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THE PHILOSOPHER AND THE VOLCANO
ON THE ANTIQUE SOURCES OF NIETZSCHE’S ÜBERMENSCH

Babette Babich

Happy and blessed one, you shall be a god instead of a mortal.

Empedocles

It has traditionally been observed that the figure of Empedocles is key to Nietzsche’s Zarathustra. But the nature of this significance is less commonly detailed; in part this is Nietzsche’s fault, as and although he includes Empedocles in his notes for the Pre-Platonic Philosophers, Nietzsche excludes Empedocles from his Philosophy in the Tragic Age of the Greeks—both of which are unpublished. Similarly unpublished and a bit less widely known are Nietzsche’s drafts of the Death of Empedocles which tend to interest Germanists who are themselves usually more interested in Hölderlin’s substantially more developed drafts for his own Death of Empedocles. For my part in what follows, I read Nietzsche’s Zarathustra as an echo of Empedocles’ orator or speaker but also in terms of Empedocles’ esoteric Katharmoi or Purifications. This means that I read Zarathustra in terms of the eternal return of the same as the teaching of going to ground, that is: death and rebirth (and I argue that death is present at the start and already at work as I later show, in the section entitled The Adder’s Bite: indeed, I show that this is explicitly at work as the teaching of the overman). For Nietzsche’s Zarathustra tells us, like Empedocles, that the human being is something that should be overcome, and thus it makes a difference that we hear Zarathustra proclaim this teaching as the tightrope walker begins his doomed dance over the marketplace and that Zarathustra’s fate, at least immediately, concerns the downward fall of this overman overcome by the danger of his calling. This same teaching conjoined with Zarathustra’s diagnosis of ubiquity of the will to power, especially among the weakest, also underlines an arch or parodic turn and even mockery.
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Hence and in order to get to Empedocles, I argue that it is necessary to read Nietzsche’s Thus Spoke Zarathustra as an overtly Menippean satire as Nietzsche refers to this tradition. Inasmuch as the satires attributed to the cynic Menippus of Gadara happen to be lost, I read Nietzsche’s Thus Spoke Zarathustra via the second century AD Lucian’s “high” or serious, i.e., truth-purposing (as the ancients described it) kind of parody—where Lucian relates to Menippus, at least in some part, as Plato does to Socrates.

In addition, it is useful to note that there are obvious parallels between some of Nietzsche’s more characteristic loci and Lucian’s favorite images, including Nietzsche’s references to truth and Lucian’s True Story [Alethe Diegemata] which includes the paradoxically Cretan claim that “not a word” he will utter is “true,” and that what makes his account distinctive is solely that he will be a more “honest liar than his predecessors.” Thus we read Lucian’s preface to the reader: “I too have turned to lying—but a much more honest lying than all the others. The one and only truth you’ll hear from me is that I am lying. By frankly admitting that there isn’t a word of truth in what I say, I feel I am avoiding the possibility of attack from any quarter.” Lucian could not make his warning plainer: “I am writing about things I neither saw nor heard of from a single soul, things which don’t exist and couldn’t possibly exist. So all readers beware, don’t believe any of it.”

The tonality is not Nietzsche’s to be sure, but the point is hardly foreign to Nietzsche who famously wonders about our preference for truth rather than lies. Where, so Nietzsche argues, some truths are deadly, we survive or live by means of life-saving illusions or lies. In addition to Nietzsche’s reflections on the language of “laws” in nature and in science and on the kind of philosopher who is impressed by physicists,
there is also Nietzsche's satirical comparison of human beings to insects at the start of his *On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense* where the perspective view from atmospheric heights above the earth is indebted not only to the Stoics' cosmic or higher perspective but also to Lucian who is also important for Nietzsche as it has long been argued that Lucian's *Kataplous*, is the source for Nietzsche's term Übermensch or Overman. A dialogue of the dead, the *Kataplous* addresses the representation/perception of the 'hyper-anthropos' in the here and now by contrast with the afterlife or underworld. Here it is significant that the context of Lucian's *Kataplous* (Downward Journey), including its thematic focus on the tyrant in the underworld contrasting with this life and the perspective on human glory and its inevitable reversals, offers a contextualization of Zarathustra's teaching that the human being is something that ought to be overcome. But for this reflection on death, as on birth and rebirth, there is a needed reflection on Empedocles inasmuch as the doctrine of recurrence is Empedoclean, articulating an older Orphic tradition that also inspires Heraclitus, Pythagoras, Parmenides, and Anaximander.

By proposing such a reading, I join those many scholars who argue that Nietzsche's Zarathustra is parodically modeled on something—be it the Bible, or Plato's *Republic*, or Wagner's Ring. Although I think there are intrinsic limitations to all such parallels and I am by no means seeking to reduce Nietzsche to either Lucian or Empedocles for that matter, I do argue—rather radically as we shall see—that in Nietzsche's case we must also include a clear reference to Lucian both for his own picture of Empedocles as well as for his satires or parodies. Thus we note Nietzsche’s emphasis in *Twilight of the Idols* of the enduring importance of satire for his own style from the start of his writerly life and throughout (TI, What I Owe the Ancients §1).

I cannot explore this here beyond a first sketching but we may also note the relevance of Lucian's *The Dead Come to Life or the Fisherman*, a dialogue in which the original and centur-
a means to test the waters for the appropriate fish
as it were particularly its reference to
Zarathustra's "golden fishing rod."

Parodying the fate of his own parodies in the
face of the philosophies he puts up for sale in his
dialogue of the same name, Lucian's Fisher we
encounter the "fishing rod" baited appropriately
and its function as proving the mettle of philoso-
phers, as a touchstone for sounding them out and
for finding them true or not, and, obviously,
mostly not, before the judgment of the personifi-
cations of Truth herself and of Philosophy herself
as well as the reanimation of the plain speaking,
because patently plain-living, Diogenes of
Sinope. Lucian's comparison of a "test" is
instructive in a Zarathustran context:

young eagles are supposed to be tested by the sun,
our candidates have not got to satisfy us that they
can look at light, of course; but put gold, fame, and
pleasure before their eyes; when you see one re-
main unconscious and unattracted, there is your
man.

The problem with philosophers as one finds
them, is indeed that although "professing to de-
spise wealth and appearance," they "take pay for
imparting" what they teach and "are abashed in
the presence of the rich, their lips water at the
sight of coin; they are dogs for temper, hares for
cowardice, apes for imitativeness, asses for lust,
cats for thievery, cocks for jealousy. They are a
perfect laughing stock with their strivings after
vile ends, their jostling of each other at rich men's
doors, their attendance at crowded dinners, and
their vulgar obsequiousness at table.,,13 Thus to
test the true from the pretended claimants to phi-
losophy (note again in the presence of Philoso-
phy and of Truth, in the flesh as it were), the
dialogue proceeds:

—"if the priestess will lend me the line I see there
and the Piraean fisherman's votive hook,"

—"You can have them; and the rod to complete the
equipment," baited with a "few dried figs and a
handful of gold."

