

## Santa Clara University Scholar Commons

Philosophy

College of Arts & Sciences

3-2007

# Eternal Recurrence and the Categorical Imperative

Philip J. Kain

*Santa Clara University*, [pkain@scu.edu](mailto:pkain@scu.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarcommons.scu.edu/philosophy>

 Part of the [Philosophy Commons](http://scholarcommons.scu.edu/philosophy)

### Recommended Citation

Kain, P. J. "Eternal Recurrence and the Categorical Imperative," *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 45 (2007): 105-116.

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Kain, P. J. "Eternal Recurrence and the Categorical Imperative," *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 45 (2007): 105-116, which has been published in final form at <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-6962.2007.tb00044.x>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance With Wiley Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

<https://www.pdcnet.org/collection/>

[https://www.pdcnet.org/collection/authorizedshow?id=southernjphil\\_2007\\_0045\\_0001\\_0105\\_0116&pdfname=southernjphil\\_2007\\_0045\\_0001\\_0109\\_0120.pdf&file\\_type=pdf](https://www.pdcnet.org/collection/authorizedshow?id=southernjphil_2007_0045_0001_0105_0116&pdfname=southernjphil_2007_0045_0001_0109_0120.pdf&file_type=pdf)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts & Sciences at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Philosophy by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact [rscroggin@scu.edu](mailto:rscroggin@scu.edu).

# Eternal Recurrence and the Categorical Imperative

Philip J. Kain

Santa Clara University

## I

Nietzsche embraces the doctrine of eternal recurrence for the first time at *Gay Science* §341:<sup>1</sup>

*The greatest weight.*—What, if some day or night a demon were to steal after you into your loneliest loneliness and say to you: "This life as you now live it and have lived it, you will have to live once more and innumerable times more; and there will be nothing new in it, but every pain and every joy and every thought and sigh and everything unutterably small or great in your life will have to return to you, all in the same succession and sequence—even this spider and this moonlight between the trees, and even this moment and I myself. The eternal hourglass of existence is turned upside down again and again, and you with it, speck of dust!"

Would you not throw yourself down and gnash your teeth and curse the demon who spoke thus? Or have you once experienced a tremendous moment when you would have answered him: "You are a god and never have I heard anything more divine." If this thought gained possession of you, it would change you as you are or perhaps crush

you. The question in each and every thing, "Do you desire this once more and innumerable times more?" would lie upon your actions as the greatest weight. Or how well disposed would you have to become to yourself and to life to *crave nothing more fervently* than this ultimate eternal confirmation and seal?<sup>2</sup>

It is not enough that eternal recurrence simply be believed. Nietzsche demands that it actually be loved. In *Ecce Homo*, he explains his doctrine of *amor fati*: "My formula for greatness in a human being is *amor fati*: that one wants nothing to be different, not forward, not backward, not in all eternity. Not merely bear what is necessary, still less conceal it...but love it."<sup>3</sup> In *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Nietzsche says: "'To redeem those who lived in the past and to recreate all 'it was' into a 'thus I willed it'—that alone should I call redemption."<sup>4</sup> To turn all "it was" into a "thus I willed it" is to accept fate fully, to love it. One would have it no other way, one wants everything eternally the same, "Was *that* life?...Well then! Once more!"<sup>5</sup>

Some commentators raise the question of whether Nietzsche intends eternal recurrence to be like a categorical imperative.<sup>6</sup> At *Gay Science* §341, we have just seen, Nietzsche said: "The question in each and every thing, 'Do you desire this once more and innumerable times more?' would lie upon your actions as the greatest weight."<sup>7</sup> In the *Nachlass*, he also writes: "My doctrine declares: the task is to live in such a way that you must wish to live again—you will anyway."<sup>8</sup>

On the other hand, though, in *Twilight of the Idols*, Nietzsche says:

Let us consider finally what naïvety it is to say 'man *ought* to be thus and thus!'....The individual is, in his future and in his past, a piece of fate....To say to him 'change yourself' means to demand that everything should change, even in the past...<sup>9</sup>

The obvious objection to understanding eternal recurrence as like a categorical imperative, it would seem, is that for a categorical imperative to make any sense, for moral obligation to make any sense, it must be possible for individuals to *change themselves*. And Nietzsche denies that individuals can change themselves. Magnus thinks the determinism "implicit in the doctrine of the eternal recurrence of the same renders any imperative impotent....How can one *will* what must happen in any case?"<sup>10</sup> Eternal recurrence seems to deny that an *ought* can make any sense at all.

