


To the Graduate Council:


I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Alexandra Ghica entitled "Critical Reception of Nietzsche's Götzen-Dämmerung in Germany, France, Italy and Spain between 1890-1910." I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in German.



David Lee, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:





Accepted for the Council:



Vice Provost
and Dean of The Graduate School

CRITICAL RECEPTION OF NIETZSCHE'S GÖTZEN-DÄMMERUNG IN GERMANY,
FRANCE, ITALY AND SPAIN BETWEEN 1890-1910

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Arts

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Alexandra Ghica

June 1988

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deepest appreciation to Professor David Lee for his patience and encouragement during the research and writing of this thesis, and for his helpful suggestions and criticism. I am also grateful to the staff of Interlibrary Loan for their assistance.

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the critical reception of Nietzsche's Götzen-Dämmerung in four countries (France, Italy, Spain and Germany) during a period of twenty years (from 1890 to 1910). The dates were chosen in order to allow enough time for the reading public to gain access to it, but the study is cut off in 1910 so as to avoid the problem of the stereotypification of Nietzsche as a destructive force partly to blame for World War I. By coincidence, the midpoint of this project is the year of Nietzsche's death (1900). This too was taken into consideration for possible effects on readership.

Götzen-Dämmerung presents several problems unrelated to the field of philosophy. Despite its importance, it has been largely ignored by the critics. Because of its title it is often wrongly assumed that the book focuses primarily on the problem of Nietzsche's relationship with Wagner. Nietzsche also made contradictory statements regarding his intent, and critics have proposed several theories about its genesis based on Nietzsche's mental condition.

In order to explain the problem of reception, I have found it necessary to include a section on the book itself as it is related to his other works. Chapters I and II deals with the writing of the book and my view of the purpose of Götzen-Dämmerung. Chapters III-VI treat

each of the countries involved. Each of these chapters includes comments on the general reception of Nietzsche's work and specific reactions to Götzen-Dämmerung.

The overall conclusions are: 1) the public, in general, was more receptive to the book than the critics were; 2) Nietzsche's purpose in writing Götzen-Dämmerung was for the book to be a transition between Nietzsche's oeuvre until then and his final work, Umwertung aller Werthe, and 3) this goal was severely hindered by the aphoristic, "shorthand" style in which Götzen-Dämmerung was written and, more importantly, by the stereotyping of Nietzsche as a pernicious influence. This was found to hold particularly true in Germany's case.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
I. The Writing of the Book	6
II. <u>Götzen-Dämmerung</u>	13
III. German Reaction	24
IV. French Reaction	30
V. Italian Reaction	44
VI. Spanish Reaction	57
VII. Conclusions	67
BIBLIOGRAPHY	69
APPENDIX	75
VITA	80

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the critical reaction to Nietzsche's Götzen-Dämmerung in Germany, France, Italy and Spain between 1890 and 1910. This work, which appeared in 1889, was the last Nietzsche wrote before his decline into madness in 1890. There are several reasons why I chose Götzen-Dämmerung and not one of Nietzsche's other, better known books. As regards the work itself, I read the book several years ago in Spanish translation with explanatory notes and found it very much to my liking. The book is considered by some to be, along with Also sprach Zarathustra, one of Nietzsche's most difficult works. As Wright has stated:

In many ways "Twilight of Idols" is one of Nietzsche's most brilliant books. It is, for the most part, composed of conclusions and comments which grow out of the laborious ethical research of his preceding volumes, and presupposes in the student an enormous amount of reading, not only of Nietzsche's own writings but of philosophical works in general. (232)

In spite of this reaction, I found it one of Nietzsche's easier works to understand. In retrospect, this was due in some measure to the notes, but also to the fact that in Götzen-Dämmerung Nietzsche touches upon a multiplicity of topics, most of them controversial, developing sweeping criticisms which are not found in his other books except separately. Mainly, however, my preference can be explained by my

belief that the book essentially is a summary of all Nietzsche's ideas, as is discussed below.

Understanding Nietzsche's works is one problem, understanding the reaction to Nietzsche is another. Reactions varied greatly, but many seemed to me to be based on gross misreadings of his works. The most obvious misinterpretation is the misuse of his concept of the Superhuman by the Nazi regime and its sympathizers. The concept was simply extended so that it encompassed the common view during the 19th century in Europe of the inferiority of the Jewish race. The proponents of Anti-Semitism refused to acknowledge that Nietzsche's best friends were not only Jewish themselves, but pro-Judaica as well (for example, Lou Andreas Salomé and Paul Rée). Furthermore, one of the targets Nietzsche most bitterly attacked is Anti-Semitism. Given the fact that Götzen-Dämmerung could be viewed as a summary of his ideas, the question then arose in my mind whether the public's reaction to Götzen-Dämmerung would have an equally wide scope of interpretation.

Gauging the extent of the reaction to Götzen-Dämmerung has proven to be problematic. There are figures that indicate that the book sold quite briskly (much more so than any of his other publications):

'The Twilight of the Idols' sold 9000 copies, but Nietzsche's mind was much too clouded to know or care that at last he was coming into his own, that the public which had denied him so long had finally begun to open its eyes to his greatness . . . (Wright, 232)

Wright gives no indication of his sources for this figure. I have not come across any separate source which verified or contradicted this, and this figure is the only one for the sales of Götzen-Dämmerung I have been able to obtain. Assuming that Wright's number is correct, my research indicates there is a dearth of critical material on the book from 1890 to 1910 -- and even up to the present day. Of the little material there is, nothing indicates that Nietzsche was more misunderstood with this work than with any other. Thus, the questions remain of the imbalance between sales figures and lack of reception and why the public's focus is so exclusively directed to previous books like Also sprach Zarathustra and Der Antichrist, when Götzen-Dämmerung certainly does not contain material any less shocking than they do. In order to counteract the lack of materials pertaining specifically to Götzen-Dämmerung, I have included several overall reactions to Nietzsche, while at the same time avoiding studies that were focused specifically on other individual works.

I chose to study the reactions between 1889 and 1910. The midpoint of my study is the year 1900 -- the year of Nietzsche's death. The news of it ran through all of Europe, and in extending the period covered to 1910, I hoped to see whether his death had any effect on the readership.

In investigating the genesis of the book and the early reaction of Nietzsche's friends my major source was the Nietzsche-Briefwechsel. At first, I concentrated on the names of Nietzsche's friends which were mentioned in the explanatory notes of my book but later the

investigation expanded to include the entire Nietzsche-Briefwechsel between 1890 and 1910. To find general responses to Nietzsche's works, my major sources were the Jahresberichte der neuen deutschen Literatur and the Internationale Bibliographie der Zeitschriftenliteratur, both of which appeared during the years under consideration. The latter, begun by Fr. Dietrich, includes titles of publications from other countries. It was necessary to start my search with these titles since there are no equivalent bibliographical works in France, Italy or Spain. The other major bibliographical sources I relied upon were those which appeared in notes or bibliographies in books dealing with Nietzsche's influence on a particular country. I have discussed these books at the beginning of the appropriate section.

Although extensive use was made of Interlibrary Loan, many titles were still unavailable. A list of these, organized by country and then chronologically, is in the appendix of this project. Due to the unavailability of primary material (primary being letters, and articles and reviews on Götzen-Dämmerung), the use of reports about articles or reviews was unavoidable. In so far as possible, I tried to obtain the pertinent texts discussed in these books to verify the bibliographical accuracy of the information. To the best of my knowledge, there has been no systematic study of the critical reception to Götzen-Dämmerung within any time period. On the whole, only the German part of my thesis could be based on fully reliable, well organized and thoroughly documented bibliographies. The French section is in second place in

this regard, although on the whole it was the interpretive material from the French which was most informative.

CHAPTER I

THE WRITING OF THE BOOK

Jenseits von Gut und Böse had been published in 1886, and the results of sales were, according to Nietzsche's standards, as disappointing, if not more so, than those of his previous books. His publisher, C. G. Naumann, wrote him encouraging letters in February 1887 and seemed rather pleased with the outcome.

