The Orientation of the Nietzschean Text

Graham Parkes

I imagine future thinkers in whom European-American indefatigability is combined with the hundredfold-inherited contemplativeness of the Asians: such a combination will bring the riddle of the world to a solution. In the meantime the reflective free spirits have their mission: they are to remove all barriers that stand in the way of a coalescence of human beings.

Friedrich Nietzsche, 1876

The past decade or so has seen a powerful resurgence of interest in the thought of Friedrich Nietzsche on a global scale. Yet while this revival has surged along several fronts in the United States and Europe—in literary theory, psychology, and social and political theory as much as in philosophy—it has generally been informed by a peculiar parochialism. To judge from a perusal of the dozens of books and articles on Nietzsche that appear each month, one would have no idea that his work has had a significant impact on the intellectual life of any non-Western culture, or elicited any worthwhile response from thinkers outside the Continental European or Anglo-American philosophical traditions. Only a handful of commentators in the West has had anything to say about Nietzsche's references—and they are by no means infrequent—to non-Western philosophies or religions. It would be worthwhile to reflect on the implications of these references for our thinking about modernity, and for appropriate orientations toward what is succeeding the modern.

The "and" linking the name "Nietzsche" to the "Asian Thought" in the title of the present collection is intended to work both ways, relating
Nietzsche's philosophy back to Asian ideas that may have influenced it (and here it is a case only of the Indian tradition), as well as forward to the influence his ideas have had on Asian thought in the course of the past hundred years (in this respect the focus is on China and Japan, where the response has been most sustained). The figure named "Nietzsche" appears to confront what was then called the Near East while looking forward to the Far East of Asia. The Nietzschean text may thus be oriented both with respect to the ways in which threads from earlier, foreign texts have been incorporated into it and with respect to the strands of Nietzsche's ideas that are being woven in turn into the intellectual fabric of East Asia. A number of Nietzsche's latter-day pronouncements concerning the imminent impact of his ideas upon the world convey an uncanny prescience that his influence would extend far beyond the boundaries of Europe. The history of the subsequent decades suggests that the hyper-global resoundings of his rhetoric did not issue merely from the megalomania of impending insanity.

While Nietzsche was more pleased than surprised that his works were nowhere less appreciated than in his native land, it was not long after his mental collapse that his fame spread rapidly throughout Germany, and from there to the rest of the European continent. Indeed, his madness was to a large extent a catalyst for his immediately ensuing fame, especially as it was exploited by his sister Elizabeth for the promotion of the "Nietzsche Cult." By 1888, a year before Nietzsche's collapse, the Danish scholar Georg Brandes had begun to give public lectures on his philosophy in Copenhagen. The many articles and the book on Nietzsche that Brandes went on to publish over the next several years served to develop an intelligent receptivity to the ideas of the "mad philosopher" throughout northern Europe.

Most ardent of Francophiles as he was, Nietzsche would have been gladdened to see the affirmative response his works were soon to attain in France, engendering an interest there that has been more steadily sustained than anywhere else and that has become especially fecund over the past several decades. In view of his love of the South, the reception of his ideas in Latin countries would also have been heartening. A book on Nietzsche in Spain discusses, among other things, his impact on the two greatest Spanish philosophers of the century: Ortega y Gasset and Miguel de Unamuno. Contributions to a volume of papers from a conference on "Nietzsche in Italy" discuss that country's importance for him and, to a lesser extent, the response his works have evoked there. Nietzsche's reception in Great Britain has been the subject of two lengthy monographs, and more detailed studies concerning particular figures in English literature continue to appear. Apart from a doctoral dissertation, however, no major study has as yet been published chronicling the course of his influence on the American intellectual world. It would surely be an illuminating exercise to document the decades up to the appearance of Walter Kaufmann's *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist* in 1950. And while Nietzsche took a certain delight in the news that his works had been banned in Russia more or less from the time *The Birth of Tragedy* appeared, he could hardly have guessed at the breadth of his subsequent influence in that vast land.

A perusal of the literature would not, however, suggest that the shock waves of Nietzsche's impact on the intellectual and cultural world spread any farther eastward than into Russia—and hardly as far as to the Far East. The revised and expanded edition of *The International Nietzsche Bibliography* purports to include a large proportion of the serious scholarly articles on Nietzsche and "virtually all of the books and monographs that came to [the editors'] attention." Of the twenty-six different languages under which the citations are listed, however, only two are Asian: in the main body of the book there is one entry in Vietnamese and two in Japanese (though both the authors cited in this latter case are European). There is no reference to any of the work on Nietzsche published in Chinese. With the addition of the Supplement, which covers the years 1960–67, twelve titles by Japanese authors find their way into the lists, bringing the total of Asian entries to thirteen—among a grand total of 4566 works listed.