The first so-called "fish" caught in the sight of
Diogenes, the original Cynic, is

—Salmo Cynicus: good gracious what teeth . . .
why the hook is bare; he has not been long assimili-
ating the figs, eh? And the gold has gone down
too."

The Cyniscan fish is followed quickly by a
Platonist, a sham Aristotle or Aristotelian, and so
on—all "fishes" summarily judged as lacking by
the same original philosophers themselves who
had initially returned to life to give Lucian what
for, but found at the end that his denunciations
perfectly fit the philosophers philosophizing in
their names.

Like Lucian, Nietzsche's Zarathustra com-
bines or mixes the language of classical literature
and classical gods with the language and the sin-
gular god of the New Testament with Nietzsche's
own paradoxical, parodic, musing touch with re-
gard to his own search for those to whom he
might speak, for readers, for human beings:

Especially the human world, the human sea—to-
dwards IT do I now throw out my golden fishing rod
and say: Open up, thou human abyss! Open up, and
throw unto me thy fish and shining crabs! With my
best bait shall I allure to myself to-day the strangest
human fish! . . . Until, biting at my sharp hidden
hooks, they have to come up unto MY height, the
mollyest abyss-groundsling, to the wickedest of
all fishers of men. (Zarathustra IV, The Honey Sac-
rifice)

"Mocking Lucians"

In the Birth of Tragedy, Nietzsche character-
izes the ancient satirists, as "the mocking Lucians of
antiquity" [spöttische Lucian des Alterthums]
(BT §8), but only as satirists faute de mieux,
grasping after "discolored and faded flowers" long scattered to the winds, grasping that to say
in the wake of the "final effulgence" [letzten
Aufglühen] that had been the origin or birth of
the Dionysian spirit in musical tragedy (BT §10).

Thus by the time you get to Lucian in the sec-
dond century AD, tragedy, as Nietzsche speaks of
it, has already long perished by its own hand (this
death begins for Nietzsche in the third century
BC with Socrates and Euripides and indeed the
New Comedy). Although commentators whether
these be theorists in a philosophical or philolo-
gist's/classicist's modality, almost uniformly fail to advert to this emphasis, Nietzsche's point for his own part in his discussion of the "Origin" of the tragic artwork was a sustained detailing of the consequences of the transition from spoken or sung performance to the written text. This same emphasis had also inspired his inaugural lecture in Basel on the famous Homer question, and his several public lectures on music and tragedy in Basel, an emphasis that has similarly gone unheard (perhaps because we continue to be impressed more by Wagner whom we assume we understand than by Aeschylus or Sophocles when it comes to reading Nietzsche's first book on tragedy).

We would seem to be on different ground when we ask who is Nietzsche's Zarathustra? For we are then thinking of Persians not Greeks, yet let us not forget the Syrian Lucian (or the Syrian Christ). Nietzsche's Zarathustra is first and foremost a speaker and above all we should bear in mind that the tale of Zarathustra is a tale of down-going. Both the language of a speaker, Heidegger says "an advocate [ein Fürsprecher]" and including Zarathustra's temperament, parallels Empedocles as orator, with all his own moodiness and Hölderlinian impatience. And the teaching Empedocles comes to teach, especially as articulated in his Katharmoi is the teaching of death (and that means for mortals, the teaching of birth and rebirth: i.e., the eternal recurrence of the same).

Where Heidegger observes that "Zarathustra speaks on behalf of life, suffering, and the circle" (NII, 212), we also find ourselves on Empedoclean ground, defined as Heidegger defines all three as "the selfsame," invoking the solid circle (in similarly Hölderlinian terms) as the ring-dance of love, as the wedding dance. Thus Heidegger echoes Empedocles' sphere: "'Circle' is the sign of the ring that wrings its way back to itself and in that way always achieves recurrence of the same." (NII, 213) For Empedocles, who emphasizes the συμβεβηκα, that which conjoins the disjoint, the "wheel-shaped Sphere is held fast in the close obscurity of Harmonia, exulting in its joyous solitude" (On Nature, KRS 358: DK 27; trans. modified).

This same wheel-shaped sphere corresponds to the golden ball Zarathustra throws, as the year throws the leaves (or the birds as Rilke says), seasons of life. Hence Nietzsche's Zarathustra teaches that the "human being is something that shall be overcome" (Z I: Prologue §3), proclaiming: "What is great in man is that he is a bridge and not an end; what can be loved in man is that he is an overture and a going under." (Z I: Prologue §4), a claim followed with a string of metaphors for death and perishing: "Life itself confided this secret to me: Behold it said I am that which always overcomes itself... where there is perishing, a falling of leaves, behold, there life sacrifices itself—for power" (Z II: On Self-Overcoming). This is the meaning of Nietzsche's will to power which he finds, so Zarathustra tells us, everywhere, even in the smallest, even in the weakest, and indeed, as will, especially there.

In the Katharmoi fragments as gathered together (an editorial tradition, Nietzsche tells us, that goes back to the Alexandrian grammarians), we have the perfect (and perfectly literal) rhetorical topos. Thus Empedocles addresses his audience:

"ο φίλοι, οι μέγα ἐστίν κατὰ ζενθοῦσι ἄκρα πόλεως / ναίετ τι ποιήσα τς πόλεως (Ye friends who dwell in the mighty city along the yellow Acragas, hard by the Acropolis). (KRS 399; DK 112)

Thus beginning, O friends, ω φίλοι — Empedocles goes on to tell of himself, to offer his own transfiguration as exemplar, saying I:

εγώ 'ομοι θεός ὕμπροτος... (But unto ye I walk as god immortal now, no more as a man, On all sides honored fittingly and well, crowned both with fillets and with flowering wreaths). (Ibid)

Thus Spoke Empedocles. Literally and this matters for Nietzsche's writings which was the point of the above reference to The Birth of Tragedy, thus Empedocles writes, thus he tells us himself.

It is as rhetorician, as a speaker, that one first attends to Empedocles and this same speaker's, orator's, rhetor's element characterizes Also Sprach Zarathustra. Nietzsche begins his inaugural lecture in Basel on "Homer and Classical
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Philology” by noting the critical importance of the person both in antiquity and as it persists as an issue in the themes of then-current scholarship. But where Empedocles is engaged in “self-presentation,” like the philosophers we cited above as Lucian mocks them in his *Philosophers for Sale*, Nietzsche’s *Zarathustra* masks himself. The Overman can be the man who walks as does Empedocles, as a mortal no more, and the overman is also and at the same time in Nietzsche’s *Zarathustra* very much the image of Lucian’s overman, the tyrant before his own going to ground.

**Death of Zarathustra and Nietzsche’s Sketches for the Death of Empedocles**

Nietzsche planned to write a drama on the model of Hölderlin’s several drafts of the *Death of Empedocles*. Nietzsche’s project follows Hölderlin’s, composing several drafts which he does not bring to fruition.