At the other end of the spectrum, those who do hold that eternal recurrence is like a categorical imperative, for their part, tend to ignore or deny that eternal recurrence is eternal recurrence of the same, that is, they ignore the determinism involved in eternal recurrence.<sup>11</sup> In this article, then, I want to explore the extent to which it can be claimed that eternal recurrence is like a categorical imperative without underestimating Nietzsche's belief in determinism.

We must be careful to remember, then, that eternal recurrence is eternal recurrence of the *same*.<sup>12</sup> That means that it is impossible to do anything in our present life that we have not done in our previous lives. Nothing new or different can occur. Nevertheless, the only thing that follows from this, the only thing we can deduce from what has gone on up to the present point in our current life, is that every detail must have been repeated

in our past lives (assuming, of course, that eternal recurrence is true). We do not know yet, in our present life, what we are going to do during the rest of our life. And eternal recurrence is able to tell us nothing at all about that. Eternal recurrence gives me no information ahead of time about what I can or cannot do in the rest of my present life. It is merely the case, rather, that whatever I do end up doing tells me what I must have done over and over in past lives and will do again in future lives.

If I believe the truth of eternal recurrence, then I believe that in my present life I cannot change anything from my past lives, but I also realize that I cannot know ahead of time what I am about to do, that is, what it is I *must* do in my present life. The fact that I take whatever I will do in the future to be strictly determined, the fact that it is fated, does not give me any information whatsoever about what it is that is fated. It does not tell me that I must do this rather than that. It gives me no information whatsoever about the details of my fate. Only once I do whatever I do can I know that it was the outcome of the whole past and of all past pasts. In short, all this determinism, rigid as it is, tells me nothing of what I am going to do in my present life.

What, then, is the point of all the emphasis Nietzsche puts on determinism, if it gives us no guidelines concerning future action in this life? The point, I suggest, is merely to generate a certain attitude toward whatever it is we end up doing. This is what Nietzsche means, I think, when he says you should "live in such a way that you must wish to live again", and immediately adds, "you will anyway." He is not suggesting that we do something different from our last recurrence, nor something that is not the fated outcome of all past history. That, he thinks, is impossible. He is merely suggesting a certain attitude toward whatever it is we finally do.

But still, isn't it impossible for *attitudes* to change from life to life? Aren't they too the outcome of all past history? At *Gay Science* §341, Nietzsche said that if the thought of eternal recurrence "gained possession of you, it would change you as you are or perhaps crush you."<sup>13</sup> This might be taken to suggest that attitudes can change. The claim that the thought of eternal recurrence "would change you as you are" suggests that in some sense you change, though also it suggests that in some sense you do not. Eternal recurrence "would change you," yet you would remain "as you are." We might be tempted to understand this as implying that attitudes can change in the sense that attitudes can arise that were not the outcome of past history.<sup>14</sup> But I do not think we need assume that this is what Nietzsche means. We should not water down his determinism without being compelled to do so for good reason.

It is quite possible to stick with the interpretation that all things, even attitudes, are the outcome of past history and still make sense of change in attitude. The basic characteristic of past history, its strict determinism, plus the fact that our life must be lived again and again, if we were to reflect upon this, if "this thought gained possession of" us, could easily cause (in perfect compatibility with the strictest determinism) a certain attitude in us, say, the attitude that we should accept this determinism and go along with it, or, as Nietzsche chooses to put it, the attitude that we should "live in such a way that [we] must wish to live again—[we] will anyway." Thus, it can make perfect sense to say that reflecting on the determinism of past history (together with the fact that it will return eternally) could change us as we are. This explanation of change is not at all incompatible with the determinism Nietzsche subscribes to, indeed, it is simply a *result* of it. It is perfectly acceptable to hold that past history contains processes that

produce changes from one historical moment to the next, it is just that once we see what in fact those changes are we must take them to have been fated, strictly determined, and thus we must accept that it would be impossible to change them from the way they actually have been determined by past history (as well as by past cycles).