Essays on Nietzsche began to appear in periodicals in Japan while he was still alive, during the last decade of the nineteenth century. Raphael von Koeber, who taught philosophy at the Imperial University of Tokyo, began to talk about Nietzsche in his lectures there during the mid-eighteen-nineties, and in 1897 the Head of the Philosophy Department there, Inoue Tetsujirō, bought an edition of Nietzsche's complete works in Germany and, on his return to Japan, introduced some of the German philosopher's ideas to his students. In 1898 an article appeared in one of the leading literary journals which presented Nietzsche's ideas as a challenge to stimulate Japanese Buddhism to engage in philosophical reflection upon its foundations. Three years later, in 1901, the "aesthetic life" debate broke out, a controversy among the most famous literary figures of the period which raged for over two years. Hundreds of pages of attacks and counterattacks were published; reputations were defamed, careers ruined; mere anarchy was loosed upon the hitherto orderly in-
The intellectual world of Japan. And at the eye of the storm, the figure of a recently deceased thinker who had spent the previous decade benighted by madness, gazing almost wordlessly into the invisible.

This was a time at which many students from China were studying in Japan, and several of the brightest returned home full of enthusiasm for the ideas of the German philosopher who had fired such an unprecedented uproar in Japanese intellectual life. The two most eminent figures here are Wang Guowei, who published a book on Schopenhauer and Nietzsche in 1905, and Lu Xun (Lu Hsun), the first of whose many writings on Nietzsche appeared in 1907. These works sparked an interest in Nietzsche in China that has ranged—and often raged—from enthusiastically pro to fanatically contra and embraced the political spectrum from Left to Right and back again. In the past several years, significantly, the interest in Nietzsche in Chinese intellectual life has enjoyed a special resurgence.

The tragic irony of Nietzsche's fate—that he sacrificed his mental and physical health for the sake of writing books which hardly anyone read during his career, but which became enormously popular shortly after he lost his sanity (in 1889)—is intensified as one comes to learn the history of the enthusiastic reception his work enjoyed in these two East Asian countries about which he knew next to nothing, a reception that burgeoned a mere decade or so after his mental collapse. The handful of works on this aspect of the response to Nietzsche represents a minuscule portion of the enormous volume of literature in Western languages which chronicles and analyzes the impact of Nietzsche's work on the rest of the world. The present collection is intended as an initial contribution toward redressing this imbalance.

II

Thus it would have to be possible to use [Nietzsche's] teachings in any given orientation.

Georges Bataille

The exclusionary character of the current "Nietzsche renaissance" in the West is highlighted in advance by the content of an aphorism Nietzsche himself penned in 1879 under the title "Where one must travel to":

Direct self-observation is not nearly sufficient for us to know ourselves: we require history, for the past continues to flow within us in a hundred waves; we ourselves are, indeed, nothing but that which at every moment we experience of this continued flowing. . . . To understand history . . . we have to travel . . . to other nations . . . and especially to where human beings have taken off the garb of Europe or have not yet put it on. (HA II/1, 223)

Although Nietzsche was in actuality a nomad for the greater part of his adult life, his wanderings were confined to Europe, and to a relatively small area bounded by the Swiss Alps, the south of France, northern Italy, and his homeland near Leipzig. But his prescription is explicitly deliteralized as the passage continues:

But there exists a subtler art and object of travel which does not always require us to move from place to place. . . . He who, after long practice in this art of travel, has become a hundred-eyed Argos . . . will rediscover the adventurous travels of his ego . . . in Egypt and Greece, Byzantium and Rome, France and Germany . . . in the Renaissance and the Reformation, at home and abroad, indeed in the sea, the forests, in the plants and in the mountains. Thus self-knowledge will become knowledge of everything [All-Erkenntnis] with regard to all that is past. 12

While the primary thrust of this call to travel is metaphorical and archeo-psychological, we shall see that there is no reason to exclude India, China, and Japan from the way-stations just enumerated for the intellectual odyssey Nietzsche is recommending.

