

Nietzsche's Dionysian Joyful Wisdom.

"Without Art, the crudeness of the world would make life unbearable." – George Bernard Shaw.

"The telling of beautiful untrue things is the proper aim of Art." – Oscar Wilde

"Imagination is the beginning of creation. You imagine what you desire, you will what you imagine, and at last you create what you will." – George Bernard Shaw

"Life isn't about finding yourself. Life is about creating yourself." – George Bernard Shaw

"I want to learn more and more to see as beautiful what is necessary in things; then I shall be one of those who makes things beautiful. Amor Fati: let that be my love henceforth! I do not want to wage war against what is ugly. I do not want to accuse; I do not even want to accuse those who accuse. Looking away shall be my only negation. And all in all and on the whole someday I wish to be only a Yes-sayer." – Nietzsche, *The Gay Science/Joyful Wisdom*, #276

*"Whither is God?" he cried; "I will tell you: we have killed him – you and I... Must we not ourselves become gods simply to seem worthy of it?"*ⁱ - Nietzsche

"All 'It was' is a fragment, a riddle, a dreadful chance – until the creative will says to it: 'but I willed it thus!'... 'Thus shall I will it!'" – Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Pt 2, *Of Redemption*ⁱⁱ

Formula For Greatness:

Nietzsche (1844-1900) – the list of things he repudiates is breathtaking: virtually everything in Western culture hitherto: religions, philosophies, art, moralities, even science. When he speaks of the "twilight of the idols" he means the entire tradition: being-centred philosophy – i.e., belief in separate beings, agents, atoms, personal selves, freewill, etc. He replaces it with *interconnected process*: no *static separate beings* anywhere. Constant change. He approves of Heraclitus saying, *"Everything flows, nothings stands still."* He rejects the "false lights" of static being.ⁱⁱⁱ

His project is ultimately a "revaluation of all values"^{iv} – an attempt to overturn and overcome our anguished neo-Christian-modern culture, which is, in his view, a product of old "slave morality" herd evaluations.^v He even provocatively declares himself "the Anti-christ."

Real joy in life, he feels, presupposes victory over all "*ressentiment*".^{vi} He writes, "This was comprehended by that profound physiologist, the Buddha. His "religion" should rather be called a kind of *hygiene*, lest it be confused with such pitiable phenomena as Christianity: its effectiveness was made conditional on the victory over resentment. To liberate the soul from this is the first step toward recovery. *"Not by enmity is enmity ended; by friendliness enmity is ended."* – these words stand at the beginning of the doctrine of the Buddha."^{vii} (See the *Dhammapada*).

This corrects two misunderstandings. First, that Nietzsche opposed all aspects of Buddhism. Rather, he opposed any "otherworldly" Nirvana as "escapism" from life in this world. For that would be indicative of resentment against life and be like Christianity in this regard, in his view. But inasmuch as Buddhism helps toward a non-resentful attitude, it's a step in the right direction, though far from being the whole exuberant Dionysian package Nietzsche wants.

Second, that Nietzsche advocates a battle of “will-to-power” in a material sense and that, therefore, he was opposed to universal love. On the contrary, the peak expression of our will-to-power is precisely a form of universal love. This is hinted at by the Buddhism comment, but more clearly by the famous passage later in *Ecce Homo*, where he states: “My formula for greatness in a human being is *amor fati* (love of fate): that one wants nothing to be different, not forward, not backward, not in all eternity. Not merely bear what is necessary...but love it.”^{viii}

Amor fati is his formula for greatness. So it must be the formula for the greatest expression of will-to-power and greatest human: the *Übermensch*, i.e., the Overman, Man who is *over* Man as Man was hitherto. Fate here – what does it mean? It means everything and everyone in what he calls “the innocence of becoming”, i.e., the ever flowing interconnected natural circle of life. Therefore, *amor fati* means love of everything. The *Übermensch*, the Overman, has this kind of love. Everyone else is “Man” – old Mankind, humanity as we have been hitherto.

