Note on Referencing

In this Element, references to works by Heidegger and some other authors are cited by the years of their *earliest* composition or publication. This is because it is relevant to my arguments to indicate the years when (especially) Heidegger articulated a specific view. In the list of "References," these years appear in *square brackets* while the dates of later editions are set in *round brackets*.

I render *Sein* as the capitalized "Being" and *Seyn* as the capitalized "Beyng" to indicate their special status as philosophical terms. I translate *Anfang* as "inception" (instead of "beginning") and *anfänglich* as "inceptual" so as to retain the etymological connection of the words. In most cases, I refer to the German versions as published in Heidegger's *Complete Works* (*Gesamtausgabe*), which I abbreviate as GA in a reference. Since the publisher of Heidegger's *Gesamtausgabe* is always the same (that is, Vittorio Klostermann), I do not repeat this in the references. Page numbers of English translations, when available, are followed by the those of the original German editions. Whenever possible, I cite from the existing English renditions of Heidegger's works, but I have often modified the translations according to the German original. When the German version alone is available, the English translations are my own. When giving the German original for a word or a phrase in the main text, I place it in round brackets; when in a citation, I place it in square brackets.

Unless otherwise indicated, emphases in citations are all from the original texts. It is very important to keep this in mind since Heidegger frequently added emphases to his writings. Additions in round brackets and curly braces in citations are all from the original texts, and those in square brackets derive from my supplementation. For some words in the existing English translations, I adapt them to current norms. For instance, I change "man" or "men" to either "the human being" or "the humans." When the original German word is *der Mensch* I render it as "humanity."

Introduction

It is indisputable that Heidegger's thinking involves constant dialogues with Eastern/Asian thought. Far from being thoroughgoing and unitary, these dialogues assume various forms at different junctures of his path of thought – as resistance, as confrontation, as conversation, and as "deep encounter."[1] With the publication of Heidegger's *Gesamtausgabe* (*Complete Works*) almost completed, it is long overdue to treat Heidegger's comportment toward Eastern/Asian thought as a fundamental element of his philosophical enterprise. A focused study of this element has yet to be incorporated into the field of specialized Heidegger studies.[2] It is also expected to throw fresh light on Heidegger's thinking as such, and to provide a steadfast anchor for further explorations in intercultural and comparative philosophy.

This Element elucidates the metamorphoses of Heidegger's comportment toward the East/Asia from the 1910s to the 1960s. The variations of his comportment are dependent on which "East" or "Asia" is at issue, and which stage of his thinking is involved. Such terms as "East," "Asia," and "Orient" in Heidegger's own writings have complicated senses and references, but interpreters have either taken them to be abstract labels for pure otherness or reduced them to an exclusive concern with East Asian thinking. In Patrick Unruh's concordance to Heidegger's *Gesamtausgabe*, under *Asiatische* (Asiatic) are listed a dozen terms: *alte Welt* (old world), *Asien* (Asia), *ferner Osten* (Far East), *Griechen* (Greeks), *Indien* (India), *Ionien* (Ionia), *Kleinasien* (Asia Minor), *Orient*, *Ostasien* (East Asia), *Osten* (East), *östliche Welt* (Eastern world), *Russen* (Russians), and *Zen* (Unruh 2017).[3] According to this list, we can differentiate between five kinds of Asia: West Asia, South Asia, Greek Asia, Russian Asia, and East Asia; and five kinds of East: the Near East (now often replaced by "the Middle East" in a broad sense), the Greek East, the Russian East, the Indian East, and the Far East. Hence, apart from East Asian thinking, the "East" involves ancient Near Eastern traditions that had intense interaction with Greece, and it also refers to Russian thought, which figures predominantly in Heidegger's *Black Notebooks* published in the 2010s.