Es wurden <von Jenseits> verlangt:

a. cond.	fest	baar	total
297	20	65	449

Diese Aufstellung erscheint mir im Vergleich mit den früheren nach zwei Seiten hin beachtenswert. Sie zeigt einmal, dass Jenseits von Gut und Böse einen bescheidenen Kreis von neuen Freunden erworben hat und auch fernerhin zu erwerben vermag, ohne irgendwelche Propaganda durch Inserate, etc. zu erheischen. (Naumann, 22 Feb. 1887, 23)

The modestly optimistic hopes did not bear fruit, and Nietzsche is profoundly perturbed at the lack of readers, as stated in his letter of 30 August, 1887 to Franz Overbeck:

Das Resultat vom Verkauf von "Jenseits" ist sehr lehrreich; dies Mal ist Alles gethan, was ein geschickter und beliebter Buchhändler zu Gunsten eines Buches thun kann; es sind ebenfalls gegen 60 Freiexemplare an Zeitschriften und Redaktionen vertheilt worden. Trotzdem jämmerlicher Abschluss der Rechnung, buchstäblich 106 Exemplare verkauft, Alles sonst remittirt. . . . Damit glaube ich am Ende mit den Bemuhungen

zu sein, meine bisherige Litteratur "verständlich" zu machen:
und nunmehr wird für eine Reihe von Jahren nichts mehr
gedruckt . . . (Nietzsche, 30 Aug. 1887, 140)

Nietzsche was correcting the proofs of Zur Genealogie der Moral when he made this decision not to publish anything more, convinced that none of his European readers understood his books, or indeed even read them: "Verzeihung, wenn ich mir mitunter zum Troste sage: 'ich habe bis jetzt nur zwei Leser!'" (Nietzsche, 14 Nov. 1887, 198). Nonetheless, and despite his now rapidly decaying health, Nietzsche quickly became interested in producing a last work which would be an ultimate summary of all his views. At this point in his life he had roughly one year of productive sanity left. Nietzsche's stated intention was to produce only one book, Umwertung aller Werthe, but this ambition translated itself into several works he left for posterity: Der Fall Wagner, Der Antichrist, Ecce homo, Nietzsche contra Wagner, Götzen-Dämmerung, and Dionysos-Dithyramben.

By February 1888 he had completed the first draft of Umwertung aller Werthe and by June Der Fall Wagner was published. While he was engaged in planning the structure of his last major book, he wrote letters affirming a new, complete view of everything and a renewed desire to work. The first reference to Götzen-Dämmerung comes at a point when Nietzsche had already sent the manuscript to the publisher:

Die letzten Wochen war ich auf die seltsamste Art inspirirt:
so daß Einiges, was ich mir nicht zugetraut hatte, wie
unbewußt eines Morgens fertig war. . . . Unglaublich, aber
wahr: ich habe heute morgen das sorgfältigste, sauberste und
ausgearbeiteste Manuscript, das ich je verfaßt habe, an die

Druckerei geschickt -- ich mag gar nicht nachzahlen, in wie wenig Tagen es zu Stande gekommen. Der Titel ist liebenswürdig genug "Müssiggang eines Psychologen" -- der Inhalt vom Allerschlimmsten und Radikalsten, obwohl unter viele finesses und Milderungen versteckt. Es ist eine vollkommene Gesamt-Einführung in meine Philosophie:-- das Nächste, was dann kommt, ist die Umwertung aller Werthe (deren erstes Buch beinahe fertig ist). (Nietzsche, 9 Sep. 1888, 414)

Hence, we know of a Nietzsche who in 1888 is working at an impressive pace. This hardly lends credence to theories that by then he was quite insane, or that these are the works of a spirit fast approaching the final collapse. Some have voiced the opinion that this pace was due to the fact that he somehow "knew" or "felt" that his productive life was nearing its end. There is nothing to indicate in his letters between 1885 and 1889 that he saw himself in that light.

Götzen-Dämmerung was written in an exceedingly short period (between September and November 1888), leading us to believe he had the main scheme well organized in his mind. Nietzsche states in letters to his friend and helper, Peter Gast, that he intends for Götzen-Dämmerung to be an intermediate step between his previous publications and what he was then planning as his major work -- Umwertung aller Werthe. Thus, everything up until the publication of Götzen-Dämmerung may well only be a series of stepping stones which lead to the development of this philosophical argument.

One theory regarding Götzen-Dämmerung advanced by Andrés Sánchez Pascual is that work on Götzen-Dämmerung and the other shorter pieces

written at this time is tantamount to the destruction of his last major endeavor.* However, upon examining Nietzsche's letters, one is better able to see a clear purposefulness to his attacks in Götzen-Dämmerung, and Nietzsche himself unambiguously states that among all, Götzen-Dämmerung is "die radikalste [Schrift] vielleicht, die es giebt" (Nietzsche, 14 Nov. 1888, 472) and "eine Gesamt-Einführung in meine Philosophie" (Nietzsche, 9 Sep. 1888, 414). This is the purpose of the book: an introduction to his philosophy -- the necessary groundwork for his next planned work, Umwertung aller Werthe, to be successful. I believe that Nietzsche saw Götzen-Dämmerung as necessary in order to achieve his aim in Umwertung aller Werthe and that so little time was put into it that it can not be viewed as the cause of Nietzsche's failure to complete the larger project. The effort of actually putting the text together also seems to have been a concentrated activity, requiring little effort, since Nietzsche was

* Friedrich Nietzsche, "Introducción," Crepúsculo de los ídolos, trans. Andrés Sánchez Pascual, El Libro de Bolsillo, 2nd ed. (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1975) 7-25. The translator's argument is based on a letter by Nietzsche stating he would not write any more books. (See Nietzsche's letter to Overbeck on p. 5). As is known, Nietzsche changed his mind later and left six books to be published. Because he was working on Umwertung aller Werthe, Sánchez Pascual takes the interruptions Nietzsche made while writing, among others, Götzen-Dämmerung, as having destroyed any chance Nietzsche might have had to finish Umwertung. This is not an unfounded theory, but I question its validity due to existing sketches and notes for Umwertung which indicate he was working on that project (its first book, Der Antichrist, was completed) and Nietzsche's own assertions that he regarded these [smaller] works as recreational from the arduous labor required for Umwertung.

"auf die seltsamste Art inspirirt." Whether or not the same can be said of his other short works is of no import here.

Still other critics regard the book as an amusement of Nietzsche's, produced while he was really occupied with the structure of the "more serious" work while others think it is a last attack on Wagner, and they generally ascribe it to an irreversibly sick mind. It is too simplistic to assume that the book was only another attack on Wagner when Nietzsche describes it as "sehr werth, weil es in der aller kürzesten (vielleicht auch geistreichsten) Form meine wesentliche philosophische Heterodoxie zum Ausdruck bringt" (Nietzsche, 14 Sep. 1888, 432). As will be seen below the original title had nothing to do with Wagnerism and was only changed after the book had gone to press. This issue later became a tangential concern, but was not the book's primary purpose; even though Nietzsche did confess in two letters, "Die Götzen-Dämmerung [ist] in Allem als Zwillling zum Fall Wagner . . . "Beide Schriften [sind] nur wirkliche Erholungen inmitten einer unermesslich schweren und entscheidenden Aufgabe" (Nietzsche, 12 Sep. 1888, 417).

A transvaluation of all values will first need a re-evaluation of that which hitherto has been deemed a value, a judgment on what must disappear: "Götzen-Dämmerung -- auf deutsch: es geht zu Ende mit der alten Wahrheit . . ." (Ecce Homo, 1928, 266). Nietzsche furthermore describes Götzen-Dämmerung in Ecce Homo as "[das] Substanzenreicheres, Unabhängigeres, Umwerfendes, -- Böseres" (Ecce Homo, 1928, 266). In his letters and in Ecce Homo as well as in

Götzen-Dämmerung he delineates the immediate task of bringing all truths down from their absolute, eternal level to the level of 'idols' -- a demeaning concept since the Greek connotation of the word is that of a pseudo-god, a falsity. This attempt must cover all truths; nothing can be held sacred.

