

CHINY – DZIEDZICTWO I PRZEMIANY CHINY

Roger T. Ames

CORRELATIVE THINKING: FROM ABDUCTION TO ARS CONTEXTUALIS IN EARLY CHINESE COSMOLOGY

Marcel Granet makes the claim that early Chinese cosmology offers us a distinctive way of thinking – what some sinologists and comparative philosophers have come to call “correlative,” “analogical,” “associative,” or “coordinative” thinking. I cite Joseph Needham here at some length to provide a starting point for our reflection on what this notion of “correlative thinking” might entail:

A number of modern students – H. Wilhelm, Eberhard, Jablonski, and above all, Granet – have named the kind of thinking with which we have here to do, “coordinative thinking” or “associative thinking.” This intuitive-associative system has its own causality and its own logic. It is not either superstition or primitive superstition, but a characteristic thought-form of its own. H. Wilhelm contrasts it with the “subordinative” thinking characteristic of European science, which laid such emphasis on external causation. In coordinative thinking, conceptions are not subsumed under one another, but placed side by side in a pattern, and things influence one another not by acts of mechanical causation, but by a kind of “inductance.” ... The key-word in Chinese thought is *Order* and above all *Pattern* (and if I may whisper it for the first time, *Organism*). The symbolic correlations or correspondences all formed part of one colossal pattern. Things behaved in particular ways not necessarily because of prior actions or impulses of other things, but because their position in the ever-moving cyclical universe was such that they were endowed with intrinsic natures

which made their behaviour inevitable for them. If they did not behave in those particular ways they would lose their relational position in the whole (which made them what they were), and turn into something other than themselves. They were thus parts in existential dependence upon the whole world-organism. And they reacted upon one another not so much by mechanical impulsion or causation as by a kind of mysterious resonance¹.

Needham describes this correlative thinking as “a characteristic thought-form of its own,” and invites us like Alice down a portal that would take us to the other side of the looking glass to share with us his encounter with a wonky, wobbly world that has “its own causality and its own logic.”

In this essay, I want on the one hand to try to temper Granet and Needham’s claim and to demystify this putatively other world by building on the notion of “abductive reasoning” as a more familiar form of correlative thinking that was developed by C.S. Peirce, the putative founder of American pragmatism. On the other hand, I also want to explain why David Hall and I in our interpretive studies of Chinese philosophy needed to introduce the neologism, *ars contextualis*, to give a sufficiently capacious account of the ontological force of “correlative thinking” as it functions in early Chinese cosmology. Indeed, I will argue that it is our human capacity for *ars contextualis* – for engaging in “the art of contextualizing” – that gives consummate persons the important generative and normative role they have in early Chinese cosmology. As my source of textual corroboration, I will rely primarily on the cosmology as it is expressed in the *Daodejing* – indeed, a process cosmology that, while certainly changing in time, is both antique and persistent.²

I use the term Daoist “cosmology,” but in classical Greek philosophy, *kosmos* is associated with a cluster of terms, including *arche* (origin, source, principle),

¹ An earlier version of this essay was published as “Classical Daoism in an Age of Globalization: From Abduction to *Ars Contextualis* in Early Daoist Cosmology.” *Taiwan Journal of East Asian Studies* Vol. 12, no. 2 (December 2015).

See his *Science and Civilisation in China*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1956, Vol. II., pp. 280–281.

² Although Needham takes Marcel Granet’s *La pensée chinoise* to be “a work of genius,” he criticizes Granet along with other major commentators on Chinese cosmology such as Alfred Forke and H.G. Creel for having “the serious defect of assuming that the cosmism and phenomenism of the Han was ancient.” The scientist Needham chooses instead to attribute the emergence of this correlative worldview to the School of Naturalists – Zou Yan 鄒衍 (305–240 BCE) and the Yinyangjia 陰陽家 – thinkers who had the marked advantage of having “a mind trained in the natural sciences.” See his *Science and Civilisation* Vol. II., pp. 216–217. On this matter, I side with David Keightley in his many publications where he ascribes correlative thinking to intellectuals as far back as the Shang dynasty. I make this argument most recently in *Confucian Role Ethics: A Vocabulary*, Chinese University Press and University of Hawai’i Press joint publication, Hong Kong and Honolulu 2011.

logos (account, structure), *theoria* (contemplation), *nomos* (law), *nous* (mind, rational agency), and *theos* (divinity), and references a single-ordered, divinely sanctioned “uni-verse” that has little relevance for Daoist philosophy. Indeed, arguing that the myriad things (*wanwu* 萬物) in Daoism constitute a *kosmoi* rather than a *kosmos* – a “pluri-verse” rather than a single-ordered world – we opted to describe Daoism rather awkwardly as an “acosmotic” cosmology. I have also in the past resisted using the term Daoist “metaphysics” because, if metaphysics is to be understood in the classical Greek sense as knowledge of the ultimate, self-sufficient, and unchanging character of “being” *per se*, then given the primacy of vital relationality and the absence of anything that could be construed as either independent or unchanging in a Daoist cosmos, Daoist philosophy is resolutely ametaphysical (dare we say “ametaphysic”).