A few remarks on the different emphases of previously published secondary literature dealing with Heidegger's Asian connection: The edited volume entitled *Heidegger and Asian Thought*, which contains thirteen important essays, primarily focuses on initiating comparative studies. The editor Graham Parkes claims

[1] For "deep encounter," compare Ma 2008, 73–75.
[2] An example is the recently published *The Cambridge Heidegger Lexicon* (Wrathall 2021). Out of its 220 entries, none touches on Heidegger's thinking concerning the East or Asia.
[3] In Unruh's concordance, these terms listed under *Asiatische* do not all receive separate entries.

that comparative philosophy is "most fruitful between unconnected philosophies" while the question of influence is "of secondary significance" (Parkes 1987, 2). By contrast, Reinhard May's *Heidegger's Hidden Sources: East Asian Influences on His Work* shows an exclusive concern with demonstrating the extent to which Heidegger has drawn on East Asian thinking via a methodology of textual juxtaposition of some of Heidegger's writings and German versions of Daoist texts (May 1996). As the translator, Parkes offered the phrase "hidden sources" (culled from Heidegger's work), and he thereby withdrew his earlier claim.[4] These two books have significantly promoted studies of Heidegger in connection with Asian thought. *Heidegger on East–West Dialogue: Anticipating the Event* presents contextualized examinations of Heidegger's own ponderings on the question of East–West dialogue, revealing their potentials and problematics (Ma 2008). Since most of Heidegger's relevant remarks were made during and after World War II and were made mainly in relation to East Asia and East Asian languages, this book does not probe into those relevant themes occurring in his early work, neither does it sufficiently explore other kinds of "East" than East Asia.

The Element builds upon and yet differs from *Heidegger on East–West Dialogue* in that it aims to obtain a holistic view of all kinds of "East" insofar as Heidegger was engaged (or disengaged) with them. Consulting seventy pieces of Heidegger's original writings, it attempts to construct an account of his shifting stance on Eastern/Asian thought with an eye to the way in which it is embedded in different phases of his *Denkweg*. Hence, the coverage of this Element is much broader. Though it does not purport to elaborate on affinities or divergences between Heidegger and Eastern/Asian thought as such, it embodies implications in that direction.

Furthermore, this Element extends the timeline of the theme to the 1910s – even as early as 1908 when Heidegger attempted to learn Russian – and it draws on Heidegger's own works that have been largely neglected in studies of his Eastern connection. Some examples are his early works like *The Phenomenology of Religious Life* (1920/21), *Introduction to Phenomenological Research* (1923/24), and *Basic Concepts of Ancient Philosophy* (1926), just to mention a few prior to *Being and Time*. Moreover, this Element broaches new topics such as "primitive Dasein," "mythical Dasein," and Russianism (*Russentum*). An inquiry into the last topic has been made possible only with the recent publication of his *Black Notebooks*.

Heidegger's invocation of the East is inseparable from the rich tradition of German Oriental studies. In a way, Edward Said paid a compliment to German scholarship when he exempted it from "a protracted, sustained *national* interest in

[4] Reinhard May used the Latin phrase *ex oriente lux* as the original title of his book (May 1989).

the Orient" due to the limitation of Germany's overseas colonial sphere (Said 1979, 19). Advocating a "synthetic" approach and inducing other reasons for the specificity of German Oriental studies, Suzanne L. Marchand treated "German Orientalism" as more a matter of intellectual pursuits than merely a function of politics (Marchand 2009, xx; cf. xxix, xxxiii). Although the label "Orientalism" still retains one of its original meanings as the (supposedly neutral) Western discipline of studies of Asian traditions, it has lost luster due to Said's influential criticism. That is why Marchand sometimes was inclined to use the German word *Orientalistik* or the lower-case "orientalism" so as to keep it apart from the potentially ideologically loaded "Orientalism." What have taken the place of Orientalism are such terms as "Asian studies," "Near Eastern Studies," and "Islamic Studies" – terms that involve the specific areas under study. Nowadays, a more integrated approach and a global vision is being cultivated to counteract the segregation of those area studies. This development constitutes the backdrop against which this Element attempts to delve into Heidegger's thinking on the East by bringing in multifarious Eastern traditions he has encountered so that not just one single Eastern tradition is privileged at the expense of the other traditions.

The rise of modern Oriental studies in Germany was related to several events in the late eighteenth century. In 1786, Sir William Jones announced his discovery of a genealogical connection between Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit. This discovery had immediate repercussions in Germany. In his lectures "On the Language and Philosophy of the Indians" delivered in 1808, Friedrich Schlegel included the Persian and German languages in this family of resemblance, inducing numerous concrete examples of affinity (Schlegel [1808], 430–39). The attention paid to the East gave rise to what Schlegel called the "Oriental Renaissance" that could rival the Italian Renaissance. It has promoted a rewriting of the history of antiquity in the light of the newly discovered bond with the East. Schlegel devoted a lengthy discussion about the doctrine of metempsychosis and drew the conclusion that Pythagoras' philosophy was "no Hellenistic invention, although it was soon developed and adorned with all the riches of Hellenistic genius and ingenuity" (Schlegel [1808], 476). Presuming that Pythagoras had borrowed this doctrine from either Egypt or Western Asia, Schlegel strongly recommended: "We must, then, also be prepared completely to reject the oldest and proportionately best accounts of the Pythagorean philosophy" (Schlegel [1808], 476).[5]

What lies behind the infatuation of German scholars with the Oriental, especially the Indian Oriental, is an attempt at establishing a potentially divergent cultural lineage by placing an older Indian "Aryan" heritage before Greece.

