



Heresy, Tradition, History*

Kuang-ming Wu*

Abstract

This essay roughly has three points. First, heresy “takes” (*haireisis*) oneself in its original etymological rigor to provoke convention to define itself as “orthodoxy” in self defense. All this is the kid’s growing pain called “heresy.”

Further, heresy-controversy centers on learning from mistakes, a rhythmic dynamics of “Baby Mary” that protests and cleanses corrupt “orthodoxy.” This is the true meaning of “tradition.”

Finally, painful illness, cruelty, insanity, and many others serenade the actuality of heresy as a negative dialectic of “history.” Thus heresy, tradition, history, these three remain, and the crucial dynamo to them is heresy.

Key Terms: heresy, orthodoxy, mistakes, learning, Baby Mary, tradition, history

* 收稿日期：2009.08.14，接受刊登：2009.12.15。

* Ph.D. (Yale). Professor of Philosophy, University of Denver, CO, USA
kmwu2002@yahoo.com



Heresy, Tradition, History

Kuang-ming Wu

We all want to be in the right, so we keep denying wrong that keeps gadfly-awakening us to *our* wrongs. We try to swat that gadfly dead, unaware that that gadfly points us to our gadfly-wrongs *in* us, egging us to set our house straight. So, wrong is our ugly mother of right. We need heresy our hated wrong to sober us soberly orthodox. Heresy dawns *before* orthodoxy. This thesis points to the fact, heretically opposing our common sense of orthodoxy-priority, and we do not like it.

Still, we must squarely face this *fact* before we can be straight on the basic dynamics of right and wrong, or rather, wrong *in* right. “No one is perfect” must burn into our orthodox-nisus. Imperfection is painfully essential on our struggling roads toward less imperfection, and our struggles describe our dealing with wrong heresy, often quite wrongly. This essay gazes squarely at “heresy” as our essential inner-dynamics to tradition and on to history of humanity.



I happened to see a CD titled, “What’ s Wrong with Right.”¹ I showed it to a store keeper, and we agreed that there must be something *wrong* with “right.” Coming home, I thought to myself that if this is so, then there must be something right about *wrong* in some sense. Thus right and wrong interpenetrate, the dynamics of the push is wrong called “heresy,” not right or orthodoxy, and the “tradition” is born of fights against right and against wrong through time, to make “history.” This essay traces some of this intriguing dialectic of the “absolute opposites” of heresy and orthodoxy. The dialectical fights make up the drama of “heresy, tradition, history,” the drama of life itself.

Life begins with Baby Mary. Being told to share things she snatched, Baby Mary snapped back, “Not fair!” Such “heretical” protest protects her visceral desires, snatching what she desires to enrich herself. This is her ontological accomplishment that inherits the tradition of achievements to make history. Baby Mary’s primal “Not fair!” repeats in the exclusive monotheism of Christianity that takes pagan practices to deepen as it shouts “Abominations!” to them.

The heresy-orthodoxy pair indicates detestable against admirable and evil-false against good-sublime. Being no god, *our* human obligation is to detest heresy to learn from it.

¹ Hacienda Brothers, *What’s Wrong with Right*, Proper Records, 2006. This is what’s “proper”!



Heresy comes about by the *tradition's* need to renovate, transmit, and weave *history*. Baby Mary leads our adult way through to *the* great Adult-with-baby-heart (Mencius 4B12²), pushing the Sisyphus' rock, human imperfection, up to the elusive hilltop of sharing.

Baby Mary:

My Baby Mary, aged two, snooped around to snatch anything she liked, "Mine!" "No, honey, that's Johnny's." I said. "Not fair!" she snapped back. I had to go get the same toy for Johnny her brother. Then, she scribbled on paper, asking, "Daddy, what's this?" "I don't know, Baby. What is it?" "It's a design! Don't you know!" "O, I'm sorry. I didn't know that." These incidents stick in my heart. She is now grown up to "share" as professor-researcher in pediatric dermatology, caring for her three babies.

"Not fair!" is as invincible as kids' "I'm busy!" when called, for kids are so full of themselves as to overflow space and time; they are never "busy," i.e., harried, for they are not even "relaxed" to care about tomorrow an exotic Never Land Elsewhere Else-when in their limitless fullness of "here now." So "I'm busy!" they mimic the adults they admire, and we just love their admiration. Baby Mary's "Not fair!" is also so

² 「大人者不失其赤子之心者也。」(孟子·離婁下)



full and happy that she has no use for adult fairness; she was just posing, and her posing is so captivating.

Still, “Not fair!” remains a protest that we think indicates two wrongs. Mary (1) identifies private discomfort with objective injustice, which (2) she tries to bend back toward subjective desire as if spitting at the sky, to get hurt, as some college students³ argue with “unfair” professors on low grades, deserved or not.

“Mary is forever my baby I must guide,” I say, yet I am surprised. Unlike the college student, Mary’s protest reveals less the wrong than something deep to which we adults must conform. We adults (大人) try to suppress Baby Mary’s discomfort toward objective “fairness”; Mary intensely protests it with visceral discomfort of her primal “fairness” twisted. What happened goes like this.

The adult “fairness” splits justice from desires, while Mary’s is in the Primal Milieu *before* the desire-justice split; there she “desires without overstepping the line,” to which Confucius (2/4) finally grew up at 70, where *the* great Adults (大人) lose none of their “hearts of baby” (*Mencius* 4B12), and adult “justice” corrupts all this (Lao Tzu 38).⁴

³ We will return to college kids in the final section, “Baby Mary through All These.”

⁴ Why desires are *the* cosmic rule appears in the final section, “Baby Mary through All These.”



Mary *is* the Realm of Primal Paradise is where God is in heaven who knows, and many birds down here are pecking at the grass under many trees nonchalantly around, while people enjoy waters here and mountains there (Confucius 6/23), strolling around, “entering among birds, not disturbing their going 入鳥不亂行,” happily “together without being together 相與於無相與” (*Chuang Tzu* 20/36, 6/61).

Baby Mary shouts “Not fair!” to warn us, “Don’t disturb!” Her shouting protest was Cherubim’s flaming Sword guarding the Garden of Eden (Genesis 3:24), where spontaneous “scribbles” *are* themselves natural “designs.” Her “fair” and “design” show how desire is the right; her desires and deeds are her rule nature-designed.

But now, once we adults say our dear Mary is “wrong,” her desire, thinking, and behavior turn into dear “heresy” to our “orthodoxy.” Heresy is the romance of orthodoxy, then, for without Mary’s “wayward” desire and behavior our adult “rightness” would not have appeared,⁵ not even as “corrupt rightness.”

We think that orthodoxy judges heresy as heretical, so orthodoxy is primary and heresy, derivative; Baby Mary shows it is heresy that provokes orthodoxy into existence. So we must

⁵ All religions were born of fights with heresies, as we will soon see in the section, “Heresy Learned to Deepen the Tradition.”



consider *heresy* with care. We will be surprised to see its triple twin-aspects, innovation and tradition, democracy and self-examination, evocation and provocation revolve around Baby Mary, Baby (self-choice) and her growth (criticism).

Heresy Provisionally Defined:

Baby Mary awes us adults even while we think she is wrong and attempt gently to guide her out of her “mistake” of taking thwarted-desire as unfair. Heresy was originally *haireisis*, a royal taking (of a city) that came to mean taking up oneself, perhaps against convention.⁶ Thus self-choice is at the root of heresy, and we cherish the integrity of the self, and so Baby Mary awes us valiantly self-choosing, in “Not fair!”

We see Baby Mary’s awesome self-integrity in Confucius saying (recorded *twice*, 9/18, 15/13), “It’s all over! I am yet to see anyone loving virtue as loving sex!” Our visceral desires should be our virtue, following desires without overstepping the line (2/4)! So Mencius (1B5) accepted Duke Hsüan of Ch’i 齊宣王 loving riches and sex, and urged the Duke to *share*⁷ these loves with his people.

This is to take-oneself (heresy) to spread “all pleasures to all people,” utilitarianism universalized-deontologized. “Snatching stuff is theft, snatching the state is ruler,” says

⁶ This provisional definition will be discussed in detail in the later section, “Heresy Learned to Deepen the Tradition.”

⁷ Its original is a strong “same 同”-as-verb.



Chuang Tzu (10). We say, “Snatching for oneself is greed; snatching for us all is virtue. Greed staying greed is rascal; rascal-greed—heresy—grown *universal* is democracy in family-style.”

Orthodoxy chooses “oneself,” too, but its “holier than thou” air *excludes* others, and soon greed stays greed to corrupt Plato’s “best few” into dictatorial monarchy, and the sophists’ “cosmopolitan democracy” into demagoguery. Now, “all under heaven, one family 天下一家” is monarchic “all under heaven, my-one family 家天下.” In this manner, “orthodox” self-choice self-corrupts as does the spoilt college kid.⁸

Thus we must choose between two self-choices, either to exchange goods with all, as heretics would grow up to do, or to exclude others, as the orthodox do. Baby Mary who now irritates her brother would grow⁹ up to share things with him and all others, in observant inter-learning, “monkey see, monkey do.”

Baby Mary growing up to share “Mine!” with Brother John and “all brethren with the Four Seas” parallels Adam and Eve outside Paradise redeemed into the Second Adam *the great*

⁸ The dictator-college-kid connection appears in the final section, “Baby Mary through All These.”

⁹ Her “pattern of growth” appears in the section, “Heresy Learned to Deepen the Tradition.”



Baby, to share “this, now, bone from my bones” (Genesis 2:23) with all Gentiles as Church Universal, “Christ’s wife.”

This is irritating heresy-Baby’s root-desires growing; “all-best that is ‘mine!’ with all people” gives much greater joy than “Mine!” hoarded “pleasures for me alone.” Utilitarianism is greed for pleasures growing, in deontological universalizing growth. So, “heresy” is self-choice, not blind obedience or self-indulgence, to share, not exclude, in cosmopolitan inter-learning, not “holier than thou.”

Heresy as Criticism and Self-Criticism:

Now, “heretical” self-choice is directed self-recursive in the No radicalized as *criticism*, social criticism and self-criticism. Such criticism is invincible in space and time, both *spatially* ubiquitous (criticizing criticism endorses it) and unending through *time* (posterity criticizing us now criticizing past forebears).

We are the Sisyphus forever pushing up ourselves the rock of imperfection; our push our criticism *continues* to the hill beyond now. Our push makes “culture,” forever *Homo Viator*¹⁰, on our way of critical betterment. Camus declares, “The struggle itself toward the heights is enough to fill a man’s heart.

¹⁰ The phrase is quoted from Gabriel Marcel’s, *Homo Viator: A Metaphysic of Hope* (1951), NY: Harper & Row, 1962.



One must imagine Sisyphus happy.”¹¹ How do we push the rock of our imperfection? We do by inter-criticism in inter-learning.

We learn from others as we criticize them, to revise our views, widen our horizon, by daily watching over our word-act inconsistency of loving the better to act worse. Master Tseng confessed (*Analects* 1/4), “Daily do I self-examine threefold. Was I disloyal in planning with others? Was I an unfaithful friend? Did I not practice what transmits me?” He watches over failures into Adult losing no Baby-Heart. *Heresy* the self-choice self-criticizing is *tradition* keeping orthodoxy vibrantly going as *history*.

Tradition as Heresy-Orthodoxy Intertwined:

Orthodoxy is thus *inherently* entwined with heresy. Life in *quest* is an art; all art can only be learned by apprenticeship under the master, to be initiated into the tradition. Such is transmission of the human best, our originality, i.e., novelty that differs from, if not opposes, the transmitted best.¹² Discipline of discipleship induces dissent.

Orthodoxy of tradition, however, thinks it must sift genuine creative dissent from “cranks, frauds, and burglars”

¹¹ This phrase concludes Albert Camus’ *The Myth of Sisyphus*, NY: Random House, 1959, p. 91.

¹² See my book *The Butterfly as Companion*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1990, p. 9.



by looking into what “plausible” value the dissent has, yet such value is to be “original,” what cannot be plausible. Thus inherent is the tension between discipline and dissent, plausibility and originality, in the transmission of tradition toward the indefinable future.¹³

In all this tension of the tradition transmission, “cranks, frauds, and burglars” are significant. They spell “heresies” undesirable yet un-reject-able. We have four potential situations: dissent is fraud while tradition is not, dissent is not fraud while tradition is, both are frauds, and both are not—all significant, for they are conflicts where it is hard to judge which party is a real fraud. To know is divine, to be ignorant, human.¹⁴

We must, then, presume *any* dissent as decent until proven otherwise. Legendary rulers secretly collected popular critical poems-songs in the *Classic of Poetry* and Ch’i Wei Wang 齊威王 actively sought people’s critiques of his governance,¹⁵ so that “Look into one’s wherewith, observe one’s wherefrom, discern wherein one is at home—how could

¹³ I rifled Michael Polanyi, *Science, Faith and Society*, The University of Chicago Press, 1964, pp. 15-17.

¹⁴ The final section shows how senseless this reasonable classification is in the dynamic context of heresy.

¹⁵ Cf. Lin Yutang, *A History of the Press and Public Opinion in China* (University of Chicago Press, 1936) NY: Greenwood Press, 1968. On Chi’i Wei Wang 齊威王, see *Intrigues of the Warring States*, “鄒忌修八尺有餘,” *戰國策*, (臺北：三民書局，民 87，p. 366).



anyone remain hid, then?”¹⁶ It is the royal road to true government.