Perhaps an acceptable alternative and more inclusive understanding of cosmology or metaphysics consistent with our own present philosophical temperament might be something both as simple and as complex as “experience in its broadest perspective.” As Wilfrid Sellars has observed about the function of philosophy in general:

The aim of philosophy, abstractly formulated, is to understand how things in the broadest possible sense of the term hang together in the broadest possible sense of the term. Under “things in the broadest possible sense” I include such radically different items as not only “cabbages and kings,” but numbers and duties, possibilities and finger snaps, aesthetic experience and death. To achieve success in Philosophy would be, to use a contemporary turn of phrase, to “know one’s way around” with respect to all these things, not in that unreflective way in which the centipede of the story knew its way around before it faced the question, “how do I walk?”, but in that reflective way which means that no intellectual holds are barred.³

As we will see below, for Chinese “cosmology” the goal of our philosophical inquiry like Sellars will be to come to know our “way” around (*zhidao* 知道) “the myriad of things” (*wanwu* 萬物) in the broadest possible sense of the term “things.” But given that Daoist cosmology begins from the primacy of vital relationality and the doctrine of internal, constitutive relations that follows from it, the real challenge for us lies in understanding that in Daoist cosmology, “knowing” is not limited to a cognitive and theoretical grasp of the real world; it is to acquire the wisdom to fund the practical activity of realizing a world in the sense of

³ Wilfrid Sellars, “Philosophy and the Scientific Image of Man,” *Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind*, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London 1963, p. 1.

making a optimally desirable world real. And “the myriad things” are not discrete “things,” but in fact reference the interdependent, dynamic events that constitute our shared experience, including the narratives of sagacious human beings who, as active collaborators with the heavens and the earth, occupy a prominent role in the realizing of this meaningful world.

Corollary to this primacy of vital relationality is that Daoist cosmology is an aestheticism in which the quality achieved in always *sui generis* relations (*de* 德) that constitute the contents of experience is registered in the totality of the effect, or *dao* 道. As Needham has tried to say above, the unique identity and insistence of any particular thing is a function of what it means for the full complement of other things.

As we can see, what makes Daoist cosmology an aesthetic order in this Whiteheadian sense is that it is holistic rather than reductionistic. All things without exception not only collaborate in the production of the dynamic, patterned order of the cosmos in which no single privileged order predominates among things, but also collaborate in the production of any particular thing. *Dao* as an “appellative” or “courtesy” name (*zi* 字) for this complex, anarchic order – a “style” name that reflects its provisional, contingent, and speculative nature – is emergent, and accrues enhanced resolution from the narratives of those persons whose realization is such that they are able to bring a peculiarly intense foci of meaning and value to a particular time and place. Such consummate persons have a determining influence on the direction that *dao* takes as an aggregating and unfolding way forward in the human experience.

Needham again draws on Granet to provide what is a vivid description of the unfamiliar cosmological vision we will need as our interpretive context for reading the *Daodejing* – that is, a vision of not only what this cosmology is, but perhaps more importantly, of what it is not:

Social and world order rested, not on an ideal of authority, but on a conception of rotational responsibility. The Tao [*dao*] was the all-inclusive name for this order, an efficacious sum-total, a reactive neural medium; it was not a creator, for nothing is created in the world, and the world was not created. The sum of wisdom consisted in adding to the number of intuited analogical correspondences in the repertory of correlations. Chinese ideals involved neither God nor Law. The uncreated universal organism, whose every part, by a compulsion internal to itself and arising out of its own nature, willingly performed its functions in the cyclical recurrences of the whole, was mirrored in human society by a universal ideal of mutual good understanding, a supple regime of interdependences and solidarities which could never be based on unconditional ordinances, in other words, on laws. .

... Thus the mechanical and the quantitative, the forced and the externally imposed, were all absent. The notion of Order excluded the notion of Law.⁴

To clarify what Needham means here by “rotational responsibility” with each thing having “a compulsion internal to itself” and with the efficacious sum-total being “a reactive neural medium” we will have to first explore Daoism’s doctrine of internal relations and its alternative holistic “causality” that brings with it an understanding of creativity as a continuing *in situ* or “situated” increase in meaning that would defy any separation between creator and creature. Marcel Granet uses the language of aspect to express the way in which erstwhile things are in fact dynamic matrices of relations that constitute continuous, extended events:

Instead of observing successions of phenomena, the Chinese registered alternations of aspects. If two aspects seemed to them to be connected, it was not by means of a cause and effect relationship, but rather “paired” like the obverse and converse of something, or to use a metaphor from the *Book of Changes*, like echo and sound, or shadow and light⁵.

Granet is here reflecting on the resonant “pairing” among alternations of aspect defining of events that is denoted by the vocabulary of *yinyang* 陰陽, *youwu* 有無, *biantong* 變通, *tiandi* 天地, *tianren* 天人, *tiyong* 體用, *liyue* 禮樂, *xinshen* 心神, *jingshen* 精神, *renyi* 仁義, *daode* 道德, and so on. We will now turn to an examination of the basic terms of art, *dao* 道 and *de* 德 as field and focus respectively.

The primacy of vital relationality in this Daoist cosmology means that any understanding of it must begin from the doctrine of internal relations that follows from such an assumption. This doctrine of constitutive relations will shed light on what Needham is referring to here as “the universal uncreated organism” with “its own causality and its own logic.” We might cite Peter Hershock here who offers a rather straightforward and uncontested account of these internal, constitutive relations in diagnosing the persistent problem that we have in seeing the world as being comprised of discrete “things”:

Autonomous subjects and objects are, finally, only artifacts of abstraction. ... What we refer to as “things” – whether mountains, human beings, or complex phenomena like histories – are simply the experienced results of having established relatively constant horizons of value or relevance (“things”). They are not, as common sense insists, natural

⁴ Needham, *Science and Civilisation in China*, Vol. 2, p. 290.