Towards Amor Fati:

How is a person, already conditioned to the idols of our culture, as Nietzsche himself was, supposed to overcome this to become an Overman? The answer is given in a key paragraph in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* about the Camel, Lion, and Child:

“I name you three metamorphoses of the spirit: how the spirit shall become a camel, and the camel a lion, and the lion at last, a child...What is heavy? asks the weight-bearing spirit; thus it kneels down like the camel and wants to be heavy-laden...but in the loneliest desert the second metamorphosis occurs: the spirit here becomes a lion; it wants to capture freedom...why is the lion needed in the spirit?...to create freedom for new creation. Tell me what the child can do that even the lion cannot?...The child is innocence and forgetfulness, a new beginning, a sport, a self-propelling wheel, a first motion, a sacred Yes...a Yes, is needed, my brothers, for the sport of creation: the spirit now wills its own will, the spirit sundered from the world now wins its own world..”^{ix}

The passage states how transformation from Man to Overman is to occur. The Camel is a metaphor for our culturally conditioned mind. It bears the heavy burden of all the values and beliefs – the idols – of the past. It is the spirit of gravity in us. The Lion is a metaphor for the critical inquiring mind that questions everything. Lion shakes the foundations and brings about the “twilight of the idols” that includes the idol of so-called truth. Nietzsche re-describes our “truths” as merely the “triumphant fictions” of the past – the cultural stories that have ruled our hearts and minds hitherto. Lion sceptically tears them apart and undermines them. It brings an end to the hubris of our old idolatries.^x

Lion creates room for new opportunity: the arising of the Child in us. The Child is a metaphor for the Nietzschean free spirit that exhibits a new kind of action and levity – “profound frivolity”, the humour and “crazy wisdom” – and capacity in us to create and *will* a new story or “fiction” into existence. Note: a *willed* story, so not any kind of so-called revealed truth, e.g., of religion, mysticism, rationalism, or science – hubris. A *willed* story is what Nietzsche sees as *noble* – viz., actively created, not thrust upon us. It’s Art v. Revelation, you could say.

Now, what kind of artistic story is the Nietzschean free spirit going to will into existence? One that enables greatness: the Overman, *amor fati*. But what story enables *amor fati*? What kind of perspective on life would we need to take to be *able* to view everything and everyone as, not merely bearable, but actually lovable? Nietzsche’s answer is...a pagan Dionysian perspective. See everything from the standpoint of being Dionysus.

He announces this theme in his first book, *The Birth Of Tragedy*. Dionysus is the name used to symbolise the will or spirit or god of nature in all its transformations: pleasure and pain, birth and death, beauty and cruelty, etc. In this sense Dionysus is the apotheosis of nature and its will-to-power. What does this Dionysian pagan nature spirit seek? Dramatic and beautiful artistic effects: an awesome theatre show, pleasurable and painful, beautiful and cruel, creation and destruction.

Now, if this beautiful and cruel theatre show was created by some Being *separate* from us – the usual idea of God with a capital G – we could with good reason *nobly* object, inasmuch as it has been thrust upon us without our will or consent. It is some other Being's idea and project, not ours. We are merely pawns in the game, puppets or victims, lackeys or slaves, given our scripts and roles to play by a separate playwright. So we feel alienated from it, indignant, nobly rebellious, opposed to it, angered or anguished by it – a common existentialist theme. Or, if we are being religiously servile and obsequious, we submit to it humbly, seeking our reward for this later on. Or, if we are being Stoical, we calculate it would be more pragmatic to accept a given fate as best we can and not *awfulise*, as Dr Albert Ellis would say.

In short, we are likely to be either a) anguished and rebellious, like old-school existentialist types, such as Camus or Sartre, or b) religiously obsequious, like Christians, Muslims, and similar types, or c) stoically resigned. None of this gets close to *amor fati*, however. Nietzsche defined this as not merely “bearing what is necessary” but actually “loving it” – much more positive. So the question is: what is *wrong* with these old stories that they fail to *enable* us to love life and reality nobly and freely, i.e., without anguish, servility, or resignation? What is their common error, the epic fail they all share? It is, in a word, dualism.

Dualism is any philosophy that reality is composed of separate beings or substances. For example, the Cartesian idea that mind and body are separate beings or substances that inexplicably interact; or the idea that we are separate from nature, hence supernatural in some way, e.g., as separate souls or accountable beings with freewill; or the view that God and Man are separate beings with God *over* us. In Nietzsche's view, dualism cannot enable *amor fati*. The opposite: it disables it. That is why a fully noble and joyful universal love has not existed in Man hitherto. That's why the Overman must get *over* Man as Man was and *over* the God that has been over Man. Hence the “God is dead” theme. It means: get over the separate God and separation from nature – typically Christian. Get over being a prisoner of dualism.