[5] For Heidegger's connection with Schlegel, see Moore 2019.

In this way, they hoped that Germany could be set upon a *Sonderweg* (special path) apart from the prevalent Graeco-Roman-Franco "Occidental" lineage privileging English and French traditions.[6] Believing that the Indians shared the same pedigree with the Germanic people, most German Indologists enlisted the Indian epics in a quest to define German identity as "secular, Enlightened, and rational" as opposed to dogmatic and conservative Roman Catholicism that has "destroyed the ancient epic culture of the Germans" (Adluri & Bagchee 2014, 115, 119). In addition, they treated Buddhism as an Eastern analogue of Protestantism and deprecated Brahmanism in terms resembling Martin Luther's diatribe against Catholicism. German Indology enjoys the longest history and reaps the richest harvest as compared with other areas of Oriental studies despite the polemics it has given rise to.[7] German intellectuals in general were more informed of the Indian East even if they did not necessarily find in it a kindred spirit. In view of this historical and intellectual nexus, it is less possible for Heidegger to define Indian thought as "entirely different" and "wholly other," as he did with respect to East Asian thinking (though meanwhile he was also deploying such phrases for the sake of his own philosophizing; Heidegger [1953/54], 5/85, 41/126). At the same time, it becomes easier to understand why Heidegger invoked Sanskrit words in his philosophical corpus.

A prominent example of Heidegger's invocation of Sanskrit words occurs in his *Introduction to Metaphysics* (Heidegger 1935), where he mentioned two Indo-Germanic stems for the word "to be" (*sein*): one is *es*, Sanskrit *asus*, denoting "life, the living, . . . the self-standing"; the other is *bhū*, *bheu*, which receives a more originary interpretation on the basis of "the confrontation with the inception of Greek philosophy": "an emerging" that "in turn is determined by coming to presence and appearing" (Heidegger [1935], 75/54). These references long predated his inquiries in 1960 concerning whether there were possible Sanskrit words that could match his own fundamental notions such as "Being" (*Sein*), "unconcealment" (*Unverborgenheit*), and "forgetfulness" (*Vergessenheit*) (Heidegger 2001, 254/318–19; cf. Hoch 1991, 251–53). However, it can be presumed that, in Heidegger's eyes, Sanskrit as an Indo-European language also involves a subject–object structure that is conducive to metaphysical thinking. Probably for this reason, Heidegger scarcely engaged with the Indian East except for mentioning Indian Buddhism a few times and

[6] For a discussion of Germany's *Sonderweg*, compare McGetchin 2015, 113.
[7] For example, German Indology is perceived as an enterprise that utilized Protestant-theological and even racist preconceptions (Adluri & Bagchee 2014).

Brahma once (see Section 6). Of course, he cited "the Indies" and "the Indians" in the context of elucidating Hölderlin's poetry.[8]

Between 1880 and 1914, a period during which Heidegger was born (in 1889) and spent his earliest years, colossal archeological discoveries were made of Persian, Assyrian, and Sumerian materials that led to unprecedented large-scale specialized studies, what Marchand called the "Second Oriental Renaissance" (Marchand 2009, 157–215). Doing away with previous assumptions concerning the East recorded either in the Old Testament or by the Greeks, the studies growing out of the "Second Oriental Renaissance" suggested a strong Near Eastern influence on early Greece. This has enhanced the tendency of "Orientalizing" the history of Western culture while resisting an enduring tradition of philhellenism (cf. Marchand 2001).

