

UNITED WISDOM

Zhuangzi: Changing Perspective and the Limits of Certainty

Traditions and Worldviews

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-23-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Zhuangzi: Changing Perspective and the Limits of Certainty

Epigraph

> *“Life is limited, but knowledge has no limit.”*

Zhuangzi, chapter 3, opening sentence. Editorial English translation of our Russian rendering of Columbia’s English selection, *Sources of Chinese Tradition*, 1999, pp. 103–104; not a verified published English quotation. The sentence questions the cost of endlessly pursuing knowledge, not demands abandonment of understanding.

About this article

The knife passes easily between joints. To an observer, the work seems to happen by itself. But the master reaches a difficult place, stops the habitual movement, and looks closely. That pause is easily missed when Cook Ding’s story in the *Zhuangzi* becomes a hymn to spontaneity.

The master’s confidence does not consist in never doubting. He distinguishes where familiar skill suffices from where it must yield to care. This opens a book that repeatedly unsettles readers’ certainty without requiring them to stop understanding, acting, or learning.

How does judgment change with viewpoint? Can we acknowledge limited knowledge and still prefer a more accurate decision to a less accurate one? We will examine the book’s literary form and stories of butterfly, tree, and cook, then distinguish openness to other perspectives from indifference to truth. The contemporary examples serve our analysis; the ancient book was not a manual for workplace conflicts.

I. A book that does not speak with one voice

The *Zhuangzi* is a composite text associated with Zhuang Zhou, not a transcript of one teacher’s sequential course. It contains dialogues, fantastic journeys, paradoxes, and artisans’ stories. Inner, Outer, and Miscellaneous Chapters are conventionally distinguished, but precise authorship remains under study. The IEP academic overview specifies that “Zhuangzi” in philosophical discussion often refers to the text’s ideas rather than a securely established historical person’s opinion.

This directly affects reading. A surprising speech by a character called Confucius cannot immediately be added to Confucius’s biography. A wise person refusing office in one story

does not make refusal a universal rule. Literary voice, dramatic situation, and concluding instruction are different levels.

A parable first makes us accept an evaluative order, then confront what it cannot accommodate. We see a tree through a carpenter, skill through a spectator, and a dream through someone awake. Then the observer's chosen position proves to constrain the answer. The book not only reports perspective; it changes readers' perspectives as they read.

We should therefore resist "Zhuangzi teaches that everything is relative." This formula promises a completed result before inquiry begins, turning the text into another system of ready-made assertions. Its force often lies in an unexpected transition: a seemingly understood story suddenly questions how we understood it.

This does not exclude arguments. The book combines reasoning and imagination differently. A changed scene exposes a hidden premise that a dry definition might miss. Assess a story by asking not only "What is the moral?" but "What habit of judging did it reveal?"

II. Perspective determines a question without abolishing its object

A contemporary hypothetical example: one person calls a room spacious, another cramped. The first wants quiet reading; the second plans equipment and ten workers. They may see the same room and speak honestly. "Enough" contains an unspoken task.

This simple dispute can be resolved through measurements and requirements once goals are clarified. Difficulty grows when someone forgets an evaluation's conditions and declares their measure the thing's nature. The room becomes "objectively cramped in general," an activity "entirely useless," a person "a failure altogether." A relative judgment assumes a final verdict's form.

The problem is not differences existing, but conclusions expanding. "This method does not solve my task" quietly becomes "It has no value"; "I do not understand the motive" becomes "The motive is irrational"; "I know more than a beginner" becomes "My approach exhausts the subject." Familiar measures grow less visible.

The SEP discussion of Zhuangzi describes one influential interpretation of skepticism as broad in scope but moderate in strength: it limits final certainty while allowing degrees of understanding. This is an interpretation, not an undisputed solution to the entire book. Its usefulness lies in leaving room for learning.

If every viewpoint were equally valuable for every question, broader understanding would change nothing. Yet people can acknowledge that they previously missed an important

circumstance and now see it. They need not declare the new position final. Two thoughts are compatible: the present explanation is better than its predecessor, and may still be incomplete.