In a section titled, “The Philosophers of the Tragic Age revealed, the world as tragedy” (KSA 7, 527), Nietzsche sketches “The tragic human being,” outlining three acts of his plan for the “death” of Empedocles, the parallel with Zarathustra, even at this early stage, is patent. Both Empedocles and Zarathustra are compared with the divine and both are simultaneously absorbed with mortality. Indeed, Empedocles accedes to divinity by dying, elected or “staged” as such (his refusal of kingship is part of this accession), as he had already characterized himself as an outlaw in these terms “Of these I too am now one, an exile from the gods and a wanderer, having put my trust in raving strife” (KRS 401: DK 115).

David Allison and others have reminded us that Nietzsche’s original plans for his *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* also included Zarathustra’s literal death. But one might go still further, as I do, even beyond the figurative and, as I have already suggested, take the Lucanian reference to Zarathustra’s downgoing in Zarathustra’s Prologue as announcing the literal eventuality or “fact” of Zarathustra’s death in the first book of the published text where Zarathustra succumbs to a snake bite under a fig tree (nothing like one metaphorical cliché after another): “Your way is short the adder said sadly, ‘my poison kills’” (ZI, *The Adder’s Bite*).

The bitten Zarathustra has the adder “take back” his poison (nothing like successfully teaching the will to will backwards). Thus we read that the adder falls upon his neck a second time. Yet, and this is the lesson of teaching the will to will backwards, adders do not “take back” their bites however we may will such a replay or taking back of the past and however much we may imagine it. But if the second bite is fantasy, part of the delirium induced by the adder’s venom, the entirety of *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* becomes a dream before dying—another philosopher’s dream to be added to the array of such and the interpretation of the same.

The focus on downgoing, the experience with the tightrope walker as we shall, see together with the death-springing, ear-whispering dwarf and so on, is part of a constant engagement with death as background and theme throughout the text. Indeed, we read in the section *On Free Death* of “the death that consummates,” where Zarathustra describes death as a “festival.” And we have yet another fairly explicit echo of Lucian’s *True Story [Alethe Diegemata]* offered in the title of *On the Blessed Isles*, titled as Lucian does after Hesiod and Pindar as well as Plato and so on. The Lucanian references include figs and Nietzsche invokes the afterlife, where Zarathustra describes himself as “a wind to ripe figs,” emphasizing that rather than salvation or redemption or eternal life, it is “of time and becoming that the best parables should speak: let them be a praise and a justification of all impermanence” (Z II: *On the Blessed Isles*).

Quite explicitly, now paralleling Empedocles, Zarathustra reflects: “Verily, through a hundred souls I have already passed on my way, and through a hundred cradles and birth pangs. Many a farewell have I taken; I know the heart rending last hours” (ibid.; cf. DK 31). But “thus my creative will, my destiny, wills it. Or, to say it more honestly: this very destiny: my will wills” (ibid.). In addition, Empedocles’ teaching of rebirth echoes in the language of the “nuptial ring of rings, THE PHILOSOPHER AND THE VOLCANO

217
the ring of recurrence" (Z III, The Yes and Amen Song).

Zarathustra teaches the Übermensch, as the transition that is the overman and the eternal recurrence of the same. But by speaking of the human being as "a rope over an abyss," Nietzsche's Zarathustra gives a sermon in the marketplace against the backdrop of a dynamic tableau (the tightrope walker and his balancing act) of which Zarathustra seemingly notices nothing until it crashes down around him. Thus Zarathustra's words are illuminated for his auditors who see what transpires above and behind him. It matters indeed that the people to whom Zarathustra speaks did not come to hear him, just as the Agrigentians seem constitutionally incapable of attending to what Empedocles teaches them, thus the Purifications are addressed to Pausanias: this is the earmark of the few and the many, as Heraclitus complains: for the most part, those who hear a teaching are the same both before they hear it and after hearing it (DK 1). It is the fate of most teachings that they go in one ear and out the other.

Zarathustra begins his oratorical discourse, just as the tightrope walker "began his performance," a staging which renders the entirety of the speech an inevitable (if also involuntary) commentary on that "performance." We thus discern, and the Straussians have made nothing but hay from this depiction, a patent dramatization of above and below, esoteric and exoteric. It is in this context, as the tightrope walker makes his way above the crowd, producing a tension that seemed to Zarathustra to offer the kind of attention that permitted him to expand upon his account, describing the human being as "a dangerous across, a dangerous on-the-way, a dangerous looking-back, a dangerous shuddering and stopping," that Zarathustra teaches the overman. Thus Zarathustra's sermon on the "rainbow bridge" of life is offered as a life and death drama proceeds above him, step by careful step:

I love those who do not do first seek behind the stars for a reason to go under and be a sacrifice, but who sacrifice themselves for the earth, that the earth some day become the overman's. . . . I love him whose soul squanders itself, who wants no thanks and returns none: for he always gives away and does not want to preserve himself." (Z I: Prologue §4).

Many readers take the point but commonly assume the reference to be nothing other than that of the Christian teaching of dying to the life of the world or the body.

Yet we also know that Nietzsche's Zarathustra teaches the "great reason" of the body, urges us to be true to the earth and to a self that "wants to create beyond itself" (Z I: On the Despisers of the Body). Thus Zarathustra here affirms not only the "rainbows and bridges of the overman" (Z I: On the New Idol) but declares "I love him who wants to create over and beyond himself and thus perishes." (Z I: On the Way of the Creator). This teaching should remind the reader of Nietzsche's shadow discourse in the book appended to his Human, All-too-Human, The Wanderer and his Shadow, where the shadow turns, vanishing as it does at the end. Thus Nietzsche writes of the human being as a small overstressed kind of animal, which—happily enough—as also had its day; life on earth as such, the blink of an eye, a detail, an exception without consequence, something that remains insignificant for the general character of the earth itself, like every star, a hiatus between two nothingness, an event without a plan, reason, will, self-consciousness, the most wretched sort of necessity; the stupid necessity" (KSA 13, 16 [25], 488). Like the great year of the ancient philosophers, the great noon is the turning to the new and it is also associated with Heraclitean fire and with the sun as a consummation: "that is the great noon when man stands in the middle of his way between beast and overman and celebrates his way to evening as his highest hope: for it is the way to a new morning" (Z I: On the Gift-Giving Virtue).

Inasmuch as Zarathustra teaches what philosophy teaches—namely, the art of living—Zarathustra teaches the overman as "the meaning of the earth," thereby teaching that the human is
"something that shall be overcome" (Z I: Prologue §3). The point is literal enough: the art of living as we have recently required Hadot and others to remind us, is the art of dying. 20 The art, in Nietzsche’s words, of dying in the right way and, indeed: for the right reason, “at the right time” (Z I: On Voluntary Death).

"Love and Kisses to All the World": On Meat-Eating, Encroachment, and Purification in Empedocles and Nietzsche

This work is Lucian’s, who well knew
The foolishness of times gone by,
For things the human race finds wise
Are folly to th’ unclouded eye.