Flouting this power of the helpless people invites disaster. People loudly complained of Duke Li 厲王’s tyranny; he then silenced them with threat of death. His adviser 邵公 remonstrated with the Duke, saying that stopping people’s mouths is more ominous than damming the river; as damming river-flow invites lethal disaster, so stopping people’s mouths lead to royal downfall. The advice was not heeded, and three years later, people exiled the Duke. This history is recorded in *Words of the States*.¹⁷

Humanity is made of its world history of dealing with heretics who disturb the society. In the end, “World history is world judgment” or literally “*Weltgeschichte ist Weltgerichte*; world happenings are world righting” (Hegel). However difficult, we must perform this worldwide¹⁸ discernment on a world-historical scale, on pain of losing our own life-orientation.

Thucydides said, “I shall be content if it is judged useful by those inquirers who desire an exact knowledge of the past as an aid to the interpretation of the future, which... must

¹⁶ They are Confucius’ words in *The Analects* 2/10.

¹⁷ The story was recorded as the third in the *國語*, as 邵公諫厲王弭謗 (臺北：三民書局，2006，p. 7)。

¹⁸ In “Heresy Refining Tradition-Transmission” we will see how solid a bulwark against demagoguery such worldwide universalization would make of democracy.



resemble if it does not reflect it. My history has been composed to be an everlasting possession..." History judges heresy as heretics make history, and "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it," said Santayana.¹⁹

Heresy Refining Tradition-Transmission:

So heresy is related to history. The historical pattern of dealing with heresies is that "cranks, frauds, and burglars" vanish in inter-attack to inter-learn. In the attack (Mary's No!) to inter-learn (Mary growing), the negative interweaves with the positive. Often irritatingly strange novelties are first vehemently attacked as "heresies," *and then* the "heresies" are accepted, modified.²⁰

For example, in his attack on the sophists, Plato's Socrates was quite similar to the sophists' thinking *mode* and rhetoric,²¹ e.g., "(self-)criticism" in "(Socratic) irony," self-contradiction. In content, Plato's devastating attacks on them include his attack on their democratic cosmopolitanism, saying they lack self-examination toward objective eternal truth against winds of demagoguery. We can, however,

¹⁹ Thucydides, *Peloponnesian War*, bk I, sec. 22. George Santayana, *Life of Reason* (1905-6), vol. I, ch. 12.

²⁰ Mary's "No!" is more varied than protesting parental authority, as in "Baby Mary through All These."

²¹ Jacqueline de Romilly stresses this point, perhaps to a fault, in *The Great Sophists in Periclean Athens*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1992.



defend them twofold way, their cosmopolitanism related, surprisingly, to Socrates' self-examination.

One, the *cosmopolitan* spread of democracy would be enough to defend itself against demagoguery that *can* never spread cosmopolitan as a constant worldwide trend through time, for demagoguery is deception for private profit, privacy is of individuals who come and go, and *can* never be universalized. One can only cheat for occasional private profit, and can never *cheat* for global profit through time. Universalizability in universalization is a sure defense against occasional temptations of demagoguery.

Two, universalization spells inter-being in ceaseless *self-examination*; the rub here is “ceaseless.” Being cocksure about self-examination tends to Platonic objectivism -beyond beyond *self-examination*, examining no subject-base the sophists insist on. Platonic “beyond” sires Cartesian “mind” and Ruskin's “pathetic fallacy” against “roses” as “smiling.”

Plato's heretic would urge self-examination, saying, “Could you so live beyond living, by mind alone, as to take roses as smileless? Aren't roses smilelessly smiling? Physiologically smileless, don't roses smile ladies rosy, our days rosy? So do birds, lilies, and even grass; no wonder Jesus points to them to turn us all smiles!”



Socrates' heresy of self-examination wants us never to take ignorance as negation. Such self-examination forbids us to take objectivity as no-subject. Objectivity is really to let matters be as they are, different from subject-less objectivism; it is to commit the fallacy of misplaced objectivity²² of cocksure scientism, to hurt us and nature.

Cutting trees cuts cutters (Indian proverb); cultivating trees cultivates cultivators (Chinese common sense). Nature-human mutuality is co-existential, as all existents are inter-existent, and those who deny the mutuality, in "un-pathetic fallacy," are falsified to death in eco-disaster.

One may say the pathetic fallacy *just* warns against attributing human feelings to nature, but even atoms inter-prehend, inter-"feel," says Whitehead. We are together (co-feeling) without being together (in respective ways). Puppies care for the prison inmates caring for puppies; caring for flowers fulfills gardeners. Care for nature "natures" us.²³

²² This is analogous to A. N. Whitehead's "Fallacy of Misplaced Concreteness" in *Science and the Modern World* (1925), NY: Free Press, 1953, pp. 51ff.

²³ Christina Cheakalos, "New Leash on Life: Puppy Love Behind Bars," *Smithsonian*, August 2004, pp. 63-68. Lao Tzu's humane socio-politics concerns nature—water, woodblock, valley, seasons, all paradigms of poetic correlations of innate family-sociality, "politics," not melting mysticism but politics as geo-poetics. The *Chuang Tzu* and *Aesops's Fables* are made of dialogues with things in nature.



Plato cuts such inter-being to soar above it to cut us dead. What happened? Well, even advertising self-examination mesmerizes to cut self-examination. As Socrates looks into, examine, himself, “he” grins him back in self-approval into otherworldly confidence; he should not have let Daimon in. If the Western philosophy in self-examination is “a *series* of *footnotes* to Plato,” then it is a ceaseless *series* of *noting* itself at its *foot* in “self-examination” the gadfly of heresy.

Verification—its principle, its procedure—must itself be verified, analysis must be analyzed, and objectivity objectively examined.²⁴ Stopping this dynamics of “*series* of footnoting” starts the orthodoxy of Whitehead scholasticism.²⁵ Sisyphus always pushes the rock, i.e., the *ever* vigilant self-examination, a self-self interchange to self-change, in interchange with gadfly-*heretics* to inter-*change* to inter-be. Socratic gadfly-heresy stings out a self-examining series to inter-be the *tradition* of ever living *history*.

What is “tradition”? For Kant scholar Paton, hardly a heretical thinker, inheriting the tradition *adds* achievements;

²⁴ Verification was examined by Karl Popper, analysis by Wittgenstein, and objectivity as above.

²⁵ A *Key to Whitehead's Process and Reality* (Donald W. Sherburne, University of Chicago Press, 1966) and *Process and Reality: Corrected Edition* (eds. David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne, NY: Free Press, 1978) make us wonder about Whitehead's IQ and admire the editors' Whitehead orthodoxy—an irony!



tradition is no imitation.²⁶ Now, as achievement adds novelty to existing old, so tradition-inheriting is its revolution -*renovation*, achieved by heresy that is then not abolition of tradition but its continuation as the *paradigm* of self-examination, as Jaspers' Paradigmatic Individuals were alive to *heretically* renovate tradition and *us*, to transmit such tradition of provocation.

Let us put it another way. Basho said, "Don't imitate me;/ it's as boring/ as the two halves of a melon." Again, "Don't follow in the footsteps of the old poets, seek what they sought,"²⁷ ever refreshing novelty, insights. Thus true disciples of a genius are also geniuses. To repeat the genius of the genius is to be as genius as the genius, as unique and independent as the genius.

To follow the master is to follow him alive as he is, to differ from him as he does from the past, i.e., from the tradition the master embodies by *heretically* differing from it. To protest is patriotic in the Republic of Truth; to dissent upholds its *tradition* of examining inquiry, inquiring inquiries, to continually self-renew into *history*.

²⁶ H. J. Paton, *The Good Will*, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1927, pp. 16-17. See my *The Butterfly as Companion*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1990, p. 9.

²⁷ They are quoted from *The Essential Haiku: Versions of Basho, Buson, & Issa*, ed. Robert Hass, Hopewell, NJ: The Ecco Press, 1994, pp. 47, 233.



Inherently *tensed* then is the inherent connection between the “right” old and the “wrong” new. We express ourselves in our “mother tongue” of inherited thinking-mode and assumptions, and *do so to bring* exciting novelty *out* of tired old.²⁸ Here, “doing so” inherits the tradition; “to bring novelty out” confounds existing novelty. We must keep it *up* to keep it, confound the old to continue the old. Just to continue the old as dead orthodoxy confounds it to destroy it.

How do we continue the old? The old must be “warmed up, to lead to knowing the new” (Confucius 2/11), yet the new by nature dissents from the old, which reacts to the new as “out of line,” as new wine bursting old wineskins (Mark 2:22), thereby turning the old into “orthodoxy” that rejects the new as heresy, as cranks. Such rupture by *cranks*’ revolution alone can continue the tradition of excellence. Such is the tension inherent in tradition-transmission.

To result in “new wine in new wineskins,” new wine must pour into old wineskins to spill in a mess, to *change* radically both unpleasant new wine and ruptured old wineskins, enriching both. Passionately attacking the sophists,

²⁸ Such is how Susan K. Langer began her “On Cassirer’s Theory of Language and Myth” in *The Philosophy of Ernst Cassirer*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp, La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1949, 1973, pp. 381-382. She may not have realized, however, the bloody heresy-orthodoxy tension *inherent* in tradition-transmission.



Plato's Socrates unwittingly adopted sophistic tactics, now self-recursively made responsible.

We are impressed with how "primitive Buddhism" from India quietly absorbed Chinese riches of Confucianism and Taoism and blossomed into a bewildering variety of schools, from Seng-chao through Chi-tsang, Hsüan-tsang, to T'ien-t'ai, Hua-yen, and Ch'an (Zen).²⁹ All these schools of "Chinese Buddhism" are unheard of in its original home of India.

Confucianism in Chinese tradition, on its part, vehemently rejected and attacked two "heterodox" trends, Buddhism from abroad and Taoism at home, yet thereby unwittingly absorbed them to develop into the so-called "Neo-Confucianism" of depths and riches with metaphysical glories reminiscent of Buddhism and Taoism. We see how Dharma-upaya correlation blossomed into "one principle, diverse spread 理一分殊" of Ch'eng I and Chu Hsi, and Zen's utter One-Mind flourished in the Mind-Principle unity of Lu Hsiang-shan and Wang Yang-ming—all unheard of in "primitive Confucianism."

We now look into how such changes in "revolt turned acceptance" took place in the human region of *ultimacy*. We take a radical example, of all places, in the exclusive

²⁹ Wing-tsit Chan has deftly summed up bewildering Chinese varieties of Buddhism in *A Source Book of Chinese Philosophy*, Princeton University Press, 1963, pp. 336-449.



monotheism, Christianity, which almost convulsively rejected “heretical abominations,” only to assimilate them into its very core, now enriched and deepened.

Heresy Re-Defined to Deepen the Tradition:

To learn from heresy, we must re-envision what heresy is³⁰; originated in glorious military *town-taking*, the word—*hairesis*—came to mean obnoxious *heresy*.³¹ What happened? Here is its historical evolution³² that explains it, at the cost of slightly repeating what was said above.

Originally “hairesis” meant taking towns desired, then taking fairness, life, for oneself, then taking oneself, and then self-choosing. “Heresy” as taking things outside is radicalized to taking oneself, choosing oneself; it now means to so assume one’s own views as to provoke people of established “correct” views, to oppose and brand them “heretics,” separated from “orthodox” people.

More importantly, the “heretics” themselves do no such orthodoxy rejection, but just publicly propose *their* newly

³⁰ The previous section, “Heresy Provisionally Defined,” briefly defined it that is expanded here, for it comes alive in its surprising applications here.

³¹ H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1996, p. 41, does not even mention “heresy,” only “factious”; “heretical” appears only at Supplement p. 12. No explanation.

³² See Heinrich Schlier’s historical explanation in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. G. Kittel, Grand Rapids, MI: Wm Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964, I:181-183.



found views (e.g., Gnostics' "creation" as a return to primal origin) to discuss (Luther's "95 Theses") with anyone. It is those who embrace existing views, not "heretics," who oppose, brand, and separate "heresy" from "orthodoxy."

"Wise men from the East" dared to ask King Herod, "Where is a new king born in your territory? We came far to worship him (not you)," for we always need a new ruler. "Is life unfair? Change its rules," says a 12-year-old boy. Kid's frustrated "Not fair!" protests adult fairness, "No, that's Johnny's"; her protest criticizes the existing ideal to change it, to *better* the existing best, to make progress. Baby Mary grows in protests, ever changing the targets; growth lies in the protean "Not fair!" Such heresy!

Orthodoxy was thus born thanks to heresy's provocation not meant; "religion" is established by anti-heretical controversy. An extreme case is exclusive monotheistic Christianity that came about in reaction to "idolatrous paganisms."

Christianity was born of controversy [with heresies]. Not only the twenty-seven-book canon of writings but the individual books of the New Testament itself are charged with the spirit of contention and defense—so much, indeed, that a strong case may be made for seeing the canon as the earliest stratum in Christian apologetic literature.



So began Hoffmann to go into all New Testament writers as orthodox contenders with heresies.³³ Eliade chimed in, saying,³⁴

The first systematic theology is the consequence of the dangerous crises that shook the church during the second century. It was in the course of criticizing the “heresies” of the Gnostic sects...that the Fathers gradually elaborated orthodox doctrine [that] consisted in fidelity to the theology of the Old Testament... [T]here was complete incompatibility between the ideas of Gnosticism...and the theology, cosmogony, and anthropology of the Bible. It was impossible to call oneself a Christian and not accept the doctrines of the Old Testament.