Changing perspective therefore does not create truth at will. It changes access to the object and reveals a question's limits. Rooms retain dimensions, decisions consequences, and actions people harmed. Openness begins by noticing a deficient framework and continues by checking what a new framework actually reveals.

III. The butterfly dream and the limits of final awakening

In chapter two's famous episode, Zhuang Zhou dreams of being a butterfly and, on waking, questions the relation between the states. The story nevertheless preserves a distinction between Zhou and butterfly and ends with the transformation of things. The university selection of primary passages places it beside reflections on considering ourselves fully awake within dreams.

Our reading concerns not the spectacular "Does the world exist?" but certainty accompanying a state. A sufficiently convincing dream needs no constant proof. Awakening changes the framework for evaluating earlier certainty. We realize its strength did not guarantee ultimate knowledge.

This does not make waking and dreaming identical in every respect. The narrative offers no experiment proving the world physically unreal. It cannot justify denying others' pain or actual consequences. Someone who stops distinguishing agreements from fantasies after reading has not demonstrated philosophical depth; they lost a distinction necessary for shared life.

A subtler risk is declaring oneself finally awake and all dissenters still asleep. A story limiting confidence becomes its amplifier. The interpreter already stands at the top of a ladder, and every objection proves only the objector's immaturity.

Read more productively by questioning the ladder. What lets me speak of another's limitation? Can I explain precisely what they miss? Will I name conditions under which I would change my position? Does "awakening" mean anything beyond feeling right?

This retains discovery's value without making its experience an irrevocable status. Someone may undergo an important turn and remain a person with a particular history, language, and experience. New understanding deserves attention through what it clarifies, not the solemnity of a transformation narrative.

IV. Can we know the happiness of fish?

In the dialogue above the Hao River, Zhuangzi and Hui Shi dispute knowing fish's condition. One appeals to their free movement; the other observes that the spectator is not a fish. SEP discusses this chapter-seventeen episode through differing conditions of "knowing" and the question of where knowledge comes from.

The reader faces a real difficulty. We lack direct access to another's experience. Yet requiring complete identity with another being as knowledge's sole foundation removes almost every possibility of understanding others. We could not even explain their failure to understand us, since that explanation also requires knowing something about them.

Our analysis need not treat Zhuangzi's final reply as strict proof of his initial claim. Literary cleverness and logical persuasiveness differ. Keep the tension: observers notice behavior but should limit inferences about experience; critics of knowledge also rely on observations and assumptions.

A hypothetical human case clarifies this. A colleague is silent in a meeting. You are certain they are unhappy. They may be, but may also be calculating something difficult, tired, or unwilling to interrupt. "I see their silence" has stronger grounds than "I know why they are silent." Failure to distinguish turns observation into mind-reading.

The opposite extreme also obstructs understanding. "I cannot be them, so there is nothing to ask or understand" closes conversation. Sufficiently grounded understanding combines signs, questions, and correction. It need not be absolute to help relationships.

Insufficient confirmation and established refutation remain importantly distinct. In our hypothetical conversation, unhappiness is not yet sufficiently grounded. It does not follow that the colleague is happy. Doubt weakens an assertion rather than automatically replacing it with its opposite. A critic immediately asserting the reverse again concludes something about another's state, sheltered by claims that knowledge is impossible.

Ask what the objection established: several possible explanations of silence, missing information, or evidence incompatible with the original guess? These results have different strengths. Clarification protects conversation from competitive confident denials. We can acknowledge a real limit while still asking and distinguishing. This helps examine the fish dialogue's demands on "knowing" without turning a literary reply into final proof or preemptively abolishing understanding.

Changing perspective here means allowing another's inner world to resist our explanation, not appropriating it. I report what I saw and how I understood it; another may clarify. A clarification contradicting my guess becomes information, not an obstacle to a beautiful version. Respect for another perspective is tested precisely when it disagrees.

V. The useless tree and the power of one measure

In the story of a large crooked tree, Hui Shi finds it unsuitable for carpentry. Zhuangzi proposes another relation: it offers space for rest, and its unsuitability for harvesting helps it survive. This chapter-one episode appears in the Columbia selection.