⁵ Cited in Needham, *Science and Civilisation in China*, Vol. 2, p. 283.

occurring realities or [things]. Indeed, what we take to be *objects* existing independently of ourselves are, in actuality, simply a function of habitual patterns of relationships⁶.

Hershock offers us a perceptual cure that allows us to see “through the conceit that relations are second-order realities contingent upon pre-existing actors.” A doctrine of constitutive relations requires a different common sense:

This amounts to an ontological gestalt shift from taking independent and dependent actors to be first order realities and relations among them as second order, to seeing relationality as first order (or ultimate) reality and all individual actors as (conventionally) abstracted or derived from them⁷.

Indeed, for Whitehead the very assumption that there is a world comprised of deracinated individuals who are perceiving discrete things wherein they are all defined by external relations is a prime and prominent example of what he calls the “Fallacy of Simple Location:” that is, the familiar and yet fallacious assumption that isolating, decontextualizing, and analyzing “things” as simple particulars is the best way to understand the content of our experience. Whitehead rejects a world of “objects” as being mere retrospective, second order abstractions from our continuous experience, and argues the fundamental realities of both experience and nature itself are best understood as irreducibly extended and transitory events. For Whitehead, the notion of the discrete individual is a specific and persistent example of what he has called elsewhere “misplaced concreteness.” This second, closely related fallacy is to regard abstracted entities presumed to have a simple location as being “more real” than their “transitivity,” that is, than their field of dynamic, extended relations and all of the untidy transitions and conjunctions that constitute the genuine content of the human experience⁸.

Charles Hartshorne elaborates upon this concern of Whitehead’s, problematizing our common sense understanding of our ostensive “inner” and “outer” domains by insisting on the mutual implication and interpenetration of persons in their relations with others that follows from this doctrine of internal, constitutive relations (although the notion of *dao* as “unsummed totality” will have to do the work here of Whitehead’s “God”):

⁶ Peter D. Hershock, *Buddhism in the Public Sphere: Reorienting Global Interdependence*, Routledge, New York 2006, p.140.

⁷ Hershock, *Buddhism in the Public Sphere*, p. 147.

⁸ Alfred North Whitehead in *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology*, Donald Sherbourne corrected edition, Free Press, New York 1979, p. 137 observes: “This presupposition of individual independence is what I have elsewhere called, the ‘fallacy of simple location.’”

[A]s Whitehead has most clearly seen – individuals generally are not simply outside each other (the fallacy of “simple location”) but in each other, and God’s inclusion of all things is merely the extreme or super-case of the social relativity or mutual immanence of individuals⁹.

In classical Chinese cosmology, the animating, transforming *qi* 氣 is conceptualized in terms of what in modern parlance we might call a “vital energy field” in which “things” are sometimes more and sometimes less persistent, vital perturbations or foci that, once having arisen, continue in the fullness of time to transform into other things. This field is not only pervasive as a condition of all things, but is also the “neural,” existential medium through which all things come to constitute what they have become, whether it is the appearance of cabbages and kings or the aspirated energy of finger snaps. There is neither animating *qi* without form nor form without *qi*. Indeed, “form” and “animating *qi*” are two nonanalytic aspects of the same transforming reality, where “transitivity” and “form” are both implicit ways of understanding the transformative “functioning and forming” (*tiyong* 體用) process. By nonanalytic aspects, I mean that form and animation are simply two ways of looking at the same phenomenon, and that they are separable only through abstraction by foregrounding one as opposed to the other. As such, “animating *qi*” and the various ways of saying “forming” are an explanatory rather than an ontological vocabulary; we need both terms to give an adequate account of what we experience.

We might appeal to the notion of *shi* 勢 as one concrete way in which *ars contextualis* has come to be expressed to illustrate how this Daoist understanding of the production of order among erstwhile “things” entails “its own causality and its own logic.” We see the cosmology described by Granet and Needham above quite literally spring to life in the *Daodejing*:

Way-making (*dao*) brings things to life,
 Their virtuosity (*de*) provides them with nourishment,
 Environing things shape them,
 And their contextualizing circumstances (*shi*) usher them to completion.
 It is thus that all things revere *dao* and esteem *de*.
 As for this reverence and esteem,
 It just arises spontaneously without anything decreeing it to be so¹⁰.

⁹ Charles Hartshorne, *A History of Philosophical Systems*, Philosophical Library, New York 1950, p. 443.

¹⁰ *Daodejing* 51: 道生之，德畜之，物形之，勢成之。是以萬物莫不尊道而貴德。道之尊，德之貴，夫莫之命常自然。

Shi 勢 is a generic term that expresses the complex, holistic dynamics of the process of “trans-form-ing” (*tiyong* 體用) as it occurs within the evolution and con-summation of any particular situation. First, there is the element of cultivation and enhancement that is captured in the etymology of the term as “sowing and cultivating” (*yi* 藝) and in its cognate term, the “performing arts” (*yi* 藝). Situations do not just happen; they emerge in their complexity as a growing pattern of changing relations that are vital, and display the possibilities of incremental design as well as an achieved, aesthetic virtuosity. Situations by definition also have a morphology or “habituated” aspect – a localized place with its persistent yet always changing configuration. But as Hershock has observed above, we must see the “relationality as first order (or ultimate) reality and all individual actors as (conventionally) abstracted or derived from them.” Putative “things” are horizons, and thus only convenient abstractions from persistent and continuous matrices of interdependent relations. And these relations do not terminate anywhere, but reach out to the furthest limits of the cosmos. Any particular “thing” or situation emerges at the pleasure of every other situation, and is thus at once a cause and an effect. Another way of saying this would be *ziran* 自然 or “self-so-ing” means all of a thing’s relations that come to constitute it as its “self” (*zi* 自) thereby give birth to its unique *ran* 然 that makes it insistently so.