So also, reflecting upon this determinism, upon the fact that nothing can be changed, upon the fact that all is fated, might cause a further attitude, perhaps the attitude that: 'Fine, I wouldn't change it anyway!' And if such an attitude were produced in us, then when we hear about eternal recurrence it might strike us as divine. When we hear about our fate, we might love it. We might even be able to turn "all 'it was' into a 'thus I willed it'."<sup>15</sup> When we hear about all this rigid determinism, we could conceivably "*crave nothing more fervently* than this ultimate eternal confirmation and seal..."<sup>16</sup>

So far, then, we have explained the sense in which change is possible for Nietzsche. The question is whether this is enough to allow us to say that eternal recurrence is like a categorical imperative?

I think we *can* say that eternal recurrence gives us an imperative. In *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Nietzsche himself writes: "Once man believed in soothsayers and stargazers, and therefore believed: 'All is destiny: you ought to, for you must.'"<sup>17</sup> This is to say that all our actions are fated, determined, they cannot be changed, and thus we "must." But it is also to say that we should have a certain attitude toward this fate, that we accept it, will it, love it, that we "ought." In short, the imperative is that we ought to "live in such a way that [we] must wish to live again—[we] will anyway."

Once we adopt this attitude, but not before, we can be sure that we adopted it in all past lives. Only then can we be sure that this attitude has been fated—that we had no

choice but to adopt it. But until we adopt this attitude, we do not know whether or not we are fated to do so. We cannot know ahead of time what our reaction will be when we finally realize that all is fated. Our reaction could be one of horror such that we will be crushed by the fatedness of our actions. Or the fact that all is fated, once "this thought gained possession of" us, might cause an attitude of acceptance. Furthermore, Nietzsche's urging us to "live in such a way that [we] must wish to live again—[we] will anyway," together with his further reflections on eternal recurrence and *amor fati*, might just be the factors that tip us in the right direction. Thus it seems to me quite legitimate to understand Nietzsche's urging as an imperative.

We can also say, I think, that the imperative which eternal recurrence gives us involves a form of universalization—indeed, the ultimate universalization. Borrowing Kant's language, we could say that Nietzsche wants us to act on those maxims we could will be repeated eternally—we will anyway.<sup>18</sup>

Nevertheless, there are enormous differences between Kant and Nietzsche that we must attend to. Perhaps the most important is that the *Übermensch* can will that *anything* be repeated eternally. After all, he<sup>19</sup> turns *all* "it was" into a "thus I willed it."<sup>20</sup> He loves every detail of his life no matter what it is. Suppose we consider an action like telling a lie. For Kant, we cannot universalize telling a lie and thus we should not tell one. Nietzsche, of course, does not think that discovering whether or not a maxim is universalizable will or should determine our behavior one way or the other. After all, whether we lie or not is determined by all past history and its eternal recurrence—it is fated. It cannot be determined by the rational analysis of maxims alone. Unlike the



categorical imperative, then, eternal recurrence has nothing to do with the moral rightness of actions.

Nietzsche is not concerned with whether or not we tell a lie. He is concerned with the *attitude* we adopt toward whatever action we do take. He wants us to love every detail of our lives—whether we told a lie or not. What matters is not whether we lied, but whether we love our actions. Eternal recurrence is not concerned with *what* is affirmed, only with *affirmation*. The *Übermensch* can act so as to violate the moral law in the most objectionable way, and yet still love every detail of his life. As Owen and Ansell-Pearson point out, the categorical imperative commands ethical content; eternal recurrence does not.<sup>21</sup>

Nietzsche, then, cannot live up to the demands of the Kantian form of universalization. We might also ask, though, whether Kant could live up to the demands of the Nietzschean form of universalization? Can Kant fulfill the Nietzschean demand that he act only on that maxim he could will be repeated eternally? Could Kant live in such a way that he must wish to live again—he will anyway? Suppose that you have led a moral life in the Kantian sense, acting for the sake of the categorical imperative at every step—or that you have come as close to this as would be possible for a human being. Would you therefore be willing to live your life again—would you be willing to live it again an infinite number of times? Could the Kantian categorical imperative be expected to produce *amor fati*? The moral law, Kant says, does produce in us a feeling of respect—a feeling self-wrought by a rational concept.<sup>22</sup> It would produce in us respect for the moral law and presumably even more so for a moral law that had succeeded in (or come close to) regulating an entire life. Well then, could we expect that a life so

regulated by the moral law would engender in us sufficient respect that we should be willing to live that life again? To put it in shorthand, could the Kantian categorical imperative lead to *amor fati*—the embracing of Nietzschean eternal recurrence?