The carpenter need not be professionally mistaken. If the trunk cannot produce the required part, it really is unsuitable for that work. Error begins when professional suitability becomes existence's only permitted value. Everything outside the purpose becomes the object's defect.

Our analysis asks a sharper question: whom does usefulness benefit? A felled tree helps whoever uses its wood. For the tree, usefulness means an end. "This is needed" may therefore conceal different interests. The user's viewpoint differs from the position of what is used.

This does not justify abandoning obligations or dismissing work's results. People depending on us need concrete actions, not philosophical excuses for absent help. But it challenges a broader demand: a person's existence must be justified in every respect by external output.

Preserving space not subordinated to immediate usefulness is not deliberately becoming unskilled. Reading, walking, conversation, or pauses may matter without productivity reports. They need not secretly pay off through better work either. Otherwise criticism returns to its original measure: rest is permitted only to squeeze out more results.

The story does not promise that what goes unused is always safe. Reality is more complex: being unwanted may hurt, poverty constrains choices, and withdrawing can increase vulnerability. Transfer the image cautiously. Its useful work reveals a verdict's limits, not guarantees a fate.

VI. Cook Ding: skill that knows how to slow down

In chapter three, Cook Ding explains cutting a carcass through following its structure. He moves through spaces, preserves the blade, and becomes especially attentive at difficult places. The ruler finds a lesson in preserving life. The primary Asia for Educators passage permits direct reading of this transition, though only part of the chapter.

Our analysis distinguishes acquired skill, sensitivity to an object's structure, and recognition of automatic action's limits. Retain only ease and we get endless flow; retain only caution and we lose the mastery enabling fine action. Their combination makes the story interesting.

A hypothetical experienced translator quickly understands an ordinary sentence but pauses at a word determining a contract's meaning. Delay does not remove competence; noticing difficulty expresses it. A beginner may pass faster precisely because they see no reason to stop.

Nor is intuition superior to every check. Skill has a domain and acquisition history. Sensitivity to craft materials does not automatically produce precision in politics, relationships, or another tradition. Success in one field may even intensify dangerous confidence in another.

Preserving the blade means attending to action's cost in our reading. Results can be achieved by destroying tools, exhausting workers, or breaking resistant materials. Brief success then conceals accumulated damage. Another approach seeks less violence against the task's structure.

"Less effort" cannot be applied mechanically. Effort may be necessary to maintain a boundary, stop harm, or undergo long training. The question is not making everything easy, but distinguishing effort appropriate to a situation from effort forcing it into a predetermined picture.

Mastery thus read does not remove people from a changing world. It makes them more attentive. Better skill makes noticing a new case beyond the old approach more important. Stopping belongs to precision rather than defeats it.

VII. The wheelwright and what a formula cannot transmit

In Wheelwright Pian's episode, a ruler reads dead sages' words. The artisan questions complete inheritance: he feels his work's exact measure but cannot fully convey it verbally even to his son. This chapter-thirteen story appears in the Ebrey selection.

Our reading does not make all books useless. The book offering the story would immediately lose its ability to address us. The question concerns verbal transmission's boundary: what understanding survives in a formulation and what arises only through activity?

Information and skill cannot be equated. Someone may know a movement's description but not perform it under changing conditions, or act precisely while struggling to explain every ground. These knowledges connect without replacing each other completely.

The participants' changed positions matter especially. A manual worker addresses someone with political status reading an authoritative text. He sees a limit high status cannot remove. Distribution of social roles does not distribute final understanding.

Craft experience cannot become a new absolute foundation either. Knowing wheelmaking does not establish knowledge of every reading, governing, or ethical action. Perspective should not merely replace one infallible judge with another. It opens what the initial hierarchy obscured.

A discipline of inheritance follows. Words preserve questions, distinctions, and directions of attention. They help notice errors our experience repeats. Yet acquiring a formulation is not

reproducing its speaker's capacity. Work remains between reading and action that reverence for a name cannot do.