We might be initially overwhelmed when we examine what is in fact a non-exhaustive list of the possible English translations for this term *shi* 勢 revealing of its broad compass of meaning. But there is a logic internal to these seemingly disparate meanings. The complex significance of *shi* can be subsumed under the following coherent pattern of associations:

Relationality: leverage, differential, advantage, purchase

Vitality: potential, momentum, timing, tendency, propensity

Virtuosity: influence, power, force, style, dignity, status

Embodiment: terrain, configuration, situation, circumstances, disposition, shape, appearance.

In lifting coherence out of this glossary of disjunctive translations, we must begin from the relations that constitutes any particular situation and register the vital and thus changing pattern or structure that emerges from them. And this structure – from its relationality and vitality to its achieved virtuosity and embodiment – can be drawn upon to answer some of our basic cosmological questions. First, this reflection on *shi* provides an alternative vocabulary for thinking through the dynamics of continuing experience and the multiplicity of its content. *Shi* provides a centered, “from-field-to-focus” conception of the principle of individuation. That is, beginning from the wholeness of experience, we divide up, conceptualize, foreground, and thus make determinate its otherwise continuous flow by bringing

focus and meaningful resolution to its horizons as it is entertained from one perspective or another. The primacy of vital relations means that situation will always have priority over agency, and that nothing does anything by itself. An ostensive “thing” is first a specific focus or matrix – a particular configuration – within an expansive context of changing, constitutive relations. But importantly, it can achieve insistent focus and resolution, and further be cultivated and shaped in its interdependent relations with the “other” things that constitute it. The dynamics of *shi* explains what it means for something that is at once unique and yet continuous with other things to act and to move, and to be acted upon and to be moved, where the shaping and being shaped is one continuous process. *Shi* as one and many – as foci and their fields – provides some insight into what the logic of an alternative unity and diversity and sense of inner and outer might actually mean. Indeed, the inseparability of unity and diversity guarantees the uniqueness of each situation, and means at the very least that there can be no single dominant order, but only many interdependent and interpenetrating sites of order. And the reversibility of inner and outer means that in searching inwardly for a unique, lived identity we are in fact exploring the web of outward relations that make us who we are.

When *shi* is used to reflect on the human condition specifically, it explains the emerging individuality of unique “persons” situated within the evolving circumstances of their extended families and communities, and within the changing conditions of their natural environment. Persons are irreducibly transactional, ingesting and embodying their environs as a focused field of selves. The cultivated distinctiveness of these persons is not exclusive of relationships, but rather by virtue of the quality achieved in them. To the extent that we are able to thrive within productive relations, we can emerge as distinctive and sometimes even distinguished persons, and thereby bringing distinction to the nexus of relations to which we belong. *Shi* suggests how persisting habits and specific habitudes that constitute identities are shaped from original impulses – the 勢源 (potential source) – into definite and significant activities of unique persons.

The somatic and vital aspects of *shi*, and the interpenetration of all things as focus and field brings clarity to the claim in *Daodejing* that:

Those who esteem their own persons as much as the world
Can be entrusted with its governance,
And those who love their own persons as much as the world
Can take it as their charge¹¹.

The point here is focus and field: Since the entire world is implicated within each of us as persons, it is only appropriate that we treat ourselves with the same

¹¹ *Daodejing* 13: 故貴以身為天下，若可寄天下；愛以身為天下，若可託天下。

esteem that we would extend to the world. Or said more simply, to love ourselves is to love the world. It is only those who fully realize this interpenetration between world and things, and among things themselves, can “grasp and cherish the ‘three treasures’ (*sanbao* 三寶) enumerated in the *Daodejing* as compassion (*ci* 慈), frugality (*jian* 儉), and deference (*bugan wei tianxia xian* 不敢為天下先). And these three treasures are necessary to extend oneself to the full compass of experience as a precondition for exercising influence over it.¹² It is in this way – through deference to all things – that consummate human beings have a vital role in expediting the creative possibilities that experience has on offer.

Before turning to a reflection on Peirce’s abductive reasoning and on our notion of *ars contextualis* as an effort to appreciate, clarify, and extend Peirce, I want to first register the centrality of the human being in the key terms of art that are defining of “*Dao-de-ism*.” And it is perhaps better to refer to “Daoism” as “*dao-de-ism*” because it is the correlative, field-and-focus relationship between these two reversible terms, *dao* and *de*, that provides us real insight into early Daoist cosmological and axiological thinking. In fact, Sima Tan in his “Preface of the Grand Historian” uses the expression *daode* in his first reference to Daoism as a “lineage” (*jia* 家). And the title of Daoism’s seminal text is not the “*Dao-jing*,” but as “*Daodejing*” remembers the fact that both of the early Mawangdui manuscripts dating to 168 BCE are explicitly a combination of a *de-jing* and a *dao-jing*.¹³