Heresy’s incompatibilities provoked orthodoxy to self-shape; the NT needed OT³⁵ for its theology, cosmology, and

³³ R. Joseph Hoffmann, *Celsus on the True Doctrine: A Discourse against the Christians*, Oxford University Press, 1987, p. 5, and so on in his long General Introduction. See also, John Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay on the Early History of the Canon*, London, 1950, on the anti-heretical feature of the NT canon.

³⁴ Mircea Eliade, *A History of Religious Ideas: vol. 2: from Gautama Buddha to the Triumph of Christianity* (1978), tr. W. R. Trask, University of Chicago Press, 1982, p. 396.

³⁵ OT was no “heresy” to Jesus but the fiercely OT-people took Jesus as arch-heretic.



anthropology, which in turn are derived from surrounding “heretical” mythologies.

This birth of exclusive Christian orthodoxy out of heresy has its root, of all places, in Jesus’ words. Jesus gives us two puzzling sayings. He said, “He who is not against us is for us.” And then he said, “He who is not for us is against us.” They sound not quite together, but a close look shows they are complementary statements of a logically identical point. One statement says no-A is F; another says no-F is A, and so they say the same point—and yet they are socio-ethically various and have different stresses.

“He who is not against us is for us” is spoken about *others*, telling us to be accommodative; it is a mission-statement that encourages acceptance and expansion. “He who is not for us is against us” is said to warn *us* and encourage us to be devoted to our responsibility of kindness, an exhortation to considerateness. They are hand in glove.

Now, let me go deeper in more detail. *First*, we see that a significant context surrounds “he who is not against me”; it goes as follows:

John said to him, “Teacher, we saw someone casting out demons in your name, and we tried to stop him, because he was not following us.” But Jesus said, “Do not stop him; for...Whoever is not against us is for us.



For truly I tell you, whoever gives you a cup of water to drink because you bear the name of Christ will by no means lose the reward.” (Mark 9: 38-41)

[This and all the following passages are in the *New Revised Standard Version*]

Jesus’ point is that whoever is not against “us”—Jesus—is doing what we do. This position embraces *other* religions; no sectarianism is here. Anyone giving us just a cup of water even, because we are we—Jesus group—deserves accolade. This is because of something special about “Jesus,” i.e., because of compassion Jesus-group represent, as specified in this incredible passage that places compassion at the top of respect of all ranks and denominations:

Whoever welcomes you welcomes me, and whoever welcomes me welcomes the one who sent me. Whoever welcomes a prophet in the name of a prophet will receive a prophet’s reward...and whoever gives even a cup of cold water to one of these little ones in the name of a disciple—truly I tell you, none of these will lose the reward. (Matthew 10:40-11:1)

Here is a clear tinge of cosmopolitanism. Jesus wants his followers to follow him in his limitless magnanimity and compassion, totally devoid of sectarianism. *Anyone* who



practices what Jesus practices—ubiquitous compassion—is *his* people. He wants us to join them. Joining them joins him!

Now, *secondly*, let us go into “he who is not for me.” It is a reverse side of above, and is a *severe* warning against failing to do what he does and lives and what those do who to what he does and lives.

Whoever is not with me is against me, and whoever does not gather scatters. Therefore, I tell you, people will be forgiven for every sin and blasphemy, but blasphemy against the Spirit will not be forgiven. Whoever speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come. (Matthew 12:30-32)

In other words, to speak against what Jesus does is to speak against Jesus’ spirit, the Holy Spirit, and is entirely unforgivable. We have absolutely no excuse not to do what he does, the deed of compassion. This compassion includes respect of other peoples of other persuasions and schools and religions, and the slightest compassionate deed of even giving a cup of cold water to the littlest one deserves reward fitting to the name in which water is given, “prophet,” “righteous one,” to any religion “outside” Christian.



This is *the* divine Categorical Imperative³⁶ of absolute respect and compassion toward others who do not belong to “us.” Racism, bigotry, ethnocentrism—Eurocentrism, Sino-centrism, etc.—are totally excluded. They are abominable sins against the Holy Spirit, deserving of eternal damnation!

Now, this point has a revolutionary repercussion for plurality of religions in the world’s most exclusive Christian faith. If asked for the root of all claims above, Jesus would have answered with a very simple simile with deep significance. “No good tree bears bad fruit... for each tree is known by its own fruit. Figs are not gathered from thorns, nor are grapes picked from a bramble bush.... Thus you will know them [false prophets] by their fruits.”³⁷

This simple saying has four implications to compose Jesus’ compassionate respect of religious *differences*, his “comparative religion.” [1] Good tree is known by its good fruit; its root—its good quality—is invisible, while its fruit is good to eat, quite visible. Good fruit is compassion such as giving a cup of water to the littlest ones; “good” fruit benefits people. Only bad trees bear thorns to hurt people; only false prophets curse people with cunning and deception.

³⁶ Emil Brunner’s massive (728 pp) *The Divine Imperative*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1947, never comes to this radical far.

³⁷ Luke 6:43-44. Matthew 7:15-20.



[2] Now, “good” fruits *differ* in kind as their trees differ; figs differ from grapes as fig tree differs from grape vine. Likewise, “compassion” that benefits people also differs in kind according to what “trees” it comes from. Compassion is given in different names of different sages and different religions. The “heart unbearable at people” in pain is from the Confucius tree; karuna of mercy is from the Buddha tree; visceral pain moving Jesus’ heart is from the Christ tree.

[3] We—I—must plant fig trees or grape vines, dig soil around them deep, fertilize and prune them, and the good trees will bear good fruits all by themselves. Otherwise, bramble will scrawl to prick me to hurt others. We must patiently plant and faithfully nurture good trees now still invisible as “good.”

We cannot *make* good fruit; it just grows naturally. We cannot contrive compassion; it just shows naturally, grows naturally from us the “trees.” Try to make good fruit without taking time to plant and nurture, and we turn hypocritical, bigoted, turf-jealous, “orthodox” and brutal, hardened self-righteous, imprisoned self-proud, buried closed-in group-think, never minding outside. That’s how we prick and we hurt while ignorant that *we* are the brambles.

[4] The good fruit is compassion various and personal. Each person’s compassion is rewarded by each different religion, as “prophet” or “righteous man,” in whose name



compassion is shown. Good trees are all good yet different without confusion; good deeds of compassion are all good yet different without confusion. Here is mutual respect in the community of *differences*. Such is Jesus' words in the exclusive faith of Christianity urging us to compassion in mutual respect of *differences*.

Now, in this exclusive cosmopolitanism we must remember this. As Baby Mary snatched things for herself and shouted "Not fair!" so five among others of "unsavory" practices of pagan "heresies" have been snatched *into* Christianity to strengthen, enrich, and deepen its sinews: suffering, slavery, sensuality, sacrifice of first-borns, and cannibalism, ordered in increasing intensity of abhorrence; paradoxically,³⁸ the least tolerable proved to be the deepest set at the core of the Christian faith.

(1) No one loves *suffering*, least of all Christians with promises of ineffable blessedness.³⁹ The ancient Greeks

³⁸ Was the author of *The Paradox of Jesus in the Gospels* (Charles W. F. Smith, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969) aware of such *painful* paradox in Christian faith, and its why and its how? The contents of the book are quite traditional, benignly insipid.

³⁹ Christianity dissolves no pain (as does Buddhism) but shows how to live *with* it. Christ's healings and feedings were "signs" (John). "Let us go into the other town" when everyone was "looking for" him (Mark 1:38); "you came for perishable foods; work for foods imperishable" (John 6:27). Praising a widow's scanty offering, he did not resolve her poverty (Mark 12:43); "the poor you have with you always" (John 12:8). He foretold cosmic disasters (Mark 13). All his disciples died in violence as he, and



heroically made, however, a virtue of necessity of suffering, proud of the catalogue of sufferings as a certificate of one's experienced virtues. Heresy as self-taking is exemplified here as Greek certificate of suffering.

Paul seized this pagan convention and boasted of his sufferings, not to prove his virtues but to show his *gratitude* for being counted worthy of partaking in His sufferings. As Greek catalogues of sufferings certified virtues, Paul's certified Christian discipleship; while he was ever free to keep enriching personal integrity precisely via pain. Suffering is now life's blessing, in whose wonder Paul exulted.⁴⁰

(2) *Slavery*, treating persons as chattels, is another unsavory "heresy" of ancient Greece; no one would wish to be a slave whose life and death are in someone else's hand, and slave revolts and elopes were quite common. (1) Slaves owe absolute obedience to the master. In addition, (2) slaves were in as high a status as *their* master, and (3) the ruler derived authority from being symbolically "enslaved" to the

persecutions spurred the Gospel-spread (Acts of the Apostles). Paul's list on "more than conquerors" (Romans 8:37-39) portrays victory *within* pain, etc. Paul's list of sufferings as his slave-pride (Corinthians) is in this trend.⁴⁰ This is Wu's extrapolation from a somewhat repetitive research on this theme by John T. Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel: An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthian Correspondence*, Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988. It was his Ph.D. thesis at Yale Divinity School.



ruled. Here is an incredible self-taking (heresy) via the slave as master and the master as ruled.

All these three features of heretical practice of slavery Paul adopted, and turned *proud* as “Christ’s slave.” He owes absolute obedience to his Master, and got as high a status as his Master’s—heavenly status! Then Paul claimed authority over his congregation as of their serving *slave*,⁴¹ to echo Jesus’ saying, “The leader [must become] like one who serves” (Luke 22:26).

Three more examples below, sex, child sacrifice, and cannibalism, are religious, not in living (suffering) or social convention (slavery). Here, despite all factual information available,⁴² we have no book to consult with on what and how Judeo-Christian monotheism *assimilated* what it absolutely rejected, as Baby Mary snatched things for herself while shouting “Not fair!” This provocative theme—

⁴¹ Again, Wu has extrapolated from a rambling research on this theme by Dale B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990.

⁴² See *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, eds., Karel van der Toom, Bob Becking, Pieter V. van der Horst, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995. *Merriam-Webster’s Encyclopedia of World Religions*, Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, 1999. Susan Niditch, *Ancient Israelite Religion*, Oxford University Press, 1997. Walter A. Elwell, ed., *Baker: Theological Dictionary of the Bible*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1996. Wu has consulted other encyclopedias of religions. Detailed information is much less crucial than how the Judeo-Christian tradition handled “pagan abominations,” and so tedious citations are omitted.



assimilating absolute abominations—is basic and central to Christianity.

(3) *Sex-worship* of fertility religions, with irresistible *sensual* lure, surrounded the Israelites and early Christians. Prophet Hosea and Apostle Paul were dead-set against such ubiquitous odious practices. If we need any “heresy” to Christianity, here is a clear example. Here is Baby Mary’s adamant No!

And then, things incredible happened; Baby Mary snatches it for herself. Hosea proclaimed God the *Husband* of Israel, insistent, jealous, and yearning; Paul proclaimed Christ the *Husband* no less insistent and devoted to his church, to which he gave his very life! Yet does this divine “wedded love” repeat pagan Baal the “lord”-husband’s love?

Sex-worship in paganism was to be participants’ self-enhancement—heresy as self-taking!—taking part in cosmos-origination, nature-regeneration, yet strangely, God the Husband of Israel and Christ the church’s Husband seem to lack believers’ self-enhancement, and instead differ saliently in four ways.

One, people pursue their lord-husband Baal, while God the sole Husband of Israel pursues his wayward wife and Christ gave life to redeem back his “wife” his church. Judeo-Christian God’s wedded love is pagan love *in reverse*.



Two, Baal-fertility is available to anyone who copulates—Baal is impersonal—while Husband God-and-Christ is personally devoted; this matter is pagan sex *transformed*.

Three, people's sex-acts to follow Baal is a condition for Baal-love; unconditional Husband-God loves "us alone" though we are rebellious. *Four*, a ShowBar ad says, "Wearing nothing but a smile," to allure. This ad reminds us of a kid, for both attract. Sex is thus as primal as babies and children, as primordially beyond us. What does this "beyondness" mean?

Being titillated by ShowBar ad, obsessed by girlishness, is just paganism; to be "reminded" of girlishness into its connection with primal core of our being, is to learn from paganism to go beyond it, as Confucius says, "Damn it! I'm yet to see anyone loving virtue as loving sex."⁴³ Christianity on its part learns from pagan Baalism and called the Lord "the Husband of Israelis" wooing them with persistent fidelity. *Thus* this pagan abomination uniquely deepened the Judeo-Christian tradition.

(4) A horrendous pagan practice is *human sacrifice* of the first-born, widespread among Baal, Dagon, and Moloch,⁴⁴

⁴³ *Analects* 9/18, 15/8. Cf. *Mencius* 1B5.

⁴⁴ See Harvey E. Finley's "Gods and Goddesses, Pagan," in *Baker: Theological Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. Walter A. Elwell, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1996, pp. 302-303.



practiced even by Israeli king Manasseh.⁴⁵ It is a clearest abomination provoking a staunchest champion of tolerance to unconditionally, forcefully abolish it.⁴⁶ The Bible consistently condemned it with horror; we hear Baby Mary's "No!" loud and clear.

Their violent rejection, however, led to an incredible transformation. After almost getting—then relenting—from Abraham the sacrifice of his only son Isaac,⁴⁷ God the Father himself "sacrificed" his "only Son" to redeem sinful us, pleading with us to accept *such abominable* sacrifice of His! Few realize how odiously cruel Christ's Cross at the Christian *center* is as the pagan sacrifice of the first-born.

Again, few realize how pagan sacrifice is the supreme gift any one can offer—a strange reversal of heresy as self-taking—and so is the Christian one. Offerings in both cases express the utmost devotion, sincerest love most tragic. Nonetheless, they differ in this. Pagans offer their first-borns

⁴⁵ 2 Kings 21:6.