This new trend of Orientalism is evidenced in Heidegger's own texts. In a review paper of 1910, Heidegger commented that for the modern intellectuals caught in the currents of "free research and free thinking," "[t]he Golden Calf, Fama, and the Babylonian Venus stood on the altars" (Heidegger [1910], 36/4). This is Heidegger's earliest reference to the East in a critical tone. In the 1915 report on the triduum commemoration held in Messkirch (Heidegger's hometown), he lamented the situation before the outbreak of World War I where people displayed "the same 'enthusiasm'" for "Indian Buddhism" and "Sumerian sun-worship" as for the "Pauper of Assisi" (Heidegger [1915a], 52). This is Heidegger's earliest reference to Buddhism and perhaps the only reference to the Sumerian culture. It is at least thirty-one years earlier than his negative remark on Buddhism in the *Contributions to Philosophy* (1936–38).[9]

The year 1915 also witnessed Heidegger's earliest citation of a central Islamic notion in a trial lecture "The Concept of Time in the Science of History" for obtaining the certification for teaching. When claiming that "the beginning of time reckoning systems show that they always begin at a historically significant event [*historisch bedeutsamen Ereignis*]," Heidegger provided in brackets three examples of this kind of event: "the founding of the city of Rome, the birth of Christ, the Hegira" (Heidegger [1915b], 75/432). The Hegira refers to Muhammad's migration from Mecca to Medina in 622, which helped the consolidation of the first Muslim community. At that time, Heidegger was not yet using *Ereignis* as a special term.

[8] For an account of those rare occasions where Heidegger touched on Indian thought in the early 1960s, compare Ma 2008, 161–66. In addition, in the 1966/67 seminar on Heraclitus, Heidegger mentioned: "For the Indians [*die Inder*], sleep is the highest life" (Heidegger and Fink 1979, 132/214). The English version rendered *die Inder* as "the Hindu."

[9] "No Buddhism! The opposite" (Heidegger [1936–38], 134/170). For a discussion of the full passage, compare Ma 2008, 180.

In the age of Enlightenment, German philosophers such as Leibniz and Wolff drew on the reports by the missionaries to China concerning Confucianism to construct a natural theology and ethics. With the interest shifting to Sanskrit and Indian thought, China came to stand for Oriental stagnation. Lacking any linguistic affinity with Indo-European languages and seemingly irrelevant to researches of classical antiquity (as contrasted with Near Eastern traditions), studies in the ninteenth century devoted to the Far East lagged behind, rarely being considered a part of the Academy. This forms the backdrop against which it seems a matter of course for a European like Heidegger to apply the labels of "entirely different" and "wholly other" to East-Asian thinking on various occasions (Heidegger [1953/54], 5/85, 41/126). As Marchand rightly observed, "China and Japan would only appeal to the Germans for whom classical aesthetics, Christian orthodoxy, and traditional humanistic institutions had been fully discredited" (Marchand 2009, 368).

Before the outbreak of World War I, with the social, political, and economic crises in Germany becoming ever more intense, East Asian thinking emerged in the intellectual arena. Following the appearance of close to ten renditions of the *Daodejing* 道德經 (for instance, Plaenckner 1870, Von Strauss 1870, and Ular 1903), in 1910 Martin Buber published the first translation of the *Zhuangzi* into German entitled *Discussions and Parables of Zhuangzi* (*Reden und Gleichnisse des Tschuang-tse*) using Giles' English edition as the source (Giles 1889, Buber [1910]). Buber selected fifty-four stories from the *Zhuangzi*, gave each his own title, and attached introductions of the main characters from the stories as well as an article on Daoism by himself. According to Buber, ancestor worship as advocated by Confucianism was not suitable for Europe; instead, Daoism could initiate a new path for European scholars. In 1912, Richard Wilhelm published *Zhuangzi: The True Book of South Flowerland* (*Dschuang Dsi, Das wahre Buch vom südlichen Blütenland*) in China and in Germany at the same time (Wilhelm 1912). It was directly translated from Chinese but was not a complete edition.

With the access to Chinese classics in German translations, such writers as Herman Hesse and Alfred Döblin drew on Daoist motifs in their literary works. Recalling his travels to China and India, Hesse articulated his confidence in the salvation coming from the East:

> "[H]omecoming and fruitful renewal beckon to us from that "spirit of the East" which leads from Laozi [*Lao-tse*] 老子 to Jesus, which was born of ancient Chinese art and today still speaks in every gesture of the true Asiatic" (Hesse [1916], 69).