As Nietzsche stated in his letter of 27 September, 1888 to Peter Gast his first choice for the title was "Mühsiggang eines Psychologen." After corresponding with friends he decided to amplify the title with the descriptor "Magnum in parvo" and later with "Multum in parvo." Still, accurate as the original title was (bringing into reference the observations of a psychologist), the image was changed shortly thereafter as Nietzsche considered several possibilities: Götzen-Hammer. oder Heiterkeiten eines Psychologen, or Götzen-Hammer. oder wie ein Psycholog Fragen stellt, or finally, Götzen-Dämmerung. Oder: wie man mit dem Hammer philosophirt, which ultimately prevailed (Thatcher, 250-268). An interesting but perhaps minor question is whether a remark by a correspondent of Nietzsche's, Carl Fuchs, had any bearing on Nietzsche's final choice. In Fuchs' letter of 4 June 1888 there is a maxim in Greek which uses the term "eidolon" and which translates as: "be mindful that you are a man that you may not appear to be a babbling idol."* Thus, the final version of the title contained the essence of the book, and simultaneously it provided

* The Greek text reads: μέμνησο ἄθρωπος, -- ἵνα μὴ ψαινῆ εἰκὼν λαλοῦσα εἶναι

critics with fuel: "Götzen-Dämmerung" could be viewed as only a strike against Wagner, and the destruction of all other idols could be ignored; the image of the hammer as a tool of the "blond beast" would in many people's mind only reinforce the image of complete destruction with no mention of creation which reinforced the erroneous impression that Nietzsche was a nihilist. Had the image of the psychologist remained, the overall impression would have doubtless been more gentle.

CHAPTER II

GÖTZENDÄMMERUNG

Götzen-Dämmerung is the last work whose publication Nietzsche oversaw. The work presents various arguments as to its purpose. Peter Gast, Nietzsche's friend and helper, summed up his impression of Nietzsche's intent in Götzen-Dämmerung by declaring "[Nietzsche hat seine] Artillerie auf die höchsten Berge gefahren" (Köselitz, 20 Sep. 1888, 309). My assessment of the book and of Nietzsche's intent is a variant of the theory that Nietzsche did mean the book to be a transition between his previous works and the planned Umwertung. In order to make the transition to a re-evaluation of values, Nietzsche devised Götzen-Dämmerung as a summary of all his previous thought, leaving absolutely no doubt as to what was in need of change (or obliteration) in order to achieve the conditions necessary for an "Umwertung." Among the necessary conditions for this re-evaluation is the creation of the Superhuman who is to Man as Man is to an Ape; that is, a step forward in evolution. Previously, Nietzsche had stated Man was only to be held as "a rope across an abyss" between Man's predecessor, the ape, and his successor, the Superhuman. (Also sprach Zarathustra, 134).

My view, I believe, explains several of the critical problems that have been raised regarding this particular book. If Nietzsche meant the book as a summary, as his description states, this would not only explain why it is written in a predominantly aphoristic style, but also why these aphorisms are often not self-explanatory and assume some acquaintance with Nietzsche's general train of thought. Both Nietzsche's choices for a title -- Müssiggang eines Psychologen and Götzen-Dämmerung. Wie man mit dem Hammer philosophirt -- indicate the value of the book as a cultural statement: A psychologist who is (idly) musing, can in his musings determine what is "wrong" and can offer a remedy (that is, a re-evaluation); the hammer is an element of destruction which leaves the ground clear for creation after having done away with the obstacles to that new creation, i. e. the false idols, or all the "truths" perceived by society as elementary when in reality they only lead to societal and individual degeneration.

No doubt Nietzsche is correct in assessing the need for this transition since obliteration of the old is necessary for the creation of the Superhuman. Götzen-Dämmerung is a harsh cultural indictment as Nietzsche himself admits: ". . . unter dem sehr wohlwollenden Titel Müssiggang eines Psychologen sage ich aller Welt Artigkeiten und Unartigkeiten -- eingerechnet dieser geistreichen Nation, den Deutschen --" (Nietzsche, 13 Sep. 1888, 420).

The first section is titled "Sprüche und Pfeile," and each of the sections thereafter aim at a specific symptomatic problem, for example, "Das Problem des Sokrates" or "Die vier grossen Irrthümer."

In all he is quick to point out flaws, and he is equally quick in destroying the hitherto accepted validity of universal truths. Philosophically, a falsity can not be a truth, a premise which brings to mind his choice for the title: "Götze" is a false god.* If a premise held as a "universal truth" is discovered to be untrue, it must be destroyed. Hence, the "Dämmerung" making way for new creation, led by "Umwertung". He calls Götzen-Dämmerung "diese kleine Schrift" "eine grosse Kriegserklärung" (Götzen-Dämmerung, 54). This force and destructiveness is considered necessary by Nietzsche given the advanced state of degeneration of modern society, and he explains his choice for the title by admitting that his "Wahlspruch [seit langem war]: increscunt animi, virescit volnere virtus" (Götzen-Dämmerung, 53), a not surprising variation of the popular Darwinian theory of evolution via the elimination of the weaker, the unsuited. The major impediment to new values and the superior being is the decadence of society which became endemic with Socratic Greece:

* Götze, as found in Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm's Deutsches Wörterbuch (Vol. 8, Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel, 1958), is defined as the diminutive of "gott." It can also mean "dummkopf," as in a weak imitation. In this sense it is used in reference to images of religious figures ("bildwerk"). Lastly, Luther and others used the word "mit einer übertragenen anwendung (des wortes) in der bedeutung "abgott" (1430-1449). Compared with this, "eidolon" is defined in the Greek-English Lexicon (comp. by Henry George Lidell and Robert Scott, rev. by Sir Henry Stuart Jones, 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966) as: I. 1. pertaining to ghosts, 2. any unsubstantiated form, 4. in the system of Epicurus, film given off by any object and conveying an impression to the eye; II. 1. image in the mind, idea, 2. phantom of the mind, fancy; III. image or likeness; IV. (later) image of god, idol. (483)

Nietzsche characterizes Socrates and Plato as "Verfalls-Symptome" (Götzen-Dämmerung, 65) and dismisses the dialectician as a "Hanswurst", [der] "die Dialektik nur [wählt], wenn [er] kein andres Mittel hat. . . . Sie kann nur **Nothwehr** sein, in den Händen Solcher, die keine andren Waffen haben" (Götzen-Dämmerung, 65). He defines decadence as

Das grellste Tageslicht, die Vernünftigkeit um jeden Preis, das Leben hell, kalt, vorsichtig, bewusst, ohne Instinkt, im Widerstand gegen Instinkte war selbst nur eine Krankheit, eine andre Krankheit -- und durchaus kein Rückweg zur "Tugend", zur "Gesundheit", zum Glück. . . Die Instinkte bekämpfen **müssen** -- das ist die Formel für decadence: so lange das Leben **aufsteigt**, ist Glück gleich Instinkt. (Götzen-Dämmerung, 68)

Logically, according to this formula, any attempt against instinct is unnatural. Conventional morality, a curb on instincts, should be avoided since its (artificial) existence is a mistake. He refers to morality in the title of section IV as "Widernatur" (Götzen-Dämmerung, 77) and maintains that it has harmed civilization:

Der Einzelne ist ein Stück fatum, von Vorne und von Hinten, ein Gesetz mehr, eine Nothwendigkeit mehr für Alles, was kommt und sein wird. Zu ihm sagen, "ändere dich" heisst verlangen, dass Alles sich ändert, sogar rückwärts noch . . . Die Moral, insofern sie **verurtheilt**, an sich, **nicht** aus Hinsichten, Rücksichten, Absichten des Lebens, ist ein spezifischer Irrthum, mit dem man kein Mitleiden haben soll, eine **Degenerirten-Idiosynkrasie**, die unsäglich viel Schaden gestiftet hat! . . . (Götzen-Dämmerung, 82)