⁴⁶ Vitoria argued forcefully for *peaceful* spread of Christianity, until hitting the idea of a forceful rescue of "innocent victims of human sacrifice." See Samuel Fleischacker, *The Ethics of Culture*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994, pp. 174-177, and Felix Alluntis, "Vitoria, Francisco de," *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Paul Edwards, NY: Macmillan, 1967, VIII: 256-257. We see that whatever we reject as abhorrent to *our* conscience will haunt us, seep into us, and change us unawared, often to *our* good.

⁴⁷ Genesis 22:1-14.



to pacify gods who deserve; the Christian God offers *his* Son to us, to redeem us “miserable offenders.” Again, it is pagan sacrifice *in reverse, even reversed in value*; Christianity rejects paganism to absorb it, changed, into its core.⁴⁸

(5) In *cannibalism*, where our abhorrence reaches unspeakable ultimate, primal peoples (Papua New Guineans) consume revered deceased parents’ brains to inherit them, and consume defeated enemies to take over their vital spunk. Here is heresy as self-taking by taking over vitality from outside; we could call it “love,” as insistent reverence of parents, as eager pursuit of vitality even of enemies. Cannibalism is a ritual of vitality takeover; it is our animal cannibalism of life-transfer extended.⁴⁹

Jesus in his gutsy ultimate love of us offers our bodily takeover of *his* vitality; it is clear cannibalism. No blinking the fact; cannibalism is now the central Christian sacrament: “Take, eat; this is my body. This is my blood; drink ye all of

⁴⁸ Leviticus has other pagan abominations the Judeo-Christian tradition did not adopt, perhaps because child sacrifice is the most odious. Cannibalism was not mentioned but blood-drinking was condemned.

⁴⁹ *Merriam-Webster’s Encyclopedia of World Religions*, Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, Inc., 1999, p. 180 (long). *The New Columbia Encyclopedia*, NY: Columbia University Press, 1975, p. 443; even its brief entry is shortened later. This topic is so odious that even books on “primitive societies” omit it. Cf. Michel de Montaigne’s “on cannibals,” *Essays*, Penguin Books, 1958, pp. 105-119. Ashley Montagu’s “A Brief Excursion into Cannibalism,” *Man in Process*, NY: Mentor Book, 1961, pp. 85-86.



it.” Christ (John 6:54) has a stark word, *trogo*, to “gnaw, crunch, and munch on” his flesh, even “drink my *blood*,” expressly banned.⁵⁰ Offering cannibalistic eating-drinking of him offers his bodily vitality-transfer for divine-human unity; all his miracles and death act out all this.

We remember that the fifth century Athenians welcomed the sophists (as experts of wisdom), then challenged them (as crafty wily), and finally assimilated them (learned from them changed).⁵¹ Likewise, early Christians rejected pagan abominations *and* then assimilated them, changed, into their *core* of beliefs. Baby Mary snatches things into her as she rejects adult injunction not to, with a vehement “No!”

“Are all pagan practices ‘symbols’ to the Christian faith?” Yes, the pagan-human is thrown-together—*sun-ballein*—into the divine Beyond, called the Incarnation, the Divine Beyond enfleshed in the raw human; it is the really gutsy raw human that the orthodox call “superstition,” even “abomination.”

Significantly, tons of records tell ubiquitously scandalized responses to the Greek sophists, but few of their

⁵⁰ Leviticus 17:10-14, Acts 15:29.

⁵¹ Jacqueline de Romilly, *The Great Sophists in Periclean Athens*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1992, pp. xii, xv. This is the main thesis of the book that is more captivating than succinct.



own writings remain.⁵² Similarly, as we piously repeat the bequeathed Christian practices, we lose the biting impacts the “primitive” practices left us—pain, slavery, sex, sacrifice of first-borns, cannibalism.

Remember. We humans draw vitality from our soil-ed milieu as cannibals do from humans (as *we* do from chickens and cows). Those who proudly cut themselves off from such soiled pagans lose soil-vitality, hollowed into the proud orthodox shell. No wonder God gives us pagan heretics of abominations! As heresy is self-taking in sharing, so Christianity takes itself by taking over heresy it rejects.

Now, “rejecting as abomination” while taking it over is what enriches us while saving us from self-adulterating dissipation. Beware, however. Easy random taking is no taking in what we *reject* as abomination. To see the difference, think of what makes racial intermarriage, cultural or sexual, *differ* from random promiscuity.

Inter-enriching intermarriage strengthens cultures and families, while random and indiscriminate promiscuity dissipates the stability that composes personal-cultural

⁵² Ibid., pp. viii-x said nothing on what this fact *means*. Nor did Karl Jaspers ponder on the meaning of Paradigmatic Individuals leaving no life-records (*Socrates, Buddha, Confucius, Jesus: The Paradigmatic Individuals* (1957), San Diego: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1990, pp. 87-88).



integrity,⁵³ which must be preserved before inter-enrichment can occur. Integrity is preserved only by shouting “No!” at anything different, taking things alien as “abominable,” and this intense discomfort spells “heresy” to hurl at those who differ from “us.” Dissipation, not enrichment, ensues without this rejection that preserves integrity.

No wonder, as Baby Mary is a nuisance to adults, Christians themselves were branded “heretics” by surrounding religions. The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church. Heresy sires religion to thrive self-integrity. Thus the freedom in the confusion of inter-learning, intermarriage of ideas, to inter-enrich, has its own orderliness.

Let me repeat; all this is not anything-goes debauchery, cultural or sexual, but under-laid with intense rejection with opprobrium, for they are *they*, not “us.” Such orderliness not to be mocked, however, has con-fusion all its own, taking in *anything* alien that “we” could not have imagined have happened.

⁵³ Random attraction to indiscriminate copulation, sexual or cultural, is a trap. Indulge in it, and we turn dead leaves blown in desire-winds. “Watch out!” Mencius (4A8) warns; it would be destruction of domino effect: 「人必自侮，然後人侮之；家必自毀，然後人毀之；國必自伐，然後人伐之。People must self-despise before being despised; families must self-destroy before being destroyed; nations must self-attack before being attacked.」



Such is the pattern of growth of integrity, Baby Mary's dynamic physiognomy. The naughty child parents the decent adult, for adults to nurture the uncomfortably novel "childish" beginning of life. The child proclaims, our life is the tensed moving logic, "birthing, ever birthing without ceasing." Still, beware! Growing by assimilation is a matter of confrontation with abominations; it is a dialectics of evocation by *provocation*.

Inter-Learning and History:

"You've been touting learning from heretics, inter-learning among opponents. Don't friends inter-learn also? If so, are opponents still needed?" Well, we learn by inter-evocation and inter-provocation, friendly learning and fighting opposition, both kinds. Chuang Tzu yearns after wording-with word-forgotten ones, friends with "hearts-and-souls not inter-opposed." Confucius enjoys wording-with his disciples on poetry, mentioning the past to know what's to come, raising one for three to return.

Such is friendly inter-learning. In contrast, Confucius fumed over the intolerably improper to shape his "proper respect." Chuang Tzu shaped his nonchalant naturalness by



opposing Confucius' studious propriety and logicians' empty exactitude. That's learning via opposition.⁵⁴

Evocations among friends and inter-provocation in animosity result in "tradition." Evoked by Confucius, Mencius produced Confucianism; provoked by Chu Hsi, Wang Yang-ming enriched Neo-Confucianism. Time-honored universal "brotherhood within Four Seas" is now "globalization," ancient "nature" is alive in today's "ecology," while Christ was reflected on by his disciples, then the church fathers, and then by later thinkers.

All this while, inter-provocations continue. Mencius was enriched by attacking Kao Tzu and Mo Tzu, Wang Yang-ming imbibed the Taoist sentiment he rejected, as the Judeo-Christian tradition was deepened while rejecting pagan religious practices, and now secularism, scientism, relativism, irreverence, and indifference. This *tradition* of inter-evocations and inter-provocations produces *history*. Life shifts to grow into oneself, with opponents and with friends. Three points describe how they unite.

One, the *self*, said Confucius (6/20), grows from "knowing 知" through "liking 好" to "enjoying 樂," shuttling among others outside. Confucius grew (2/4) from deciding at

⁵⁴ *Chuang Tzu* 26/49, 6/47, 62; *Analects* 1/15, 3/8, 7/8; 3/1. On Chuang Tzu's relation to Confucius, see Wu, *The Butterfly as Companion*, op. cit., p. 400, note 10.



15 to learn (the outside) to standing-on-his-own at 30 (in himself); this is *knowing*. He turned without distraction (in himself) at 40 and discerned heaven's dictates at 50 (the Beyond outside); this is *liking*. At 60 his soul-ears were attuned (to things outside) till at 70 he followed all desires correctly (in himself)—in *enjoyment*.

Chuang Tzu (24/64-65) pitied *others* self-losing, and then pitied *his* pitying them, but then he saw days keep growing distant. Pitying others was to outside; pitying oneself was to oneself; seeing so as long ago was beyond both. He overheard umbra-penumbra dialog outside (2/92-94); dreamed himself to be a butterfly (2/94-96), now dragon-up, now snake-down, thing-ing things (20/6-7), beyond both. Confucius and Chuang Tzu enter Heaven Balance 天鈞 (*Chuang Tzu* 2/40) to enjoy water and hill (Confucius 6/23).

Two, *opponent*-provocation made Chuang Tzu to shape his logic-beyond-logic with logician Hui Tzu thinking of enjoying fish self-enjoying (17/87-91), with others on dealing with tyrants by playing along with them as trailing the killer tiger's nature (chapter 4). Confucius hammered out his sense of propriety and respect, provoked by a nobleman usurping emperor prerogatives (3/1), and became "princely" by undergoing world-pain of being ignored (1/1).

Three, evocation makes *friends*, on seeing one in death bed, to realize living truths beyond death (*Chuang Tzu*



6/54-64), and made Confucius (1/15, 3/8) delightfully learn with his students on implications of *Poetry Classic*. All this depicts *history* as inter-enriching in friendly evocation and heretical provocation, inter-calling-*forth*.

The final crucial question remains. If friends inter-learn, do we need opponents? Yes, for inter-learning's forwarding dynamo is provoked by heresy; inter-learning happens clearly, friendly or no, among *differences* even "contrary" to initial thoughts. Thus friendly learning *derives* its significance from opponent-learning as it is refined by friendly learning.

Having seen the ghost of Hamlet's father, two friends confided to each other, "O day and night, but this is wondrous strange!" "And therefore as a stranger give it welcome./ There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,/ Than are dreamt of in our philosophy./ But come,..."⁵⁵

"*More* than our philosophy" our orthodoxy "dreams of," there are things in heaven and earth so contrary to us, indeed. This "more" there beyond we know here is what makes obnoxious heretics to push us. No one enjoys being pushed around, yet the beyond over *there* keeps pushing us, as Socrates sent by the Divine Beyond keeps stinging us; we have to swat him as a detestable gadfly-heretic.

⁵⁵ Hamlet 1.5.166-169, in *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works, Compact Edition*, eds. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1988, p. 662.



Saying so pulls friends to opponents, evocation to provocation; tensions *within* tradition-transmission stay. Few Mencius' words are like Confucius'. It is unclear *why* Confucius was pleased with his disciples' responses, for they surprised him. It is unclear how Confucius' disciples, even Mencius, *are* his. "Warming up the old to know the new" (2/11), it is unclear how the *surprising*-new transmits the old, what "transmits" means here.

If the Confucius-Mencius relation, supposedly "unproblematic," is hard to demonstrate, the Lao-Chuang relation is as elusive. Chuang Tzu did repeat Lao Tzu, but so did he Confucius, in fact oftener.⁵⁶ Particularly damaging is Chuang Tzu's criticism of Lao Tzu at his funeral,⁵⁷ offending customary reverence to the teacher, especially at his death; no excuse ("it's just an allegory") can alley this "capital offence."

Similarly, none sees Jesus as transmitting the tradition of cannibalism, yet he explicitly urged it in instituting the pivotal Eucharist. None denies Paul as Christ's apostle, yet controversies over his legitimacy raged all his life.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ See Wu, *The Butterfly as Companion*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1990, p. 400, long note 10.

⁵⁷ This story is authentic, in the Inner Chapters, *Chuang Tzu* 3/14-17. See Wu, *Chuang Tzu: World Philosopher at Play*, NY: Crossroads and Scholars Press, p. 3.

⁵⁸ Paul the former avid persecutor of Christians haunted him all life; he had to fight up the church ranks. Persecutions came raging from church inner circles oftener, more vehemently, than from non-believers.



Evocation is provocation toward tradition; its history is bursting at the seam as new wine poured into old wineskins.

Proud of tradition as it is, China is full of learning from *opponents*. Mencius hammered out bounty-sharing in unbearable sensitivity, with two tyrants Dukes of Hui of Liang (1A7) and Hsüan of Ch'i (1B5), human nature as good with Kao Tzu (6A1), progressive expansion of graded love with Mo Tzu and Yang Chu (3B9), etc. No wonder Mencius was dubbed "fond of arguing" (3B9). Logician Hui Tzu provoked forth Chuang Tzu's logic of no logic, "useless" naturalness, etc., and was missed at the grave (24/48-51). We would not be surprised if Confucius' sigh (9/18, 15/13), "yet to see any one loving virtue as loving sex!" was provoked by meeting sensuous Nan Tzu (6/28).

