

Spring 2006

# WHO IS ZARATHUSTRA'S NIETZSCHE?

David B. Allison

*SUNY Stony Brook*, nosillad@suffolk.lib.ny.us

Follow this and additional works at: [https://fordham.bepress.com/phil\\_babich](https://fordham.bepress.com/phil_babich)

Part of the [Continental Philosophy Commons](#), and the [German Language and Literature Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Allison, David B., "WHO IS ZARATHUSTRA'S NIETZSCHE?" (2006). *Articles and Chapters in Academic Book Collections*. 39.  
[https://fordham.bepress.com/phil\\_babich/39](https://fordham.bepress.com/phil_babich/39)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Philosophy at DigitalResearch@Fordham. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles and Chapters in Academic Book Collections by an authorized administrator of DigitalResearch@Fordham. For more information, please contact [considine@fordham.edu](mailto:considine@fordham.edu).

## WHO IS ZARATHUSTRA'S NIETZSCHE?

**DAVID B. ALLISON**

With the appearance of *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* and the work immediately following that – particularly, in Book Five of *The Gay Science* and in the 1886 Prefaces to the Second Edition of his works, there emerges a remarkably transformed sense of Nietzsche's own self-awareness, a turn, based on his own autocritique, that basically works as a form of self-therapy – enabling him to grasp the really binding purchase the social symbolic has on the individual. In submitting himself to this autocritique, he first raises the question as to its possibility, and then proceeds to effectuate it in a rather complex manner. Ultimately, this opens the way for his finely detailed metacritical works of the later period, especially, *Beyond Good and Evil* and *On the Genealogy of Morals*.

### **Nietzsche's Despair in *Zarathustra*: Personalization**

In large part due to the self-consciously rhetorical import of his work, the reader of Nietzsche is acutely aware that he is really attending to the witness, the testimony, of a *particular* author, a particular thinker. And of course this complicates matters of interpretation. Certainly, Nietzsche is the *last* philosopher who would hide behind the cloak of anonymity or the authority of tradition. And while an author may well introduce himself and his concerns in the prefaces to his works, this takes on a rather roundabout itinerary in Nietzsche's case – basically, his explicit self-disclosure takes place in *Zarathustra*, and the articulation of this revelation really occurs in the 1886 prefaces. As he wrote to Malwida von Meysenbug:

The long prefaces which I have found necessary for the new edition of my complete works tell with a ruthless honesty some curious things about myself. With these I'll ward off "the many" once and for all... I've thrown out my hook to "the few" instead, and even with them I'm prepared to be patient.<sup>1</sup>

Of course Nietzsche exhibits a preoccupation with himself early on, clearly betraying a *romantic*, youthful bias, in his several autobiographical sketches, and his early reflections on religion, fate, and free will. With his writings on culture by the period of the *Birth of Tragedy*, Nietzsche still writes under the influence of Schopenhauer, stressing the role – and the suffering – of the *genius*, the purported defender and savior of traditional culture – the "true" or "superior" culture – faced with what he calls the "universalization" of culture, the "commercial culture" fostered by state and industrial interests. Such an *individual* must suffer isolation and personally carry the burden of cultural enlightenment. In the earliest accounts

of this, such a burden is sustained by cultivating the Apollonian-Dionysian *instincts or drives* — and this is most obvious in the Lugano Fragment of early 1871,<sup>2</sup> and in the lectures “On the Future of our Educational Institutions,” of late 1872.<sup>3</sup> But a striking change takes place with the revision of the Lugano Fragment into his essay “The Greek State,”<sup>4</sup> whereby the rather romantic, metaphysically suffering *individual* is seen not so much in some *heroic, individual isolation*, but rather as a *product* of the *culture’s social and political dynamics*. This *cultural subjection* is also paralleled in his revision of the essay, “On Music and Words,”<sup>5</sup> where Nietzsche explains that the individual’s most intensely personal states of Dionysian ecstasy are in fact *induced by the actual performance* of the dynamic musical spectacle. This emphasis on the *cultural dynamic* is also seen in his celebrated essay, “Homer’s Contest,”<sup>6</sup> whereby it is the socially and politically orchestrated *agon*, that gives rise to the unique strengths of classical Greek civilization, and to the individuals such a *culture* produces. Clearly, it was Jacob Burckhardt who was behind this remarkable *decentering shift* in Nietzsche’s concerns, particularly Burckhardt’s lectures on “The Agonal Age,”<sup>7</sup> lectures Burckhardt had been working on since as early as 1864, and which were the focus of his many extended conversations with Nietzsche.