By attacking conventional morality as a whole, Nietzsche is making a sweeping criticism of the development of German culture. Focusing on the Germans, he states: "'Deutscher Geist': seit achtzehn

Jahren eine contradictio in adjecto" (Götzen-Dämmerung, 58). The date meant is that of the Franco-Prussian war. In Götzen-Dämmerung he refers constantly to French culture, upon which he looked more favorably; critical editions note that his reading at the time included both French authors and French journals (Sanchez, 143-170). Conventional morality, and with it the Church (especially the Christian one), "gehört ganz und gar unter die **Psychologie des Irrthums**: in jedem einzelnen Falle wird Ursache und Wirkung verwechselt" (Götzen-Dämmerung, 91). He outlines the Four Great Errors which he believes have led Philosophy astray. They are the confusion of cause and effect, false causality, imaginary causes, and belief in the existence of free-will. Basing their work on these four premises, those who would like to better mankind proclaim moral codes which actually restrain man from his instincts, weakening him and leading to degeneration. Nietzsche's most bitterly criticized target here is again Christianity:

Erst das Christentum, seinem Ressentiment gegen das Leben auf dem Grunde, hat aus der Geschlechtlichkeit etwas Unreines gemacht: es warf **Koth** auf den Anfang, auf die Voraussetzung unseres Lebens . . . (Götzen-Dämmerung, 158)

He shows his admiration for the structure of the Church, the structure of which allows it to have such extensive and intensive influence, but he decries its effect. In the following passage "taming" is seen as the preferred method used by the Christian Church, "breeding" the method adopted by Hinduism.

Sowohl die **Zähmung** der Bestie Mensch als die **Züchtung** einer bestimmten Gattung Mensch ist "Besserung" genannt worden . . . Physiologisch geredet: im Kampf mit der Bestie **kann** Krankmachen das einzige Mittel sein, sie schwach zu machen. Das verstand die Kirche: sie **verdarb** den Menschen, sie schwächte ihn, - aber sie nahm in Anspruch, ihn "verbessert" zu haben. . . (Götzen-Dämmerung, 95)

In reference to both concepts of "Züchtung" and "Zähmung," Nietzsche makes a case for both being admirable if the application of the concept achieves powerful influence. The stumbling block however, particularly with "Züchtung," is the negative consequences brought upon a society if misapplied:

Wie armselig ist das "Neue Testament" gegen Manu, wie schlecht riecht es! -- Aber auch diese Organisation hatte nöthig, **furchtbar** zu sein, -- nicht dies Mal im Kampf mit der Bestie, sondern mit **ihrem** Gegensatz--Begriff, dem Nicht--Zucht--Menschen, dem Mischmasch--Menschen, dem Tschandala. (Götzen-Dämmerung, 96)

He also criticizes the predominance of one race over another, and warns of the dangers of such conceptualization: "in ihnen [den Verfügungen der Religion] haben wir einmal die **arische** Humanität, ganz rein, ganz ursprünglich, -- wir lernen dass der Begriff 'reines Blut' der Gegensatz eines harmlosen Begriffs ist" (Götzen-Dämmerung, 97). I believe he is here warning us of the misapplication of the concept of "Züchtung," even though he calls the concept of "reines Blut" "der Gegensatz eines harmlosen Begriffs." In other words, he admires its potential power, not what it has or may become (in the face of growing Nationalism).

The next chapter, "Was den Deutschen abgeht", centers on the Germans and what they lack. From 1870 on, Nietzsche profoundly laments that nationalism is on the rise, "'Deutschland, Deutschland über Alles', ich fürchte, das war das Ende der deutschen Philosophie . . ." (Götzen-Dämmerung, 100). He continues:

-- Was der deutsche Geist sein könnte, wer hätte nicht schon darüber seine schwermüthigen Gedanken gehabt! Aber dies Volk hat sich willkürlich verdummt, seit einem Jahrtausend beinahe: nirgendwo sind die zwei grossen europäischen Narcotica, Alkohol und Christentum, lasterhaft gemissbraucht worden. (Götzen-Dämmerung, 100)

He sums up his view of German civilization by calling Germany "Europas Flachland" (Götzen-Dämmerung, 101). There is little hope of an "Übermensch" being produced in such a gloomy environment. The symptom of this is "dass es nicht einen einzigen deutschen Philosophen mehr giebt, darüber ist des Erstaunens kein Ende" (Götzen-Dämmerung, 103). The counterattack on this is based on changing the aims of education. Education today has become utilitarian, one does not learn any longer for the sake of learning. The change must be that ". . . Erziehung, Bildung selbst Zweck ist -- und nicht 'das Reich'" (Götzen-Dämmerung, 103). All these unhealthy, unnatural attitudes are the very ones Nietzsche is out to eradicate so as to free man to his instincts and propel him to life. In "Streifzüge eines Ungemässen" (Götzen-Dämmerung, 107) he describes influential thinkers, whether he approves of them or not, and the majority of them are contemporary French; among them are Hugo, Rousseau, Sand, the Goncourt brothers, Zola,

Renan, Sainte-Beuve, Comte, Baudelaire, Pascal, and among the non-French, Seneca, Schiller, Dante, John Stuart Mill, G. Eliot, Carlyle, Raffael, Schopenhauer. Antonio Sanchez Pascual's statements in his critical translation of Götzen-Dämmerung that Nietzsche was very much influenced by French thought at the time he was writing the book are certainly well supported by these proportions (Götzen-Dämmerung, 107-153). He admires the French moralists, but he wishes to preserve the spirit of their efforts rather than the letter of their precepts.

This section's title is misleading. The "Streifzüge" neatly touch upon everything he has written about in previous books. Thus, the reader can scan through his thought, and find diverse topics there. Nietzsche treats aesthetics (Apollonian vs. Dionysian) and Darwinism (he cautions one must not take the theory at biological value only but must include the spirit as well: "Man muss Geist nöthig haben, um Geist zu bekommen . . ."[Götzen-Dämmerung, 117])). He discusses art ("Die Kunst ist das grosse Stimulans zum Leben: wie könnte man sie als zwecklos, als ziellos, als l'art pour l'art verstehn?" (Götzen-Dämmerung, 124) or, "Das Recht auf Dummheit: In . . . Zeitaltern hat die Kunst ein Recht auf reine Torheit, -- als eine Art Ferien für Geist, Witz und Gemüth. Das verstand Wagner. Die reine Torheit stellt wieder her . . ."[Götzen-Dämmerung, 127])). He rejects both Christ and the anarchist ("Beide sind *décadents*." . . . "Bin ich ein *canaille*, so solltest du es auch sein': auf diese Logik hin macht man Revolution. - Das Sich-Beklagen taugt in keinem Falle etwas: es stammt aus der Schwäche" [Götzen-Dämmerung, 129])).

The morality of decadence comes under criticism ("Statt naiv zu sagen, 'ich bin nichts mehr werth', sagt die Moral-Lüge im Munde des decadent: 'Nichts ist etwas werth, - das Leben ist nichts werth'. . . Ein solches Urtheil bleibt zuletzt eine grosse Gefahr" [Götzen-Dämmerung, 131]). Nietzsche talks on his concept of freedom ("Der freie Mensch ist Krieger" [Götzen-Dämmerung, 137]) and of genius ("Der grosse Mensch ist ein Ende; die grosse Zeit, die Renaissance, zum Beispiel, ist ein Ende" [Götzen-Dämmerung, 144]). His last aphorism in this section explains his perception of himself and his oeuvre:

Der Aphorismus, die Sentenz, in denen ich als der Erste unter Deutschen Meister bin, sind die Formen der "Ewigkeit"; mein Ehrgeiz ist, in zehn Sätzen zu sagen, was jeder Andre in einem Buche sagt, -- was jeder Andre in einem Buche nicht sagt . . .

