu Xiaogan labels *piān* 11–16 “Huang-Lao.” However, apparently what Liu means by “Huang-Lao” is simply what Graham means by “syncretic.” Liu claims—falsely, as we will see—that these *piān* “collectively exhibit...appreciation of and tolerance for” values from various schools of thought, including benevolence, righteousness, ritual and law, and universal love (1994, 130). This is at least partly what Graham meant by “syncretistic.” Liu sees this eclecticism as matching Sima Tan’s description of Daoism, and Sima’s “Daoism,” he suggests, is what is now designated by the term “Huang-Lao.” Unlike Graham, who sees *piān* 12–14 as containing at least some “Primitivist” writing, Liu holds that this group of *piān* is sharply distinct from *Zhuāngzǐ* 8–11A. As I will show in a moment, this judgment is mistaken. Strangely, Liu does recognize that *piān* 12 contains at least two pericopes that are similar in content to 8–10, but he dismisses such “traces of being jumbled” as irrelevant to “our general classification of the Outer and Miscellaneous chapters” (p. 123). (I note that Liu’s use of the term “Huang-Lao” seems at odds with *Shǐ Jì* 史記 63, where it describes 申不害 and 韓非, neither of whom had much appreciation for benevolence, righteousness, ritual, or universal love.)

I suggest that since the reference of the term “Huang-Lao” is both vague and deeply contested, it is not a helpful analytic label to use in examining *Zhuāngzǐ* materials. I will set it aside here.

*

In the accompanying table, I’ve identified pericopes from the last section of *piān* 11 through *piān* 16 and characterized them briefly, using the above labels among other descriptions. I won’t attempt an exhaustive discussion of the table but will merely call attention to a few prominent points.

An obvious observation is that Graham was right to emphasize the highly heterogeneous nature of these *piān*. Indeed, of the 36 pericopes shown, only five are “syncretic” in the sense I defined. Only three or four appear to endorse bureaucratic Laoism. (However, the syncretic and bureaucratic Laoist material may be linked to further pericopes Graham considered syncretic when we consider other motifs, such as “帝王之德.”)

Graham was also right to note that §12.15 is “Primitivist,” insofar as his use of that term generally identifies texts that fall within the discourse of *xìng* ethics. Indeed, of the 35 pericopes in *piān* 12–16, eight can be classified as parts of the *xìng* ethics discourse. Because these eight reject mainstream ethical values such as benevolence, they contrast sharply with pericopes expressing syncretic views.

This stark opposition between the syncretic and the *xìng* ethics pericopes decisively

undermines any interpretive or analytical approach that takes the *piān* as a basic unit. The *piān* as wholes cannot accurately be characterized as “syncretic”—or, for that matter, “Huang-Lao.” Nor can they be regarded as collections of material that supports, illustrates, or elaborates on some initial syncretic or bureaucratic Laoist view. Their content is fundamentally diverse and riven by disagreement over the status of values such as benevolence.

Looking again at the pericopes forming a discourse on *xìng*, we can also remove an unfortunate distortion introduced by classifications, such as Graham’s and Liu’s, that isolate the material in *piān* 8–10 from other *Zhuāngzǐ* writings. What we see is that there are a range of pericopes that treat *xìng* as having normative significance, which are concentrated in *piān* 8 through 16. The full list is: §§8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.5, 9.1, 9.2, 10.2, 11.1, 11.3, 12.12, 12.15, 13.5, 14.6, 16.1, 16.2, 23.1, 24.3, 25.6.