Thus tradition transmits novel excellence that overhauls tired old, and novelty often comes by unpleasant surprises to orthodox platitude. Claiming to fulfill laws and prophets (Matthew 5:17), Jesus so offended Judaic establishment as to be executed. Claiming to transmit tradition, not to contrive it (7/1), Confucius revolutionized "princely person 君子" from one of princely pedigree-position to one of princely virtue-desert.

"Heresy as an origin of orthodoxy" seems a radical claim, in fact, wrong, for heresy is judged heretical in the light of what's correct, that is, the orthodox. Actually, the situation is



the reverse, as shown above. It is heresy that originates orthodoxy, not the other way around. Why? We understand the situation this way.

We have seen that we innocently believe in God of Christianity until jolted by “heresies,” forced by them, to defend our faith by defining what it is, and such definition originates orthodoxy. It is likewise with politics. We innocently live and develop our social economy until Marx came along to accuse it of injustice, and we had to define our sociopolitical system as “capitalism” to oppose “communism.”

“The Tao walks it and forms,” says Chuang Tzu (2/33); “To be is to be perceived,” says Berkeley. Mathematics is performed, as Kant observed it as “synthetic a priori,” and geometry is also, as Merleau-Ponty sees. As an utterance performs (Austin), so the Word performs to originate and create (the Bible).⁵⁹ To say is to do, and to do is to manifest to make. These acts differ, for saying is not doing, doing is not making, and yet one acts out the other, for saying does, and doing makes to declare its sense.

⁵⁹ Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 1781, B15-17. Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, NY: Humanities Press, 1965, pp. 384-395. George Berkeley, *Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*, 1710. John Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, 1962. Kuang-ming Wu, *History, Thinking, and Literature in Chinese Philosophy*, Taipei: Academia Sinica, 1991, pp. 16-18. Genesis 1:1 and John 1:1.



“Come on, occasion is no origin,” someone says. “You should say that saying occasions doing, as doing does the making. Kant’s ‘operation of $7+5=12$ ’ exists as eternally valid. We just incarnate it and partake of it, when we do $7+5=12$. Please don’t confuse epistemology with ontology.”

We respond with two points. One, “exists as eternally valid” is an article of faith; it is never provable. Two, at this point, such wrangling as occasion vs. origin is a verbal calisthenics. From the perspective of actuality, “origin” is simple and straightforward, while “occasion” is loaded with interpretation based on assumptions that need be proven and cannot be proven, the eternal independent validity of ontology and orthodoxy.

It is time to take stock. We will later, in section, “What Heretics Are,” produce a balanced view. At present, we would claim: Heresy sires orthodoxy as provocation sires evocation and enemy does friend. Enemies must be loved, who are those of my household.⁶⁰ Do we still doubt if we need opponents to learn?

Baby Mary through All these:

It is time to weave all these provocative bits into an organic whole. This living whole is our dear Baby Mary contrary, protesting, snatching, and growing. Watching her

⁶⁰ Matthew 5:44, 10:36.



closer now, and we see her “Not fair!” leading heresy through tradition to history.

Baby Mary has two features of her own, her resolute “No!” and her snatching growth. “No!” describes how patriotic heretical protest is in the Republic of Authenticity, and “snatching growth” describes how heresy inter-learns to inter-enriches.

“Not fair!”, “It’s a design! (No retouch!)”, and “I’m busy! (Don’t disturb!)”—all bravely protest-reject parental authority; heresy is a resolute self-take. Baby Mary grows up to *the* great Adult of Mencius, by snatching-adding what takes her fancy while protesting “Not fair!” for her Baby-integrity, as the Bible condemns abominations as it changes to accept them, by rejecting them.

Spontaneous Baby Mary differs from spoiled college kid. She takes in—snatches, “monkey see, monkey do” and monkey take—as she rejects; he just rejects, taking in no professor’s advice, mere self-“orthodox,” stuck only to himself without change, while she is heretical snatching as she protests while changing mind. Thus her “No!” grows taking-in, constantly on the move, while he ossifies himself. Tradition (adding) and history (going) both result from heretical No! (Baby Mary).



We see now; No is another Yes, Baby Mary's "Not fair!" grows up to snatch for us *all*. We all want to snatch whatever we desire, and the greatest snatch snatches every pleasure for everyone everywhere, every-when—sharing, inter-learning, "monkey see, monkey do," and monkey take—among *all* monkeys.

Likewise, Mencius urged Duke Hsüan of Ch'i to share his (love of) riches and sex with all his people; otherwise it is "Not fair!" not satisfying all desires everywhere. The protest "Not fair!" is protean, now against "authority" that interferes, now against things snatched as "abominable," always a stand against *anything* against free integrity—never covered before authority, never possessed by fascination or revulsion.

Baby Mary and the college student shout "Not fair!"—to professor, to parent—yet they differ in *that* for which they shout. He shouts for his spoilt self, blind to the bigger growth with professorial advice, while she shouts for her primal self of primal desire; her "Mine!" grows into snatching "All ours!", otherwise "Not fair!" to her/our very nature to grow. Her self-integrity shouts at his self-indulgence that stays put to self-imprison.



“Heaven-pulled woe, still can dodge; self-pulled woe, cannot live.”⁶¹ Sadly, spoilt college kid is made of indulged desires toward egomania. Johnson sighed,⁶²

What murdered Wentworth and what exiled Hyde,
By kings protected, and to kings allied?
What but their wish indulged in courts to shine,
And power too great to keep, or to resign?

In the end, we realize. These rascals are tragic-comedians of history—how many cartoons were made of them?—not because they are greedy but because they are not “greedy enough” to snatch all pleasures for *worldwide* happiness. The book of *Mencius* begins (1A1) at warning against the petty greed of Profiteering 利—big fish grabbing from small fish—as sheer disaster.

Profiteering is “Not fair!”—failing to work for the big *enough* desire, the Humane Right 仁義—sharing all pleasures with all people.⁶³ Tu Mu 杜牧 lamented over what Mencius

⁶¹ *Mencius* 2A4, 4A9.

⁶² Johnson, *The Vanity of Human Wishes*, quoted by William Empson in his *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (1930), NY: New Directions, 1966, p. 68. This fact sadly parallels many a petty “loyal subject” in China.

⁶³ Mencius explained the “Humane Right 仁義” as sharing pleasures with all people (1A2, 3, 4, 5, 6), to culminate in its root-fountain, the “Heart of Not Bearing People 不忍人之心” in pain (1A7).



warned, dire consequences of failing our Greatest Desire for All People Tu Mu called Loving People 愛人,⁶⁴

Alas! What destroyed Six States were Six States, not Ch'in; those who cut the Ch'in family were Ch'in. Alas,...were Ch'in to love peoples 愛人 of Six States,...Ch'in would have ruled for myriad generations and who would dare cut Ch'in? Ch'in had no time to mourn itself; posterity mourned it. Posterity mourned it yet did not take it as their object lesson, and let later posterity in turn mourn *them*.

Baby Mary thus shouts “Not fair!” at them all, those who miss the whole world-happiness for their petty desires indulged, to their ruin and the ruin of us all. They are real heretics, not as Baby Mary *the* heretic.

Shouldn't we then grade heretics, e.g., paradigmatic individuals, spoilt college kids, and then political rascals? Well, as Baby Mary irritates the parents, so paradigmatics are all heretic-rascals. The mystery of primal self vs. spoilt self

⁶⁴ “天作孽，猶可違，自作孽，不可活 Heaven-pulled woe, still can dodge; self-pulled woe, cannot survive,” (*Mencius* 2A4, 4A9) warns us as To Mu 杜牧 lamented. Johnson's *The Vanity of Human Wishes* was quoted and explained by William Empson, *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (1930), NY: New Directions, 1966, pp. 68-70, without touching the fatal attraction of such egomaniacal vanity. The quotation from Tu Mu concludes his blood-dripping dirge, “阿房宮賦,” in *古文觀止*, 蘇石山編著, 臺南:麗文文化公司, 1994, p. 605.



stays, similar to Zen's "the hill was a hill, then it was not it, and now the hill *is* the hill."

Heresy penetrates orthodoxy as our abhorred rejects seep all over to vitalize *us*. Grading is an act of expectation. So grading would grade away all the *unexpected* sting of the ubiquitous "wrong"; it is orthodoxy budding to kill itself and the history of the tradition, to be vitalized by learning from obnoxious "heretics."

"Come on! How many rascal heretics in history made it to the paradigmatic rank? Do rascals have a chance? They may, they may not. They were heretics to begin with, what was it that may be preventing them from approaching the paradigmatic rank? What enabled the early rascal heretic Jesus to become paradigmatic over the years? No gradation would cheapen the paradigmatic rank!"

Now, all this is *legitimate*, my brother, and your legitimacy is horrific, for it blocks "us correct people" from learning from "them hopeless rascals." *Can* we learn from them, though? As provocation leads evocation, child sacrifice and cannibalism enriched exclusive monotheism, so the socially irredeemable edify, told by a vast number of stories and novels



worldwide. I learned once from a serial killer Jeffrey Dahmer,⁶⁵ who exhibited a primitive pattern of cannibalism.

“Still, are these irredeemables redeemable, even into paradigmatics?” Significantly, it was my Baby Mary who early in 2006 alerted me to “the Gospel According to Judas Iscariot,”⁶⁶ where Jesus urged Judas to sell him to shed his body on the cross into the cosmic Christ; this is exactly Gnosticism rejected *in toto* by the church fathers to shape the Christian orthodoxy.

Thus even Judas the arch-heretic, of whom Jesus said “better never to have been born,”⁶⁷ is now *the* pivotal apostle at the monotheistic core, to restructure Christianity, to urge us to learn from *all* “obnoxious heretics,” even though no book has appeared in the Christian circle yet on how Christians are enriched by such arch-heretic turned arch-hero.

And so, Yes, we must “cheapen *our* high paradigmatic rank” to let the *low* sink in us as cannibalism did Jesus. Here is the rub: We do *not* know who is “heretic to begin with” or who “later comes to ascend to the paradigmatic rank.”⁶⁸ To

⁶⁵ Wu, *On Chinese Body Thinking: A Cultural Hermeneutic*, Leiden: Brill, 1997, pp. 172-173.

⁶⁶ At least seven titles on this Gospel have appeared during the first half of 2006 alone.

⁶⁷ Matthew 26:24(=Mark 14:21). (*Message*, Eugene Peterson)

⁶⁸ Karl Jaspers (*Socrates, Buddha, Confucius, Jesus* [1957], San Diego, CA: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1990) missed the fact that they *were* all



know is divine; for *us* human, to *know* is orthodox hubris, grading is god-pretension to perish as proud orthodoxy. We are sure of one thing alone—to learn from what we now take as *low* heresy (as well as high orthodoxy).

Still, we did oppose Baby Mary to Dad, Baby to spoilt college kid, Christianity to paganism, and paragons to rascals. These contrasts suggest a rough physiognomy, a sort of phenomenology, of “heresy vs. orthodoxy,” as follows.

Baby Mary’s pristine protests “Not fair!” and “It’s a design!” proclaim one’s gut desires as *the* rule. Adulthood comes along to take Baby as wayward, to pit orthodoxy against heresy. The originative process depicts *haireisis*’ etymological turn from self-taking (Baby’s snatching “Mine!”) to heresy (parent’s “No, no.”). Then Baby will later grow up taking in Dad’s “No, no,” adult-fairness, to join subjective desires with objective decency in “all pleasures for all people,” while keeping her Baby-heart intact.

The Baby’s growth consists in keeping the Baby-heart, while *taking in* as she originally protested, “Not fair!”; the spoilt college kid cannot do so but pampers his own desires. This self-indulgence would harden into an orthodox “holier

heretics. Buddha was a rebel (Huston Smith, *The World’s Religions*, HarperSanFrancisco, 1991, pp. 92-99); Confucius was ignored (1/1, 16); Socrates was a sophist (*Apology*); Jesus was a blasphemer (John 10:30-33). Prophets of doom Jeremiah and Ezekiel were *false* prophets.



than thou” sainthood that refuses to take in from outside anything different from the “proper and right”; Baby takes in, spoilt college kid does not.

Now, the Judeo-Christian tradition in all its exclusive monotheism did take in pagan abominations as shown above but, mind you, with “all its exclusive” rejections, as vehemently as it could. It sounds paradoxical, and it is, but it is the essential pattern of human growth-by-assimilation, as is Baby Mary’s “*Not* fair!” that takes. In contrast, inclusive polytheistic religions do not reject foreign elements as they take them.

This exclusive thrust is the spirit of discernment in “critical Socratism” (Marcel). This thrust made all Paradigmatic Individuals Jaspers identified *paradigmatic*—Socrates, Buddha, Confucius, Jesus—socially shunned in their lifetimes, intensely rejected as heretics, or executed as rascals. They were not simple rascals precisely in their *open* critical spirit.

“Saints not decease, great thieves not cease 聖人不死, 大盜不止!” blusters heretic Chuang Tzu (10/16). How devastatingly valid! The repeated “not” critical heretics perform: thieves protest the “holier than thou” to accomplish “saints decease,” as heretics asymptotically reach for “thieves cease” into *true* orthodoxy ever out of reach.



Surveying all such vignettes, however, we still see no taxonomy of truths, still unclear on exactly *what* distinguishes heresy from orthodoxy, though we are struck by the dynamic, *distinct*-indefinable sorts of performances and attitudes. In other words, the heresy-orthodoxy pair has two connotations—attitudinal and evaluative. They connote what we detest vs. admire, and also evil-false vs. good-sublime.