Ich habe der Menschheit das tiefste Buch gegeben, das sie besitzt, meinen Zarathustra: ich gebe ihr über kurzem das unabhängige, -- (Götzen-Dämmerung, 151)

His last section covers what he has taken from Antiquity. In it he continues his criticism of Greece, mainly striking out at Plato. But Plato is merely symptomatic of Hellenic decadence, "ein Feigling von der Realität -- folglich flüchtet er in's Ideal." (Götzen-Dämmerung, 155). Nietzsche proclaims himself "der Erste, der, zum Verständnis des älteren, des noch reichen und selbst überströmenden hellenischen Instinkts, jenes wundervolle Phänomen ernst nahm." (Götzen-Dämmerung, 156). The phenomenon to which he refers is Dionysos: Dionysos as the "Wille zum Leben" (Götzen-Dämmerung, 157) which enabled the Greeks to achieve "das ewige Leben, die ewige

Wiederkehr des Lebens." (Götzen-Dämmerung, 157). No longer did Greeks say yes to life, including its hardest trials, as the pre-socratic Greeks had done before them but they produced philosophers who attempted to rationalize:

Die Philosophen sind ja die *décadents* des Griechenthums, die Gegenbewegung gegen den alten, den vornehmen Geschmack (-- gegen den agonalen Instinkt, gegen die Polis, gegen den Werth der Rasse, gegen die Autorität des Herkommens). Die sokratischen Tugenden wurden gepredigt, weil sie den den Griechen abhanden gekommen waren: reizbar, furchtsam, unbeständig, Komödianten allesamt, hatten sie ein paar Gründe zu viel, sich Moral predigen zu lassen. Nicht, dass es Etwas geholfen hätte: aber grosse Worte und Attitüden stehen *décadents* so gut . . . (Götzen-Dämmerung, 156).

Götzen-Dämmerung concludes with a passage from Also sprach Zarathustra, "Der Hammer redet." In it the diamond asks coal why, if related, the coal is so soft. And how will coal, with the diamond, be able to create, to triumph. The diamond ends the monologue by exhorting the coal:

Diese neue Tafel, oh meine Brüder, stelle ich über euch: werdet hart! -- -- . . . [denn] alle Schaffenden nämlich sind hart. Und Seligkeit muss es euch dünken, eure Hand auf Jahrtausende zu drücken wie auf Wachs, -- Seligkeit, auf dem Willen von Jahrtausenden zu schreiben wie auf Erz, -- härter als Erz, edler als Erz. Ganz hart allein ist das Edelste. (Götzen-Dämmerung, 163).

In Götzen-Dämmerung the reader finds, as Kunne-Ibsch points out in her book,* the application of Nietzsche's thoughts, not philosophical theory. Thus, any reader, whether then or now, finds the work extremely concentrated and, therefore, difficult to read.

That Nietzsche meant it to summarize his views and to pave the way for Umwertung aller Werthe is shown by the fact it has nothing new in it and by the constant exhortations to overturn conventional morality and to "become hard." Dimming the false gods of truths must be accomplished if these are a hindrance to evolution. To expose these idols in order to destroy them is the main goal of Nietzsche's Götzen-Dämmerung. The destruction will then allow for the creation of "Umwertung".

* This generalization is my interpretation of the main thrust of Kunne-Ibsch's book. The book deals with Nietzsche in general and does not mention Götzen-Dämmerung specifically, but her point is well made.

CHAPTER III

THE GERMAN REACTION

My sources for this section stem from R. Hinton Thomas' book which provides a reliable bibliography, and the Nietzsche-Briefwechsel which gives his friends' and correspondents' initial appraisals. Thomas did extensive research in Germany and mainly made use of newspapers and periodicals. His purpose was not to study literary reception, but report on the use of Nietzsche's philosophy by social or political groups in Germany. His book, Nietzsche in German Politics and Society: 1890-1918, is arranged by chapters. Each of these deals with a specific group ("Social Democracy, the Jungen, and Nietzsche," "The Feminist Movement and Nietzsche," "The Youth Movement and Nietzsche," "The Alldeutsche Verband, Social Darwinism and Nietzsche,") or a political phenomenon ("Social Democracy, Ideology and Nietzsche," "Social Democracy, revisionism and Nietzsche," "The Subversion Debate and Nietzsche," and "Social Democracy, Max Maurenbrecher and Nietzsche"). There are few references to literary events.

Thomas identifies 1890 as the year in which Nietzsche's influence expanded dramatically. This occurs shortly after Götzendämmerung is published but Thomas ascribes the change to the end of the Bismarck

era (Thomas, 2). Two influential journals, Die Gesellschaft and Freie Bühne, started publishing numerous articles on him, his work and his influence, which was described as extensive and exceedingly important for the times. This sudden fascination did not limit itself to the artistic circles but extended also to political activism which later accounted for a disastrous stereotyping.

Tönnies speaks of a "Nietzsche-Kultus" by 1897 and confesses to having belonged to it. He describes his original reaction in the following terms:

Ich habe für diesen Autor geschwärmt, zu einer Zeit als (ausserhalb einer engen Gemeinde) fast niemand ihn kannte. Damals, als seine früheren Bücher erschienen, war ich 16-20 Jahre alt. Er sagte mir viel, und ich meinte ihn zu verstehen, mit ihm zu empfinden. (Tönnies, v-vi)

To a larger extent than in other countries, Germany made use of "catch phrases" of a Nietzschean turn: "Individualität," "Persönlichkeit," "Herdentier," "freier Geist," and so on (Thomas, 11 ff.). As early as 1898 G. Grupp published an article entitled "Nietzsches Bedeutung für unsere Zeit" (116). In it he sees Nietzsche's influence as being the major force at this time and succeeds in summarizing his most important ideas. He also ties them in with historical precedents. His summaries, however, would lead the uninitiated reader to erroneous conclusions: for him Nietzsche is "ein zweiter Rousseau der 'zurück zur Natur' [geht]" (86). In reality, Nietzsche considered Rousseau's way a path to chaos (Götzen-Dämmerung, 107). Grupp finds that Nietzsche's concept of "Sklavenmoral" to be one what "flattered the

mob" 'dem Pöbel [schmeichelte]'" (Grupp, 86). The uninformed reader would probably equate "Pöbel" immediately with society's lower classes. Nietzsche did not intend the "aristocratic" in his concept of "Aristokratischer Realismus" to be synonymous with Europe's aristocracy. I consider this article to be representative of contemporary summaries of Nietzsche's thought: they are not in themselves incorrect but, because of the heavy reliance on catch phrases, they can lead to mistaken conclusions. Hence, very different groups with different aims used some aspect of Nietzsche's ideas as a vehicle to achieving some level of power. Landauer wrote in 1895 that "'Selbstherrlichkeit' is of the essence of anarchism, but it is 'not absolute.'" (Thomas, 54). The feminist movement, when it suited its purposes, ignored similarities between Nietzsche's anti-feminist ideas and those propounded by Ibsen and Strindberg and also made use of "Individualität" to advance the rights of women. Helene Lange, an ardent but still relatively conservative feminist, published Weltanschauung und Frauenbewegung in 1900 (Thomas, 94). She uses a typically Nietzschean exhortation to draw from internal strength to change; a feminist's version of "Werdet hart!"* Maurenbrecher judged Nietzsche's Superhuman to be the evolved new Socialist Man in 1904: "a bridge to new forms, consciously collaborating in evolving a new

* According to Thomas (chapter VII), Lange's exhortation called for change from within; this would amount to a variant of the "Werdet hart!" (Götzen-Dämmerung, 163).

type of man." (Thomas, 41). Only eight years after Nietzsche's death a book by Mügge was published. In it Mügge summarizes all of Nietzsche's works, interprets his thought and analyses the reception of Nietzsche in Europe. He states: "One has attributed classicism to Kant, the first romanticism to Fichte; one might similarly attribute this 'Youngest Germany'-romanticism to Nietzsche" (334). With this quote Mügge makes clear the extent to which he credits Nietzsche's influence in Germany. It is indisputable, that, despite Nietzsche's bitter opinion of the Germans, the new generation was strongest influenced by him. Both Thomas and Mügge emphasize the abundance of poetry, dramas and novels that appeared shortly after the turn of the century. Whatever the cause or aim may have been, it was easy to adapt Nietzsche's "Übermensch" to overcome any purported obstacles and become the champion. Perhaps more so than in any other country at the time, this resulted in misreading the full Nietzschean theory and increased stereotyping. As elsewhere, his destructive power was recognized and, later, used or at least called upon by various groups. And, as an immediate counter-reaction, there are reports of people in educational and religious fields who regard Nietzsche with horror but without having read anything by him (Thomas, 62 ff., 94 ff.).