In his first book, *The Birth Of Tragedy*, dualism is to be defeated by achieving an experiential sense of self-identification with Dionysus, the god spirit of nature, by way of a revelation of truth achieved in an altered state of conscious induced by art, theatre, and music on a grand scale. It would be like a trance, like a feral rave, a mind-altering experience of losing the sense of personal individuation and separation from nature.^{xi} We would feel unity with the power of nature and, despite all the pain and suffering nature can create, bless it and life anew. Nietzsche argued that this was how the ancient Dionysian festivals and tragic theatres worked to rejuvenate the Greeks. He proposed that it be reinvented and tried again, this time using the talents and music of his artistic hero of the time, Richard Wagner.

The idea was mystical, neo-Romantic, inspired by something very common in our culture: a youthful enthusiasm for powerful music and self-loss in an exultant crowd completely lost in the moment. He outgrew it though. Rejecting Wagner, he also rejected this approach, later referring to it as juvenile. However, he did not reject the idea of self-identification with Dionysus and the pagan theatre of natural life. He comes back to it, but changes the way it is to be achieved. It is not to be done through music or revelations. So how is it to be done?

As said, by the three metamorphoses: philosophical self-transformation. A person must be a Camel first, get over the Camel with Lion, and get over Lion with Child – thus becoming an Overman, over Man as Man. An Overman achieves self-identification with Dionysus directly without needing external means and inputs, simply by *creating it as art* and *willing* it. For Nietzsche, *the will* is “the great liberator”. So it should all be done by *will* as an act of the highest will-to-power. Empower oneself by creating and willing the perspective, the triumphant fiction, the make-believe, that deep down, behind the mask and persona of the individual human person, what one really is...*is* Dionysus, suffering spirit of life and death.

It would *not* be noble if the Dionysus idea were thrust upon us by conditioning or by anything purporting to be a revelation of truth. *It is noble only if created and willed by a free spirit.* We are to sustain the worldview by choice, like a crazy wisdom, without proof, and without needing or even seeking any. For after all, to seek proof is merely to seek self-deception, bad faith, idolatry, hubris, and servility. The Overman is over servility, over idolatry.

Suppose someone objected to this and said: “Look here, this isn’t crazy wisdom, this is just plain crazy. It is obvious that you are not Dionysus. You are just an ordinary human being like the rest of us, made of flesh and bone, and as such a completely insignificant speck of dust in a mind-bogglingly huge material universe that is at least 13 billion years old.”

How would you respond? If you have not done philosophy, you’d probably be stumped. But what’s happening here? All that’s happening is some person is bellowing like a Camel. He or she has some material universe idolatry going on. The person has not become an Overman over Man and Man’s claim to truth. As we learned from Socrates, we don’t know anything. So we don’t know we are material beings in a material universe – or indeed *what* we are. That being so, we could be Dionysus after all. So why not make it so? We use the opportunity provided by lionhearted questioning to create and *will* this perspective.

If you find it difficult to will the make-believe that you are really Dionysus, creator of the whole beautiful and cruel theatre show of our pagan nature, then realise that this is Camel mind talking. Get over it with your Lion mind. Then get over the Lion with the creative Child and renew the art of exuberance. We can do this over and over till we really are over Man – i.e., our old self, the old Man in us.

Why would we be doing this? To recap: because dualism disables free and noble *amor fati* and the Dionysian perspective enables it. How does it help? It helps because we can now view everything that happens as being what we really wanted to happen. Nietzsche touches on this in a key section called *Redemption* in his book, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Part 2. There he writes as follows,

“To redeem the past and to transform every “it was” into an “I wanted it thus” – that alone do I call redemption! Will – that is what the liberator and bringer of joy is called: thus I have taught you, my friends! But now learn this as well: The will itself is still a prisoner...powerless against that which has been done, the will is angry spectator of all things past. The will cannot will backwards; that it cannot break time and time’s desire – that is the will’s most lonely affliction.”^{xii}

The will liberates and brings joy; but not fully, if fettered. That is, if it can only look and create forward in time, but cannot will that it has also willed the past. He goes on to say it is because we think we have not willed the past that we easily fall into resentment and seek revenge, e.g., in stories of holy vengeance and just punishments; or else fall into despair and disparage life, retreating or even negating the will to live; or perhaps we make up a story that life is evil, the world wicked. It should never have happened. Out of *ill will* Man has created *sickly* stories and

these stories keep the *ill will* and *sickliness* going from generation to generation. That's the deep sickness and pessimism of our culture, and what we are to get over to be Overman.