A much more likely reaction, to be honest, would be that of Aeneas, the most *pious* of men, who nevertheless was appalled when he discovered that he would have to live his life again.<sup>23</sup> If there is anything about a moral life that should make one want to live it again, an infinite number of times, I do not see what it would be.<sup>24</sup>

Indeed, I think that the prospect of living one's life over and over again an infinite number of times, once "this thought gained possession of you," would sap the Kantian moral life of its very significance. Whatever appeal a moral life might have would be undermined by the prospect of repeating it infinitely. Eternal recurrence obviously implies that there is no noumenal realm, no transcendental self, no freedom of the Kantian sort. Every action, every thought, every reflection returns eternally and exactly the same. We have determinism, causality, heteronomy—all the way down. While acting autonomously on the moral law, in Kant's view, would produce in us a sense of dignity,<sup>25</sup> the prospect of being fated to repeat that same exact action an infinite number of times, far from producing an increased sense of dignity, would *eliminate* autonomy and so subvert any dignity.

Thus, while actions are universalizable for Nietzsche, they are not universalizable in Kant's sense. We might say that for Nietzsche they are subjectively universalizable. Whether one is able to universalize them depends upon one's subjectivity—one's attitude. Such universalization is not something objective, something we can expect of all rational beings. The *Übermensch* can will to universalize every detail of his life—will to repeat it

eternally—but this is clearly not the case for everyone. Most people, in fact, would be crushed by the idea of eternal recurrence. Moreover, the *Übermensch* is able to universalize what for Kant is not universalizable. On the other hand, Kant would not be able to live up to the demands of Nietzschean universalization—he could not accept eternal recurrence.

## II

In comparing eternal recurrence and the categorical imperative, then, we have major differences between Nietzsche and Kant. And one of the main differences is that Nietzsche's views on eternal recurrence seem to have little to do with morality. We must begin to explain, then, the way in which Nietzsche's views on eternal recurrence are connected with moral matters. Nietzsche says that we should live in such a way that we must wish to live again—we will anyway. This means that we should act as if our acts were all fated—they are anyway. The consequence of this, we must now see, is that we should act as if our acts were all *innocent*—they are anyway. Eternal recurrence, Nietzsche thinks, redeems us from guilt and makes us innocent. This must be explained.

In the *Genealogy of Morals*, Nietzsche claims that:

man was surrounded by a fearful *void*—he did not know how to justify, to account for, to affirm himself; he *suffered* from the problem of his meaning. He also suffered otherwise, he was in the main a sickly animal: but his problem was *not* suffering itself, but that there was no answer to the crying question, "*why* do I suffer?"

Man...the one most accustomed to suffering, does *not* repudiate suffering as such; he *desires* it, he even seeks it out, provided he is shown a *meaning* for it, a *purpose* of suffering. The meaninglessness of suffering, *not* suffering itself, was the curse that lay over mankind...<sup>26</sup>

We live in an empty and meaningless cosmos, a cosmos that does not care about us, and we cannot face this. Suffering we can handle, but meaningless suffering, suffering for no reason at all, we cannot handle. So what do we do? Nietzsche thinks we give suffering a meaning. We invent a meaning. We create an illusion. The Greeks constructed gods for whom wars and other forms of suffering were festival plays and thus occasions to be celebrated by the poets. Christians imagine a God for whom suffering is punishment for sin.<sup>27</sup>

Nietzsche even thinks we used to enjoy inflicting suffering on others:

To see others suffer does one good, to make others suffer even more....[I]n the days when mankind was not yet ashamed of its cruelty, life on earth was more cheerful than it is now....Today, when suffering is always brought forward as the principal argument *against* existence, as the worst question mark, one does well to recall the ages in which the opposite opinion prevailed because men were unwilling to refrain from *making* suffer and saw in it an enchantment of the first order, a genuine seduction *to* life.<sup>28</sup>

Why was the infliction of suffering so enjoyable? Why was it a seduction to life? The answer is not, I do not think, that people of past ages were just sadists, as Danto and others seem to think.<sup>29</sup> Rather, since meaningless suffering is unbearable, we give it a meaning. We make it a punishment and inflict it ourselves. In doing so, suffering is no longer meaningless, it is made to participate in the web of meaning we have created. That is why it is so enjoyable to inflict suffering. That is why it is a seduction to life. We keep meaninglessness at bay. We engage in practices that invest suffering with the meaning it must have for us. We unconsciously participate in the imposition of meaning.