This list forms a discourse that draws together *piān* 8–10 with four pericopes from the “Heaven” *piān*, both pericopes in “Mending Nature,” and three pericopes from other, highly miscellaneous *piān*. My proposal is that these should be read together, as part of an extended late Warring States or early Hàn conversation about the role of *xìng* in ethics and moral psychology and how it relates to norms such as benevolence, among other topics. (More broadly, of course, these pericopes can also be read as part of a wider conversation about *xìng* that includes portions of *Mèngzǐ*, *Xúnzǐ*, and *Lǚshì Chūnqiū*.) These *Zhuāngzǐ* pericopes may or may not cohere in presenting a unified doctrine, but they do cohere as contributions to a prominent “conversation.” If we bifurcate this discourse by considering some of the pericopes a distinct “Primitivist” set of writings and others part of a supposed “syncretic” set, we risk overlooking how they cohere as a discourse and how they are actually distinct from other parts of the “Heaven” *piān* and pericopes across the entire *Zhuāngzǐ*.

Similar observations about context hold if we wish to understand the relation between *Zhuāngzǐ* material and *Dàodéjīng* material. The *Zhuāngzǐ* pericopes with particularly close connections to the *Dàodéjīng* are the following: §§9.2, 10.1, 10.2, 11.1, 11.3, 12.1, 12.8, 12.13, 13.1, 13.3, 16.1b, 18.1, 19.13, 22.1, 23.1. There is significant overlap between this list and the preceding one about the *xìng* discourse. Focusing on a *piān*-level distinction between the “Heaven” *piān*, the supposedly “Primitivist” *piān*, and a “School of *Zhuāngzǐ*” group of *piān* may obscure the various respects in which these pericopes relate to each other and to the *Dàodéjīng*.

Of course, it is also intriguing to note that no pericopes from *piān* 1–7, 17, most of 19, 20–21, and 24–32 appear on this list. And, conversely, it is interesting to note some of themes and motifs familiar from those parts of the *Zhuāngzǐ* corpus that are absent from *piān* 12–16. For example, only one pericope in 12–16 mentions wandering, and none treat perspectives or dependence. There is no skeptical questioning, as in *Zhuāngzǐ* 2. There are no colorful stories about disease, deformity, and death, nor any wrestling with practical difficulties of service, as in §§4.1–4.3. There is only one dialogue with *Zhuāngzǐ* as a character and one skill story (the wheelwright story, which seems unrelated to any other material in Zz 12–14). Confucius is treated exclusively negatively, whereas in other parts of the *Zhuāngzǐ* corpus he is portrayed in

a positive light in roughly half his appearances. (Confucius appears in about 50 *Zhuāngzǐ* pericopes, far more than any other character.) The Confucius-Lǎo Dān dialogues, many of which appear in the “Heaven” *piān*, can be considered a discourse of their own, one feature of which is their deprecatory treatment of Confucius.

*

By contrast with the *xìng* discourse and the *Dàodéjīng* allusions, three pericopes from the “Heaven” *piān* fit well into a discourse that does include material from an “inner” *piān*, namely *piān* 7, “Fit for Emperors and Kings.” Graham conjectured that whoever produced the “Heaven” *piān* may have edited the “inner” *piān* or chosen their three-character titles for since, for example, 宗、師、 and 帝王 occur both in the text of the “Heaven” *piān* and in the titles of *piān* 6 and 7. I find this conjecture plausible but not well supported, since alternative, equally plausible scenarios are easily imaginable. Still, there does seem to be a close relationship between *piān* 12 and *piān* 7, and they may represent different selections from the same material or different versions of similar tropes. §§12.9, 12.10, and 12.12 fit easily into a discourse with §§7.2 and 7.4 and indeed have many rhetorical resemblances to them. If an ancient editor had included these three pericopes in *piān* 7, I expect later readers would have considered them to fit very well. §12.9 shares phrasing and a rhetorical structure with §7.4, and indeed to some extent the two seem variants of the same basic anecdote, §7.4 being framed to address the enlightened king, §12.9 the sage. §12.10 resembles §7.2 in having one character present conventional political advice, which is then ridiculed by a second character, who offers alternative advice. It presents a description of how the sage governs that overlaps descriptions in §7.2 and 7.4. (§12.10 also shares the praying mantis analogy of §4.3.) §12.12 describes “sagely governance” in a manner that echoes §7.2. In contextualizing these pericopes, then, we want to consider both how they relate to political material in the “Heaven” *piān*—why §12.10 shares the noun phrase 帝王 with §13.1 and §13.3, for example—and also how they relate to §7.2 and §7.4, which they should be read alongside.