We realize, [a] they are attitudinal *to us*, [b] being no god, we do *not* know the evaluative aspects, and so [c] *our* human obligation is to *accept* attitudinal heresy. Point-[b] shows relativism-nihilism that the dynamics of point-[c] turns into purposeful progress. Detesting heresy to learn from it, Baby Mary's "Not fair!" grabs to grow, to depict *the* great Adult of Mencius. Such dynamics of detesting things to grab them, baby going into adult, boggles our minds.

All this is due to the heresy-orthodoxy distinction being as paradoxical and self-referential as is any ethical notion. Saying "I am humble" denies my humility, yet saying "I'm not humble" is awkward.⁶⁹ We cannot forget Nixon's "I'm not a crook!" and yet we cannot deny being orthodox (correct) without embarrassment, either. The heresy-orthodoxy pair is elusive because they are intensely social and inexpressibly personal. Objective evaluation here is practically impossible

⁶⁹ I could confess "I *was* not humble," but less naturally, "I *was* humble."



yet essential to our social functioning, as we must know who is trustworthy, who is yet so elusive.

Thus heresy and orthodoxy are situation-sensitive, and worse. Indexicals are I, here, now; we pronounce the same “I,” but my “I” is not your “I,” for the “I” is definable not by itself but by its *situation*. The “I” is also *systematically* elusive (I cannot completely describe myself),⁷⁰ so are heresy and orthodoxy protean, unsystematic, and subject-bound. Let us see some examples.

“He’s heretical (or orthodox)” means “I abhor (or adore) him,” “I’m heretical (or orthodox)” is “I’m free (or decent),” all emotively protean, for evaluative attitude is protean, personal. No wonder, “views [were] regarded as heretical which the Church...judged to be so. [O]rthodoxy and heresy [were] not uniformly specified from age to age and from group to group.”⁷¹

⁷⁰ On indexicals, see *Demonstratives*, ed. Palle Yourgrau, Oxford University Press, 1990, Richard M. Gale, “Indexical Signs, Egocentric Particulars, and Token-Reflexive Words,” *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Paul Edwards, NY: Macmillan, 1967, 4:151-155. On “The Systematic Elusiveness of ‘I,’” see Gilbert Ryle, *The Concept of Mind* (1949), London: Hutchinson & Co., 1965, pp. 195-198, Ian Ramsey, *Christian Empiricism*, Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1974, pp.17-31, and Natsume Soseki, *I am a Cat* 夏目漱石, *吾輩は猫である*, 東京:新潮社,平成八年, p. 154. All three books are well-written and mis-titled.

⁷¹ David Larrimore Holland, “Heresy, Renaissance and Later,” *Dictionary of the History of Ideas: Studies of Selected Pivotal Ideas*, ed. Philip P. Wiener, NY: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1973, II: 424-431, esp. 424.



“Still, haven’t you ‘distinguished’ saintly heretics universalizing all our desires to *all* peoples, *from* rascal heretics who do not?” Yes, but it was done with intuition un-systematize-able, gazing far up at Sisyphus’ hilltop of desires united with joys of all, toward which we unceasingly push *our* heresy-rock of self-examination.

Such attitude-value crisscrossing renders senseless theoretical distinctions, four potential situations: dissent is fraud but tradition is not, dissent is not fraud but tradition is, both are frauds, and both are not. We need values, we feel them, but “grading” them falsifies them. Are unpleasant words an advice? It depends on how we take them. The heresy-situation is more complex than such a complex situation.

As saying “I’m normal” denies so,⁷² so moral *expression* is immorality, for life *presents* morality unawares, ostensive words or acts cut it, Taoists tell Confucians, and then Taoists themselves switched Confucian “morality 仁義” into their own, 道德, with a wink. It is quite an affront to our common sense.

The loaded question, “Can virtue be taught?” spun Socrates and Meno into the will-o’-the-wisp of remembrance;

⁷² The spirit of pragmatism expresses life; the pragmatic spirit presents it (Wu, *The “Logic” of Togetherness*, Leiden: Brill, 1998, pp.313-342. See also Wittgensteinian M. O’C. Drury’s insights on wording, *The Danger of Words*, NY: Humanities Press, 1973).



“What is the good?” spun Socrates and friends up the Republic of Health in Heaven. Our “Can heresy and orthodoxy be graded?” as loaded, spun us into the quicksand trickier than indexicals and the I.

What if Judas *the* black, against which all white shines, was sacrificially *playing* black villain (cf. the “Gospel” in his name)? Was his heresy now orthodoxy, or was his “ortho doxy” part of the high priests’ heresy?⁷³ Such confusing possibilities show how impossible it is to objectively grade “heresy” meant for self-examination. So, heresy-orthodoxy values go by attitudes, felt but hard to see, and *expressing* them falsifies them.

Now, however, doesn’t such talk itself cut a *heretical* figure? Thus, heresy, tradition, and history, these three remain, and *the* crucial push behind them is heretical *nisus* “Not fair!,” the Baby Mother “taking oneself” for us all. Realizing so, we also realize that the “*God* who knows” is the Tao Pivot, the Yin-Yang entwining. Baby Mary shouts Yin-heretical “Not fair!” to grow up to be *the* Yang-orthodox Adult losing no Baby Heart. How does she grow up?

A “**quotable**magnets” says, “always make new mistakes (esther dyson),” but we cannot *make* mistakes, nor can we

⁷³ Professor David Schenker kindly supplied such fascinating possibilities, for which I am grateful.



purposely make *new* ones, much less *always*. For all this, making the same mistakes stays in the same rut and, being imperfect, we do make mistakes (or realize so *post hoc*), and making *new* mistakes makes progress by learning from old ones. Still, no one *wants* to make mistakes, for they are defects no one wants; we only see them in *others*, *post hoc*. So we need unwanted mistakes—what a bind!

Heretics are here to help. They tell us *we* are mistaken, we tell them *they* are, not *post hoc* but *now*; heretics force us all to self-examine. So we need unwelcome heretics, to make *new* Yin-mistakes to make small Yang-successes *each* day, to inherit the tradition of progress, to push its history up Sisyphus' hill of mistakes.

Pushing up our rocks of *new*-mistakes is enough to fill our hearts, in Peace of Ineffable Joy. Let us join gentle *heretic* Lennon's Placid Joy, born of the provocative trinity on the go—heresy, tradition, history—in our Sisyphus journey of *Homo Viator*, through this world and the beyond.

Imagine by *John Lennon*

...

Imagine there's no countries

It isn't hard to do

Nothing to kill or die for

And no religion too



Imagine all the people
Living life in peace...

...

And the world will be as one

Imagine no possessions
I wonder if you can
No need for greed or hunger
A brotherhood of man
Imagine all the people
Sharing all the world...

You may say I'm a dreamer
But I'm not the only one
I hope someday you'll join us
And the world will live as one.

A Wrap-up: Heresy the Negative Dialectic to Advance

We find us “correct” by finding “heretics” to loudly oppose them, and then, quietly, we are enriched-in-synthesis. Here thesis and antithesis are interlocked negatively; its negativity spells “heresy” to explain how heresy breeds orthodoxy. Such is what this essay has been insisting. Let us go slower.



Honesty must show *through* me, yet I must not show it *off*; for my showoff blocks honesty from showing through transparently. Still, I-transparency is tricky. I *cannot* say “normal,” for to say “I’m normal” shows me abnormal; but I *cannot* not-say “normal,” either, for it is such discrimination that makes “saying” possible.

Now, this twofold “cannot” spells heresy, an origivative push of the negative dialectic. Hegel’s positive dialectic is Platonic, *ending* in the Absolute Geist. In contrast, heresy is put as a thesis of “cannot” to incite an antithesis of “orthodoxy,” for orthodoxy to be enriched by heresy. Heresy on its part turns an antithesis to orthodoxy that comes as a thesis attacking, only to enrich heresy.

This negative dialectic never ends, with a felt provisional discrimination that emerges to enrich; so does this negative dialectic go on. Thus the “cannot” is the push of heresy that vitalizes the tradition, the Sisyphus’ push that makes history. In this orthodoxy-heresy interlocking, which comes first? It seems a chicken-or-egg dilemma.

In so far as “heresy” does not exist until recognized by others as obnoxiously different, heresy owes its existence to those others. In so far as those “others” do not self-proclaim as “orthodoxy” until labeling others as “heresy” the obnoxiously different, orthodoxy owes its existence to heretics. Here,



recognizing the difference as obnoxious and labeling them as “heretical” generates the inter-owing of inter-existence of orthodoxy and heresy.

Thus heresy comes first, after all; our being “right” emerges as we oppose the obnoxiously different as “wrong.” All we know is this Yin-of-“wrong” provoking the our Yang -of-“right,” and such inter-arising via inter-opposition—so it is not quite a Buddhist co-arising—leads to inter-learning, thereby must lead to inter-enrichment.

What Heretics are:

We have been considering heretics, but *what* are they, really? Strange that this basic question is raised at this late stage, but there is a good reason for this. It is that heresy and heretics are quite elusive, and we have had to consider many things so far on heresy to prepare ourselves to grasp what it really is. We have three points here, Proteus, Baby Mary, and mistake-making.

ONE Proteus: Heretics remind us of a “minor” Greek god Proteus, whose elusiveness helps us understand heretics’. Proteus is a sea-god, as treacherous as sea, changing himself at will into fire, flood, and ferocious monster, and is wise with the wisdom on what is to come; he is a protean god of the



future. Though quite slippery, he was finally captured with his own daughter's counsel, "Hang on to him!"⁷⁴

Heretics are our own elusive Proteus, because heretics are also elusive as our own "self." Strangely but significantly, considering the heretic amounts to considering the self, for one is as elusive and important as the other; in fact nothing is more important than either, as we shall see now.

Let us see the self first. Hume famously puzzled that he could not catch himself, only a bundle of sensations. Ryle explained it, saying that the self cannot be caught because the self describing the self must include describing this self-describing, and this describing of self-describing requires describing this describing, and...—in short, there can be no end to such self-description. Ryle called this situation, "the systematic elusiveness of 'I,'" over which Ramsey quibbled but in the end agreed with both Hume and Ryle. Natsume Soseki said via his "cat" that describing 24 hours' life requires

⁷⁴ "Proteus, in Homer's *Odyssey* (4. 351) a minor sea-god, who herds the seals, knows all things, and has the power of assuming different shapes in order to escape answering questions; this he will do if held until he resumes his true shape..." (*The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature*, ed. M. C. Howatson, New Edition, Oxford University Press, 1989, p. 470.) See also Edith Hamilton, *Mythology*, Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1942, pp. 42, 298-299, 427, and Thomas Bulfinch, *Bulfinch's Mythology*, NY: The Modern Library, 1993, pp. 162, 178. Proteus is so "minor" that he is not listed in Kevin Osborn and Dana L. Burgess, *The Complete Idiot's Guide to Classical Mythology*, Indianapolis: Alpha Books, 1998.



24 more hours, and there is no end to duplicating such rounds of “24 hours.”⁷⁵

Now, if self-knowledge is important, so is its part, self-description; either is so elusively impossible, however, as to require a third party such as a “cat.” This “cat” happens to be as obnoxious a gadfly as heretic Socrates, and the heretic is as elusive as Proteus. Gadfly Socrates warns that, as an unexamined life is not worth living, so an unexamined orthodoxy is not worth having, being in the right is not worth being, although we all want to be in the right, to be orthodox.

Such self-examination is made on the basis of elusive self-description and conducted by elusive heretics, led by gadfly Socrates. “Elusive” here is “minor” in our consciousness; we want to forget such heretics egging us on for uncomfortable self-examination, and because of this elusiveness heretics are harbinger of our elusive future.

If all this is valid—elusively valid—then nothing is more important than heretical elusiveness. We smile at the “minor god” Proteus elusive, and we must hold on to him no matter

⁷⁵ David Hume, *Treatise of Human Nature*, ed. Selby-Bigge, p. 252. Gilbert Ryle, *The Concept of Mind*, London: Hutchinson, 1949, pp. 195-198. Ian T. Ramsey, *Christian Empiricism*, London: Sheldon Press, 1974, pp. 17-31. Natsume Soseki, *I am A Cat*, 夏目漱石, *吾輩は猫である*, 東京:新潮社, 平成八年, p. 154.



what to derive wisdom from him for our future. We do not know that he is our self, our heretic, nothing “minor” about this “god”; luckily Socrates cherished his elusive Daimon. To better our elusive self we must grab our obnoxious heretic as elusive.

Now, the heretics are quite elusively Protean, they can be as beloved as Baby Mary, can be as obnoxious as pagan abominations, and can be all things critical in between. Besides, Baby Mary’s “Not fair!” grows from protesting our “No, no, Mary!” to achieving the grabbing of all for all people, otherwise “Not fair!”

Abominations, on their part, were obnoxious paganism, such as human sacrifice, cannibalism; now they turn central to the orthodoxy of exclusive Christianity, such as Christ on the cross and his Eucharist, as we saw above in surprise. Heretics are Protean, indeed; we must hang on to them to obtain wisdom of such sort, and many others.

Especially, we must hang on to know what such heretics amount to. Heresy and heretic originated in *hairesis*, grabbing, grabbing what one desires, royal grabbing of a city or heretical grabbing of oneself. In doing so, heresy-heretics *break* the “rules” of what it means to be in the right. Rule-breaking is obnoxious, a mistake. Such “mistake” we judge according to “our orthodox rules,” so without orthodox



rules there would have been no mistakes, right? So we the orthodox people think. Are we sure?