Can we stop this sickness continuing for another millennium? Yes, if we can learn to will that we have willed the past. Thus, he finishes with, "*All "It was" is a fragment, a riddle, a dreadful chance – until the creative will says to it: 'But I willed it thus!... Thus shall I will it!'"*"^{xiii} Only then, he says, does the will "unlearn resentment" and become fully "its own redeemer and bringer of joy".

He is being deliberately pagan and anti-Christian in saying we are *own* redeemer. Can we be? Yes, but only by willing that we have willed history. How is that possible? We cannot say we have willed it as an ordinary human person, but we could say we have willed it as Dionysus. The passage not only implies that we create joyful wisdom by being over resentment and revenge, but that we do this by an artistic self-identification with the ultimate artist. Fate can then be viewed as our own art, will, and choice. It has not been imposed on us by any separate power. It is what we ourselves wanted deep down. Hence, there is nothing in life to resent. With nothing to resent, there is no impediment to *amor fati*. The love of fate is at last enabled.

If something is happening to you that you think you don't want, take the view that it actually is what you want. Even if it is conflict at a personal level, at a deeper level there is no conflict, because you wanted the conflict. We can love fate because we get what we want as artists. Deepest desire being met – that's a natural basis for love. Choose the raw material you give yourself in life and make some life-affirming art out of it. Like any good artist be prepared to suffer for your art – which is nothing less than your *life*.

Someone said to me the other day that she's "a drama queen". Oddly enough, Nietzsche is saying something similar on a much grander scale. We are all the drama queens because we are all Dionysus – apotheosis of will-to-power and suffering artist of the beautiful and cruel world theatre we call nature. You might think you don't want it at a personal level, but deep down you do. Just don't take things so *personally*. Instead identify with Dionysus as the spirit of life and nature itself. You *are* life then: the very *becoming* of it all, as it is, from moment to moment.

The last line of Nietzsche's last book runs: "*Have I been understood? – Dionysus versus the Crucified?*" It is Nietzsche, identified with Dionysus, versus any dualistic or supernatural kind of philosophy, notably – but not only – Christianity. Similarly, in *Ecce Homo, Why I Am A Destiny* 5, he tells us through Zarathustra what he wants: a person who is not *separate* from reality "but is reality itself... *only in that way can man attain greatness.*" And in the final section of *The Twilight Of The Idols*, he says his aim all along has been to show how one can "be *oneself* the eternal joy of becoming".^{xiv} Pain and death is redeemed by beauty and pleasure in the whole show.

The story is non-dualistic. No separate God or power has created our life or purpose. We create it ourselves and for that reason we can love it. It is our own. It is up to us to take ownership of life. The world is a stage and we are both playwright and player. Life is our theatre of Dionysian self-deceptions because at a deep level we want the tragic art and the drama.

Re-engagement With Life:

An Overman would talk in ways strange to modern ears and say something like this:

When I look backwards in time I gaze thankfully on everything that ever was without any sense of pity and horror, without being morally judgmental, and without any grudges or resentment, because it has all been my own artistic will from the beginning, and it has led me to this exuberant moment of the joyful wisdom where I can will

and say a complete Yes to life. And when I look forward in time I act with a creative hand that wants to vigorously shape the future as the bridge to the Overman, making this our goal and meaning of life, so that others may learn to be artistic Yes-sayers as well, who are over Man as Man and who identify with life as art.

The looking forward, acting with a creative hand, expresses the *virtue ethic* of the Overman. It is a bold and active magnanimity and mercy: an *areté*, a virtue/virtuosity springing spontaneously from being in healthy good spirits without resentment and recognising the unity of all humanity in oneself. We act to give expression to the Dionysian ideal. He says, “Formula of my happiness: a Yes, a No, a straight line, a goal...”^{xv} We need to have a goal in life: motivation and sense of purpose. *The promotion of a new culture of Dionysian joy in life is it.*

The Overman is not morally judgmental. We just act naturally, according to artistic disposition, with vital good spirits overflowing into goodwill, all in a joy “deeper than heart’s agony”, as Nietzsche puts it.^{xvi} For with no grudge to bear, and being oneself a great enjoyer and exponent of the joyful wisdom, why would we not help others to this great redemption if or when we can? It is the resentments we feel, the ingrained dualism, the disappointments and setbacks, and the ill-tempered ill will, that makes us act badly, or withdraw from active life. Help people get over that, and when they *are* well, they will *act* well. It is not punishment we need. It is a good education and daily practice of the joyful wisdom. The Overman will have the resilience, the magnanimous mercy, the healthy energy and motivation, to re-engage artistically with life to help others create this *joy in life* also. This, then, is *the* Dionysian artistic lifestyle.