In Plato's Symposium Diotima rehearses to Socrates the various ways in which “what is mortal shares in immortality” (208b). Superior to the crudely literal procreation of offspring is the method that proceeds by achieving honor and glory. But higher still is a "pregnancy of soul" which, stimulated by intercourse with another, beautiful soul, gives birth to wisdom in the form of poetic discourses and ideas (logoi)—such as the quasi-immortal children produced by Homer, Hesiod, and other great poets. Platonic parent that he is, Nietzsche is fond of adopting (and adapting) Plato's psychological metaphors, and even in his most "scientific" work he speaks of immortality in a context similar to that of the Symposium. In the context of a discussion of "real immortality" he writes of the happy fate of the author

who as an old man can say that all of life-engendering, strengthening, elevating, enlightening thought and feeling that was in him lives on in his writings, and that he himself is nothing but the grey ashes, while the fire has everywhere been saved and borne forward. (HA I, 208)

The next aphorism elaborates the idea of the work of art or of thought as a vehicle for a kind of immortality on the part of its creator:

The thinker, and the artist likewise, who has secreted his better self in his works, feels an almost malicious joy when he sees how his body and his spirit are being
slowly broken down and destroyed by time; it is as though he observed from a corner a thief working away at his money-chest, while knowing that the chest is empty and all the treasures saved. (HA I, 209)

In the well-known discussion of writing in Plato’s *Phaedrus*, Socrates contrasts the written text unfavorably with living speech, denigrating it as a bastard form of discourse consisting of “dead” characters incapable of defending or explaining themselves in the absence of the father who engendered them. From a Nietzschean perspective Socrates would appear to be a pathologically protective parent:

Once a thing is committed to writing it circulates equally among those who understand the subject and those who have no business with it; a writing cannot distinguish between suitable and unsuitable readers. And if it is ill treated or unfairly abused it always needs its parent to come to its rescue. . . . (*Phaedrus*, 275e)

 Aphorism 208 of *Human, All Too Human* bears the title “The Book Almost Become a Human Being,” and its author shows himself to be a relatively relaxed progenitor of vital works:

Every writer is surprised anew how, once a book has detached itself from him, it goes on to live a life of its own; . . . it seeks out its readers, enkindles life, makes happy, terrifies, engenders new works, becomes the soul of new designs and undertakings. . . .

It is instructive to reflect on the changes that such an “almost human” being undergoes when it travels to foreign lands. Rather than move us to complain that the Nietzschean text is inevitably distorted and misunderstood when it is interpreted in an alien cultural context, that readers from a different tradition read too many of their own assumptions into the author’s “own” text, the responses of foreign interpreters may serve to open us to hitherto concealed aspects of the corpus. It is interesting enough to contemplate the mutations and adaptations of a strain of plant or species of animal in response to the different conditions of a new environment; how much more can be learned when the creature in question is possessed of an “almost human” intelligence.

III

A growing number of collections of essays on Nietzsche has been appearing recently—a happy circumstance, for the most part, in view of the anthology’s being such an appropriate genre for secondary literature on a primarily literary thinker. Nietzsche is above all a writer in many voices, and one problem with books written about his work is that they have been mainly “monologic,” with the author speaking in only one voice. There is a far greater chance that justice will be done to the polyphony of Nietzsche’s thought and the diversity of his styles in an anthology, where an actual multiplicity of different voices is invited to discourse on his texts. The present collection improves the odds still further by bringing a number of voices from East Asia as well as from Europe into the dialogue. The expectation is that such an anthology (the term originally refers to a collection of the flowers of poetry) may lend new bloom and fresh perspectives to our picture of the thinker Nietzsche.

Joan Stambaugh opens the conversation by invoking a figure who has been largely neglected in the scholarly literature: Nietzsche the mystical poet and “poetic mystic.” She closes by suggesting an affinity between Nietzsche and the thinkers of classical Daoism, though in the context of a disavowal of explicit comparisons in what has just gone before. Her essay is richly allusive, its initial discussion of Zarathustra’s paeon to the heaven sounding a chord that evokes immediate and lasting resonances with the idea of “Heaven” (*tian*) in Daoism. Stambaugh suggests, on the basis of a consideration of some of the more mystical episodes in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, that an important aspect of *das Fremde* (the foreign, the Other) for Nietzsche may well have been the realm of mystical experience. In this context she adduces some passages from Meister Eckhart and the thirteenth-century Japanese Zen thinker Dōgen which appear, in spite of their very different contexts, to be describing similar realms of experience to those explored by Zarathustra.13