Incomplete transmission does not mean teaching is impossible. Demonstration, participation, and gradual correction deserve greater seriousness. Teachers can provide conditions for acquiring a capacity without inserting ready-made skill into students. This limitation changes expectations rather than devalues teaching.

Criticizing bookish certainty therefore differs from rejecting text. One asks what reading enabled someone to do; the other rejects a means of checking experience beforehand. The *Zhuangzi* leaves readers between them: a book can transform seeing without issuing final wisdom's certificate for having been read.

VIII. Why openness is not surrender of judgment

The strongest practical objection is: if every opinion is limited, how can we reject harmful decisions? Could caution excuse someone unwilling to call deception deception?

The danger is real when three positions are confused: people begin from different conditions of understanding; our judgment may be wrong; every assertion is equally grounded. The first two do not require the third. Perspectives explain disagreement's origins without settling adequacy of grounds.

Suppose participants dispute whether work is finished. Each has interests, moods, and notions of success. They can still read agreed requirements, inspect results, and identify a missing element. This provides no view from nowhere, but creates a shared procedure limiting arbitrary verdicts.

Answer every ground with "That is only your perspective" and one evades the level on which an assertion can be checked rather than demonstrates depth. Every perspective has observational conditions and consequences of use; acknowledging them makes conversation substantive.

Openness does not oblige agreement. Careful discussion may clarify differences rather than reduce them. That can help: we understand an incompatible principle, missing information, and necessary distance. Ending argument does not always mean unity.

Finally, changing perspective and changing a decision differ. We can understand why someone justifies an act and still reject the justification. Understanding limits caricature without removing responsibility for our choices. Contemporary application remains productive while retaining this distinction.

IX. Dreams and living knowledge: recognition does not erase different paths

Limited certainty may lead to seeking an ultimate foundation or changing judgment's measure. Comparison distinguishes these movements. A literary dream question is not yet a universal assertion that the world is unreal or all knowledge meaningless.

Descartes uses doubt to seek certain knowledge; the academic account of his epistemology, §4.1, explains the thinker's existence. This neighbors the butterfly story substantively: current certainty's force does not settle its foundation. But the *Zhuangzi* does not end with the Cartesian cogito. We cannot add an answer that makes the parable a convenient preface to another system.

In al-Ghazālī's Deliverance from Error, university excerpt, dreams also participate in doubt, while restored certainty involves divine light. Similarity is striking precisely because conclusions differ. Al-Ghazālī's narrative moves toward a particular religious foundation; here we examine literary transition and transformation of things. One shared dream scene cannot establish identical ultimate truth.

The wheelwright opens another connection. Plato's Phaedrus, 275d–276a, distinguishes knowledge's written trace from responsive living speech. External possession of words guarantees no understanding. But craft precision and Platonic dialogue have different objects and checks. Comparison does not establish that hand mastery understands everything books discuss.

Comparison itself consequently needs a stricter measure. First identify the recurring question; then examine each tradition's means, satisfactory answer, and permitted certainty afterward. Omit the second step and matching images lead to prematurely stopping reading.

Cook Ding tests this mistake well. He acts skillfully and notices places requiring another action. Readers encountering a similar idea elsewhere can also slow down: an unfamiliar foundation may lie behind a familiar image. This does not make every answer equal. It lets us assess a particular explanation without forcing another book to repeat our favorite philosophy.

X. Confidence capable of learning

The *Zhuangzi* troubles readers seeking a final key to every situation. The butterfly complicates final awakening, the tree disrupts a single measure of usefulness, and the cook joins free movement with attentive stopping. Together they invite assessing confidence through its encounter with limits.

Confidence may defend an unchanging self-image: I understood already, so new information must confirm it. Or it may involve orientation: I know enough for this step, notice what I lack, and can correct movement. The latter is less solemn but leaves room to learn.

Certainty's limit need not end action. We still distinguish better explanations, answer for promises, and stop harm. But we cease treating our measure as the object's only possible existence. Another person may say something our original framework did not expect.

The cook story's most useful detail is thus not miraculous ease but care before a difficult joint. Understanding shows strength when it can stop, see something new, and continue differently.