In any case, it is the role of the *agon*, the contest or competition, that will, as it were, put Nietzsche’s preoccupations with *the individual per se*, back in the box of the social symbolic. And it is from this perspective of Burckhardt’s methodology of cultural historiography, that Nietzsche will develop the broad outlines of cultural analysis that stem from *The Birth of Tragedy* itself right to the end of his productive writings. Already, in *The Birth of Tragedy*, we see his preoccupation with the Greek *cultural dynamics* of the “tragic age,” the broad cultural motifs of the Apollonian and Dionysian elements, the role of religious cult worship and celebrations, and finally, the Socratic culture itself. “Homer’s Contest” sharpens the focus of the underlying *cultural dynamics*, and the *Untimely Meditations* offers us several analyses of his contemporary cultural milieu — perhaps most importantly, his scathing treatment of David Strauss’ rational Christian theology. In *The Use and Abuse of History*, he critiques the monumental and antiquarian “great men” historiography, and insists on critically understanding what he calls “our historical horizon,” i.e., the whole set of traditions, usage, codes, customs, values, social and cultural assumptions that constitute our *social symbolic order*. It is this social symbolic order that will be repeatedly articulated through his analyses of our religio-metaphysical tradition, as the death of God and its aftermath, the morality of mores, and especially, slave morality, with its remarkable power to induce and to structure our very affects themselves so as to produce a culture of *ressentiment*, guilt, bad conscience, asceticism, shame, etc., all pointing the way to his account of a seemingly inevitable decadence and nihilism.

While each of these concerns is treated to one degree or another in *Human All-Too Human* and *Daybreak*, they are perhaps best presented, collectively, in *The Gay Science*, where Nietzsche carefully lays out a detailed account of the death of God — his avatars of nationalism, modern science, the utilitarian ethics of sympathy and pity, as well as nihilism — and the *antidote* of a de-deified nature, understood under the formulation of the eternal return.

Now, in the first version of *The Gay Science* — i.e., the first four books, published in 1882 — the penultimate section, §341, is the only one that deals with the eternal return in any detail whatsoever, and it is only two brief paragraphs long. It poses the question of whether one would be crushed or liberated by the “eternal hourglass of existence.”<sup>8</sup> The preceding section — “The Dying Socrates” — clearly indicates that Socrates was indeed crushed: Nietzsche recalls his dying remark, “O Crito, I owe Asclepius a cock.”<sup>9</sup> The section before that, “*Vita Femina*,” celebrates what he calls “the most powerful magic of life... A veil of beautiful possibilities, sparkling with promise, resistance, bashfulness, mockery, pity, and seduction. Yes, life is a woman.”<sup>10</sup> Since Nietzsche composed this in the presence of Lou Salomé, during their retreat to Tautenburg in the early summer of 1882, we may assume that Nietzsche, unlike Socrates, did *not* suffer life as a disease. The final section of the 1882 edition of *The Gay Science* has Zarathustra emerge from from his cave, bathed in sunlight, to give his teaching about the eternal return, which will be his under-going, or rather, his *overcoming* of the old morality, what he will call the “spirit of gravity.” This final section, §342, of *The Gay Science*, is effectively the beginning of “Zarathustra’s Prologue,” which will itself issue on the specific, and quite dramatic, motif of *one’s own self-overcoming*, in *Zarathustra’s* first speech on “The Three Metamorphoses.”