*

In terms of their relations to other texts, §13.1 and §13.2 are among most complex pericopes in the entire *Zhuāngzǐ* corpus. They constitute major nodes in what I call the “stillness” discourse, which draws together pericopes from *Zhuāngzǐ*, the *Guānzǐ Xīnshù* (I) essay 心術上, *Hánfēizǐ* 5, and *Lǚshì Chūnqiū*. The water and mirror metaphors in §13.1 also connect it to pericopes such as §5.1 and §5.4. (*Zhuāngzǐ* passages we might associate with this discourse include §§5.1, 11.4, 12.1, 13.1, 13.2, 15.2, 19.10, 22.6, 23.7, 23.10, and 26.11.)

§13.2 is a remarkably composite assemblage of text. It introduces a conception of “heavenly happiness,” which it then expounds through several reused bits of text before tying the whole package back to the stillness motif of §13.1. §13.2 provides the only attribution within the *Zhuāngzǐ* corpus to an authorial *Zhuāngzǐ* figure of a known piece of *Zhuāngzǐ* content, namely a few sentences from §6.8, which in that section are spoken by Xǔ Yóu, not *Zhuāngzǐ*. These sentences are recontextualized to offer an exposition of heavenly happiness that bears no relation to §6.8. The pericope then ties heavenly happiness to material taken

from a “scratch paper” section, §15.2, which in turn also seems a source for passages in *Huáinánzǐ* 7. The themes of “setting” or “fixing” the mind (心定) and “reigning over the world” (王天下) further link §13.2 to two of the three “master said” (夫子曰) pericopes in the “Heaven” *piān* (§§12.2, 13.7).

The references to “the virtue of emperors and kings” and to “reigning over the world” clearly position §13.1 and §13.2 as having a political dimension, and presumably the reuse and reinterpretation of the quotation from §6.8 is intended to imply that the ideal ruler’s relation to the world should be modeled on that of the *dào* as described in §6.8. (This conception of the ideal ruler I think also complements that in §7.4.) §§13.1–13.2 may be compatible with bureaucratic Laoism, but their stance is distinct from it, as there is no implication in §13.1 that *wúwéi* is restricted to the ruler only. Rather, they seem to present a political application of a broader conception of responsive agency focused on stillness. This conception is distinct from the adaptive, responsive conceptions of agency explored in the skill stories, the “Mind-fasting” pericope (§4.1), “Autumn Waters,” or some of the material in “Evening Things Out” (Zz 2). Nor do §§13.1–13.2 allude to syncretism about mainstream values such as benevolence.

Without attempting to tie together all the messy threads poking out of §§13.1–13.2, let me suggest that here we are probably looking at a sample from a Qín-Hàn discourse about sagely cultivation and agency that the writer was attempting to promote as applicable to rulership, among other roles. It regards Zhuāngzǐ as an authoritative figure and attests that some material now found in *piān* 6 was already attributed to him. It presents views that share family resemblances with but are distinct from those in other parts of the *Zhuāngzǐ* corpus. These views are more closely related to certain sections of the *Lǚshì Chūnqiū* (17.3, 17.5, 25.3) and *Guānzǐ* than to other *Zhuāngzǐ* pericopes besides §15.2 and §23.7 (which is identical to Lscq 25.3).

I see §§13.1–13.2 as underscoring the complexity and heterogeneity of the material in the “Heaven” *piān*. We are looking at a wide-ranging, rich collection of diverse writings that do not tie together into a neat, coherent package and resist general labels or characterizations. Indeed, the “Heaven” *piān* epitomize the anthological nature of the *Zhuāngzǐ* corpus as a whole.