I want to argue that the sagacious human being as portrayed in the *Daodejing* has cosmic stature. There is in this text a much elevated and amplified expectation of human participation in the emergence of a micro and macrocosmic order that in its own time challenged the more narrowly defined views of Confucianism found in texts such as the *Analects* – what John Berthrong has called early Confucianism’s “meso-” or “inbetween” view of the cosmos. And it would seem to be this Daoist challenge occasioned a response by the evolving Confucian tradition in self-consciously hyperbolic texts such as the *Daxue* and *Zhongyong* that rise up to celebrate the cosmic reach of personal cultivation.¹⁴

¹² *Daodejing* 67: 我有三寶，持而保之。一曰慈，二曰儉，三曰不敢為天下先。 。 。 。 天將救之，以慈衛之。“When *tian* is going to rescue something, it surrounds it with compassion.” The last phrase in the Mawangdui version has: 天將建之，如以慈垣之。“When *tian* establishes anything, it is as though it fortifies it with a wall of compassion.”

¹³ See Sima Qian 司馬遷, *The Records of the Grand Historian (Shiji 史記)*, Zhonghua shuju, Beijing 1959, pp. 3288–3289. This *de* and *dao* division is not respected in the three Guodian bundles of text dating to about 300 BCE wherein chapters from the *de* and *dao* sections in the Mawangdui manuscripts are mixed together in each of the groupings.

¹⁴ See John H. Berthrong, *Expanding Process: Exploring Philosophical and Theological Transformations in China and the West*, State University of New York Press, Albany 2008, pp. 60–61.

This clear interpenetration and complementarity of *dao* and *de* reinforces the assumption that Daoist cosmology is really a generalized sociology in the sense that it is a phenomenology of the possibilities of the human experience. It is an account that is not simply descriptive of human flourishing, but that is also prescriptive of a way of pursuing it, and exhortative about getting on with it. The *daode* dyad with each component having “human” and “right way forward” implicated within them defines human virtuosity as an optimization of the relations that constitute our interpenetrating focus and field narratives as we journey forth within our natural, social, and cultural contexts.

Another way of thinking about this quest for virtuosic relationality is to remember that *dao* can also be parsed as “speaking,” and the quality of *dao* is in important measure dependent upon the productivity of the continuing human discourse. The graph suggests that the sages “hear” (*er* 耳) what is valuable to hear, and on that basis are effective in “making manifest” (*cheng* 呈) and communicating their vision of what will be. Sages (*shengren* 聖人) then, are virtuoso communicators of cosmic and epochal proportions. Two expressions frequently associated with sages in the tradition broadly is a kind of prescience that enables them to see what is still inchoate (*ji* 幾), and on that basis, to take the initiative (*zuo* 作) in guiding the unfolding propensity of things in a positive direction.

Given that in this cosmology, persons are constituted by their relationships, implicated within the sages are the inspired worlds they have raised to higher levels. Indeed, they do not lead their people; they embody the heights that the people themselves have achieved in defining and integrating the communities of the past, and of the future as well. This enhanced awareness of sages gives them the capacity to go beyond the particular time and place in which they live, effecting a continuity not only with their contemporaries, but with those who have preceded them, and with those who are yet to come. And their sagacity is measured by their success in orchestrating and embodying in themselves the efforts of the people to realize their shared project, and as such, they themselves through their deference to the full content of their experience are camouflaged and remain imperceptible as a collaborative source of influence.

The metaphors used to describe the sages are cosmic and celestial, and the culture that finds its focus in these rare persons elevates the human experience to heights of profound aesthetic and religious refinement, making the human being a worthy partner with the heavens and the earth. The model of the sage shines across generations and across geographical boundaries as a light that not only stabilizes and secures the human world, but that also serves humankind as a source of cultural nourishment and inspiration. It is the sages who collaborate with the ways of the

world (*tiandao* 天道) and through deference extend the way of becoming consummately human (*rendao* 人道) into its more certain future.

We have seen that the focus-field notion of person assumed in this *daode* and *qi* cosmology stands in stark contrast to a metaphysical realist conception of an inner, private domain and a shared outer world. It begins from this doctrine of internal, constitutive relations and requires a fundamentally different understanding of persons in which their particular identities and the unsummed totality – their foregrounded focus and its field – are two holographic and thus mutually entailing ways of perceiving the same phenomenon. That is, any particular phenomenon in our field of experience can be focused in as many different ways: on the one hand, it is a unique and persistent particular, and, on the other, it has the entire cosmos and all that is happening implicated within its own particular pattern of relationships. Just as each live note in a symphony has implicated within it the entire performance, so persons as live focal events have implicated within them their entire field of experience. And just as the symphony is the complex totality of the effect as it is construed from the perspective of each unique note without the privileging of any particular one among them, so persons are anarchic in construing the entire field of experience from their own unique perspective without the regulation of some invisible hand.