Given a life “sparkling with promise,” and presumably already in possession of his own teaching, the question that arises, however, is precisely, “What is there to overcome?” — for Zarathustra himself, who, after all, has *left* Plato’s cave, and, much less, does this have anything to do with the *person* of Friedrich Nietzsche, who seemed so blissfully happy in Tautenburg? In *The Gay Science*, the *textual distance* between the eternal return and Zarathustra’s *Prologue*, presciently entitled “*Incipit Tragoedia*,” is *one section number*, but between *The Gay Science* and *Zarathustra’s* completion, there is a distance of some *three years*. What accounts for *this* distance? What happened? Quite simply, Nietzsche’s world completely fell apart. His break with Wagner was sealed in stone by the spring of 1878, when Wagner accused him of suffering from an excessive preoccupation with onanism. This was revealed to Nietzsche by his physician, Dr. Otto Eiser, who, as President of the Frankfurt Wagner Circle, also circulated Wagner’s charge about Nietzsche’s alleged misbehavior to the assembled festival celebrants at Bayreuth. Nietzsche was humiliated, and forcibly had to remove himself from perhaps the single group of

educated and cultivated figures with whom he would have enjoyed public contact and recognition. But by the spring of 1882, he had met — and fallen passionately in love with — Lou Salomé. At once he found the love of his life, to compensate for his loneliness, and an intellectual peer, whom he also thought of as his closest disciple. While she rejected his three marriage proposals, Nietzsche nonetheless pursued her avidly, thinking their four weeks in Tautenburg, vacationing in a country home secluded in the forest, would bring her around to his affections. Unfortunately, she dropped Nietzsche for Paul Rée, who was infinitely more pliable than Nietzsche, was emotionally stable — if somewhat dull at times — but who was nonetheless wealthy: his family having extensive land and property holdings in Pomerania and East Prussia. When Nietzsche met the two for an afternoon in Leipzig, in October of 1882, he realized that all his hopes for Lou had been irretrievably crushed. He never saw either of the two again, he was devastated by what he thought was Rée's deception, and he was cast completely alone, bereft of any emotional or intellectual companionship whatsoever.

Now, many of Nietzsche's letters from this three year period separating the composition of *The Gay Science*, Books I-IV, and Book V — i.e., the period of *Zarathustra's* composition — present a remarkably personal, if not somewhat strident, tone, and they offer a most unusual insight into the nature of *Zarathustra* itself. In a letter to von Gersdorff, e.g., Nietzsche writes:

My *Zarathustra* ...will be sent to you within a few weeks. ... Don't be put off by the mythic style of the book: my entire philosophy is behind those homey and unusual words, and I have never been more serious. It is a beginning at self-disclosure — nothing more! I know perfectly well that there is no one alive who could write anything like *Zarathustra*.<sup>11</sup>

Likewise, he writes Peter Gast: "It is incredibly full of detail which, because it is drawn from what I've seen and suffered, only I can understand. Some pages seem to be almost *bleeding*."<sup>12</sup> In another note to Gast, he writes:

At the moment *Zarathustra's* value is entirely personal... For everyone else, it is obscure, mysterious, and ridiculous. Heinrich von Stein (a splendid example of a man, whose company has given me real pleasure) told me candidly that of said *Zarathustra*, he understood "twelve sentences and no more." I found that very comforting.<sup>13</sup>

Initially, these remarks appear completely counterintuitive. Wasn't *Zarathustra* precisely *the* most widely read, admired, and commented upon of all of Nietzsche's works? — in practically every language from Ural-Altaiic to Urdu? Yet Nietzsche seems to have held — even to the end — that *Zarathustra* was *entirely personal*, bred from his own experience and suffering, and that it was a beginning at *self-disclosure*. In fact, in *Ecce Homo*, he recounts the story of von Stein's incomprehension, this time claiming that von Stein didn't understand even a single word of *Zarathustra*.<sup>14</sup> In any case, if one is thus provoked by the veritable eruption of Nietzsche's personal life into the text of *Zarathustra*, and one turns to the *Nachlass* from early 1882 to

late 1885, one will quickly find a huge amount of personal detail therein. In fact, the whole of the Lou affair is bared through tears, the years of ridicule from Wagner, the final sense of Wagner's pitiable transformation into a fawning, repentant Catholic in *Parsifal*, the devious deceptions and slights by Wagner and Rée — it's all rehearsed in the *Nachlass*, and finds its expression in the text of *Zarathustra* — usually encoded symbolically, figuratively. But more strikingly, what is really at work in the *Nachlass* of the period is Nietzsche's work of self-therapy, his *working-through-by writing-it-out* — of his desperate sense of rejection, humiliation, and shame, the *memories* of his earlier successes, which now burden him down, as well as the memories of his lonely isolation, despair, impotence and frustration. And this whole process of self-rehabilitation is orchestrated precisely according to the initial statements of Zarathustra's three metamorphoses — the camel, lion, and child.