Contextualizing *Zhuāngzǐ* 11.7–16

章	HY	Themes	Orientation	Related Sections
11.7	11/66–74	褒仁、義、禮; 主由天道以無為、臣由人道以有為	Syncretic; Bureaucratic Laoism	13.3; 無為而尊: 13.1
12.1	12/1–6	君無為、天德; 以道治名分	Syncretic; Bureaucratic Laoism	天德: 13.4, 15.2; DDJ 37 君無為: 13.3
12.2	12/6–12	"夫子"; "君子...無為...愛人利物之謂仁"	Syncretic	"夫子": 12.3, 13.7; 12.2 and 13.7 disagree about 仁
12.3	12/12–18	"夫子"; "王德...立之本原而知通於神"	Unique	"夫子": 12.2, 13.7
12.4	12/18–20	黃帝; 象罔	Non-specific	
12.5	12/20–26	堯、許由、齧缺等人; 褒天貶人	Heaven discourse	Responding to 1.2, 2.13, 6.8, 7.1, 22.3, 24.11? 堯: 12.5, 12.6, 12.7
12.6	12/26–33	貶堯, "聖人...鳥行而無彰"	Non-specific	堯: 12.5, 12.6, 12.7
12.7	12/33–37	貶禹, "德衰"; 貶賞罰	Overlaps <i>xìng</i> ethics	堯: 12.5, 12.6, 12.7; LSCQ 20.2 德衰: 16.1; 賞罰: 11.1?
12.8	12/37–41	泰初有無; 性; 玄德	Non-specific	玄德: DDJ 10, 51, 65
12.9	12/41–45	孔子見老聃: 褒天、「忘」	Similar to Zz 7	Shares phrasing with 7.4 孔見老: 12.9, 13.5, 14.5, 14.6, 14.7, 21.4, 22.5
12.10	12/45–52	大聖治天下, 搖蕩民心	Similar to Zz 7; 帝王說	帝王之德: 12.10, 13.1, 13.3; Content similar to 7.2, 7.4
12.11	12/52–69	圃者貶"機心"; 全德、神全; "明白入素, 無為復樸, 體性抱神, 以遊世俗之間"	褒德貶儒	Format similar to 6.6; echoes of DDJ and Zz 5.1
12.12	12/69–77	聖治、德人、神人	Overlap with material in some 內篇	Shares phrasing with 2.11 Political views similar to 7.2 神人: 1.1, 1.3, 4.5, 24.12, 26.11
12.13	12/77–83	至德之世; 貶仁義	<i>Xìng</i> ethics	至德之世: 9.2, 10.2
12.14	12/83–95	貶世俗之意見; 天下大惑	Non-specific	
12.15	12/95–102	褒性、貶曾史、貶楊墨	<i>Xìng</i> ethics	8.1, 8.5, 10.1, 11.1
13.1	13/1–10	"夫虛靜恬淡, 寂漠無為者, 天地之平而道德之至, 故帝王聖人休焉"	Stillness; bureaucratic Laoism?	Zz 15.2, 23.7; Gz 36 (Z15.2); Lscq 17.3, 17.5, 25.3; HFz 5; 無為而尊: 11.7 Zz 5.1, 5.4: water, mirror, level 帝王之德: 12.10, 13.3
13.2a	13/10–12	"天地之德...大本大宗...人樂、天樂"	Heaven v. humanity?	宗: 5.1, 7.5, 13.2a, 13.3, 21.4, 22.5
13.2b	13/12–17	莊子引文、"以虛靜推於天地, 通於萬物...天樂" "一心定而王天下"	Stillness	6.8, 15.2; 虛靜: 13.1; 心定: 13.7; 王天下: 12.2, 13.3, 13.4
13.3	13/17–41	"帝王之德; 以天地為宗, 以道德為主, 以無為為常"; 君無為, 臣有為; 形名; reflects controversy over "大道之序"	Bureaucratic Laoism; syncretic (no "stillness")	w/ 11.7, 12.1 unique in Zz 德配天地: 21.4 帝王之德: 12.10, 13.1 宗: 5.1, 7.5, 13.2a, 13.3, 21.4, 22.5
13.4	13/41–45	天地者, 古之所大也, 而黃帝、堯、舜之所共美也		王天下: 12.2, 13.3, 13.4