People say it is the mountain that makes the valley, for mountain is visible, not valley. Taoists quietly point at the valley, saying, “It is the valley that makes the mountain high.” People laugh and say, “You have eyes, and you do not see the big mountains?” Taoists say, “Having eyes, you must see deep valleys usually not seen.”

Similarly, we assume that the right judges something to be mistaken, until we are shocked by *mistakes* to find what is to count as “right.”⁷⁶ I remember my friend indiscriminately added “the” to every word, to jolt me into seeing where “the” properly belongs. It was the “the”-improper leading me to “the”-proper, not the other way around.

Thus “mistake” is rule-breaking, full of pep enough to strike out in new unheard-of direction, and this “striking out” is the grabbing of what strikes our fancy. This grabbing to one’s desires is connected to “mistake,” but what a strange connection it is, self-grabbing as mistake! How could self-grabbing be a mistake, how could taking oneself be taking amiss?

⁷⁶ I mentioned this point to a scholar-friend of mine, and he turned furious, saying I was totally wrong.



We must remember that, for Baby Mary, there is nothing mistaken about taking things desired. That is why she protested, “Not fair!” Here is an equation of calumny, heresy-grabbing as mistake, as abominable. Such equation indicates the dynamics of the inter-personal, quite unpleasant, and yet, so says our Proteus heretic, it often turns out beneficial; gadfly-stinging provocation is how heresy works, by bringing in branded “mistake abominable.”

For all this, however, we must further remember, that this negative dynamics is not what the heretics purposely make, for it would be insane to say “I am abominable.” “Heresy as abominable” is the word describing the *outsider’s reaction*, as most of nouns are. Scandalous word “heresy” few would claim to themselves. Seldom do we say, “I am a heretic,” or “my view is heretical”; or if we say so, we always add, “to Mr. A” or “to those people,” attributing the name “heretic” to originate in someone *else* than we.

Since, no one wants to claim being a “heretic,” the heretics’ function is forever *elusive*, unbeknown to heretics themselves, much less to those who reject them. Perhaps “function” here is loaded; it is really influence, impact, radioactive *unawares*, for we do not want to see it, it is so negative we must violently reject it. And then while we are rejecting, we benefit from it unawares, incredibly.



It is thus that we see here the elusive unity of threat and origin to our identity, the gadfly that loves us, in the ugly Socrates. Here is the incredible and impossible Yin-Yang unity, internecine, inter-nascent, enrichment in destruction. How we deal with such a terrifying unity?

The counsel on how to deal with Proteus applies here with vengeance—Hang on to the heresy, never let it go! Then we will find the heretic Protean Socrates is not obnoxious though slippery—remember Socratic method, Socratic irony, and Socratic maieutics—and wise as heretics.

Remember Proteus is a *minor* god; likewise heresy we wish to relegate to “minor” part in life, for we don’t want to be bothered, we want to “pass it by on the other side,” as the orthodox priest and Levi did, says the arch-heretic Jesus (Luke 10:31-32), “ignore” it, as Confucius sighed (1/1), and “forget” it all, as Heidegger said that we forget Being. But the heretic Socrates did not forget his Daimon, that still small voice that restrains us as our conscience does.

Heretic Jesus, on his part, jumps on the elusiveness of the whole matter here. He said, “Become light and become salt.” Become light that cannot be seen but lets things appear for us to see; we must keep up our inner light—become heretic by grabbing ourselves—to shine *out* unawares.



And we must become salt that stings and preserve things on contact, by pervading them; we must be salt to sting our self and others to preserve the integrity via stinging self-examination. Neither light nor salt can be hid, nor can heresy. We must become heretics to ourselves and to others, to keep ourselves and others on toes, alive, forever self-examining.

Now, here is a special case of heresy, Baby Mary contrary, to show that the heretics themselves keep their baby-hearts (*Mencius* 4B12). Babies *grow* multi- dimensionally, and they *are* multidimensional. They are themselves; they are “wrong” often; their “wrongs” are instructive; they are heretics, so attractive in a strange way; they are never scandalous.

Here is an oxymoron “beloved heretic” or “instructive wrong.” She shouted “Not fair!” at her parents, the spoiled college student refuses to learn, and rotten dictators—they are all heretics each with different meanings, with an insistent call to us to learn. All this is so elusive, yet we had better hang on to it—as we have so far—to derive wisdom from it, to become Mencius’ Great Adult, to make Confucius’ tradition and human history.

An arch-heretic Jesus declares he came “not to destroy but to fulfill the law” of Truth, by sending “not peace but



sword”⁷⁷ of devastating critiques; he is the gadfly biting into cozy self-repose to keep us on edge, hanging on to our dear selves. The temptation to comfortable orthodoxy is forever with us, locking ourselves into a whitewashed sepulcher of snobbish outside filled inside with defilements of hubris, prejudices.

Grave-cleansing is bothersome, and the pain blesses. The cleansing pain to health is granted us by heresy from outside—we cannot do it to ourselves from inside—to bring us back to our “self,” to take-oneself that is the true meaning of “heresy.” Thus both heresy and orthodoxy are intertwined into inter-verbs, always on the go, unstable, to *be* ourselves. Emerson calls such instability “truth,” perhaps the truth of authenticity, when he said,⁷⁸

God offers to every mind its choice between truth and repose. Take what you please—you can never have both. Between them as a pendulum, man oscillates. He in whom the love of repose predominates will accept the first creed, the first philosophy, the first political party, he meets—most likely his father’s. He gets rest, commodity and reputation: but he shuts

⁷⁷ Matthew 5:17, 10: 34.

⁷⁸ “Intellect,” in *The Essential Writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, ed. Brooks Atkinson, NY: The Modern Library, 2000, p. 271.



the door of truth. He in whom the love of truth predominates will keep himself aloof from all moorings, and afloat. He will abstain from dogmatism, and recognizes all the opposite negations between which, as walls, his being is swung. He submits to the inconveniences of suspense and imperfect opinions, but he is a candidate for truth, as the other is not, and respects the highest law of his being.

A heretic Confucius confessed to enjoying happily such continuous learning within the very uncertainties of life, at the opening of his work *The Analects*. Heretics are Natsume Soseki's "cat" outside our species, so humiliating to us, our mirror so detestable as gadfly, to help us correct—and correction is always painful—our elusive "self."

We must hang on to the heretics as we do slippery Proteus to yield wisdom on our own future. Heretics are our Socratic Daimon forever with us to restrain, to nudge us to examine, our Proteus-conscience elusive as our "self." We go this way, and they are here, we go that way, and they are there, forever beside us beyond us.

We would rather be without these heretics to go "on our own," when they pull us aside to see how "on our own" goes contrary to "our own" integrity, which is "Not fair!" to us. Now, have you seen the whole bit here repeating itself? In this



repetition, have you seen kids repeating things important to them? It's time we go meet children.

TWO Baby Mary: Now do not forget. The connection of Baby Mary with heresy is never accidental but quite intrinsic, inevitable, and ineluctable. An arch-heretic Jesus throws a bombshell at us, “Children are the greatest in the Kingdom of God,” not “the perfect sages are.”

Now, children being imperfect and the Kingdom being the Perfect place, how could the imperfect be the greatest in the Realm of Perfection? How could anyone learn to become imperfect, least of all when children themselves do not want to stay as themselves, as we see a baby pointing at another, saying, “Baby!”? This is the challenge of heresy the arch-heretic Jesus throws at us. We must look at imperfect children to learn about perfection.

We see no child wants to stay being a child. To be a child is to be eager to leave their now, to learn from adults the perfect, as they proudly declare, “Mom knows!” We adults must, then, become the child keenly aware of being imperfect, the child-who-learns from others—and *such* is the greatest of perfection in the kingdom of perfection.

To state as above sounds quite irrational, however. To appreciate how irrational it is, let us look at imperfection.



No one wants to become imperfect by learning from imperfection, for it is impossible to learn from imperfection, much less become imperfect, and yet to learn from children to honestly admit being imperfect, however painfully humiliating, is the only access to learning, and such painful admission and learning is the only way to grow toward perfecting oneself, as children do.

Now we begin to see the closest of connection between Baby Mary and heresy. No baby wants to be called “Baby!”; no one wants to become or be called a “heretic,” and in fact, no one can honestly call oneself a heretic. Still, Baby Mary is keenly aware of being a baby and tries hard to grow out of babyhood. Likewise, it is being keenly self-aware of being obnoxious as heretic, and trying hard to leave that abominable situation, that is heresy. In fact, such mindset of heresy is the spirit of orthodoxy *alive*, the greatest in the Kingdom of orthodoxy. A further explanation is in order. Let us look at the child again.

Almost all of us love children, yet not many realize that all childhood virtues we adults admire stem from the child being self-aware of imperfection. Imperfection *accepts*, as Lao Tzu would say, and honest acceptance breeds trust, purity, spontaneity, humility, and self-forgetfulness, all the beautiful virtues that we think belong to orthodoxy. But these virtues



stem from imperfection, or rather, self-awareness of imperfection of the child. Imperfection we hate rhymes with heresy we hate. Orthodoxy stems from childhood-heresy, then. We had better explain why.

Heresy shares with childhood a self-awareness of imperfection no one wants, not the child, not the heretic. The child is a heretic internalized, self-aware of imperfection that is oneself, and abhors it. To know oneself imperfect makes for self-dissatisfaction, to induce going out to criticize oneself. Self-criticism is one most radical and effective way of self-improvement. Beware, however. Someone outside oneself spells a “heretic” one does not want to see.

The child is one who internalizes this hated outsider to grow out of oneself; growth means growing out of oneself. Likewise, to internalize self-criticism, to internalize—accept—heresy is to grow orthodox *outside* oneself to grow into orthodoxy; to grow into orthodoxy *is* orthodoxy.

Now we understand. “Unless you turn around and become one of these little children, you will never enter the Kingdom of God.” Unless you turn around and become one of the imperfect ones you will never enter the Realm of Perfection. Unless you turn around to internalize the obnoxious heretic, you will never be orthodox. “The Great Adults are ones who lose none of their baby-hearts.” The orthodox is one who loses none of his



heresy-warnings inside, Baby Mary protesting “Not fair!” to our true Self.

If admiration of heroes pulls us forward, rejection of heretics stings us into self-examination that leads to digestion of heresy, unawares. Heresy performs hero-worship negative way. Heresy is anti-heroism; the heretic is our anti-hero. Both heroes and anti-heroes pull us forward, one in reverence, the other with horror. Both admiration and abomination, Yes and No, compose Baby Mary. Admiration we know, Abomination we did not realize belongs also to Baby Mary. Now abomination is sibling to mistakes.

THREE Mistake-Making: So let us put the whole matter another way. What all this amounts to is this curious human fact of mistake-making. Everyone admits that to err is human, for being human is to be imperfect, yet no one would *like* to admit that one is mistaken “now.” Mistake is unavoidable yet we hate to admit it. Thus humanity is caught between an admission of being mistake-prone and its concrete denial.

Combined, this fascinating twofold fact of mistake-making indicates past-cleaning for progress ahead. Thanks to mistakes we have made that we hate, we learn to clean up our soiled past toward a “better” future, perhaps—because we are imperfect and mistake-prone—by making *new* mistakes, and the process repeats to better ourselves.



In all this, “mistake”-making is in time, not a standstill, thanks to combining admission of unavoidable mistake-making with concrete denial of *me* having made this mistake, much less *now* making it. Socrates and Royce,⁷⁹ in their awesomely complex probes into “how errors are possible,” recognize the general fact of our making mistakes and overlook the specific fact that no one wishes to make mistakes, much less admit them. Both men overlook “mistake” as a time-retrospective verb, not a noun ready for analysis.

Two important implications can be drawn from this fact—a strange combination of general admission and specific denial, mistake as time-dynamic. One, no one would purposely make mistakes, for mistake is defect no one wishes to own, even while admitting the human as imperfect erring. So, two, mistakes are recognized in someone *else* than us, not us, and else-when, sometime before, not now (not even then-soon).

Let me repeat. Mistake is a retrospective verb of our looking backward to realize what we have done as a mistake that we never admit now or later, for no one wants to make mistakes or plans to make them. Mistake does *not* exist opposed to no-mistake at the same *time*, as if we could say,

⁷⁹ See Socrates’ Dialogue of *Theaetetus* and Josiah Royce’s *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy* (1885), *The World and the Individual* (1900).



“This is mistake; that is no-mistake,” on a par with “This is false, and that is true.”

All this makes “heretics” obnoxious, reminding us of mistakes we all hate and don’t want to make; we think *they* are mistaken, while they point at us to self-examine our own mistakes. Still, progress is made only by making mistakes, to own and correct. Progress is made by correcting mistakes, mistakes can be corrected only when admitted, and heretics goad us to admit *our* mistakes, much as we loathe to. Heretics are thus our loathsome agents of progress we need, our “necessary evil” because mistakes are.

To be precise, progress can be made only by owning and correcting mistakes we have made, to make room for making *new* mistakes soon—to err being human—so as to make progress by reenacting the process of owning and correcting our new mistakes. In order to do so, however, we forever need the obnoxious heretics to goad us toward admitting and correcting mistakes newly made, again and again.

“Orthodoxy” is the process of becoming orthodox by correction, or rather, the process of striving to become orthodox by striving to correct ourselves against smug self-satisfaction. This process requires heretics to goad us to admit our mistakes and correct them, again and again. Orthodoxy is born of the obnoxious womb of heretics.



Now, have we realized it? The matter of heresy is protean as Proteus is unpredictable, for heresy grows defiantly as Baby Mary against the status quo, and such dynamics of growth is the verb of mistake-making at the core of our progress. In the midst of all this protean dynamics of growing progress beyond expectation, the central dynamo is what we hate, heresy and its agent the heretic.