In his hermeneutically oriented essay Eberhard Scheffele surveys the spectrum of Nietzsche’s discussions of “the foreign,” which—from the perspective of his “own” German culture—range from France, Italy, and Poland, through Greece and the Near East, to India and China. He argues that Nietzsche’s primary concern with other cultures distant in space and time grew out of the hermeneutic enterprise of attaining a better understanding of the contemporary European cultural situation. For that, according to Nietzsche, it is necessary to gain some distance, to exit the familiar and transpose oneself into the realm of the foreign. Scheffele suggests that Nietzsche’s excursions to Asia are less in the interests of an understanding of alien cultures and ways of thinking in themselves than in the service of attaining different and enlightening perspectives on the traveler’s home environs.
With respect to the influence of Asian ideas on the development of Nietzsche's thought, the only candidates come from India, a country whose culture he was most fond of invoking. Johann Figl begins at the beginning, with a consideration of Nietzsche's first introduction to Asian thought while a student at the famous boarding school at Pforna. From a meticulous study of the archival materials pertaining to that period, Figl carefully delineates the range of texts and ideas to which the young Nietzsche appears to have been exposed.

Moving to a consideration of some of Nietzsche's published works, Michel Hulin examines the rather complex attitude of their author to the topic of asceticism, with particular reference to the ascetic tradition in India. The illumination provided by an Indologist points up the limitations of some of Nietzsche's views of Indian culture, highlighting his tendency to make broad generalizations on the basis of insufficient knowledge. But at the same time this essay prompts an appreciation for the intuitiveness of some of his insights into a culture so foreign to his own. Personally an ascetic character himself, Nietzsche's reflections on asceticism in an alien context serve to fill out his picture of the phenomenon as it manifested itself closer to him, in the Christian tradition in which he grew up.

Mervyn Sprung presents the results of his research into the archives concerning an aspect of Nietzsche's adult life. A complementary examination of correspondence and biographical documentation by Nietzsche's friends leads the author to what may be for many a surprising conclusion concerning the extent of the mature thinker's acquaintance with and interest in Indian culture and philosophy. However intrigued the young Nietzsche may have been by the subject, the evidence presented here militates against an abiding interest in Indian thought per se—and may be seen as supporting Scheiffele's claim that Nietzsche's primary concern with "the foreign" is as a moment in a hermeneutic strategy of distancing for the purpose of better self-understanding.

Leaving the question of influence behind, Glen Martin undertakes a comparison of Nietzsche's methods and ideas with those of a major figure in the Mahayana Buddhist tradition (with whom Nietzsche was presumably not acquainted), Nagarjuna. There have been as many arguments in the literature concerning the true nature of Nagarjuna's aims and methods as there have been (in a different literature) concerning Nietzsche's, and Martin's intelligent juxtaposition of the two thinkers in this context may well serve to settle some of them. In the concluding section of the paper he broaches the topic of nihilism in Nietzsche, relating it to a recent extension of Mahayana Buddhist thought in the work of the contemporary Japanese philosopher Nishitani Keiji.

The initial reception of Nietzsche's works in foreign countries was almost always on the part of literary figures rather than philosophers, who have in general been slow to appreciate the full depth to his ideas. The case of China is no exception to this rule, as a recent essay by Yue Daiyun demonstrates in some detail. Many of the writers associated with the May Fourth Movement of 1919 were great Nietzsche enthusiasts, seeing his ideas as tools with which to build a "new China." No less enthusiastic were the right-wing intellectuals aligned with the Guomindang in the early forties, but they had to highlight quite different aspects of Nietzsche's thought in order to use it for opposite ideological purposes. This salient feature of Nietzsche receptions in many places—that enthusiasm may run equally high at opposite ends of the ideological spectrum—is especially interesting in the case of China and Japan, where his putative "individualism" exploded with the force of a fragmentation bomb, igniting blazing controversies on either side of a variety of ideological fences.

Chen Guying looks back to some of the earliest texts of the Chinese canon, to a thinker whose texts resonate more sympathetically with Nietzsche's than those of any other from that tradition: the classical Daoist thinker Zhuang Zi (Chuang Tzu). Chen's discussion, which is exemplary of modern Chinese scholarship on Nietzsche, articulates a number of similarities between the two philosophies—in spite of their stemming from totally disparate social and cultural circumstances. The author also delineates the major areas of difference, concluding with some criticisms of both for being unnecessarily antisocial in their thinking.