Alongside Oswald Spengler's most influential *Decline of the West* (first volume 1918, second volume 1922), *Travel Diary of a Philosopher* by Count Hermann Keyserling (1880–1946), recording his prewar travels in India and China, also

drew attention to the presumably uncorrupted spirit of the East (Keyserling 1919).[10] In 1920, Keyserling founded the School of Wisdom in Darmstadt. Like Wilhelm's China Institute established in Frankfurt in 1924, it promoted Eastern wisdom through all kinds of activities. It was also in 1924 that Paul Dahlke opened the first Buddhist temple in Europe near Berlin. In 1930, Kitayama Junyū (a Japanese scholar) completed his dissertation dealing with Buddhist metaphysics under the supervision of Karl Jaspers (cf. Kitayama 1934).

Because East Asian traditions were normally not included in the curriculum of philosophy, they rarely received any serious attention in the circle of philosophy, let alone scholarly research. Ernst Cassirer's philosophy of culture is an exception, though Heidegger quibbled at his neo-Kantian approach.[11] In *The Way into Philosophy*, published in 1926, Georg Misch strongly commended Chinese philosophy, and he opened the second chapter of his book with Zhuangzi's 莊子 vision of the boundless world in "Autumn Floods," regarding it as a breaking-through of the natural outlook on life and thus as the beginning of philosophy (Misch 1926). Since Heidegger had contact with Misch starting from 1922, and they maintained correspondence till at least the end of 1920s, he may well have been aware of this book by Misch.[12]

East Asian thinking appealed to the young Heidegger as well. Although he has always remained silent about his reading of German renditions of Daoist texts in his early life, in the 1945 "Evening Conversation," Heidegger revealed a connection (in the role of the "Older Man").

> But in order to say good night and maybe to thank you as well, I would still like to relate to you a short conversation [*ein kurzes Gespräch*] between two thinkers, which in my student years I copied down from a historiological account of Chinese philosophy because it struck me, though I did not quite understand it earlier. This evening it first became bright around me, and therefore this conversation well occurred to me. The names of the two thinkers escape me. (Heidegger[1945], 156/239)

This interlude is of the nature of autobiography and is comparable to Heidegger's later account of his sustained inquiry into the essence of language in "A Dialogue on Language" inasmuch as invention and factuality are mixed (Heidegger [1953/54]). Since Heidegger completed his Habilitation thesis in 1915, it is likely that he read German versions of the *Zhuangzi* in the early 1910s.

[10] Karl Löwith mentioned Keyserling three times in his correspondence with Heidegger in 1921 (Heidegger and Löwith 2021, 22, 27, 43).
[11] I address Heidegger's criticism of Cassirer in Section 2 of this Element.
[12] In a footnote of B*eing and Time*, Heidegger mentioned Misch for his contribution to Dilthey studies (Heidegger [1927], 498 note xiv/399 note 1).

Starting from 1919, Heidegger had contact with a number of Japanese scholars who studied in Freiburg, and this constituted an important channel for his knowledge of Japanese ideas and art.[13] Japanese art was transmitted to Europe much earlier. In 1862, following Japan's opening to the West in 1858, over 600 Japanese works of art and artifacts were displayed at London's International Exposition and made a sensation. What European artists found the most impressive were the vivid colors and different perspectives of Ukiyo-e woodblock prints (浮世絵). What was called *Japonisme* played a role in the birth of modern art. Japanese works of art were also collected by the citizens in Bremen, a business city that is situated in northern Germany with a harbor and is well connected with the outside world, being the earliest German city that initiated trade relations with China in 1861. During his first visit to Bremen in October 1930, where he read out the parable about the joy of fish from Buber's translation (originally from chapter 17 of the *Zhuangzi*) after having delivered the lecture "On the Essence of Truth" to a gathering of nonacademic philosophers, Heidegger viewed a collection of East Asian artworks (Buber [1910], 59).[14] According to Heinrich W. Petzet – Heidegger's lifelong friend who organized his various visits to Bremen from 1930 to 1962 – he very much appreciated the (Ukiyo-e) woodblock prints by Sharaku Toshusai and Kokusai Ozaki, and found impressive a work by Utamaro Kitagawa (Petzet 1993, 169). In 1954, to celebrate Heidegger's seventy-fifth birthday, Petzet gave him an engraving by Moronobu Hishikawa (who is regarded as the founder of the style of Ukiyo-e woodblock prints) from his family collection, which depicts a Zen monastery. Heidegger hung it in his study next to two rolls with a couplet from chapter 15 of the *Daodejing* (Petzet 1993, 169). In the same year (1954), Heidegger observed (the observation is published in GA 100 – part of his nine-volume *Black Notebooks*): "Early, before World War I, the import of products [*Erzeugnisse*] of East Asian spirit – its art and poetry – had started. Many of