Erasmus 21

It is still common to assume that Nietzsche’s Übemensch corresponds, more or less coincidentally, more or less historically, to Hitler’s fantasy, the evolutionary apex of human development: a superior human being (and that is also to say, with Plato and Aristotle and even Alasdair MacIntyre, a superior warrior or perfect soldier): the fruit of science or at least good breeding, by which one means a family of a certain economic wherewithal, whereby heir to a certain “good” education, nutrition, environment, travel, etc. 22 Indeed, the whole of technologically oriented society via the fantasy of genetic engineering and associated nano-fixes as well as the fantasy life that is the internet and the media in general—just think of Kurzweil’s supposedly incipient “Singularity”—presupposes the same vision of the human per se and in general as supreme, as other, as “higher,” in Nietzsche’s words. If Nietzsche opposes Darwinism in one thing, namely in the conviction that today’s species represent improvements or developments over past species, he shares the values of Darwin in associating humans and apes, here specifically following Pindar’s sardonic comparison.

Rank ordering presupposes a developmental progression, but Empedocles also invokes a kind of evolution, if not a progressive one: dispersal in time, abandonment or expulsion, as expiation. Here we recall the ethical parallel with Anaximander, for a crime, that is for the bloody violence of dealing death and eating meat.

When anyone sins and pollutes his own limbs with bloodshed, who by his error makes false the oath he swore—spirits whose portion is long life—for thrice ten thousand years he wanders apart from the blessed, being born throughout that time in all manner of forms of mortal things, exchanging one hard path of life for another. The force of the air pursues him into the sea, the sea spews him out onto the floor of the earth, the earth casts him into the rays of the blazing sun. (DK 115; KRS 314–15)

Empedocles supposed that our age is the age of extinction, the time of strife or hatred, precisely because of our creativity and diversity one from another but also because of the killing that we cannot seem to stem. If being born and taking form against and by contrast with the apeiron is an encroachment on other possibilities, as it is for Anaximander (and this is the reason Nietzsche names him the first ethical philosopher), think what it is to practice injustice actively, to kill or to shed blood? And we all do this, with our every breath, our every step and in addition we have made an industry of such injustice: we eat the flesh of animals, the beings we “care” for from birth (this is domestication), and whom we raise in order to kill in order to cut slices from their bodies and limbs to roast and boil and steam, sometimes we eat them raw, sometimes before they are born. Wild animals or domestic, we kill them all. All this is unchanged since Empedocles’ day:

The father lifts up his own son changed in form and slaughters him with a prayer, blind fool, as the victim shrieks piteously, beseeching as he is killed. But he deaf to his cries slaughters him and makes ready in his halls an evil feast. In the same way son seizes father and children their mother, and tearing out life they eat the flesh of those they love. (KRS 415; DK 137)

Empedocles is speaking, as Nietzsche would speak (this is the ontological meaning of the will to power), 23 of the fundamental relatedness of all living things. We are not “other” than animals and we are certainly not—consider only what we do!—“higher.” The animal you barbecue is your
brother, physiologically, biologically speaking, not a one that could be in some spiritualist sense, your literal (i.e., human) brother, or son. This that you do to the least of your neighbors, the least of your brethren, this you do to the Christ.

So we have heard from the man Nietzsche named the only Christian, the one who hung on the cross and who died for the things he said.

We have already noted the relevance of Empedocles' purification thematic in our discussion of the metaphor of honey at the start of Nietzsche's *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* as well as with reference to the language of the "honey sacrifice in Book IV. As Empedocles writes, the problem is the problem of "defilement" and thus the title of the poem, Katharmoi: "Their altar was not drenched by the unspeakable slaughters of bulls, but this was held among men the greatest defilement — to tear out the life from noble limbs and eat them" (KRS 411; DK 128).

Dwelling as commentators do on Empedocles' egregious egotism, they tend to dismiss his reflections on carnivorism and thus I find it useful to read Nietzsche's own commentary for both its dispassion and its precision:

Empedocles sought to impress the oneness of all life most urgently, that carnivorism is a sort of self-cannibalism [*Sicheselbsterpeisen*], a murder of the nearest relative. He desired a colossal purification of humanity, along with abstinence from beans and laurel leaves. The need for a "colossal purification of humanity" has to do with what is human, all too human and in this case it is not simply, as Nietzsche interprets a matter or prohibiting violence against those related to us by blood, but and beyond consanguinity it is a matter of, and here Nietzsche echoes Hölderlin, our relatedness with everything that is. This is key to the Pre-Platonic Greeks as Nietzsche reads them. In addition, we can add Nietzsche's reference to beans as they are part of this same purification (and are among the Pythagorean's taboos). Similarly, laurel leaves are associated both with Apollo and the traditional victor as well as with tyrants. Setting aside the question of kingship as already addressed above, the Pythagorean question of rebirth is common to both Empedocles and Nietzsche in the doctrine of eternal recurrence.

As Nietzsche who always emphasized simplicity with reference to ancient doctrine reminds us, that a good deal of what was regarded as moral practice in antiquity is "currently treated as medical" (KGW III/4 Herbst 1873, 31 [4], 360), whether with regard to matters of physical or else of mental health, and Nietzsche notes that where we often lack self-control, the Greeks regarded moderation as part of "retaining mastery over themselves." (Ibid., 361). And Nietzsche makes it plain that he prefers the ancient "care of the self" to "the talk of modern moral philosophers who take the human being to be a marvelously spiritualistic essence; it seems almost indecent to them that humanity should be treated thus nixedly-antique and to recount their many needs even indeed their baser necessities. Their embarrassment goes so far that one would believe that the modern human being has no more than a apparent body [*Scheinleib*]" (Ibid.). It is in this context, although this must be understood in connection with Nietzsche's life-long scientific interest in physiology and nutrition, that Nietzsche confesses: "I believe that the vegetarians, with their prescription to eat less and more simply, have been more useful than all new moral systems put together" (Ibid.).

It is thus, after speaking of the need for purification in the Empedoclean sense, that Nietzsche's *Zarathustra* asks "What does your body say about your soul? Is your soul not poverty and a polluted river" (Ibid.), Zarathustra reflects on greatness as opposed to the image of such. "What is great in man is that he is a bridge and not a goal; what can be loved in man is that he is going-across and a downgoing" (Z, Zarathustra's Prologue, 4).

But like the people to whom Zarathustra speaks, like the Agrigentians to whom Empedocles speaks, his words are not for our ears. Hence Nietzscheans and anti-Nietzscheans alike believe in the idea of the overman as a "superior" being. And we also assume that we all are or that we could be and indeed that we should be overhumans, posthumans, or, to use the latest
language, transhumans, at least potentially. After all, think of Nietzsche’s modern moral philosophers: we are the dominant species in comparison with the ape (and every other living being). Or if not yet by ordinary or natural evolutionary means, then certainly on the model that some scientist most currently be developing using the latest genetic or stem cell technology, further transforming us in the same direction that we already find ourselves going.

The human, all-too-human is the overman.