But we are not content, in Nietzsche's opinion, merely to inflict suffering on others. We go further. We inflict it upon *ourselves*. As society develops and we are unable to discharge our instincts outwardly, we direct them within. We create guilt.<sup>30</sup> And priests are quick to nurture this new development.<sup>31</sup> Just as we inflict suffering on others to keep meaningless suffering at bay, so we inflict it upon ourselves. We give *all* suffering a meaning. No meaningless suffering is allowed to remain—anywhere. Meaninglessness is eradicated. And just as inflicting suffering on others was a seduction to life, so in inflicting it on ourselves, "life again became *very* interesting...one no longer protested *against* pain, one *thirsted* for pain; '*more pain! more pain!*'"<sup>32</sup>

Nietzsche finds all of this highly objectionable. And he will not accept any of it. He rejects it completely. He wants to restore the innocence of existence. He wants to rid the world of guilt and punishment:

This instinct of revenge has so mastered mankind in the course of millennia that the whole of metaphysics, psychology, conception of history, but above all

morality, is impregnated with it....He has made even God ill with it, he has *deprived existence* in general *of its innocence*; namely, by tracing back every state of being thus and thus to a will, an intention, a responsible act. The entire doctrine of the will, this most fateful *falsification* in psychology hitherto, was essentially invented for the sake of punishment....[T]he priests at the head of the oldest communality: they wanted to create for themselves a right to take revenge—they wanted to create for *God* a right to take revenge. To this end, man was conceived of as "free"; to this end, every action had to be conceived of as willed....[W]e halcyonians especially are trying with all our might to withdraw, banish, and extinguish the concepts of guilt and punishment from the world...<sup>33</sup>

Thus, Nietzsche's position is that because we cannot accept meaningless suffering, we have given it a meaning—as punishment. We inflict punishment ourselves to invest it with a meaning. In fact, we go even further, we inflict suffering on ourselves internally—we invent guilt. We also invent a will and thus responsibility so that we can be held guilty and so that God can have a right to inflict punishment. Nietzsche wants to reject this whole set of meanings that have been given to suffering, return us to the innocence of existence, and construct a different meaning for suffering. Nietzsche says of Buddhism that it did not need "to make its suffering and capacity for pain *decent* to itself by interpreting it as sin—it merely says what it feels: 'I suffer'."<sup>34</sup> Eternal recurrence, likewise, reduces our suffering just to the suffering. There are no psychological surpluses or increases.

If our actions repeat eternally, if they *must* repeat eternally, if they are not something we can change, if they are fated, then we cannot be held responsible for them, we cannot

be guilty of anything. It makes no sense to see our suffering as punishment. We are innocent. Our suffering is not a retribution. It just happens. One is no longer accountable.<sup>35</sup> We are redeemed from sin and guilt.<sup>36</sup> Nietzsche says, we must "take the concept of punishment which has overrun the whole world and root it out!" It has "robbed of its innocence the whole purely chance character of events."<sup>37</sup> Fate, necessity, eternal recurrence restore the innocence of existence.

### III

To conclude, I think the preceding has shown that despite Nietzsche's commitment to an extreme form of determinism, there is no problem in his advocating that we live in such a way that we must wish to live again—we will anyway. Moreover, it is not unreasonable to describe this as an imperative. Furthermore, this imperative urges us to act as if our acts were all *innocent*—they are anyway. None of this requires us to act any differently. It certainly does not require changing the past—let alone the whole of past history or our past lives. It simply tries to change the way we view our actions. It tries to redeem them. It tries to redeem them from sin and guilt. And thus it does not seem to me unreasonable to describe what we have here as in some sense a *moral* imperative. And since this moral imperative has a certain universal and necessary quality to it, I can see nothing wrong with calling it a *categorical* imperative. Though, again, we must be careful to remember all of the deep differences that have been pointed out between Nietzsche's categorical imperative and Kant's.

---

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Bill Parent for comments on an earlier version of this article.