William James provides us with a helpful image. In the *Pluralistic Universe*, James uses a phenomenology of consciousness to reflect on and to give a rather vivid picture of what he calls “the pulse of inner life,” a pulsation that, in being both holistic and vitally specific at the same time, requires that we abandon any notion of “inner” and “outer” as exclusive domains. As we will see below in exploring the notion of *xin*, we must reconceive the relationship between inner and outer in focus-field, holographic terms where they are simply two ways of foregrounding and emphasizing different aspects of the same phenomenon:

In the pulse of inner life immediately present now in each of us is a little past, a little future, a little awareness of our own body, of each other's persons, of these sublimities we are trying to talk about, of the earth's geography and the direction of history, of truth and error, of good and bad, and of who knows how much more? Feeling, however dimly and subconsciously, all these things, your pulse of inner life is continuous with them, belongs to them and they to it. . . . The real units of our immediately felt life are unlike the units that intellectualist logic holds to and makes its calculations with. They are not separate from their own others, and you have to take them at widely separated dates to find any two of them that seem unblent. . . my present field of

consciousness is a centre surrounded by a fringe that shades insensibly into a subconscious more. . . Which part of it properly is in my consciousness, which out? If I name what is out, it already has come in. The centre works in one way while the margins work in another, and presently overpower the centre and are central themselves. What we conceptually identify ourselves with and say we are thinking of at any time is the centre; but our full self is the whole field, with all those indefinitely radiating subconscious possibilities of increase.¹⁵

The following *Daodejing* passage with its holographic understanding of persons and their fields of experience, is explicit in calling into question our familiar distinction between an inner self and an outer world:

Sages are ever without thoughts and feelings (*xin*)
 In taking the thoughts and feelings of the common people as their
 own...
 As for the presence of sages in the world,
 In their efforts to draw things together they make of the world one
 muddled mind.
 The common people all fix their eyes and ears on the sages,
 And the sages treat them as so many children.¹⁶

Xin 心 has conventionally been translated as “heartmind” to challenge the familiar separation of the cognitive and the affective, connoting as *xin* does both thinking and feeling. But in addition to resisting the cognition-affect dualism, *xin* also precludes the familiar mind-body, inner-outer, subject-object, and agent-action dichotomies, and might be better read gerundively (if ungrammatically) as “lived bodyheartminding.” In this *Daodejing* passage, implicated in the narratives of the sages are the lives of the common people. The ordinary people certainly look to these sages for direction in finding their bearings, but they also retain the spontaneity (*ziran* 自然) to live their own diverse lives in a way that retains the indeterminacy of so many children, with everyone being given the space to create their

¹⁵ William James, *A Pluralistic Universe*, Longmans, Green and Co., New York 1912, pp. 286–288.

¹⁶ *Daodejing* 49: 聖人恆無心，以百姓心為心。 。 。 。 聖人在天下，歛歛為天下渾其心，百姓皆注其耳目，聖人皆孩之。 The received text of *Daodejing* 49 has 聖人無常心: “Sages are without constant thoughts and feelings.” On the basis of a Mawangdui text A variant that has 聖人恆無心, Liu Xiaogan 劉笑敢 uses received commentaries to argue for the cogency of this alternative: “Sages are ever without thoughts and feelings.” See his *Laozi Past and Present* (老子古今), Zhongguo Shehuikexue Chubanshe, Beijing 2006, Vol. 1, p. 487. I read the *wuxin* 無心 here as an additional a *wu* 無-form that expresses a sedimented habit of engagement: an unmediated “thinking and feeling,” or “thinking and feeling immediately.” Like *wuwei* 無為, *wuxin* describes an optimal pattern of deferential relationality rather than the absence of activity.

own unique narrative in the world. Without any specific regimen being imposed upon them, the world around them is simply the unsummed totality of many different orders, allowing them to enjoy the diversity of participating whole-heartedly and like-mindedly in a happily muddled *xin* in which their differences make a difference for each other, and for the sage.

In order to make sense of this passage – a passage that is reminiscent of the Mencian claim that “the myriad happenings of the world are all implicated here in me”¹⁷ – we need to invoke an alternative to our common sense understanding of the “inner” and “outer” as two separate domains. Most obviously, as noted above, it is a commonplace that *xin* does the work of both cognizing and feeling in a life experience that includes both felt thoughts and cognitively informed feelings. And further, there is no strict dichotomy between intellection and sensation, between body and mind, between structure and function, between thinking and doing, between center and context, between nature and culture. These aspectual distinctions are nonanalytic and mutually entailing; they do not serve to separate and isolate different components within “lived bodyheartminding” nor fragment the activities that are defining of it.

Taking our cue from Chinese medicine as a practical application of this cosmology, we have to avoid the formalism that comes with a doctrine of external relations by acknowledging the inseparability of physiology and anatomy, of the function and structure of the life experience. As medical anthropologist Judith Farquhar observes in her attempt to make sense of what we this early Chinese *qi* 氣 cosmology, “*Qi* is both structural and functional, a unification of material and temporal forms that loses all coherence when reduced to one or the other ‘aspect’”¹⁸.

Indeed, it is because traditional Chinese medicine has a dynamic, symbiotic understanding of the coterminous relationship between structure and function often captured in the expression “forming and functioning” (*tiyong* 體用) – or put more simply, “trans-form-ing” – that it can provide us with a significantly different way of understanding the lives of the common people that are implicated in the life of the sage. Systemic physiological functions have parity if not privilege over the more persistent, localized anatomical structures in traditional Chinese medical sensibilities, requiring that explanations be holistic and inclusive rather than being overly specific and thus exclusive.

¹⁷ *Mencius* 7A4: 孟子曰：萬物皆備於我矣。反身而誠，樂莫大焉。強恕而行，求仁莫近焉。 Mengzi said, “Is there any enjoyment greater than, with the myriad happenings of the world all implicated here in me, to turn personally inward and to thus find resolution with these happenings? Is there any way of seeking to become consummate in my person more immediate than making every effort to act empathetically by extending myself into the places of others?”