Disagreeing with both Nietzscheans and anti-Nietzscheans, Nietzsche demurs, as I have said, suggesting that the overman or the human ideal, may be less than we suppose. To see this we need to take the classical scholarly “step back” just and inasmuch as such a backstep often changes one’s perspective.

Zarathustra’s Übermensch and Lucian’s ὑπεράνθρωπος

Every Nietzsche scholar seems to know that Nietzsche’s Übermensch is a coinage taken or derived from Lucian, in particular, from the Downward Journey or Journey to the Underworld [ΚΑΤΑΠΛΟΤΣ Η ΤΥΡΑΝΝΟΣ]. Every scholar “knows” this because Walter Kaufmann tells us so and nearly every account I have read duly cites Kaufmann (the citation is easy to find and very simple, “Kataplous, 16”).27 Kaufmann does not offer a context and this may have been because he was simply interested in the coinage per se (and Kaufmann’s interest would seem to have set the tone for the positivism of source scholarship to this day). But Lucian’s A Voyage to the Underworld or the Tyrant, offers an intriguing insight into the notion of the “overman.”

In his monograph on the ancient Greek novel and its antecedents, Nietzsche’s friend Erwin Rohde emphasizes the importance and the odd significance of the idea or notion as such of “travelling in the underworld, for the sake of gaining philosophical knowledge.”30 And this very subterranean undertaking appears in both Nietzsche (Zarathustra) and Lucian, and it is of course the transfiguring point of Empedocles’ leap into the Volcano. And we are familiar with the idea in Dante as elsewhere.

Just as the dwarf leaps after the tightrope walker or “overman” at the start of Zarathustra, and then similarly threatens to drag Zarathustra down to hell, the story Lucian tells in his play on the tyrant’s rather literal downgoing, articulates the edifying, that is the instructive morality tale of those who appear in everyday life in an apparent or supposed guise as “Higher-Men.” Lucian’s provocative contrast in his Downward Journey highlights the superficial vision of the overman or man of the power class, a wealthy, or “higher” man who towers above others regarded as lower, or lesser, in this life, and the self-same man once translated or transposed into the afterlife, a contrast illuminated, as it were, in the darkness rather than the light of eternity: “The ‘superman’ ὑπεράνθρωπος is the superior man, a king among men, a man of power like a tyrant.”31 These political attributes allow the speaker to regard the tyrant (and this is the subtitle of Lucian’s satire) as “a superman in my eyes, someone thrice blessed, nothing short of an Adonis, a foot and a half taller than the rest of mankind.” ὑπεράνθρωπος τις α’ νήφ και τρισοβίδος μοι κατεσχινεντο και μονονοσιχ καλλίου και ψηλ. ὀνερος ολω πήχει βασιληκει.32

But, so Lucian’s satire continues, “when he died and had to take off his trappings, not only did he look ridiculous to me, but I had to laugh at how ridiculous I was. Imagine—I had stood in awe of that trash and had jumped to the conclusion that he was divinely happy on the basis of the smells from his kitchen and the color of his robes.”33 And after the complaints of the tyrant in hell, Lucian goes on to mock the moneylenders, and so on (and on).

The notion of Zarathustra’s downgoing as a tale of going to ground as an account of Zarathustra’s dream before dying, just as Empedocles explains that death itself is such a dream, as is life, entails that here are other parallels between Empedocles and Zarathustra. Thus in Rhode’s Psyche, we read of “the method of Incubation, or temple sleep,” by which questions might be put to a number of daimones and heroes. Rohde explains that this mantic tech-
nique “was based on the assumption that the daimon who was only visible indeed to mortal eyes in the higher state achieved by the soul in dreams, had his permanent dwelling at the seat of the oracle.”34 In this chapter on “Subterranean Translation,” following the previous surface or lateral “translation” to “The Isles of the Blest,” Rohde argues that the particular “daimon” is yoked to a particular place: “That is why his appearance can only be expected at this particular place and nowhere else. Originally, too, it was only the dwellers in the depths of the earth who were thus visible in dreams to those who lay down to sleep in the temple over the place where they had their subterranean abode.”35 If David Allison who for his part is not speaking of either Empedocles or Rohde, rightly remarks that Zarathustra spends an inordinate amount of time, counted in days rather than hours, sleeping “as one dead,”36 one can assume that Zarathustra’s “dropping off” echoes Rohde’s language of the mysterious “incubation-oracles.”37

Beyond Rohde’s Psyche and beyond Lucian’s antiquity (and note that it is not Rohde who emphasizes the concept of the overman in Lucian),38 how are we to understand Nietzsche’s overman, as this notion is arguably one of the most popularly influential of all.

In its Aryan configuration, set into what some claim to have been its original constellation in Nietzsche’s Der Wille zur Macht (that infamously “invented” book), the idea of the Übermensch is held to be the causal factor in not only Hitler’s war but also the first world war.39 Talking about Nietzsche’s Übermensch, we seem to be talking about the philosophy that generated the language of the master-race, i.e., the Übermensch as opposed to the Unter-Mensch as Nazi terminology also speaks of it.

Nietzsche uses both terms. Yet the reference to Lucian suggests that Nietzsche’s Zarathustra also teaches the Übermensch in a parodic fashion. The overman is therefore (if it is not only this) a satiric notion. This does not mean that Nietzsche’s Zarathustra does not teach the Übermensch—of course he does that—but it is easy to fail to note (certainly even many sophisticated and sensitive Nietzsche scholars do so) that the elusive doctrine of the eternal return, the doctrine that Zarathustra comes to teach, the teaching that the over-human himself or herself is meant to be the passage toward, is the eternal return of the same. And this is Empedocles’ “truth” of rebirth. Thus Nietzsche’s Zarathustra teaches that the human is charged to overcome or to get beyond or to get over the human.

**On Death: Zarathustra, the Isles of the Blest, and the Descent into Hell**

Yet more than Empedocles’ caution against carnivorism, and its reference to the doctrine of birth and rebirth and of his cosmological cycle, it is often seems to be the tableau of the volcano and the philosopher’s voluntary death that strikes us most powerfully. And then too there is the dramatic detail of a single bronze sandal, tossed up and back to the land of the living by the same volcano. Would it not have been vaporized or melted? This is so even where Diogenes Laertius begins with a veritable catalogue of the various ways Empedocles was said to have exited this world.40 Why just one? This is, so scholars remind us, always a sign. One sandal, one bronze thigh, one eye.

But a sign of what and to whom, for whom? And what is the significance of the volcano?

C. G. Jung refers to an account of Nietzsche’s Zarathustra in his lecture course on Zarathustra that apparently echoes this constellation of death. Whether self-willed or not (and therefore an image of death in life, at least as set together with Lucian’s Kataplous), Jung himself does not explore. Jung’s own emphasis is reasonable enough for a psychoanalyst in a Zarathustran context. In a passage that could not be more Empedoclean uttered in terms of Nietzsche’s reflected motivation of the need to go beyond good and evil,41 Nietzsche’s Zarathustra tells us: “Let us speak of this ye wisest ones, even if it is a bad thing” (Z Of Self-Overcoming).42 And Nietzsche goes on, as Jung emphasizes: “To be silent is worse; all suppressed truths become poisonous” (ibid.)43 This is a talking cure.