What this means in practice

Apply this way of reading to one real disagreement without calling it an ancient ritual. State your judgment precisely. "He is always irresponsible" is too broad. "He did not send promised materials by the agreed deadline" separates fact, expectation, and evaluation.

Name your measure. Why does the deadline matter? Who depends on it? What counts as adequate completion? This need not weaken a demand. It may reveal a well-grounded but poorly explained requirement, or a preference presented as a shared duty.

Separate observation from assumption. You may know materials were not received without knowing why. Ask a question permitting a new answer. "Why did you ruin everything again?" contains an accusatory conclusion. Asking about a specific obstacle leaves room to learn what you cannot yet see.

Test your perspective against another: the person doing the task, those awaiting results, and those paying for delay with their time. Do not imagine complete access to their inner positions. Identify different consequences and, where possible, ask participants.

Return to the decision. What changed through clarification? Perhaps another agreement is needed; perhaps the original boundary remains. The goal is stronger grounds, not guaranteed gentleness or agreement. A firmer but better-grounded measure may also result from attentive understanding.

Set reflection's limits beforehand. Endless reframing sometimes avoids action. Name a point where available grounds suffice for a reversible next step. Retain revision without demanding a complete picture of the world before every act.

Key quotation

> *"My mouth cannot describe it in words, but there is something here."*

Wheelwright Pian in the *Zhuangzi*, chapter 13; editorial English translation of our Russian rendering of Patricia Ebrey's version, PDF p. 4, not a verified published English quotation. This is a literary character speaking about his work, not a biographically authenticated statement by historical Zhuang Zhou. Explanation's limit leaves actual skill without making its holder universally infallible.

Connections across traditions

These are our analytical comparisons. Shared questions and limits are shown; matching formulations alone establish no historical influence.

Positions	Similarity	Boundary
Butterfly, chapter 2 ↔ Descartes	Immediate certainty does not end questions about grounds.	Transformation does not culminate in the Cartesian cogito.
Dreams in Zhuangzi ↔ al-Ghazālī	Changed states reveal earlier certainty's limits.	Al-Ghazālī's divine light is not the butterfly parable's answer.
Wheelwright Pian ↔ Plato, Phaedrus	Words do not guarantee living capacity.	Craft measure and dialectical knowledge require different acquisition.
Cook Ding ↔ Tree	An observer's measure does not exhaust an object's structure.	Skilled use and release from exclusive usefulness are different textual turns.
Perspectives in SEP ↔ Literary diversity in IEP	Reading should notice conditions and voices.	Moderate skepticism is not automatically every part's position.

Sources

• *Zhuangzi*, chapter 3 excerpts: The Secret of Caring for Life, Asia for Educators, Columbia University. From *Sources of Chinese Tradition*, ed. Wm. Theodore de Bary and Irene Bloom, 1999, pp. 103–104.

• *Zhuangzi*, selection from *Chinese Civilization: A Sourcebook*, ed. Patricia Ebrey, 1993, pp. 28–31: Selection from The Zhuangzi, Columbia University.

• Zhuangzi, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: textual history, perspectives, and interpretations of skepticism.

• Zhuangzi, Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy: composition, Inner Chapters, and interpretations.

• Descartes' Epistemology. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Academic discussion of doubt and the cogito..

• Plato. Phaedrus, 274c–277a, translated by Benjamin Jowett. Primary text: writing, memory, and living instruction..

• Al-Ghazālī. Deliverance from Error, Hanover College university excerpt: dreaming, doubt, and divine light. Primary English excerpt; translator not established on the page..

Tags

Zhuangzi, Zhuang Zhou, Daoist philosophy, perspective, certainty, skepticism, dream, butterfly, transformation of things, Cook Ding, Wheelwright Pian, useless tree, skill, craft, caution, knowledge, observation, judgment, usefulness, literary form, Inner Chapters, Outer Chapters, Hui Shi, happiness of fish, Descartes, cogito, Plato, Phaedrus, al-Ghazālī, change of state, comparison across traditions, responsibility

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.