Besides reports from letters, no material directly pertinent to the reception of Götzendämmerung was available to me. Nor do I have any titles regarding the reception of Götzendämmerung, except for comments in the Nietzsche-Briefwechsel. One can only conclude from this lack of reception that Germany concentrated on his major works,

applied his theory to art and ignored the book which criticized them most strongly.

In September of 1888 Heinrich Köselitz calls the book "Nietzsche's highest aim" and objects to the title, Müssiggang eines Psychologen in favor of one which evoked a more vivid image (Köselitz, 20 Sep. 1888, 309). Continuing the proofreading in October, Köselitz remarks: "Die Correctur voll Bewundern angefertigt." (Köselitz, 4 Oct. 1888, 319). He seems to be the only one among Nietzsche's friends who would admire the book, or even lay claim to understanding it:

Ich glaube jetzt, nach alledem, zu verstehen, was Sie unter decadents begriffen wissen wollen, wenn sogar Plato-Sokrates dazu gehört und nicht nur z. B. die ohne Selbstironie sich so nennende Schule der Poètes decadents, deren "Faulheit" auch für ein niedrigeres Geruchsorgan bereits (um mit Hamlet zu reden) "zum Himmel stinkt". Die Exemplificirung der Begriffe "Zähmung" und "Züchtung" imponirte mir ungeheuer. (Köselitz, 8 Oct. 1888, 324)

Jakob Burckhardt, who along with Hippolyte Taine was one of the two people Nietzsche thought really understood his books, is quite unambiguous in his admission to Nietzsche's sister of not having understood it at all. In a letter to Nietzsche's sister Burckhardt explains "er hat das zugesandte Buch nicht verstanden" (qtd. in Salin, 1938). I see a discrepancy between the frequency with which Der Fall Wagner and Ecce Homo are mentioned by Nietzsche's friends in their letters and the absence of references to Götzendämmerung. All were written around the same time, and Nietzsche did send out copies

of all to several of his friends, but response again focuses on Der Fall Wagner and Ecce Homo, and not on Götzendämmerung. This leads again to the conclusion that they found the book too difficult to read.

A discrepancy seems to exist between reports of sales, followers of Nietzsche and actual evidence of the book's impact. In any case, Götzendämmerung must have had as strong an initial impact on the reading public as it had in France simply due to the title. Wagnerian groups were strong, and too many were aware of the conflict between Wagner and Nietzsche to ignore this book. If knowledge of his oeuvre was so widespread, there is no explanation as to why reaction to Götzendämmerung did not develop along more balanced lines. Two possible reasons are that the book was so critical of Germans and that it was more difficult to read and comprehend than his older works.

CHAPTER IV

FRENCH REACTION

By the time Götzen-Dämmerung was written, Nietzsche had long since proven his interest in French culture. In his own words, were he able to write in French, the grand canal of Panama would be opened between him and the French (Nietzsche, 22 Dec. 1888, 546). Reciprocally, there was a certain amount of interest on the French side for Nietzsche. Geneviève Bianquis published a book in 1929, Nietzsche en France: L'influence de Nietzsche sur la pensée française, which presents the most complete account of reactions to Nietzsche during these very early years. Her study is extremely thorough and methodical, to the point of its winning in 1928 the Nietzsche-Gesellschaft prize as the year's best contribution to the study of Nietzsche. I have verified all her sources in the Mercure de France and the Revue Bleue. Her sources were mine as well since there was no French equivalent to the Jahresberichte or the Internationale Bibliographie. Unfortunately, Götzen-Dämmerung is not dealt with in any depth since the author deals with general criticism of Nietzsche without dealing with specific works.

Up until the end of his lucid, productive life, Nietzsche was quite adamant about the fact that it would be the French who would

understand and accept him. Although he is thought of as a classical scholar, he frequently alludes to French thought as being the only intellectual tradition in the Modern Age to approximate Greek thought. His later books, beginning with Menschliches, Allzu-Menschliches, attest to his admiration for French thinkers, and as we have seen this admiration was also expressed in Gützen-Démmerung.*

The main pattern encountered in reading the French reactions is that, though the reactions pro and contra are clearly visible, those who seemed to be most enthusiastically for Nietzsche's ideas are not at the center of the intellectual establishment -- the universities and the academies -- but people like journalists, students and artists. The university professors as a whole were quite anti-Nietzsche, and a large portion of the public who came across Nietzsche immediately associated him almost exclusively with Wagner (Sobejano, 82). In other words, their knowledge of Nietzscheana was only in relation to the falling out between Nietzsche and Wagner once their views clashed, a fight which was sensationalized by the intellectual press. Their lack of exposure to his works may be explained by the fact that as late as 1893 the only two fully translated works by Nietzsche available in France were Richard Wagner in Bayreuth and Der Fall Wagner. A majority of those who were anti-Nietzsche were quite

* Menschliches, Allzu-Menschliches formalized the break between Wagner and Nietzsche. There is constant reference in positive terms to the French moralists, and he uses Voltaire to attack Wagner's concept of art. He wished, and was able to have the book published in time for the hundredth anniversary of Voltaire's death.

blatant in their pro-Wagnerism and frequently criticized him exclusively from the Wagnerian point of view (Bianquis, 2-3).

Another problem in assessing the French reaction does not pertain only to the French but is of a chronological nature: it was far too early for any systematic study to have appeared, and people had to approach Nietzsche's works piecemeal. At the turn of the century, and appearing at almost the same pace as the reactions in Germany, there were numerous theses, comments and opinions being turned out. These dealt with some aspect of his philosophy and almost always viewed him as either an Antichrist or as the New Creator (Bianquis, 4). As in the rest of Europe, the immediate preliminary reactions to any of Nietzsche's publications, were of profound scandalization (Bianquis, 5), which initially retarded the acceptance of his ideas. Despite this immediate problem, it must be quickly pointed out that the French proceeded at a much faster pace than did the rest of non-teutonic Europe to absorb the shock and accept his ideas at least as being worthy of consideration. Publications in literary journals and magazines about Nietzsche came out almost as fast in France as they did in Germany, and perhaps even faster since, as Nietzsche himself frequently complained, he had no readers in his own country and there was a definitely strong interest in France (Bianquis, 1). Of all the people who read his books, Nietzsche himself seems to have had the most respect for and the highest confidence in only two: Hippolyte

Taine in Paris and Jakob Burckhardt in Basel (Nietzsche, 14 Nov. 1887, 198).

There is considerable debate as to exactly how far Nietzsche's sphere of influence spread in France during these early years: Wyzewa states in 1891 that "En France, personne encore ne le connaît" (Bianquis, 4). In any case, only two years after the publication of Götzen-Dämmerung, articles began to appear in France on Nietzsche, most of them thanks to the reviews by H. Albert (Bianquis, 5). Besides numerous articles on Nietzsche, the bulk of which can be found in the Mercure de France or the Revue Bleue, H. Albert had translated by 1894 Les oeuvres complètes de Nietzsche. In his articles it is evident that he is following Nietzsche closely, describing, as did many others, the philosopher's last years and the illness which finally killed him. All in all, there are articles that deal with the relationship between Nietzsche and other prominent Germans of his time or that deal with his views on specific topics, such as culture, music, the return to Antiquity, and most commonly the Superman (Nietzsche et Georges Brandes, Mercure de France, 1894; Lou Andreas Salomé sur Nietzsche, Mercure, 1895; Chronique (Maladie de Nietzsche), Mercure, 1900; A propos de Mouettes, Nietzsche et Paul Adam, Mercure, 1906).