Just to give one case: in the *Nachlass* to *Zarathustra*, Nietzsche symbolically works through his own despair, pitting a female protagonist — named "Pana" — against the broken-hearted Zarathustra. Pana is the symbolic Lou Salomé who had herself created the broken-hearted Nietzsche: so, through several drafts, Nietzsche has Pana *kill* her own now-baleful creation, precisely the despairing, broken-hearted Zarathustra, and in the last of several versions, Pana collapses in death because she could not grasp the eternal return — which states that everything depends on one's own happiness, and that one must simply accept what happens, together with the blessings this brings. Unable to grasp this "secret" of the eternal return, Pana dies, broken by this simple truth, in despair and revenge. She takes her posthumous revenge on the broken-hearted Zarathustra, however, when *he dies* of laughter at *her* pitiful, suffering condition.<sup>15</sup>

There is an awful lot of dredging-up of painful personal material here, and he recounts a remarkably detailed series of personal and interpersonal dynamics. But it seems as if Nietzsche himself didn't reach a satisfactory resolution in the text of *Zarathustra*. Zarathustra's self-overcoming is *incomplete* in that he never attains the state of innocence, the third metamorphosis of the child. Rather, he stands accused of, and indeed acknowledges, his final *sin*, namely, that of "pity for the higher man" and wanders off once again with the lion — ever courageous, but not yet innocent, at the very close of Part Four.<sup>16</sup> Even if Nietzsche worked through his intense personal suffering, and really came to deal with it effectively, what ultimately forecloses resolution in *Zarathustra*, is that he can't overcome the *memory content* of his previous states of elation and despair — both kinds of memories are instruments of torture to him — and he simply cannot forget them, i.e., he *cannot forget* the "it was," the acceptance of which the eternal return was meant to accomplish. "The *child* is innocence and forgetting": *not* the Nietzsche of *Zarathustra*.

### Autocritique of Morality in the 1886 Prefaces and *The Gay Science*, V

We know that Nietzsche contemplated writing another, final part to *Zarathustra*. But he didn't, probably for a variety of well-considered reasons. What he did do was to resolve the third metamorphosis of *Zarathustra* in his immediately succeeding works of 1886: Book Five of *The Gay Science* and his series of new prefaces to his earlier works, for a second, collected edition, by his new publisher, Fritzsch.<sup>17</sup> In these works of 1886, Nietzsche comes to realize that — as an individual — he was himself constituted precisely by the elaborate system of cultural encoding, which he had so insightfully described and criticized in his earlier work. He realizes that he, too, was subject, as was everyone else, to the ethics of sympathy and pity, to the elaborate moral and affective determination of his cultural milieu, governed by 2,000 years of Christian-priestly-ascetic values — not the very least of which was the belief that love itself is redemptive, salvific. And, of course, this value tradition is the very source of moral authority, the entire inherited series of “thou shalt” that Zarathustra so labored to destroy.