Fascinatingly, we never welcome heretics into our orthodox pride, but violently reject them, and strangely, we learn deeply from them to enrich, enlighten, and rectify our status quo, precisely in our violent zealous attacks on heretics. Heresy is a negative dialectic of positive progress, a much needed dynamo to orthodoxy the orthodox abhor and reject. Nothing is more strangely fascinating than such heretics that help orthodoxy, making orthodoxy orthodox, precisely by their rejection.

This essay is a plea for a push to the new. A day is “new,” “day new, day new, again day new,” since the days of King T’ang several millennia ago as he bathed in his metal bathtub on which the saying is carved. This essay then insists that the new comes by handling mistakes, the push forward anew is made by knowing mistakes, and to know mistakes to correct them is the mission of heresy. Heresy is our needed push forward.



To put it another way, the new is a happy happenstance called mistakes, what a painter Bob Ross calls “happy accident” that occasions new direction in new creation. We follow along with the mistake made 將錯就錯, as if to scheme along with what is schemed 將計就計 by accident.

“Can’t we make progress by improving on our success made before? Doesn’t such an improvement on success bypass mistakes?” Well, an improvement of a former success is a “breakthrough,” which amounts to taking the former success as “mistake” to break through it. Similarly sudden realization 頓悟 is a breakthrough out of boring routines.

To err is human, so learning from old mistake to make new ones is making new advances. When asked what he was drawing, Tommy casually said, “How would I know? I’m not finished yet.” Musician artist Yehudi Menuhin’s book on his life is titled *Unfinished Journey* (1977) and *Unfinished Journey—Twenty Years Later* (1999, Fromm International). He can never finish his life-journey; he is a Tommy.

In all this “mistake” is crucial, with which heresy has much to do. Orthodoxy and heresy are the rhythm of this mistake-push to the new in life’s heartbeat. Orthodoxy⁸⁰ is

⁸⁰ A sneaky way to turn “orthodox” is to specialize. Specialty indispensably helps understanding something thoroughly, yet it tempts us to turn “help” into “substitution.”



the diastole-rest, and heresy is the systole-squeeze, Tommy's happy accident of new mistake-journey.

Such is far from an aberration, or rather, this "aberration" is the core, the pivot, of living. Without this push via mistakes, there is no life. To err being human, we always make mistakes. The critical point of life is to know them (heresy tells us), learn from them (orthodoxy hopes to do), and make new mistakes again (orthodoxy points so at heresy, heresy points so at orthodoxy).

This is what happened in Chuang Tzu's conversation with a roadside skull, each criticizing the other, as reported by living Chuang Tzu, forever living for 2,400 years now. Viewed in this living forever, death is joy forever. This is the movement-form of life-music, dissonance in harmony, harmony in dissonance-learning, the Yin-Yang pulsing push alive. Mistake-handling is its life-pulse, and heresy is its expert.

Now, this essay has been in a long process of writing, trying to, if possible, systematize it, but systematization has proved impossible. The reason must lie in that "heresy" is no noun but a process of criticism, appropriated by those who resent the critics as "out of line," calling them "heretics" who yet may not mean to criticize.



“Heresy” is a verbal abuse, an attack on those disliked by “orthodox” people, who everyone is, for everyone wants to be in the right, and so Diogenes failed to find a single self-admitted “wrong person”. Occasionally we have “critics” who resent being cozy in the warm comfort of “orthodoxy,” but even the self-proclaimed critics, such as Socrates, do not claim to be a “heretic”; Socrates confidently claimed he *was* right, divinely warranted at Delphi, in his final hour of self-defense in the *Apology*.

Still, it remains a fact that heresy breeds orthodoxy meaningless without heresy; both interdepend to inter-exist. All people want to be correct, in truth, and point fingers at others, calling *them* “heretics.” Heretics are always other people, in the wrong. As dynamics of opprobrium heresy leads us to inter-learning to inter-enrich. In resentment, orthodox people accept and learn from heretics, though heretics are yet to be enriched by orthodox people, for seldom do heretics regard the orthodox as orthodox.

Heresy-orthodoxy controversy centers not on truth but on *others*’ “mistakes.” “Mistake” is a verb of retrospective realization; no one makes a mistake now on purpose. Everyone realizes *later* that what has been done in good conscience was a



mistake.⁸¹ Heretics are those who, meant to or not, *force* “us” correct people to shorten—in fact, cancel out—our period of retrospection, to make our sober realization-later happen *now*, while we are doing something “correct” in good conscience.

This strange dynamics, negative for positive, positive in negative, is also what makes it impossible to stamp out heretics, much as we love to, much as we try. The more we try, the more they spread and increase, and the more we benefit from them, however we detest, and struggle to stamp them out. What a strange dynamics heresy is, indeed.

We appropriate heresy in our own way, much as we detest it calling it abomination. This strange appropriation is done in opprobrium, not in appreciation. This is why heresy is a negative dialectics and, strange as it is, such strangely reverse dynamics is *indispensable* to our growth in every aspect, social, political, religious, as well as cultural, and in every region of the world, China, East Asia and beyond.

Heresy represents whatever that grates “us” wrong, to provoke us to stand up as “we” against “they.” Thus heresy is our negative support, our enemy our friend whom we accept by

⁸¹ So, Socrates and Royce’s question, “How is error possible?” is in error, taking mistakes as being made now with correct deeds, on the *same* simultaneous logical plane.



rejection,⁸² Hegel's dialectical process upside down.⁸³ The enemy attacks us as⁸⁴ pain, injustice, sorrows and hunger come crushing us, yet they come to strengthen our sinews, sift out our dross, and refine-deepen us into exquisite excellence.⁸⁵ They are our destructive critics the devil whose challenges we detest to sift and warily incorporate.

Thus strange as it may seem, what we take as destructive atrocities, unreasonable injustice, and abominable irregularities, are what push us ahead wiser, stronger in stamina and wealthier in resources. Voltaire said, "If God did not exist, it would be necessary to invent Him"⁸⁶; we insist, "If devil did not exist, it would be necessary to invent him." Now, if evil is to be conquered to benefit us, as heresy is to be opposed to enrich us, where is the argument from evil against all-power-loving God?

⁸² Jesus told us to "love your enemies," our heretics whom we accept as we reject, "and a man's enemies will be those of his own household," the enemies who are our own, our orthodox people we must oppose (Matthew 5:44, 10: 36, NKJV).

⁸³ Kierkegaard could be said to have practiced Hegel's dialectics upside down, but not in *our* way.

⁸⁴ I am treading on thin ice here. Fight against heresy is not quite suffering from injustice. I link them here because they are linked somehow. Hitlerism caused so much unjust pain; devil is behind evil. We do fight both with disgust for our survival and toughening.

⁸⁵ Mencius passionately said so (6B15).

⁸⁶ Voltaire, *Epître à l'Auteur du Livre des Trois Imposteurs*, November 10, 1770.



Lao Tzu sighed long (58), “O woe where weal leans! O weal where woe lies!” Woe and weal are sworn enemies-*and*-friends in time, and so our issues are not to resolve but to live with, our problems less to solve than to live in. Every burden is to be made into a blessing. *How* to fulfill this life-task is crucial. This essay has tried to delineate this how in the way of heresy. Heresy is what *makes* tradition and history to live on. There would have been no abiding human greatness were there no heresies.



List of Citations

The Analects (論語)

Hacienda Brothers. 2006. *What's Wrong with Right, Proper Records.*

Emil Brunner. 1947. *The Divine Imperative*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Albert Camus. 1959. *The Myth of Sisyphus*, NY: Random House.

Wing-tsit Chan. 1963. *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy*. Princeton University Press.

戰國策. 民 87. 臺北: 三民書局.

Chuang Tzu 莊子

Christina Chekalos. August 2004. "New Leash on Life: Puppy Love Behind Bars," *Smithsonian*.

Demonstratives. 1990. ed. Palle Yourgrau, Oxford University Press.

Michel de Montaigne. 1958. *Essays* (1580), Penguin Books.

Jacqueline de Romilly. 1992. *The Great Sophists in Periclean Athens*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Dictionary of the History of Ideas: Studies of Selected Pivotal



Ideas. 1973. ed. Philip P. Wiener, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.

M. O'C. Drury. 1973. *The Danger of Words*. NY: Humanities Press.

Mircea Eliade. 1982. *A History of Religious Ideas: vol. 2: from Gautama Buddha to the Triumph of Christianity* (1978), tr. W. R. Trask, University of Chicago Press.

Walter A. Elwell. ed. 1996. *Baker: Theological Dictionary of the Bible*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

The Essential Writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson. 2000. ed. Brooks Atkinson, NY: The Modern Library.

William Empson. 1966. *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (1930), NY: New Directions.

The Encyclopedia of Philosophy. 1967. ed. Paul Edwards, NY: Macmillan.

John T. Fitzgerald. 1988. *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel: An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthian Correspondence*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Samuel Fleischacker. 1994. *The Ethics of Culture*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.



- Edith Hamilton. 1942. *Mythology*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co.
- Robert Hass. ed. 1994. *The Essential Haiku: Versions of Basho, Buson, & Issa*, Hopewell, NJ: The Ecco Press.
- R. Joseph Hoffmann. 1987. *Celsus on the True Doctrine: A Discourse against the Christians*. Oxford University Press.
- David Hume. 1988. *A Treatise of Human Nature* (1739-1740), ed. Selby-Bigge. Cambridge University Press..
- Karl Jaspers. 1990. *Socrates, Buddha, Confucius, Jesus: The Paradigmatic Individuals* (1957), San Diego: Harcourt Brace & Co.
- Immanuel Kant. 1965. *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781). Tr. Norman Kemp Smith, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- 國語. 2006. 臺北: 三民書局.
- 古文觀止. 1994. 蘇石山編著, 臺南: 麗文文化公司.
- Susan K. Langer. 1949. "On Cassirer's Theory of Language and Myth," *The Philosophy of Ernst Cassirer*, ed. Paul A. Schilpp, La Salle, IL: Open Court.
- H. G. Liddell and R. Scott. 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford at the Clarendon Press.
- Gabriel Marcel. 1962. *Homo Viator: A Metaphysic of Hope*



(1951), NY: Harper & Row.

Dale B. Martin. 1990. *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

孟子

Merriam-Webster's Encyclopedia of World Religions. 1999. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.

Ashley Montagu. 1961. *Man in Process*. NY: Mentor Book.

Natsume Soseki. 夏目漱石, 平成八年. *吾輩は猫である*. 東京: 新潮社.

Kevin Osborn and Dana L. Burgess. 1998. *The Complete Idiot's Guide to Classical Mythology*, Indianapolis: Alpha Books.

The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature. 1989. ed. M. C. Howatson, New Edition, Oxford University Press.

H. J. Paton. 1927. *The Good Will*, London: George Allen & Unwin.

Eugene H. Peterson. 2002. *The Message: The Bible in Contemporary Language*. Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress.

Michael Polanyi. 1964. *Science, Faith and Society*, The University of Chicago Press.



- Ian T. Ramsey. 1974. *Christian Empiricism*. London: Sheldon Press.
- Josiah Royce. 1958. *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy* (1885). NY: Harper Torchbooks.
- Josiah Royce. 1959. *The World and the Individual* (1900). NY:Dover Publications.
- Gilbert Ryle. 1949. *The Concept of Mind*. London: Hutchinson.
- Heinrich Schlier's "haireomai." 1964. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. G. Kittel, Grand Rapids, MI: Wm Eerdmans Publishing Co., I: 180-186.
- William Shakespeare: The Complete Works, Compact Edition*. 1988. eds. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Donald W. Sherburne. 1966. *A Key to Whitehead's Process and Reality*. University of Chicago Press.
- Charles W. F. Smith. 1969. *The Paradox of Jesus in the Gospels*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Huston Smith. 1991. *The World's Religions*. Harper San: Francisco.
- Socrates' Dialogue of *Theaetetus*. *Plato: Complete Works*.



1997. ed. John M. Cooper. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Co.

Karel van der Toom, Bob Becking, Pieter V. van der Horst, eds. 1995. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, eds., Leiden: E. J. Brill.

A. N. Whitehead. 1978. *Process and Reality: Corrected Edition*. eds. David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne. NY: Free Press.

A. N. Whitehead. 1953. *Science and the Modern World* (1925), NY: Free Press.

Kuang-ming Wu. 1990. *The Butterfly as Companion*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kuang-ming Wu. 1997. *On Chinese Body Thinking: A Cultural Hermeneutic*, Leiden: Brill.

Kuang-ming Wu. 1998. *The "Logic" of Togetherness: A Cultural Hermeneutic*, Leiden: Brill.



異端，傳統，歷史

吳光明*

摘要

本論文有三要點：第一點說明「異端」(如其希臘語源所示)「佔取自我」而激發社會定義其因習為「正統」以自衛反對異端——這是社會成長之痛苦，此即「異端」。第二點說明：論爭「異端」的中心在於從錯誤學習——這是「嬰孩瑪利」抗拒「正統」而滌清之，此即「傳統」的真意。第三點談論病痛、殘忍、瘋狂等人生不愉快的「異端」——這是「歷史」的負面的辯證性推力。故如今常存者有三：異端、傳統，及歷史，其中重要的推動力關鍵是異端。

關鍵詞：異端、正統、錯誤、學習、嬰孩瑪利、傳統、歷史

*美國丹佛大學哲學教授