Interestingly, there are few articles comparing Nietzsche to French authors or discussing his influence on the French. French criticism is characterized by the fact that many formed an idea, usually negative, about Nietzsche without ever having read much by

him! Frequently, titles can be found that would seem to indicate Nietzsche was not read, or at least not at all carefully. One such case is one by Louis Bertrand, "Nietzsche et la guerre" which Reichert summarizes in this way: "Nietzsche sounds triumphal chant of Prussian brutality" (Reichert and Schlecta, 28). H. Albert states in 1894 in one of his articles in the Mercure de France that "Nietzsche est célèbre chez nous, mais à peine connu" (70). Despite the obvious enthusiasm he feels for Nietzsche's work, this seems not to be an inaccurate description.

H. Lichtenberger places the spread of Nietzsche's influence in France around 1895:

C'est vers 1895 que commença la vogue de ce nouveau prophète d'outre-Rhin. Cette année-là un article de L. Bernardi le signalait dans la Revue de Paris, et on lisait l'essai que lui avait consacré le critique danois G. Brandes dans ses Menschen und Werke. Wyzewa, en 1896, s'arrêtait sur lui dans ses Ecrivains Etrangers. A partir de ce moment les études se multipliaient . . . Mais c'est surtout dans les chapelles symbolistes et décadentes que Nietzsche recrute ses admirateurs. Par les exposés forcément incomplets qui ont été publiés de sa doctrine, il s'est révélé à ces individualistes comme un frère intellectuel d'Ibsen, de Strindberg, d'Oscar Wilde, plus fougueux, plus délibérément subversif encore. (qtd. in Reynaud, 281)

By 1898 Jacques Morland has summarized his views on Nietzsche's philosophy, but he does not mention Götzen-Dämmerung at all, even though all salient points from Götzen-Dämmerung appear: all truths initially appear inspired, not reasoned; man is to be surpassed, since he is only the bridge between beast and Superman; it is the will to

power which reigns supreme, not right, etc. It would seem that Morland had only read Nietzsche's major works, though he did keep up with H. Albert's articles in the Mercure de France. This analysis coincides with that of Schurä, who notes in the Revue Bleue, 8 September 1900,

Lorsque, il y a six ou sept ans, Nietzsche commença à être connu en France par des fragments détachés, les revues jeunes lui tressèrent des couronnes. . . . Ce furent là, en effet, les premiers apôtres, et les plus bruyants, du nietzschéisme. (Reynaud, 287)

It is interesting that both note the spread of Nietzsche's influence predominantly in the younger, more explosive, intellectual circles. This might account heavily for H. Albert's comment that he is famous, but hardly known. Others, on the other hand, demonstrate a lack of knowledge of Nietzsche (and are content to name him without being able to able to discuss his thought), as can easily be seen by the reaction that

Ramenée en France au lendemain de la guerre par Kant et Schopenhauer, qu'accompagnaient les fameuses "méthodes germaniques", puis par Wagner, par Nietzsche, par le marxisme, l'influence allemande semblait vers le début du XXe siècle, plus solide et plus puissante que jamais chez nous. (Reynaud, 287)

The most indicative proof of Nietzsche's fame or lack thereof at the time can be seen in two polls taken among university professors and the intellectual elite, the first of which appears in the Mercure de France in 1895. Nietzsche is mentioned by four people only: Paul

Adam, Maurice Barrès, Bernard Lazare and Teodor de Wyzewa. After his death an identical poll is again conducted in 1902, also by Jacques Morland in the Mercure de France. This time Nietzsche appears 23 times. It must be cautioned that it is not the stated purpose of either of these polls to deal with Nietzsche specifically, or even German philosophy. The topic is the state of Franco-German relations, and those polled were allowed to comment on whatever and whomever they believed pertinent (Mercure de France, 10, 1902). Jacques Bainville credits Jacques Morland with having contributed to Nietzsche's fame in France and takes note of Nietzsche's stabs at "the moralists, the humanitarian church and the greater part of the concept of democracy" (299). By this, he indicates clearly he has read Nietzsche and understood more than just the problem of the Superman. Maurice Barrès puts Nietzsche once again in the category of influential Germans while underlining the opinion that "les grands Allemands, Goethe, Heine et (si vous voulez) Nietzsche, ont eu besoin de se soumettre à l'influence française. Les Taine, les Renan, qui subirent l'action allemande, ne s'y gâterent-ils point?" (301). Other equally self-serving opinions include that of Edmond Barthelemy, who daringly affirms: "Nous retrouvons plus que jamais cette culture française dont Nietzsche ne découvrirait l'équivalent nulle part ailleurs, pas même chez ses compatriotes" (305). Barthelemy does not expound on this point, and though he mentions several times the development of art and culture from Goethe to Wagner, he fails to include Nietzsche. The most surprising of all in this 1902 poll is the answer given by

Georges Brandes, Nietzsche's Danish editor, who had maintained a considerable correspondence with Nietzsche and who contributed noticeably with his efforts at publication. Brandes, after Nietzsche's well publicized demise, does not even mention him. Further answers are also baffling: Leon Belugou calls Nietzsche "une apparition d'un moment dans le développement de la pensée de Goethe" (306). What could be called a very typical reaction is that of Saint-Georges de Bouhèlier, whose judgement, in retrospect, now seems accurate, though at the time it must have seemed rather hasty: "Quant à Nietzsche, il n'a jusqu'à présent pas fait sentir chez nous son influence. C'est d'ailleurs, un grand esprit, le plus grand esprit que l'Allemagne ait connu depuis Wagner" (377). On the very favourable side we have a few, and among them the well-known name of Rémy de Gourmont. He writes that,

Pour la philosophie, l'influence de Kant décroît; celle de Nietzsche augmente et celle de Schopenhauer n'est pas tout à fait morte. C'est qu'il avait été nourri de la pensée française et que nous retrouvons en ses écrits un peu de notre esprit et un peu de notre méthode. Les mêmes causes ont fait aimer Nietzsche dès qu'il a été connu. . . . Ainsi notre philosophie, allemande depuis Kant, restera sans doute allemande, grâce à Nietzsche. (336)

Henri Lichtenberger quotes Nietzsche for his own use; "Je ne crois qu'à la culture française" (343), while Th. Ribot agrees in judging that "Nietzsche, dont l'influence sur les contemporains est très grande, peut à peine compter pour un génie allemand" (375).

Bourdeau judges the contemporary atmosphere accurately only to allow himself to be clouded by his own tastes when it comes to incorporating Nietzsche into the group of contemporary philosophers:

"Il y a des modes en philosophie comme en chapeaux et cravates, et cette variété tient à bien des causes, à la manie contredisante, au besoin de changement, à l'impatience pour chaque génération de faire sa place au soleil" (Bourdeau, 108).

He comments further: "Aujourd'hui, c'est à deux Allemandes, Max Stirner et Friederich Nietzsche, qui vont en Europe et en Amérique, dans de petits cercles d'initiés restraints, il est vrai, l'engouement et la vogue" (Bourdeau, 109). Focussing on Nietzsche specifically:

Le nombre des commentateurs de Nietzsche est légion. On a lu les études de M. Valbert, de M. de Wyzewa. Des Revues où l'on aime à chercher l'âme éparse et confuse de la jeunesse pensive, le Mercure de France, le Banquet, la Revue Blanche, etc., ont publié des critiques et des fragments de Nietzsche. Brandes et Stein, dans la Deutsche Rundschau, Bamberger, dans la Nation, nous ont également guidé dans cette étude. (Bourdeau, 119)

H. Lichtenberger a publié la première étude d'ensemble consacré en France à F. Nietzsche . . . Deux des ouvrages les plus célèbres de Nietzsche, Par-delà le bien et le mal et le Zarathoustra, traduits par M. H. Weiskopf, G. Art et H. Albert (2) inaugurent la publication de ses oeuvres complètes. Il deviendra bientôt, en France, aussi familier à ceux qui pensent, qu'il l'est en Allemagne. (Bourdeau, 131)

But he immediately attempts to predict the consequences of this: "Des bonnes âmes peuvent s'inquieter. La philosophie de Nietzsche jouit d'une réputation pernicieuse" (Bourdeau, 132).