C. Fraser, “Contextualizing the *Zhuāngzǐ* ‘Heaven’ *Piān*”

“Zhuangzi Beyond the Inner Chapters,” Sungkyunkwan University, March 14–16, 2023

				天德: 12.1, 15.2
13.5	13/45–53	孔子見老聃: 褒德、道、性; 貶仁義	<i>Xing</i> ethics	孔見老: 12.9, 13.5, 14.5, 14.6, 14.7, 21.4, 22.5
13.6	13/53–60	Laozi castigates 土成綺; “吾服也恒服”		27.6
13.7	13/60–64	“夫子”; 褒至人、道、德、真; 貶仁義 “至人之心有所定”	Genuineness?	“夫子”: 12.2, 12.3; but 12.2 and 13.7 disagree about 仁 Phrasing similar to 5.1
13.8	13/64–74	Prelude + wheelwright story	Skill	No connection to rest of 13
14.1	14/1–5	“天有六極五常，帝王順之則治，逆之則凶”	Yīn-yáng? Bureaucratic Laoism?	Arbitrarily placed here b/c first word is 天? “帝王” links to 13.3?
14.2	14/5–13	褒德、貶仁義等; forgetting; <i>Zhuāngzǐ</i> conversation	褒德貶仁義	Shares phrasing with 6.1c, themes with 7.4; forgetting passages; <i>Zhuāngzǐ</i> conversations
14.3	14/13–30	黃帝咸池之樂: “聖也者達於情而遂於命也”	Unique	Unique
14.4	14/30–44	孔子其窮: “禮義法度者，應時而變” Rú hopeless b/c they fail to change and adapt		孔見老: 12.9, 13.5, 14.5, 14.6, 14.7, 21.4, 22.5
14.5	14/44–56	孔子見老聃: 褒真、遊, 貶仁義	Genuineness	Wandering, genuineness
14.6a	14/56–60	孔子見老聃: 褒樸、德, 貶仁義; “相忘於江湖”	褒德貶仁義; <i>xing</i> ethics	Alternate version of 13.5; phrasing shared with 6.2, 6.6; 孔見老: 12.9, 13.5, 14.5, 14.6, 14.7, 21.4, 22.5
14.6b	14/60–74	子貢見老聃: 貶聖王; 安其性命之情	<i>Xing</i> ethics	8.1, 8.2, 8.5, 11.1, 24.1
14.7	14/74–82	孔子見老聃: “夫六經，先王之陳跡也...夫迹，履之所出，而迹豈履哉”; “與化為人”	化	孔見老: 12.9, 13.5, 14.5, 14.6, 14.7, 21.4, 22.5
15.1	15/1–8	“無不忘也，無不有也，澹然無極...天地之道，聖人之德也”		天地
15.2	15/8–18	“虛無恬惔，乃合天德” (ragbag)	Stillness	Zz 13.1, 13.2; Hnz 7; Gz 36
15.3	15/18–22	“能體純素，謂之真人”	Genuineness	真: 6.1, 15.3, 17.1f, 19.2b, 20.8, 21.1, 24.12b, 31.1e, 32.5c
16.1	16/1–17	褒性、德、仁義等; “知與恬相養”; “世與道相喪”	Syncretism + <i>xing</i>	DDJ 51
16.2	16/17–21	免“喪己於物，失性於俗”	<i>Xing</i> ethics	

Terminology:

“Syncretic”: Combines 仁義 etc. with 德道 etc. No mention of 性、至人、真.

“*Xing* ethics” (aka “Primitivism”): Rejects 仁義 (etc.), deprecates sages, values 性、德.

“Bureaucratic Laoism”: 君無為，臣有為; 以道治名分; 刑名. No mention of 性.

“Stillness discourse”: Ideal agency tied to emptiness, stillness, and non-action.

“Genuineness discourse”: Valuing *zhēn* 真.