<sup>2</sup> I have used various translations of Nietzsche and, for the German, *Nietzsche Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (hereafter *KGW*), ed. G. Colli and M. Montinari (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967ff.). I will cite the page of the translation but also the section so that any other edition, English or German, may be used. *The Gay Science* (hereafter *GS*), tr. W. Kaufmann (New York: Vintage, 1974), §341, pp. 273-4. See also, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* (hereafter *Z*), tr. W. Kaufmann (New York: Viking, 1966), III, "On the Vision and the Riddle," §2, pp. 157-9; also "The Convalescent," §§1-2, pp. 215-21. *The Will To Power* (hereafter *WP*), tr. W. Kaufmann and R.J. Hollingdale (New York: Vintage, 1968), §§1057-67, pp. 544-50. For a discussion of earlier approximations to the doctrine of eternal recurrence in the history of philosophy, see B. Magnus, *Nietzsche's Existential Imperative* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978), 47-68.

<sup>3</sup> *Ecce Homo* (hereafter *EH*), in *On the Genealogy of Morals and Ecce Homo*, tr. W. Kaufmann (New York: Vintage, 1969), "Why I Am So Clever," §10, p. 258. See also, *GS*, §276, p. 223.

<sup>4</sup> *Z*, II, "On Redemption," p. 139. See also, *Z*, III, "On Old and New Tablets," §3, p. 198.

<sup>5</sup> *Z*, IV, "The Drunken Song," §1, p. 318. Much more, that need not be rehearsed here, can be said about eternal recurrence and *amor fati*; see, e.g., my "Nietzsche,



---

Skepticism, and Eternal Recurrence," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, XIII (1983), 365-87.

<sup>6</sup> This question is raised and rejected by Kaufmann, Löwith, Magnus, Hatab, and Braddock. See W. Kaufmann, *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist*, 4th edn (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1974), 322-5. K. Löwith, *Nietzsche's Philosophy of the Eternal Recurrence of the Same*, tr. J.H. Lomax (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 88. Magnus, *Nietzsche's Existential Imperative*, 57, 73, 111-13, 139-40. L.J. Hatab, *Nietzsche and Eternal Recurrence: The Redemption of Time and Becoming* (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1978), 111. G. Braddock, "Personal Identity, Determinism, and the Eternal Recurrence," *Eidos*, 14 (1997), 45-6. Jaspers argues that eternal recurrence is like an ethical imperative; see K. Jaspers, *Nietzsche: An Introduction to the Understanding of His Philosophical Activity*, tr. C.F. Wallraff and F.J. Schmitz (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1966), 359ff. Ansell-Pearson argues that eternal recurrence represents a version of the categorical imperative; see K. Ansell-Pearson, *Nietzsche contra Rousseau: A Study of Nietzsche's Moral and Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 183, 194-9. Also see G. Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, tr. H. Tomlinson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983), 68ff.

<sup>7</sup> *GS*, §341, p. 274.

<sup>8</sup> *KGW*, Part V, Vol. 2, p. 403; quoted in Magnus, *The Existential Imperative*, 73.

<sup>9</sup> *Twilight of the Idols* (hereafter *TI*), in *Twilight of the Idols and The Anti-Christ*, tr. R.J. Hollingdale (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977), "Morality as Anti-Nature," §6, p. 46.

---

<sup>10</sup> B. Magnus, Foreword to K. Löwith, *Nietzsche's Philosophy of the Eternal Recurrence of the Same*, xv. Also see Löwith, 88. Also Magnus, *The Existential Imperative*, 73, 111-3. Also B. Magnus, "Eternal Recurrence," in *Nietzsche-Studien*, 8 (1979), 363ff.

<sup>11</sup> See Ansell-Pearson, 97. Also see Jaspers, 359ff. Also Deleuze, 48.

<sup>12</sup> E.g., Z, "The Convalescent," §2, p. 221.

<sup>13</sup> *GS*, §341, p. 274.

<sup>14</sup> On the other hand, this attitude would still have to be found in all our other lives. There can be no difference between cycles without contradicting the notion of eternal recurrence of the *same*.

<sup>15</sup> Z, II, "On Redemption," p. 139. See also, Z, III, "On Old and New Tablets," §3, p. 198.

<sup>16</sup> *GS*, §341, p. 274.

<sup>17</sup> Z, III, "On Old and New Tablets," §9, p. 201.