Nietzsche's turn, his *Kebr*, as it were, lies in his recognition that he must perform an *autocritique* of the values, customs, traditionally sanctioned and sanctified emotions and affects that *constituted his very being*. In short, that critique had to be supplemented by a rigorous autocritique, and he states this necessity frequently in the new Book Five of *The Gay Science*. Section § 380, “The wanderer speaks,” is perhaps the most clearly expressed articulation of the real problem: the necessity of being able to critique the very social symbolic order that governs one's identity in the first place. And in doing so, he borrows an analogy from Machiavelli's preface to *The Prince*:

If one would like to see our European morality for once as it looks from a distance, and if one would like to measure it against other moralities, past and future, then one has to proceed like a wanderer who wants to know how high the towers in a town are: he *leaves* the town. “Thoughts concerning moral prejudices,” if they are not meant to be prejudices about prejudices, presuppose a position *outside* morality, some point beyond good and evil to which one has to rise, climb, or fly — and in the present case, at least, a point beyond *our* good and evil, a freedom from everything “European,” by which I mean the sum of the imperious value judgments that have become part of our flesh and blood. That one *wants* to go precisely out there, may be a minor madness... the question is whether one really *can* get up there. ...One must have liberated oneself from many things that oppress, inhibit, hold down, and make heavy precisely us Europeans today. The human being of such a beyond who wants to behold the supreme measures of value of his time must first of all “overcome” this time in himself — this is the test of his strength — and consequently not only his time but also his prior aversion and contradiction *against* this time, his suffering from this time, his un-timeliness, his *romanticism*.<sup>18</sup>

### The 1886 Prefaces to *Human, All Too Human*: Artifice and Autocritique

The cure for Nietzsche's despondency and alienation begins with a *ruse*, a deception, namely, with the creation of an imaginary interlocutor. Much as Descartes devised

his “evil demon” to test the limits of his resolute reflection,<sup>19</sup> so does Nietzsche say that he “invented” a series of companions — sometimes called “free spirits,” or “shadows,” or even “good Europeans” — with whom he could engage in a spirited dialogue. And what motivated this — he says in the new 1886 Preface to Part One of *Human, All Too Human* — was precisely his profound sense of isolation and loneliness, and his need to be, at least at the outset, *diverted away* from his almost obsessive preoccupation with it:

I had need of them at that time if I was to keep in good spirits while surrounded by ills (sickness, solitude, unfamiliar places, torpor, inactivity): as brave companions and familiars with whom one can laugh and chatter when one feels like laughing and chattering, and whom one can send to the Devil when they become tedious — as compensation for the friends I lacked.<sup>20</sup>

The products or results of these dialogues are, of course, his works, his books, his notes of the period, whose content derived from his recognition of the causes and origins of his own restrictions, inhibitions, and suffering — precisely what he had been debating with his feigned interlocutor. The alterity — or otherness — of the imaginary companion makes concrete the range of his own imagination: by continually varying a perspective, by contradicting an initial judgment, or by insistently prodding himself into recognizing a secondary or tertiary consequence of a position. This imaginary exchange may take the form of a jest or a question, as well: “Is that what you *really* believe?” “Is there a *deeper* motivation for you saying that?” “Is that what *you* think, or is it what most people maintain?” Effectively, such a seriously maintained self-conscious dialogue serves as a critique of beliefs, values, positions, explanations — and it raises underlying questions of conditionality, legitimacy, verifiability, truth-functionality, agency, efficacy, etc., all of which are discussed repeatedly in Nietzsche’s “work” of the period, published and unpublished.

What initially results from this discursive questioning in Nietzsche’s pursuit of a “cure,” or a “self-overcoming,” is his discovery of the particular elements that bind or restrict himself — and he finds these elements to be the causal agents, the cohesive factors, that structure the morality of mores and define the individual as such within the traditional system of morality. He terms these defining and determining elements “fetters,” and he claims that they serve to constitute normalcy itself, one’s “home,” or one’s “being at home” — the regularity and normalcy of convention, of all that is usual, familiar, and “day-to-day” in social life. He enumerates those “fetters” which most palpably bond the individual not only to the traditional order, but to his own personally experienced past, thereby preventing his liberation. As he says in the new Preface to *Human, All Too Human*:

What fetters the fastest? What bonds are all but unbreakable? In the case of men of a high and select kind they will be their duties: that reverence proper to youth, that reserve before all that is honored and revered from of old, that gratitude for the



soil out of which they have grown, for the hand which led them, for the holy place where they learned to worship — their supreme moments themselves will fetter them the fastest, lay upon them the most enduring obligation.<sup>21</sup>