Zarathustra speaks.
As his point of departure, Jung’s discussion engages “The Blessed Isles” and “Of Great Events” as these appear in Nietzsche’s Thus Spoke Zarathustra. We could have already encountered the tapas of “The Isles of the Blest” as the subtitle of Wilhelm Heinse’s Ardinghello, to whom Hölderlin dedicated the first section on “Night” of his longer poem Bread and Wine. The geographic contours of these two accounts, with Heinse offering the recollections of Ardinghello, a wanderer in Sicily, and Hölderlin of Hyperion, the hermit in an idealized and archaicized vision of modern Greece, is critical to both and both point to a locative longing. In addition to the locative “setting” of German literature, there is also a metonymic association to be made to the darkly dramatic Swiss painter Arnold Böcklin (1827–1901), Nietzsche’s contemporary Basel inhabitant. Although Böcklin also painted in 1888 a version of the “Isle of the Blest,” the Lebensinsel or Isle of Life, his most famous painting is the Toteninsel or Isle of the Dead, of which the painter created several variants between 1880 and 1886.

Most of us will recall the Zarathustran passage in question: it’s weird and not just because Jung says so, if Zarathustra scholars rarely remark upon this wackiness, and I remember reading it for the first time or for however many hundreds of times I have read it, but always without much sense. But it is worth thinking about such things, especially with reference to Nietzsche who spent his life engaged with oddities often unquestioned by supposedly critical scholarship.

Together with the above reading of Lucian, together with the suggestion that Nietzsche retells the purifications of Empedocles along with the death of Empedocles with his Thus Spoke Zarathustra (and I have been attempting here to make both claims), the constellation in question loses much of its oddness. To do this Jung adds a ghost story.

In his seminar from 4 May 1938 Jung glosses the account in Zarathustra as the descent of Zarathustra into Hades. There is the volcano and the fire underneath, the entrance to the interior of the earth, the entrance to the underworld—there is even old Cerberus, the fire dog—and Zarathustra is now going down into all this. Psychologically it would mean that after all that great talk, there is an underworld and down there one has to go. But if one is so high and mighty, why not stay up there? Why bother about this descent? Yet the tale says inevitably one goes down—that is the enantiromenia—and when one gets down there, well one will be burned up, one will dissolve.

Jung observes that Nietzsche would have had to have recognized this as the locus classicus of the Dorian city of Acragas but, as Jung reflects, Nietzsche’s Zarathustran account does not allude to Empedocles. Nevertheless, as Jung rightly remarks, the story “has a very peculiar ring.”

It was so funny—the noontide hour and the captain and his men—what was the matter with that ship that they go to shoot rabbits near the entrance of hell? Then it slowly came to me that when I was about eighteen, I had read a book from my grandfather’s library, Blätter aus Prevorst by Kerner, a collection in four volumes of wonderful stories, about ghosts and phantasies and forebodings, and among them I found that story. It is called “An extract of awe-inspiring import from the log of the ship ‘Sphinx,’ in the year 1686 in the Mediterranean.”

Jung’s reference to the Blätter aus Prevorst is to a collection of spiritualist, mesmerist, and magnetic tales inspired by Erika Hauffe, the subject of Die Seherin von Prevorst. Eröffnungen über das innere Leben der Menschen und über das Hereinragen einer Geisterwelt in die unsere, written by a Suabian poet Justinius Kerner (1786–1862).

Let us recall the passage from the section entitled Of Great Events,

There is an island in the sea — not far from the Blissful Islands of Zarathustra — upon which a volcano continuously smokes; the people, and especially the old women among the people, say that it is placed like a block of stone before the gate of the underworld, but that the narrow downward path which leads to this gate of the underworld passes through the volcano itself. (Z. Of Great Events)
The passage could not be more obviously related to Lucian but (and this is adds to its importance for understanding Nietzsche) not less to Rohde’s broader constellation of his exploration into Psy­che: The Cult of Souls & The Belief in Immortal­ity Among the Greeks.51

The relevant bit from Nietzsche’s account in Thus Spoke Zarathustra is as follows:

It happened that a ship dropped anchor at the island upon which the smoking mountain stood; and its crew landed in order to shoot rabbits. Towards the hour of noon, however, when the captain and his men were reasssembled, they suddenly saw a man coming towards them through the air, and a voice said clearly: “It is time! It is high time!” But as the figure was closest to them—or flew quickly past, however, like a shadow, in the direction of the vol­cano—they recognized, with the greatest conster­nation, that it was Zarathustra. (Z, Of Great Events)

Jung goes on to cite Kerner’s original text for his students’s sake:

The four captains and a merchant, Mr Bell, went ashore on the island of Stromboli to shoot rabbits. At three o’clock they called the crew together to go aboard, when, to their inexpressible astonishment, they saw two men flying rapidly over them through the air. One was dressed in black, the other in grey. They approached them very closely, in the greatest haste; to their greatest dismay they descended amid the burning flames into the crater of the terri­ble volcano, Mr. Stromboli. They recognized the pair as acquaintances from London.52

Same story Jung says, a sunrise he duly checks by asking Elisabeth Förster Nietzsche, who con­firms that she and her brother found this book in the library of their own “grandfather, Pastor Oehler.”53

In addition to Jung’s repeated invocation of this story as a demonstration of the working power of the unconscious—for this illustrative reason the story was one Jung had been telling since his inaugural dissertation, published two years after Nietzsche’s death in 1902—Jung notes that “such stories are recorded because they are edifying.” In the case of Kerner’s ghost story, Jung explains that “The two gentlemen from London were big merchants and evidently they were not quite alright, because they are painted with the colors of hell which express sinfulness, one is black and the other grey, whereas they should be wearing white shirts which is court dress in heaven.”54

Grügelgeschichten, tales of the dead, especially the unhappy dead and of things we do not guess in this life, as is Lucian’s Kataplous in one vein and Rohde’s Psyche in another are comparably “instructive” or edifying.

The ghostly dimension of Zarathustra’s witch-like flight, as the reference above to Lucian and to Rohde now makes plain, is literal not literary. If Gary Shapiro is right to point to the geological significance of the contrast of this passage with the Isles of the Blest where Zarathustra “appears mysteriously on a volcanic island (where his Shadow seems to fly into the volcano itself),”55 Shapiro, along with most other commentators fails to note that Zarathustra’s shadow, the shade in question, corresponds for the ancient Greek to the flattened dimensionality that is the only thing that remains of us after death, especially presuming what Rohde calls a “subterranean translation.”