Contrary to what our culture says, persons are *never* to blame. Personal neurosis, pessimism, depression, anguish, rage, resentment, crime, violence, laziness, etc., is symptomatic of a sick slave herd society. Indeed, it is part of our society’s sickness to blame persons and thereby overlook its own failings. Although the idea is laughable, our culture achieves this *by taking itself for granted as the norm for all humanity*. Psychotherapists and other panderers to public opinion comply all too readily. They don’t want to face bigger issues. Perhaps they haven’t got the philosophical imagination to think far enough beyond the norms? Nor would it be easily marketable.

To be blunt, they want to make money. So they think of psychotherapy in terms of helping people to be well adjusted to society as it is. But what if the society is sick? Then what psychotherapy is doing is helping people be well adjusted to sickness. Sickness is merely reinforced by this palliative solution of making it a bit more palatable – don’t awfulise, etc. That is called being pragmatic. It’s a medicine that never cures. It patches things over. The Overman would say that what we really need is to get over patching things over.

What if psychotherapy succeeds in adjusting people to a relative low type of happiness? This may look okay on self-assessment questionnaires, which then supports the claim that psychotherapy works, that it is scientifically supported, and so deserves more funding. It also gets widely accepted that this low type of happiness is normal for a human, when actually it might just be normal for a relatively sick human. What goes unconsidered is that a higher type of happiness is possible, i.e., for an Overman over psychotherapy.

Nietzsche implies that this wellbeing as we know it today is relative neurosis compared to the artistic life-exuberance we could be feeling through Dionysian wisdom. We should not even be aiming at happiness, but at self-overcoming and joy in creative action. Don’t stop short with anything less. But we are so used to consumerism, spectator passivity, and everyday dreariness, we take this as the norm and natural way to live. We are stuck in the joyless happiness of the ultimate or last Man, as he puts it – i.e., we conformist moderns who know and will nothing

greater than ourselves, who do not aim for or will anything remotely like the Overman. ““*We have discovered happiness*”, *say the Ultimate Men, and blink.*”^{xvii} – thus spoke Zarathustra.

Finally: Could Nietzsche’s philosophy be bunkum, product of a brilliant mind gone wildly astray, product of eccentric loneliness, or an obsessive self-deception bordering on syphilitic madness? Yes. It can be doubted. However, that seems to be part of the point. It is because it can be doubted, because everything can be doubted, that it is feasible. There are never any guarantees, and to seek guarantees – proofs, evidence, revelations, reassurances, and the like – is ignoble, because it would compromise freedom. “*Convictions are prisons!*” – says he.

Therefore, the perspective has to be *willed in the face of doubt* – quite an existentialist point. Moreover, if the philosophy is true, there is an excellent reason in it why we might find it hard to think it is true. Namely, that if we are the ultimate artist of life, we may not want ourselves to know it. Why? – Because that might spoil the art. A high degree of self-deception has been required for the drama to play. And as they say, the show must go on.

So, paradoxically, perhaps the reason why people have such difficulty getting their heads around the idea that this philosophy is true is because...it actually *is* true!

Supplementary Notes:

Nietzsche’s optimism must be distinguished from lesser forms, such as psychologist Martin Seligman’s “Learned Optimism”.^{xviii} The latter is merely about fostering a hopeful pragmatism in the ordinary affairs of life. The usual criticism of it is that it might mislead a person into underestimating any real dangers and problems they face at this level. Dionysian optimism operates in quite a different way. It is compatible with taking a realistic attitude to life’s dangers while nevertheless also taking an exuberantly joyful attitude to the whole situation of life inclusive of these dangers and any pains they may entail.