It is upon conducting this intense and highly-focused experience of analyzing the nature of his “fettters,” and of being able to critically articulate them — their number, type, and range; their purchase upon himself and upon the culture at large — that something personally dramatic occurs to Nietzsche. He is struck by the *feeling* (literally, an emotional *shock*) that many of these formerly revered duties, values, obligations, and past memories are simply meaningless, nonsensical, absurd; and that they merit little more than his honest contempt for their obtrusive pettiness and small-mindedness. Once this emotionally-charged thought befalls him, he realizes that he has himself changed, and this is the first step in his self-liberation. *He* can no longer hold these “fettters” in respect and esteem, and by this very fact, *they* no longer bind him. What it was, formerly, to be “at home” is now revealed to him under an entirely new sensibility — and this is felt as a new “drive” or “impulse” — as unworthy of residence, indeed, they are felt to be contemptible:

“Better to die than to go on living *here* — thus responds the imperious voice and temptation: and this “here,” this “at home” is everything it had hitherto loved.<sup>22</sup>

Nietzsche described the immediate effects of his new revelation as being twofold: he experienced a practically intolerable feeling of *shame* for the loss brought about by his obsessive inquisitiveness, his going to the utmost limits of his imagination to *understand* his distress, and by doing so, to have lost the veneration and respect for everything that until then, constituted belonging, identity, value, and honor — everything worthy of love and worship. But this feeling of loss was tempered, then overwhelmed, by a new feeling for the enormity of what he had accomplished, a feeling of immense *pride* and personal *exultation* that it was *possible at all*, that his contempt could overturn the very norms by whose agency he had previously suffered. Thus, he was tempted, even dangerously, to test other norms, limits, prescriptions, and proscriptions, to question what was formerly forbidden, and find it delightful, joyous, the sweetest fruit. From this feeling of exhaltation and delight there follows a determination to will and esteem, to evaluate, on one’s *own* account, in one’s *own* name — and one leaves “home,” the “at home,” seeking to relish and to develop the further capacity of self-determination, through new, multiply transforming and overturning, valuations and estimations. Literally and figuratively, for Nietzsche, this involves the determination to *travel*, to get *beside* himself,<sup>23</sup> to self-consciously seek other, *strange*, abodes and customs, other entire systems of valuation, other realms of the human spirit itself: to be an “Argonaut of the ideal.”<sup>24</sup> Thus, *one uses oneself as an experiment*, as an open-ended source of experiences for experiment<sup>25</sup> in the construction of one’s developing hierarchy of values — one’s own considered construal of what really *is* important, what *is* significant, of worth and

merit — what is worthy of admiration, affection, and esteem: again, in one's own name and in one's own service.

At the same time, one progressively uncovers the truth of things, of people and of events. By withholding the conventional value-positing perspective, the prevailing mode of esteem or belief that enshrouds something, by “turning it around,” one can uncover the distorting biases that contextualize and determine the very significance, the symbolic “truth,” of things. And, gradually, they begin to appear to a less biased eye as things yet unseen, marvelous in their complexity of texture, their simplicity of intent, ever adaptable to the disposition of the observer — mutable in their very disclosure. As Nietzsche says in the new Preface to *Human, All Too Human*:

With a wicked laugh he turns round whatever he finds veiled and through some sense of shame or other spared and pampered: he puts to the test what these things look like *when* they are reversed. It is an act of willfulness and pleasure in willfulness, if now he perhaps bestows his favor on that which has hitherto had a bad reputation — if, full of inquisitiveness and the desire to tempt and experiment, he creeps around the things most forbidden.<sup>26</sup>

Spurred on by the possibility that “*all* values” may be turned around, Nietzsche says that he began to cultivate a curious sort of cynicism, thinking that the very absolutes themselves may well have been little more than platitudes. This acquired cynicism, and a certain irony attendant to it, provokes even further “wandering” and testing of limits — until he is quite far afield, in “the desert” of his tempting experiments. This “experimentalism” produces in him, Nietzsche says, a kind of “solitude,” sometimes even a “morbid isolation,” but one that has gathered into itself such a breadth of values and penetrating perspectives that he no longer feels constrained at all — least of all by the old “fettters”:

One lives no longer in the fetters of love and hatred, without yes, without no, near or far as one wishes...also [without] the quantum of stupidity that resides in antitheses of values and the whole intellectual loss which every For, every Against costs us.<sup>27</sup>

Having broken these fetters, one has the feeling of a great elation, namely, “that *mature* freedom of spirit which is equally self-mastery and discipline of the heart, and permits access to many and contradictory modes of thought.”<sup>28</sup> Freed from “the spirit of gravity,” and free to will one's own “scale of values,” one is no longer compelled by the old fetters or compelled to suffer from them. This sense of elation or “weightlessness” one has attained, together with the fact that one has welcomed *so much* — in gratifying one's inner temptation to experiment with a plethora of experiences — means that one *returns* from one's desert transformed. One possesses a generosity of spirit, an “inner spaciousness and indulgence,” such that everything appears benign and innocent, drained of ominous portent and freed from malice of intent. One gains the stability of one's own power over one's perspective, and this at once liberates the individual from bitterness and recrimination while it places one

above — at a distance, with a feeling of distance from<sup>29</sup> — the pettiness and vindictiveness of others: rather, with a spirit of exuberance and freedom, in which “curiosity is united with a tender contempt,” he remarks:

It again grows warmer around him, yellower, as it were; feeling and feeling for others acquire depth, warm breezes of all kinds blow across him. It seems to him as if his eyes are only now open to what is *close at hand*. He is astonished and sits silent: where had he been? These close and closest things: how changed they seem! what bloom and magic have they acquired! He looks back gratefully — grateful to his wandering, to his hardness and self-alienation, to his viewing of far distances and bird-like flights in cold heights. What a good thing he had not always stayed “at home,” stayed “under his own roof” like a delicate apathetic loafer! He had been beside himself: no doubt of that. Only now does he see himself — and what surprises he experiences as he does so!<sup>30</sup>

Attaining such a state, such an attitude of mind, one is “cured,” as of a past illness and a long convalescence, by the “Great Liberation.” And everything is welcomed, without addition or loss, even “the *necessary* injustice...as inseparable from life, life itself as *conditioned* by the sense of perspective and its injustice.”<sup>31</sup> Thus, finally having gained possession of his own self-mastery through controlling his sense of perspective, having freed himself from bondage to the imperative of the “thou shalt” — and the personal discontent caused by it — Nietzsche would reflect, “You come to realize how you have given ear to the voice of nature, that nature which rules the whole world through joy.”<sup>32</sup> Reviewing the joys that nature itself bestows upon someone so “cured” as himself, Nietzsche ends the discussion of his own “liberation” with a series of light-hearted “injunctions” — the last of which affirms the resolution to Zarathustra’s paradoxical departure: smiling, strong as bronze, accompanied by his laughing lion:

You shall... You shall... You shall... You shall — enough: from now on the free spirit *knows* what “you shall” he has obeyed, and he also knows what he now *can*, what only now he — *may* do...<sup>33</sup>

### Endnotes

1. Letter to Malwida von Meysenbug, May 1887, in Friedrich Nietzsche, *Selected Letters of Friedrich Nietzsche*, ed. and Eng. tr., Christopher Middleton (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), p. 266.
2. Nietzsche, *Samtliche Werke: Kritische Studienausgabe*, Ed., Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari (Berlin: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag / Walter de Gruyter, 1980), Vol. 7, pp. 333–350. Hereafter cited as KSA, followed by the page number/range.
3. KSA 1, 641–752.
4. KSA, 764–777. Eng. tr. by Carol Diethe in Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morality* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1994), pp. 176–86.
5. KSA 7, 359–369, 185–90. Eng. tr., W. Kaufmann, in Carl Dahlhaus, *Between Romanticism and Modernism: Four Studies in the Music of the Later 19th Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), pp. 106–119.
6. KSA 1, 783–792. Eng. tr., Christa D. Acampora, in Nietzsche, *Nietzscheana*, No. 5 (Urbana, Ill.: North American Nietzsche Society, 1996). Cf. also, Carol Diethe’s translation “Homer on Competition,” in Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morality*, pp. 187–94.