Hence with respect to the claim that it is, as Nietzsche’s Zarathustra repeats, “high time,” that it is therefore late—“it’s time, it’s time” as T. S. Eliot calls, as Gadamer once spoke of age as including so many “warning shots across the bow”—so, too, Jung explains that “This is the se­cret, this is the key to the meaning of that descent into hell. It was a warning; soon you will go down into dissolution.”56

We have already noted that there are numer­ous explorations of the meaning of the over­man.57 Given the context of Lucian’s Kataplous, it may serve us to consider yet another rendering of the overman as an ironic or else in Jung’s terminol­ogy, “instructive” construct. At the same time, the didactic purpose of Zarathustra’s “teaching” becomes more rather than less ellipti­cal and the overman rather less than an ideal to be pursued straightforwardly and per se.
Coda

What Nietzsche takes from Lucian’s *Journey into the Underworld, or the Tyrant*, is the provocative contrast between the values we have in our culture and our context and our tendency to take these values, à la Herbert Butterfield’s presentism, not only as universal but as timeless or essential. Writing that man is something to be overcome, characterizing the human lifetime in a discussion of artists of grand passion as constituting “— hiatus between two nothingnesses—” (KSA 12, 10 [34], 473), Nietzsche points to a perspective beyond the here and now, one which asks us to consider not the immediate, whether in terms of economic advantage or personal delight or pleasure, but rather the scope or scheme of the world.

Thus Nietzsche does not say *The little businessman is will to power and nothing besides*, much less *The German nationalist is will to power and nothing besides*, but *The world is will to power and nothing besides—*meaning thereby the collective whole of existence in the world (and indeed beyond the earth). In this sense, he has recourse to biological metaphors and from this same perspective he also emphasizes that the aim of life is expression not survival. Only, he says, rather unkindly, the Englishman strives for life at all costs.

Nietzsche’s own reference is to the Urkünstler, as Anaxagoras and Anaximander called mind or *nous*. If Nietzsche himself draws the parallel between both Empedocles and “Darwinian theory” with a certain materialism, Nietzsche might be aligned with those who argue for intelligent design in the sense not of the Judeo-Christian God and not of Gaia, but another schema altogether, one that Nietzsche once called *aeon*, reminding us that the child had kingship, playing with chance, playing with “chance forms” as he puts in his notes on Empedocles, playing that is to say, “every possible random combination of elements, of which some are purposeful and capable of life.”

Recalling my own references to chance, it is worth noting, as Robin Small remarks, that Nietzsche returns to a reading of Lucian (albeit in another locus, recounting Heraclitus’ playful playing upon the kingship of the child, in the worlds and words of *pais, paizan, pesseron, sumpheromenos, diapheromenos*: “A child playing, moving counters, gathering and scattering.” Nietzsche reminds us, that with Empedocles—but let us also add with Newton and with Bachelard too—science “basically dissolves into magic.”

Only the true believers will be dismayed to learn this. For we need to go past the common convention that opposes science and magic (this Nietzsche never does, no more than he opposes religion and science), to ask what Nietzsche might have meant by inventing Zarathustra as a sage for a modern world and even more radically, by calling not for salvation or redemption but and much rather and just to begin with: purification?

*Fictitious Concluding Fragments*

Tightrope walkers (overman above, undermen below)

Two devils, one to jump over you, one to drag you off to hell

*Widerwillens*

German for: all of it against your will

Whereby any downgoing, any going to ground, counts as a descent into hell

To read Lucian, to read Dante, to read Sartre on Hell

Will always be to read about other people.

Question for Eliot: how many would you say death had undone?

Cut to:

*Nihilism*

Nietzsche’s idea of “Dying at the Right Time”

Empedocles and the conflicting accounts of his death

So very many postcards from the “edge,” like Nietzsche’s own.

Whereby Nietzsche’s little gloss
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“love and kisses to the whole world”
would be what?
a suicide note?
better an assumption into heaven? to prefigure or
to second-guess transfiguration?
Eternal return, everything, the same
No reserve; no exceptions
To give Empedocles the last word as a word on
purification:

Will you not cease from the din of slaughter? Do
you not see that you are devouring each other in the
heedlessness of your minds?” (KRS 414; DK 136)

Or and to the say the same—and this is by far
my favourite—
Wretches, utter wretches, keep your hands from
beans. (KRS 419; DK 140)

Endotes

1. Lucian of Samosata was translated into Latin by
Erasmus, into English by Charles Cotton as early as
1675 as Burlesque upon Burlesque; or the Scoffer Scoff’d. Being Lucian’s Dialogues newly put into
English Fustian London, 1675; corrected in 1686,
and into German by Wolfgang Wieland in 1788. Al­
though Lucian’s name tends to be unfamiliar to to­
day’s readers, those who read him in antiquity and
throughout the era leading up to Nietzsche included
most European authors from Erasmus to Thomas
More but also Rabelais, Voltaire, and Jonathan Swift,
with Jan Kott, somewhat more recently, reprising a
long standing case for Lucian’s influence on Shake­
peare, and in philosophy, in addition to Montaigne,
we can name David Hume in particular who also
read the text that is discussed in this essay with refer­
ce to its influence on Nietzsche. For her part, Smith may well have been
characterizing the dialogue in general terms just be­
cause the Katapous is indisputably a dialogue of the
dead, as it is all about death and Lucian’s favorite
tropes on the same, including shades of Elizabeth
Kubler-Ross, bargaining and stages of denial or pro­
test. Baier herself has recourse to James Fieser’s
Some Early Responses to David Hume, in 10 vol­
umes (London: Thoemmes/Continuum Press, re­
vised second edition, 2005 [1999 and 2003]).
Fieser’s collection includes a letter from Hume’s
doctor, William Cullen who offers a detailed account
of Lucian’s Katapous. For the specific reference to
Fieser, see Baier, 103. For Baier, the difficulty of lo­
cating Lucian’s Katapous deserves some remark as
it not always included in extant editions of “Lucian’s
much imitated and influential ‘Dialogues of the
Dead,’ at least not in editions of Lucian such as the
Loeb, or as far as I have been able to find out, in edi­
tions Hume would have used.” (Baier, p. 104) The
dialogue is available in different forms (see further
note 26 below), and the title is sometimes rendered
one way, some times another, so that translated as
“Voyage to the Underworld,” it features as the last di­
alogue in the first volume of the four volumes trans­
lated by the brothers Henry G. and Frances W.
Fowler, The Works of Lucian, complete with excep­
tions specified in the preface (Oxford: Clarendon
Press. 1905). Still the point of extant translations is
moot because, and as Baier herself observes (101):
Hume read his Lucian in Greek, just as Nietzsche
did.
2. Lucian is thus characterized by the fifth century
Eunapius as an “earnest” or truth-purposing or

3. Lucian thus expounds upon his own deliberate prefabrication as a variation upon the traditional misdirections or lies of other historians in his True Stories or True History [Alethe Diegenata].


5. Ibid.

6. His approach to truth runs throughout Nietzsche's texts, but see just in near textual proximity to this often discussed locus: Beyond Good and Evil §4 and §14.