¹⁸ Judith Farquhar, *Knowing Practice: The Clinical Encounter of Chinese Medicine*, Westview, Boulder 1994, p. 34.

The term *zhenmai* 診脈, for example, is certainly localized as “taking this pulse,” but more importantly it is using one’s tactile sensitivity to feel and interpret the visceral dynamics of the living body holistically, and as such, has synoptic reference not only to the organism itself as experience from within, but also to the organic, lived relationship this organism has with its external landscape. In “taking this pulse,” the medical practitioner is ultimately feeling the pulse of the living cosmos.

The familiar dualistic separation of inner and outer domains follows from a doctrine of external relations and brings with it “introspection,” where introspection is usually understood as turning from a normal outward orientation to a reflective examination of one’s own internal mental states and feelings. Inspired by this Daoist understanding of “lived bodyheartminding,” however, we might want to challenge this definition of what takes place when we look inward by inventing an alternative term – “*intra*-spection.” Such a neologism would signal the fact that the process of “*looking into* our own lived bodyheartminding” is at the same time a *looking outward* into the quality of the coalescence this “lived bodyheartminding” has achieved with its contextualizing world. When the sages go “inward” to “intra-spect” they are in fact surveying the quality they have been able to achieve in their relations with the common people. Indeed, such “intra-spection” as a looking “into” the productive connectivity of our lived bodyheartminding with the “outer” world is both inner and outer at the same time. Similarly, for the sages to be “prospective” is again to go “outward” only to survey the relations that are constitutive of their own identity – again, inward and outward at the same time. These functions are inner and outer in the sense of having a felt, existential character as well as a more objective *mein*. The point is that lived bodyheartminding is holographic, and indeed, since “everything is here in me,” in making the most of our bodyheartminding, we are literally bringing the entire cosmos into more meaningful focus and resolution from our own unique perspectives, and more completely adumbrating its whole within the events of our own lives. In so doing, we thus come to function most productively and influentially in our relations with what is happening in the world around us.

How do we achieve the quality of resolution and its quantum of meaning needed to live sagaciously? If, as Needham has said above, “the sum of wisdom” is a deliberate increase in “the number of intuited analogical correspondences in the repertory of correlations,” how do we get more wisdom?

In trying to explain the process of human reasoning, Peirce found it necessary to develop the concept of “abductive” or “explanatory” or “presumptive” reasoning as a necessary supplement to the more familiar notions of deductive and inductive reasoning. Peirce wanted from reasoning the capacity to produce new ideas – to go beyond what is already stated in the premises to contribute additional information

and content. Deduction cannot possibly do this, and while enumerative induction is content-increasing by generalizing a sample to a population, the extra content is not new but rather a generalization of the content of the premises. Deductive and inductive reasoning are thus used for justificatory purposes to confirm the validity of a given hypothesis, and are a source of security in our thinking. Abductive reasoning on the other hand is not only ampliative (amplifying the content as induction does) but is also distinctively generative (producing of new ideas). It is the process of surveying facts and coming up with a theory that can explain them often captured in the description “inference to the best explanation.”

Abduction has the function not of justifying hypotheses, but belongs to that phase of inquiry in which a theory is formulated in the first place. The more conservative interpretation is that it is a form of sleuthing or diagnostics that produces an educated guess as to the best explanation that is then available for further testing. While abductive reasoning is short on security in having to rely upon deductive or inductive reasoning to confirm its conclusions, it is nonetheless taken to be strong on uberty: it is fruitful, a source of copiousness. But the perceived strength of abduction is also its weakness. On this reading, abduction allows reasoning to be a source of new information and ideas, but it is still a logic of discovery rather than a source of real creative advance. What it makes “newly available” is information about an existing world rather than precipitating the spontaneous emergence of true novelty.

A second, liberal and certainly more interesting reading of Peircean abduction is that it is the unbounded process of making productive correlations, generating new meaning, and taking as its boundaries only the limits of our imagination. Steve Coutinho describes this mode of thinking in the following terms:

Successful abduction requires accumulated knowledge, extensive experience and a lively imagination. We start with a mystery, a perception, a text; these provide the ‘evidence’ consisting of a small number of clues, or traces. We then use our imagination, informed and constrained by our extensive experience, and accumulated knowledge to construct an explanation¹⁹.

Such penumbral thinking is an attempt to exploit the always attendant indeterminacy that honeycombs determinate vocabularies as an open and bottomless source of increased meaning.

The general vision of *ars contextualis* takes us past this second, more interesting interpretation of Peirce’s abductive thinking and any theory/praxis dualism

¹⁹ Steve Coutinho, *Zhuangzi and Early Chinese Philosophy: Vagueness, Transformation and Paradox*, Ashgate Publishing, Aldershot, UK 2004.

it might still suggest, to make it clear that Daoism requires of the human being nothing less than the ontological project of world-making itself. It takes us from reasoning about the world to the practical responsibility the human being is perceived to have in becoming a creative collaborator with the heavens and the earth. As Randy Peerenboom has asserted in his argument against a naturalist interpretation of Daoist philosophy:

Dao – both normatively, as the sanctioned way, and descriptively, as the order of the universe, the environment, the society, the person – emerges out of our contextual choices rather than as an instantiation of a predetermined blueprint. It is the result of a creative, active, participatory process. The kind of world we live in, in terms of our ethical as well as natural environment, depends in part on the choices we humans make.²⁰

Ars contextualis as a practical endeavor is a term that describes the peculiar art of contextualization that allows focal individuals to ally themselves with those contexts that they will constitute and that in turn will constitute them. There is no One behind the many; there are, rather, many unique ones, many particular foci that construe and organize the fields about them. Since there is no one-many or part-whole model that serves as an overarching context determining the shape of other contexts, the world is an open-ended affair comprised of “thises” and “thats” construable from any number of distinct perspectives. The art of contextualization is an aesthetic project involving the production of harmonious correlations of the myriad of unique details that make up the world.