7. Jacob Burckhardt, *The Greeks and Greek Civilization*, ed., Oswyn Murray, Eng. tr., Sheila Stern (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), pp. 160–213.
8. Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, Eng. tr., W. Kaufmann (New York: Vintage, 1974) IV, §341, pp. 273–74.
9. *Ibid.*, §340, p. 272.
10. *Ibid.*, §339, pp. 271–72.
11. Letter to Carl von Gersdorff, June 28, 1883, in F. Nietzsche, *Selected Letters of Friedrich Nietzsche*, ed. and Eng. tr., Christopher Middleton (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), p. 213.
12. Letter to Peter Gast, August, 1883<sub>2</sub> in *ibid.*, p. 218. Cf. also, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, in Nietzsche, *The Portable Nietzsche*, ed. and Eng. tr., W. Kaufmann (New York: Viking Press, 1968), Part I, “On Reading and Writing,” p. 152: “Of all that is written I love only what a man has written with his blood. Write with blood, and you will experience that blood is spirit. It is not easily possible to understand the blood of another.”
13. Letter to Gast, Sept. 4, 1884, in *Selected Letters*, op. cit., p. 230.
14. Nietzsche, *Ecce Homo*, in *On the Genealogy of Morals and Ecce Homo*, ed., Eng. tr., Kaufmann (New York: Vintage, 1969): *EH Why I Write such Good Books*, I, p. 259.
15. KSA 10, 443.
16. Z, Part IV, *The Sign*, p. 439.
17. For a remarkably clear and detailed account of the events leading up to the appearance of the Second Edition of Nietzsche's writings, see William H. Schaberg's *The Nietzsche Canon: A Publication History and Bibliography* (Chicago: The University Press of Chicago, 1995), pp. 126–140.
18. GS, V, §380, pp. 342–43.
19. René Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, in *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, Eng. tr., John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff, Dugald Murdoch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989). Vol. II, Med. I, p. 15.
20. Nietzsche, *Human, All Too Human*<sub>2</sub> Eng. tr., R. J. Hollingdale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), Part I, Preface, §2, p. 6. In the 1886 Preface to Part Two of HH, he reformulates this “invention” of an other “free spirit” and, less dramatically, says that, “As a solitary I spoke without witnesses,” thus internalizing the discussion as an “inner” dialogue (*Ibid.*, II, Preface, §5, p. 212). Cf. also, KSA 12, 146, a working note to the new Preface of HH, I, where he says that “solitude constrains him to create beings who resemble him.”
21. *Ibid.*, I, Preface, §3, pp. 6–7.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
23. Even if this involves an initial period of studied affectation or pretense, such that by repetition, one could induce oneself to acquire in person those attitudes one initially feigns: “It was then I learned the art of *appearing* cheerful, objective, inquisitive, above all healthy and malicious... here a sufferer and self-denier speaks as though he were *not* a sufferer and self-denier. Here there is a *determination* to preserve an equilibrium and composure in the face of life and even a sense of gratitude towards it, here there rules a vigorous, proud, constantly watchful and sensitive will that has set itself the task of defending life against pain and of striking down all those inferences that pain, disappointment, ill-humor, solitude, and other swampgrounds usually cause to flourish like poisonous fungi” (*Ibid.*, II, Preface, §5, p. 212).
24. GS, V, §382, p. 346.
25. HH, I, §292, p. 134.
26. *Ibid.*, Preface, §3, p. 7.
27. *Ibid.*, §§5,6, pp. 8–9.
28. *Ibid.*, §4, p. 8.
29. Nietzsche would call this “the pathos of distance” in *Beyond Good and Evil*, Eng. tr., W. Kaufmann (New York: Vintage, 1966), IX, §257, pp. 201–202. Cf. also, BGE II, §43–44, pp. 53–56; EH, *The Untimely Ones*, § 3, p. 281.
30. HH, I, Preface, §5, p. 8.
31. *Ibid.*, §6, p. 9.
32. HH, I, 5, §292, p. 135.
33. *Ibid.*, Preface, §6, p. 9.