Roger Ames keeps the discussion extended across the same span of time in his comparison of the Daoist idea of de ("power," "virtuality") with Nietzsche's notion of Wille zur Macht. Both ideas are notoriously difficult to understand, but in this case suspicions of explanations of obscum per obscurum are dispelled as the bifocal scrutiny begins to shed light on both poles of the comparison. By elaborating an idea from the Daoist tradition of a cosmology that is significantly different from the traditional Western conception, Ames aims to highlight some unconventionally cosmological aspects of Nietzsche's thought. Not only does the essay constitute an invitation to students of Nietzsche to look
of some corresponding ideas from the Buddhist tradition. The centerpiece of the essay is a reading of Thus Spoke Zarathustra in which Sonoda examines the place of silence in the protagonist’s attempts to give voice to the thought of the eternal recurrence of the same. He draws an illuminating parallel between the rhetorical situations of Zarathustra and the authors of the Buddhist sutras, suggesting a deeper function to language than that of communication. The essay ends with a richly allusive discussion of the well-known central episode in the Vimalakirtinirdesa Sutra.

IV

It was not in his nihilistic view of Buddhism but in such ideas as amor fati and the Dionysian as the overcoming of nihilism that Nietzsche came closest to Buddhism, and especially to Mahayana.

Nishitani Keiji

Nietzsche studies continue to be pursued with enthusiasm and rigor in Japan today. One indication of the contemporary importance of Nietzsche is the fact that the entirety of the Colli and Montinari critical edition of the published works has been available in Japanese for some time, while the project to translate this edition into English is only now getting under way. Indeed, a significant absence from the present collection of essays is a contribution from the foremost living Nietzsche scholar in Japan, Nishitani Keiji (whose work is nevertheless referred to by several of the contributors). Professor Nishitani is a major precursor in the discipline of comparative philosophy in general, and in the comparative approach to Nietzsche’s work in particular. Considerations of time and space have not permitted the translation into English, as originally planned, of a seminal essay by Nishitani on Nietzsche’s Zarathustra and Meister Eckhart, written in the late thirties shortly after his return from studying with Heidegger in Freiburg; but an extensive discussion of Nietzsche’s work may be found in a 1949 text of Nishitani’s recently translated as The Self-Overcoming of Nihilism. The author acknowledges Nietzsche as a major mentor, expressing admiration for his affirmative stance (or dance) in the face of nihilism, and offers a rewarding reading of his works from a standpoint informed by Zen Buddhist ideas.

The relations between Nietzsche’s work and Buddhist thinking in general form one of the potentially most fertile fields for future comparative research. His acquaintance with Buddhism appears to have
come primarily through Schopenhauer, with little evidence of his having done much independent study. His understanding is thus restricted to early Hinayana forms of Buddhism, and with respect to the philosophical ideas he found there he was quite ambivalent. This ambivalence is summed up in a passage from The Antichrist in which Nietzsche on the one hand ranks Buddhism with Christianity as a "décadence religion," and on the other praises it for having transcended the "self-deception of moral concepts" to attain a stance "beyond good and evil" (AC 20).

A major ground for this ambivalence is surely to be found in Nietzsche's eventual repudiation of his early mentors Schopenhauer and Wagner. The former's championship of Buddhism is better known, perhaps, than Wagner's espousal, the latter having received the major impetus to study Buddhism from his reading of Schopenhauer, who soon replaced Feuerbach as his favorite philosopher. Wagner was writing enthusiastically about Buddhism as early as the mid-eighteen-fifties, and Schopenhauerian and Buddhist ideas together exerted a strong influence on the rest of his career—on his music dramas as well as his theoretical writings. If Nietzsche criticizes Buddhism as often as he praises it, his criticisms usually have an anti-Schopenhauerian or anti-Wagnerian tone to them. In The Gay Science, for instance, he writes: "Wagner is Schopenhauerian in his attempts to understand Christianity as a seed of Buddhism carried far by the wind, and to prepare a Buddhist epoch in Europe, with an occasional rapprochement with Catholic-Christian formulas and sentiments" (GS 99). Accordingly, Nietzsche later reproaches Wagner for rewriting the end of Siegfried to give it a Schopenhauer-inspired finale of redemption: "So he translated the Ring into Schopenhauerian... nothingness, the Indian Circe, beckons" (The Case of Wagner 4). In a letter to Peter Gast just before this late text was to go to press, Nietzsche sees to confirm the basis for his criticism by asking for the volume and page reference to "a variant of Brünnhilde's last song that is entirely Buddhistic." 22