[13] According to Imamichi Tomonobu's (1922–2012) account, before leaving Germany in 1919, Itō Kichinosuke (one of his teachers) gave Heidegger a copy of the German version of Okakura Kakuzō's *The Book of Tea* (originally published in English). The phrase "Kunst des In-der-Welt-Seins" (art of Being-in-the-world) appeared in that book in relation to Daoism (Okakura 1919, 31). Itō believed that this phrase is the direct source for Heidegger's term of Being-in-the-world (cf. Imamichi 2004, 123).

[14] This is the first time that Heidegger cited the *Zhuangzi* (cf. Petzet 1993, 17–19). There are various versions of the lecture "On the Essence of Truth." The one delivered in Bremen is included in volume 80.1 of Heidegger's *Gesamtausgabe* and is dated October 8, 1930 (Heidegger [1930]). In a footnote of the lecture "On the Essence of Truth" delivered in Bremen, Heidegger quoted a verse from chapter 28 of the *Daodejing*: "The one who knows lightness, conceals him/herself in darkness" (*Der seine Helle kennt, sich in sein Dunkel hüllt*) (Heidegger [1930], 370 note 60). He cited from von Strauss' rendition except for changing the word *Wer* into *Der* (Von Strauss [1870], 140). Although this citation was removed in other versions of "On the Essence of Truth," this is the earliest occasion of Heidegger citing from the *Daodejing*.

today's European thinkers [*Geister*] and writers survive on this import secretively"(Heidegger 2020, 109). Heidegger himself should be counted among the European thinkers who drew on East Asian art and poetry that entered the European world before World War I.[15] Nonetheless, Heidegger continued to remark on a critical note:

> However – *wherein* was it imported? – *for what* did such use/abuse [*Vernutzung*] happen? – So long as we do not find the originary inception of Western-European destiny [*abendländisch-europäischen Geschickes*] that is hinting in advance, no such region opens, a region in which could be prepared a real encounter [*Begegnung*] of the "West" [*Westens*] with the Far East [*fernen Osten*]. (Heidegger 2020, 109)

This remark discloses Heidegger's suspicion concerning the relevance of such "products" imported from East Asia. It also indicates Heidegger's insistence that the enactment of the other inception of Western destiny via a dialogue with the early Greek thinkers is the necessary condition of possibility for an East–West dialogue. As is the case on other occasions, both terms of East (*Osten*) and "West" – the German original is *Westen* rather than *Abendland* – for Heidegger indicate the planetary world under the domination of the *Ge-stell*.[16] The consequence is that neither Westerners nor Asians of the current age are able to hear what was said in the old traditions, especially Asian traditions. Since the planetary world is derived from the Greek origin and since it has distorted the Greek essence, before one can speak of the possibility of a real encounter of East and West, one should first engage in a dialogue with the early Greek thinkers who were first called by Being and who had enacted the first inception of philosophy.

For his entire life, Heidegger remained entrenched in the dilemma concerning how to provide a proper account of Eastern/Asian thought without losing the pivotal weight of the Greek inception of philosophy. In this Element, I reveal the vicissitudes of his comportment in different phases of his *Denkweg*. In Section 1, I first address Heidegger's treatment of near Eastern traditions in *The Phenomenology of Religious Life* (Heidegger [1920/21]). Taking his comments on Islam as the cue, I discuss his connection with Islamic philosophy from 1915 to 1943. Heidegger's various references exhibited a degree of familiarity with Islamic philosophy, but he mainly treated it as a mediation of Aristotelian philosophy that has lost its Greek originariness.

[15] For a detailed discussion of Heidegger's connection with East Asian art, compare Ma and van Brakel 2014. One source that is not covered there is Heidegger's "Notes on Klee" written in 1957–8, in which he commented that Zen and the Nothing is not the representation of beings, but "the leading of the human being to the space-granting Nothing [*Nichts*]" (Heidegger [1957/58], 11).

[16] The difference between *Westen* and *Abendland* is similar to that between *westlich* and *Abendland* on which I elaborate in Section 4.