7. This is by far the most common attribution and I address this further in the second half of this essay, in particular in note 41 below. Other attributions exist, of course. See Claude Pavir, Nietzsche Humanist (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1998), who reads the Übermensch in a renaissance humanist context. And one can also read the Übermensch à la Faust or à la Ayn Rand, or indeed as Robert Solomon has suggested via Aristotle's great-souled man, although as noted above, this is a paraphrase rather than a direct rendering and the philological reading I explore here takes as its point of departure Nietzsche's own formation as a classicist.

8. Anke Bennholdt-Thomsen points out that as "Menschentzicher," Zarathustra is less to be compared to the disciples of Christ than to the Philosophical-Fisherman in Lucian's Piscator See Bennholdt-Thomsen, Nietzsche's Also Sprach Zarathustra als literarisches Phänomen. Eine Revision (Frankfurt: Athenium, 1974), 127–28.

9. One usually speaks of parodies in this general sense. See for further references in English. Peter Wolfe, "Image and Meaning in Also Sprach Zarathustra," MLN 89 (1964): 546–52 as well as, again, Bennholdt-Thomsen, Nietzsche's Also Sprach Zarathustra als literarisches Phänomen, for useful references to an array of German and French literature.


13. Ibid., 221.
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19. Thus Nietzsche reminds us: "I believe in the old German saying, all gods must die." (KSA 7, 124)
24. Like the duck that could be somebody’s mother in the children’s song "Be Kind to your Web-Footed Friends."
27. This citation reproduces Kaufmann's footnote in its entirety. See Kaufmann, Nietzsche, Philosopher, Psychologist, Anarchist (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), 307n1. The footnote itself clarifies Kaufmann's main text: "The hyperanthropologous is to be found in the writings of Lucian in the second century AD and Nietzsche as a classical philologist had studied Lucian and made frequent references to him in his philologia" (ibid.). Erkme Joseph, Nietzsche im "Zauberberg" (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1996) duly cites Kaufmann in his notes before going on to detail the earlier appearances of the term Übermensch as such in German (271ff.). But prior to Kaufmann, see the entry in Rudolf Eisl's Handwörterbuch der Philosophie (Berlin: Mittler and Sohn, 1913) as well as Ernst Benz: "Das Bild des Übermenschen in der Europäischen Geistesgeschichte" in his Der Übermensch. Eine Diskussion (Stuttgart: Rhein-Verlag 1961), 19–16. Similar details, drawn from Kaufmann, appear in Karen Jost, cited below, and so too with reference to anthropology and the social sciences Jueng-Ihyun Kim, Nietzsche's...


29. Lucian articulates this in the very same "Menippian" satiric fashion Nietzsche invokes at the conclusion of his *Ecce Homo*, "What I owe the Ancients:" Satirically, ironically, Lucian would seem to span Nietzsche's career. But Northrop Frye had already laid the ground rules or gone to the grounds, or, still better: to the underground for English readers, explaining in a section of his *Anatomy of Criticism* entitled "Theory of Myths—just because and rhetorically and given the distance between our own time and Lucian and Menippus, but also Nietzsche himself, it really needs explaining—that "whenever the 'other world' appears in satire, it appears as an ironic counterpart to our own, a reversal of accepted social standards. This form of satire is represented in Lucian's *Katapólous* and *Charon*, journeys to the other world in which the eminence in this one is shown doing appropriate but unaccustomed things, a form incorporated in Rabelais, and in the medieval *danse macabre*. In the last named the simple equality of death is set against the complex inequalities of life." *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University press, 1957), 232.


31. Lucian, *Katapólous* "The Journey to the Underworld or the Tyrant" [16].


33. Ibid. [what's the ibid refer to here?]


35. Ibid.


38. Thus perhaps we are right to read Nietzsche's *Zarathustra*, and to esteem Nietzsche above Rohde as Alan Cardew argues, per contra, that perhaps we might invert the order. See "The Diocletian: Nietzsche and Erwin Rohde" in Paul Bishop, ed., *Nietzsche and Antiquity* (Rochester: Boydell & Brewer, 2004), 458-78.


40. This again is the point of departure for Chitwood’s *Death by Philosophy*.

41. “And he who hath to be a creator in good and evil…”


43. Ibid.


45. In his notes from 1881, Nietzsche praises Böcklin as an exemplar of the quality of German painters as a “pathbreaking painter” (KSA 9, 536).

46. In general, when scholars say they are puzzled, they are usually halfway to dismissing the issue. The scholarly epoché brackets what does not make sense. Nietzsche’s *Birth of Tragedy*, by contrast, attempts to revive questions usually taken for granted, and in this case, fairly striking questions: why tragedy? Why the delight in the tragic, that is the enjoyment of tragic music drama?


48. Ibid., 2117.

49. Ibid. In his text, Jung refers to Kerner’s *Blätter aus Prevorst*, a series of volumes edited by Kerner and entitled *Blätter aus Prevorst; Originalien und Leseschriften für Freunde des innern Lebens*. See for a discussion, John R. Hauke, “From Somnambulism to the Archetypes: The French Roots of Jung’s Split With Freud,” *The Psychoanalytic Review* 71/4 (1984): 648–49. This is an arena that calls for further research (Robin Small has emphasized the actual historical elements of the account with respect to English history) but especially in connection with Nietzsche but also Hölderlin. The reference given by the compiler of Jung’s Zarathustra seminar is to *Die Seherin von Prevorst*. Eröffnungen über das innere Leben der Menschen und über das Hereinragen einer Geisterwelt in die unsere (Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf, 1963 [1829]). In English as *The Seeress of Prevorst*, trans. Catherine Crowe, (New York: Partridge & Brittan, 1855). It matters indeed, although this Jung does not mention, that as a medical student, Kerner had helped care for Hölderlin during his clinical confinement in Tübingen and was later to be influential in arranging the publication of Hölderlin’s collected works.

50. Kerner, *Die Seherin von Prevorst. Eröffnungen über das innere Leben der Menschen und über das Hereinragen einer Geisterwelt in die unsere* (Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf, 1963 [1829]). In English as *The Seeress of Prevorst*, trans. Catherine Crowe, (New York: Partridge & Brittan, 1855). It matters indeed, although this Jung does not mention, that as a medical student, Kerner had helped care for Hölderlin during his clinical confinement in Tübingen and was later to be influential in arranging the publication of Hölderlin’s collected works.

51. Reading Rohde can give us access to terminology Nietzsche took for granted and which some of us no longer know: beginning with the language of the isles of the blest, along with a certain expression of translation, across the surface of the earth, as of above and below the earth.


53. Ibid., 2118. In accord with the fetishism that seems to attend the search for Nietzsche’s sources (whether to prove or disprove his originality), commentators can be expected to be quick to wonder whether Elisabeth was lying but the popularity of the book and the very coincidence of which Jung speaks between his own access to the book and the young Nietzsche and his sister’s access suggest that this is not something it would served purposes to lie about. Indeed, the coin-
cidence is plausible enough even without Elisabeth's confirmation and Bennholdt-Thomsen notes, following Jung, that Nietzsche concerns himself with Kerner between the ages of 12 and 15.
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