Nietzsche's acquaintance with Buddhist ideas did not extend to the later, Mahayana schools which spread from India to China and from there to Korea and Japan. In China the confluence with the Daoist tradition led to the emergence of Chan Buddhism, which on being transplanted to the shores of Japan assumed the form of Buddhism that is perhaps closest to Nietzsche—namely, Zen. Given the deep resonances between Nietzsche's and Buddhist ideas, there are good grounds for supposing that his revulsion against certain aspects of Schopenhauer's and Wagner's thinking discouraged him from studying Buddhism more seriously—and that if he had had access to the world of later Buddhist

thought he would have found the atmosphere there philosophically bracing and the ideas much to his own taste. (A reader familiar with comparative studies of Nietzsche and the Daoists would have a similarly justified expectation with respect to Daoism.)

With his characteristic lack of modesty—so off-putting to his detractors and endearing to his admirers—Nietzsche claimed to have looked into the most life-denying forms of pessimism "with an Asiatic and trans-Asiatic eye" (BGE 56). Taken together with his suggestion that his freedom from prejudices has to do with his "trans-European eye," we are faced with a claim to an unusually synoptic and global perspective. Considerable support for the validity of this claim is provided by a number of the essays that follow.

Asian-comparative studies of Nietzsche bear upon the issue of his status as a global thinker also with respect to the debate—initiated by Heidegger and furthered more recently by thinkers such as Gadamer and Derrida—concerning the "end" of the Western metaphysical tradition. The contention that Nietzsche managed to extricate himself from the tradition of Western metaphysics is lent greater force if his thought can be shown to be congruent in important respects with two radically unmetaphysical ways of thinking (Daoism and Zen Buddhism) stemming from totally alien traditions with which he was quite unfamiliar.

Nietzsche's fantasy concerning a synthesis of Western and Asian thought (expressed in the epigraph to this now concluding introduction) was penned in the summer of 1876—a time at which he first started talking about becoming a "good European" and issuing impassioned diatribes against nationalism of any kind. It was also a period during which he was trying to discern his task in life, to determine what he himself would be able to accomplish in the brief span of time allotted to him, and what he would have to leave to succeeding generations of thinkers. He saw it as one of the major shortcomings of modernity that it discouraged people to strive for truly long-term goals—ones that would take generations to achieve. One may therefore be justified in imputing to Nietzsche an aim—that of effecting a synthesis between Eastern and Western thinking—which he had no illusions about being able to achieve within his lifetime. He saw himself as sowing the seeds of such a synthesis, in the full realization that the tending and harvesting would come only later, and from hands other than his own. To borrow an image from a work of the same period: he was concerned to "plant a tree that would demand constant tending for a century and is intended to provide shade for long successions of generations" (HA I,
Playing on the root meaning of the term just a little, one could say that the present anthology is intended to cultivate a few scions from such a tree, saplings whose branches might eventually overshadow at least some of the borderland between orient and occident.

Notes

1. Nietzsche's impact in India appears to have been less widespread than in China and Japan. The major Indian figure in this context is the Islamic thinker and poet Mohammad Iqbal, who in his thirties spent several years in Europe (1905–08) and began to publish works influenced by Nietzsche in 1915. See Subhash C. Kashyap, The Unknown Nietzsche (Delhi, 1970), and R. A. Nicholson's Introduction to his translation of Iqbal's first Nietzschean work Secrets of the Self (Lahore, 1944).

2. The most comprehensive study of Nietzsche's influence on German (and to some extent European) letters is the monumental two-volume work by Richard Frank Krummell, Nietzsche und der deutsche Geist (Berlin and New York, 1974 and 1983). Volume I covers the years 1867–1900 and Volume II 1901–1918.

3. A detailed account (with magnificent illustrations) of the impact of the figure of Nietzsche on the visual arts in Europe around the turn of the century is Jürgen Krause, "Mäthyer" and "Prophet": Studien zum Nietzsche-Kult in der bildenden Kunst der Jahrhundertwende (Berlin and New York, 1984).