<sup>18</sup> Even for Kant himself, there is an analogy between the categorical imperative and the laws of nature: "The universality of law according to which effects are produced constitutes what is properly called nature in the most general sense....[By analogy], then, the universal imperative of duty can be expressed as follows: Act as though the maxim of your action were by your will to become a universal law of nature." Furthermore, "A realm of ends is thus possible only by analogy with a realm of nature. The former, however, is possible only by maxims, i.e., self-imposed rules, while the latter is possible by laws of efficient causes externally necessitated." See *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals*, tr. L.W. Beck (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1959), 39, 57 (brackets in the

---

text); for the German, see *Kants gesammelte Schriften* (hereafter *KGS*), ed. Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1910 ff.), IV, 421, 438. So also we could say that for Nietzsche too there would be an analogy between a deterministic and externally necessitated realm of nature and the self imposed "thus I willed it" of loving one's fate. Certainly, Nietzsche could endorse completely and without reservation the Kantian imperative to: "Act as though the maxim of your action were by your will to become a universal law of nature"—indeed, he could even add: it "will anyway."

<sup>19</sup> I do not say "he or she" because I do not think one should presume, given what Nietzsche elsewhere says about women, that he thinks a woman could be an *Übermensch*.

<sup>20</sup> Z, II, "On Redemption," p. 139. See also, Z, III, "On Old and New Tablets," §3, p. 198.

<sup>21</sup> D. Owen, *Nietzsche, Politics and Modernity: A Critique of Liberal Reason* (London: Sage Publications, 1995), 115-16. Ansell-Pearson, 198. See also Kaufmann, 325.

<sup>22</sup> *Foundations*, 16-8 and *KGS*, IV, 400-1.

<sup>23</sup> Virgil, *Aeneid*, Book VI.

<sup>24</sup> Kant's categorical imperative would imply that at least some acts in one's life must be changed if one were to will to live one's life over again *and* be moral in doing so. It would not be possible, in Kant's view, that every act in one's past life was moral; see, e.g., *Foundations*, 23-4 and *KGS*, IV, 406-8. Also *Critique of Practical Reason*, tr. L.W. Beck (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1956), 33, 133 and *KGS*, V, 32-3, 128. Kant's categorical

---

imperative, in this sense also, would not be compatible with eternal recurrence of the same.

<sup>25</sup> Kant, *Foundations*, 53-4, 56 and *KGS*, IV, 434-6, 438.

<sup>26</sup> *Genealogy of Morals* (hereafter *GM*), in *On the Genealogy of Morals and Ecce Homo*, III, §28, p. 162. See also, *GM*, II, §7, pp. 68-9. See also, *TI*, "Maxims and Arrows" §12, p. 23. Also see, *Schopenhauer as Educator*, in *Untimely Meditations*, tr. R.J. Hollingdale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), §5, p. 157.

<sup>27</sup> *GM*, II, §7, pp. 68-9. *Human, All Too Human*, tr. R.J. Hollingdale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), II, §189, p. 260. See also, *Daybreak* (hereafter *D*), tr. R.J. Hollingdale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), §78, p. 48.

<sup>28</sup> *GM*, II, §§6-7, p. 67; see also, p. 68. See also, *D*, §18, p. 17; also §77, p. 46. Also, *GS*, §48, p. 113; also §325, p. 255.

<sup>29</sup> A.C. Danto, *Nietzsche as Philosopher* (New York: Macmillan, 1967), 176-7. See also, D.R. Ahern, *Nietzsche as Cultural Physician* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), 32. Also B. Magnus and K.M. Higgins, "Introduction," *The Cambridge Companion to Nietzsche*, ed. B. Magnus and K.M. Higgins (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 49. Also, see my "Nietzschean Genealogy and Hegelian History in the *Genealogy of Morals*," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 26 (1996), 142-3.

<sup>30</sup> *GM*, II, §§16-17, pp. 84-7.

<sup>31</sup> *GM*, III, §20, p. 140.

<sup>32</sup> *GM*, III, §20, p. 141.

---

<sup>33</sup> *WP*, §765, pp. 401-2. Also, *TI*, "The Four Great Errors," §7, p. 53. Also, *D*, §13, p. 13.

<sup>34</sup> *The Anti-Christ*, in *Twilight of the Idols* and *The Anti-Christ*, §23, p. 132.

<sup>35</sup> *TI*, "The Four Great Errors," §8, p. 54.

<sup>36</sup> Nietzsche writes, "to recreate all 'it was' into a 'thus I willed it'—that alone should I call redemption" (*Z*, II, "On Redemption," p. 139).

<sup>37</sup> *D*, §13, p. 13.