It is through patterns of deference and an achieved virtuosity in relations that persons extend themselves to encompass an increasingly wider range of the conative “presencing” or “arising” we have associated with *de*. In the early Confucian texts, one way of expressing this deferential activity is moral imagination – that is, the analogical and inclusive exercise of viewing a situation from the point of view of others (*shu* 恕) and “correlating one’s conduct with those near at hand.”²¹ We see in the *Zhongyong* that becoming consummate in one’s own person produces the virtuosity that simultaneously brings wisdom to one’s world:

But creativity is not simply the self-consummating of one’s own person; it is what consummates other things. Consummating oneself is becoming consummate in one’s conduct (*ren* 仁); consummating other

²⁰ R.P. Peerenboom, “Beyond Naturalism: A Reconstruction of Daoist Environmental Ethics,” in *Environmental Philosophy in Asian Traditions of Thought*, (edited by J. Baird Callicott and James McCrae), State University of New York Press, Albany 2014, p. 163.

²¹ Cf. the *Mencius* 7A4 passage cited above. Also *Analects* 6.30.

things is exercising wisdom in realizing one's world (*zhi* 知). It is an achieved moral virtuosity (*de* 德) of one's natural tendencies (*xing* 性) and is the way of integrating what is more internal and what is more external. Thus, when and wherever one applies such virtuosity, the result is fitting.²²

In the *Daodejing*, such generative deference is achieved through the cultivation of the optimal disposition toward one's contextualizing others captured in the various *wu* 無-forms: “non-coerceive acting” (*wuwei* 無為), “objectless desiring” (*wuyu* 無欲), “unprincipled knowing” (*wuzhi* 無知), “non-interfering doing” (*wushi* 無事), and the (*wuxin* 無心) “unmediated thinking and feeling” we saw above as the sage defers to the child-like minds of the common people. Through patterns of deference, the creative possibilities of a person's conditions and the potency for self-construal are proportionately increased. When virtuosity (*de*) is cultivated and the reach and influence of such persons is extended efficaciously into their environments, the environments become increasingly adumbrated in the particular person. The distinction between *dao* and *de* – between focus and field – fades as the individuating capacity of *de* is transformed into its integrating capacity. That is to say, in the person of the sage, the enhanced, resolute focus of *de* extends without discontinuity to embrace the indeterminate field of its context. *De* is both particular (the sage) and its particular field (the common people as implicated in the sage). *De* is both *focus* and *focused field*.

The term “focus” originally referenced “domestic hearth” or “fireplace,” and is thus metonymic of family and genealogy – the governing metaphor in Chinese cosmology. Focus has come to mean “place of divergence and convergence” within a “field” that also has domestic reference, but that I would use as the sphere of influence of particular foci. At any given moment, items available for *ars contextualis* can be characterized in terms of the focal point from and to which the lines of divergence and convergence attributable to them move and find resolution, and the field from which and to which those same lines proceed and have influence. To take Confucius himself as a concrete example, we would have to allow that he is corporate in the sense that the lines of divergence and convergence that constitute his focus and meaning move throughout the entire field of the Chinese cultural tradition. Confucius is both focus and China as a focused field.

Keywords: Chinese cosmology, Daoism, Chinese philosophy, abduction

²² *Zhongyong* 25: 誠者，非自成己而已也。所以成物也。成己，仁也。成物，知也。性之德也。合外內之道也。故時措之宜也。

Bibliography

1. Ames R.T., *Confucian Role Ethics: A Vocabulary, Science and Civilisation*, Vol. II, Hong Kong–Honolulu 2011.
2. *Ars Contextualis in Early Daoist Cosmology*, “Taiwan Journal of East Asian Studies”, December 2015, Vol. 12, No. 2.
3. Baird Callicott J., McRae J. (eds.), *Science and Civilisation in China*, Vol. II, Cambridge 1956.
4. Berthron J.H., *Expanding Process: Exploring Philosophical and Theological Transformations in China and the West*, Albany 2008.
5. Coutinho S., *Zhuangzi and Early Chinese Philosophy: Vagueness, Transformation and Paradox*, Aldershot 2004.
6. Farquhar J., *Knowing Practice: The Clinical Encounter of Chinese Medicine*, Boulder 1994.
7. Hartshorne Ch., *A History of Philosophical Systems*, New York 1950.
8. Hershock P.D., *Buddhism in the Public Sphere: Reorienting Global Interdependence*, New York 2006.
9. James W., *A Pluralistic Universe*, New York 1912.
10. Peerenboom R.P., *Beyond Naturalism: A Reconstruction of Daoist Environmental Ethics*, [in:] *Environmental Philosophy in Asian Traditions of Thought*, Albany 2014.
11. Sellars W., *Philosophy and the Scientific Image of Man. Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind*, London 1963.
12. Whitehead A.N., *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology*, New York 1979.