PS. Given his negative passages, some people wonder if we should be teaching Nietzsche in high schools. In reply it could be said: in addition to the fact that Nietzsche is a crucial figure in the history of philosophy, a big influence on 20th century culture, and unavoidable as such, there are big potential positives in his philosophy. For example, the teaching of the “twilight of the idols” could have the effect of helping to liberate young people from the new “idols” of the age, such as the idolization of stars and celebrities, or addiction to social networking and the internet. It might be useful for teachers to link Nietzsche with Tolkien on this point: the mistake is to call any person or thing “my precious”. In line with many philosophers, Nietzsche teaches us to be self-reliant, self-overcoming, and self-empowered in “eudemonia” – now understood as Dionysian joyful wisdom. Anything less than this would be, in his view, yet another expression of the decadent slave morality culture that we have inherited and that is now deeply rooted inside us. He could have a point.^{xix}

Prince William, in earthquake-ravaged Christchurch, said that the Queen’s motto is this: that “grief is the price we pay for love”. Nietzsche would counter: rather, *overcome grief with a far greater*

love – Dionysian love. We are not overcome then – we overcome. We are to take up whatever grief arises as itself a natural part of life – since it exists, it is real – and sublimate it into our Dionysian art and joy.

Pessimism – that is what Nietzsche (recoiling aghast from Schopenhauer) set out to overcome in himself and in our culture. What does he see as pessimism? *Everything* hitherto – e.g.: Good and Evil, Christianity, Manichaeism, Schopenhauer, Materialism, Egoism, Hedonistic Consumerism, Nihilism, Absurdism, Angst, *Nausea* – etc. In sum – get this! – *anything less than seeing oneself as Dionysus is pessimism!*

ⁱ Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, trans. Walter Kaufmann, Vintage Books, 1974, section 125, pg 181.

ⁱⁱ Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, trans. R.J.Hollingdale, Penguin Classics, 1969, pg 163

ⁱⁱⁱ For Nietzsche's rejection of both "being" and "ego" as "false lights" see *The Twilight Of The Idols*, trans., R.J.Hollingdale, Penguin, 1968, pg 49.

^{iv} See *Ecce Homo*, trans., Walter Kaufmann, Vintage Books, 1969, pg 326. By a "revaluation of values" Nietzsche intends a transformation of the traditional values of our culture into the new more "naturalistic" and life-affirming values, culminating in "amor fati".

^v Nietzsche distinguishes "slave morality" from "master morality": the latter is the form of morality used by the enslaving tribes. They described people and things as "good" or "bad". Slave morality is "reactive" to them, and much more "vindictive" (see *ressentiment* below): it invents the idea of "good and evil" – where "evil" does not merely mean "bad" but inherently *wicked*, a metaphysical *abomination*, worthy even of *damnation*: an endless punishment in hell.

^{vi} Nietzsche uses the French word in a technical way: imagine an impulse of revenge against an oppressor that cannot be vented because that would be far too risky. It builds up inside like water behind a dam, festers, and grows more and more *vindictive*. It dreams up all sorts of imaginary scenarios of "righteous vengeance" – e.g., eternal torments in hell.

^{vii} *ibid*, pg 230

^{viii} *ibid*, pg 258

^{ix} See *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, trans., R.J.Hollingdale, Penguin, 1969, pg 55.

^x See *Twilight*, *ibid*, pg 22, where he speaks of philosophising with a hammer in the sense of a tuning-fork, sounding out the hollowness of idols. See also his statement, "The sceptics, the only honourable type among the equivocal, quinquivocal tribe of philosophers." in *Ecce Homo*, *ibid*, pg 243.

^{xi} See the Section titled *The Birth Of Tragedy* in *Ecce Homo*, *ibid*, pg 270-275.

^{xii} See *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Hollingdale, Penguin, pg 161

^{xiii} *ibid*, pg 163

^{xiv} See *The Portable Nietzsche*, ed., and trans., by Walter Kaufmann, Penguin, 1976, pg 563.

^{xv} See Nietzsche, *Twilight Of The Idols*, section: *Maxims and Arrows* #44, trans. Hollingdale, Penguin Classics, 1968

^{xvi} See *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, *ibid*, pg 333 for this line.

^{xvii} See *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, *ibid*, pg 46.

^{xviii} Marin Seligman, *Learned Optimism: how to change you mind and your life*, Vintage Books, 2006

^{xix} A point to note about Nietzsche critique of Christianity is that it targets traditional mainstream views that consider God as ontologically separate. Christian mysticism of the sort advocated by Meister Eckhart (c1260-c1327) might escape his strictures. Indeed, Eckhart's claim "I and God am one." (for which he was condemned as an heretic by the Church) would be in some ways similar to a Nietzschean claim that I and Dionysus am one. Certainly this would be an interesting point

of comparison for further discussion. Can a “Christian” really go “beyond good and evil”? Another interesting point for discussion would be: Does Nietzsche provide, in effect, a more radical form of “logotherapy” than even Dr. Viktor Frankl, by showing a way to find value and meaning in everything that may befall us?