6. Thomas Harrison, ed., Nietzsche in Italy (Saratoga, 1988). This collection contains a number of interesting papers that look at Nietzsche from a variety of literary, musical, filmic, and even equine perspectives.

7. David S. Thatcher, Nietzsche in England 1890–1914: The Growth of a Reputation (Toronto, 1970) offers a detailed account of the early British reception of Nietzsche, and especially of his impact on such men of letters as George Bernard Shaw, William Butler Yeats, Havelock Ellis, A. R. Orage, and John Davidson. His chapter on the early English translations of Nietzsche's works is of particular interest. Patrick Bridgewater's Nietzsche's Nietzsche in Anglo-Saxon: A Study of Nietzsche's Impact on English and American Literature (Leicester, 1972) appears to have been written independently since it covers many of the same authors, but it also has interesting chapters on Herbert Read and D. H. Lawrence. The last five chapters discuss the effect Nietzsche exerted on several figures in American literature, notably, Jack London, Eugene O'Neill, and Wallace Stevens. John Burt Foster's Heirs to Dionysus: A Nietzschean Current in Literary Modernism (Princeton, 1981) traces Nietzschean influences on the novels of D. H. Lawrence, André Malraux, and Thomas Mann, with some discussion of his impact on Gide, Yeats, and the Russian novelist Andrei Bely. Among the studies to have appeared more recently are: Colin Milton, Lawrence and Nietzsche: A Study in Influence (Aberdeen, 1987), Frances Oppel, Mask and Tragedy: Yeats and Nietzsche (Charlottesville, 1987), and Keith May, Nietzsche and Modern Literature: Themes in Yeats, Rilke, Mann & Lawrence (Basingstoke 1988).


10. An account of the debate may be found in chapter 11 of the present volume.


12. HA II/1, 223. I have modified Hollingdale's translation here and in several subsequent passages from this work.


15. Such internal antitheses in the reaction to Nietzsche's ideas were nowhere more pronounced than in Germany itself, where his earliest proponents were socialists, anarchists, and feminists, while it took some time for the nationalists,
racists, and imperialists to extract and deploy their ideological ammunition from his works. An interesting study is R. Hinton Thomas, *Nietzsche in German Politics and Society* 1890–1918 (Manchester, 1983; LaSalle, 1986).


19. For a comprehensive account which documents the sources of Nietzsche’s acquaintance with Buddhist thought, distinguishes his references to Buddhism based on genuine understanding from those based on misunderstanding, and draws a number of interesting parallels, see Freny Mistry, *Nietzsche and Buddhism* (Berlin and New York, 1981).


21. In a letter to Franz Liszt of 7 June 1855, Wagner writes, “The deep longing [for the extinction of one’s individual existence] is expressed more purely and more significantly in the most sacred and oldest religion of the human race, the doctrine of the Brahmans, and especially in its final transfiguration and highest perfection, Buddhism” (Albert Goldman and Evert Sprinchnorn, eds., *Wagner on Music and Drama* [New York, 1964], p. 277).


23. For a comparison of Nietzsche’s ideas concerning the *Affekte* and *Leidenschaften* with those of the Zen thinkers Rinzai and Hakuin, see Graham Parkes, “The Transformation of Emotion in Rinzai Zen and Nietzsche,” *The Eastern Buddhist* 23/1 (1990). Frey Mistry, there is reason to suppose that investigation of the parallels between Nietzsche’s thought and later Buddhist ideas will be bilaterally far more enlightening than comparisons deducing early Buddhism. A careful study of the similarities between the idea of the Übermensch and the “bodhisattva ideal” of the Mahayana tradition could prove most illuminating, all the more so since it would require clarifying the relations between the Buddhist idea of compassion and Nietzsche’s conception of love in contrast to pity. The Vajrayana tradition, as it evolved in Tibetan Buddhism, offers another potentially fruitful field for comparison, especially on the topic of the optimal disposition of the emotions and passions in the greater economy of the psyche.

24. That early note was not simply a temporary aberration. A note from 1884 reads: “I must learn to think more orientally [orientalischer] about philosophy and knowledge. An oriental [morgenländischer] overview of Europe” (KSA 11, 26 [317]). Part of what Nietzsche means by “oriental” here is discussed by Eberhard Scheffele in chapter 3 below; more would have to be gleaned from a reading of the many passages in Nietzsche where the relevant terms occur.