This may seem ironic or perhaps it is indicative that at the time neither H. Taine nor J. Burckhardt wished to deal publicly in depth with Götzen-Dämmerung. Indeed, it was Taine whom Nietzsche desired as the translator of the French version of Götzen-Dämmerung (Nietzsche, 8 Dec. 1888, 511). Bourdeau finally became the translator and reviewer of several of Nietzsche's works only because Taine excused himself from the task, feeling his German insufficient "pour saisir 'toutes les audaces et toutes les finesses' du livre." (Taine, 14 Dec. 1888, 386-387). Bourdeau promptly proved to be quite an inadequate translator who had neither the background nor the inclination to fully understand Nietzsche, as is evidenced by his critical articles on him (Bianquis, 2). The earliest French article on Götzen-Dämmerung that I have found is an article from 1892 on the book by R. Dreyfus which appeared in Le Banquet titled "La Philosophie du Marteau: Le Crépuscule des Faux Dieux." In it, Dreyfus criticizes Wyzewa severely because of the terminology he has used in previous articles, correctly stating that Wyzewa confuses nihilism with negativism. Though the attack on Wagner and his Götterdämmerung does not escape him, he does not, unlike so many others, emphasize this as the book's only point. With extreme accuracy, Dreyfus identifies Götzen-Dämmerung as "un petit écrit [qui] est une grande déclaration de guerre" (68). He follows by quoting at length several representative passages of the book, clearly demonstrating Wyzewa's mistake in portraying Nietzsche as a "perfect nihilist" (66). Dreyfus' article is the exception to the norm. At the Congrès international de philosophie in Paris in

1902, H. Vaihinger, professor at the University of Halle, addressed a predominantly French public on the subject of "La philosophie de Nietzsche". His thesis is to prove that Nietzsche was much more than a writer (though he gives his talent plentiful credit for having contributed to his fame) and, indeed, even was a philosopher, despite disclaimers by those who dismissed him as lacking a complete and coherent philosophical system and, worse, as being mentally ill (474-475). Vaihinger cites Montaigne, Pascal, La Rochefoucauld, Hamann and Lichtenberg as "influential philosophers also without a philosophical system in the precise meaning of the word" (475) and Hölderlin's and Schumann's oeuvre as "classical even though their minds also entered darkness" (475). Therefore,

Ainsi ces . . . objections ne nous égarent pas sur notre tâche: nous croyons devoir prendre au sérieux Nietzsche et le mouvement nietzscheen. Ce n'est donc pas seulement un travail profitable, mais très important, de nous rendre compte des principes philosophiques qui révèlent la conception que se fait Nietzsche du monde et de la vie. Nous laissons ici tout à fait de côté l'admirable art d'écrivain avec lequel Nietzsche exprime ses vues. (476)

This Vaihinger sees as a necessity since "Dans le grand public on ne connaît de Nietzsche que ce qu'on peut désigner du mot qu'il emploie lui-même, la doctrine de 'Par-delà le Bien et le Mal'. . ." (477). He explains in detail each of Nietzsche's points the three phases of his development were already recognized at that time, while mentioning his books. However, he only goes into some detail with two of them,

namely, Also sprach Zarathustra and Der Antichrist. Götzen-Dämmerung is mentioned. But despite the fact that Vaihinger clearly states "Ce que la foule appelle 'Morale' et vénère comme sacré, est un vain fétiche que méprisent l' être fort et l'esprit clair" (477), he fails to tie this in with Götzen-Dämmerung's main purpose. In the following sentence he misstates, at least as far as Götzen-Dämmerung is concerned, "On peut appeler cette tendance anti-moraliste. Comme nous l'avons dit, c'est la seule que le grand public ait connue. Mais cette tendance anti-moraliste n'est qu'une petite partie de l'ensemble de sa doctrine" (477). Still, it must be said first that Vaihinger's summary of Nietzsche's doctrine is better than the average which appeared at that time and secondly, that he makes the correct attempt to place Nietzsche in a continuum of very diverse thinkers and view him as an extremely original one. This is his proof that "une riche et intéressante liste de prédécesseurs . . . nous apprend par la même occasion que nous ne devons point voir en lui simplement un fou, ou comme on le fait souvent, un scélérat" (487).

Finally, there was only one exceedingly short article (1 1/2 pages) in the Opinion (Paris) of 25 July 1908 by Ernest Seillère, "Nietzsche dans le roman français". In a critique of Mme D. Lesueur's latest novel, Nietzschéenne, E. Seillère summarizes the novel in which the heroine has read Der Wille zur Macht and been quite impressed by it. Seillère unequivocally assures the reader that Nietzsche, too, has long since reached the point where a fashion, "une vogue," is sufficiently strongly established to inspire a novelist

(15). Nietzsche, he says, has already done so, having directly influenced such writers as d'Annunzio, de Noailles and Paul Adam during any one of his three periods of development (the first under the influence of Wagner and Schopenhauer, the second being the rejection of the previous and the third, similar to the first, but full of the destructive spirit of Dionysos, the expression of which culminates in Götzen-Dämmerung [16]). At a distance, it is perhaps easier now to see how Götzen-Dämmerung represents the culmination and the tying-together of Nietzsche's work. By 1909 Georges Batault expresses an interest, not in Nietzsche's doctrine, but in the influence his thought has had in the world (407). His 10 page article is, however, little more than an uninspired summary of what has already been said. Götzen-Dämmerung is only mentioned in a footnote in relation to Wagner: "(2) A noter ici le jeu de mot allemand dirigé contre Wagner: Götterdämmerung et Götzen-Dämmerung" (411).

The French did a considerable amount of work quite early on, but it was limited because it focused on their influence on him and very recent historic events (like the Franco-Prussian war, and Nietzsche's mention of French intellectual figures). His value as a philosopher was often accurately interpreted, but his value as an immediate cultural influence was not realized except by smaller, less powerful groups whose eagerness to expand his influence at the cultural level was either dismissed as too radical or not taken seriously by the majority of the public, which often mentioned him or his works without

being at all able to deal with him except superficially. Here Nietzsche was mistaken when he thought that the French public, as a whole, would be able to understand his thought. In relation to Götzen-Dämmerung exclusively, despite an early translation, it must be concluded that the book was ignored entirely by the public, which paid more attention to his more voluminous works. Reaction can best be described as quite pro and those in contra are in bulk anti-German (like Barthelémy, Bourdeau and de Wyzewa). Introduced at a very early stage into university lectures by the intelligentsia, he was "lucky" that there were early fairly solid translations of his oeuvre and that he himself felt closely allied to the French culture and that Taine, Albert, Lichtenberger were there at the same time.

CHAPTER V

ITALIAN REACTION

In sharp contrast to the French reaction, which almost immediately led to a translation of Götzen-Dämmerung, and thus to easy public access to the work, the Italians did not have a translation until as late as 1924, when Il crepuscolo degli idoli ovvero come si filosofa a martellate was published in Milan by Casa Editrice Sociale as the "Prima Edizione Italiana con uno Studio di H. Lichtenberger sulla Filosofia di Nietzsche. Nonetheless, the abundance of articles in journals of all fields leaves no doubt that the Italians were at an extremely early stage well acquainted with Nietzsche's oeuvre. Statements by various critics would make it seem that more of the public was reading his works than was the case in France,* but, as we shall see, the record is not clear on this. If Nietzsche's works were being read by a broader group, then it may be assumed that, in the case of Götzen-Dämmerung, the French translation was the text used.

Unfortunately for the researcher, the enthusiastic outpourings of feelings are matched by the inaccuracy of the bibliographies, in

* This in reference to journal articles mentioning public reactions like those written by Morselli, Zoccoli, and others. See pp. 46-47, 49-50.

particular that of Stefani: Nietzsche in Italia: Rassegna Bibliografica 1893-1970. Quite a few very promising sources were unavailable to me. Of potential interest were the reports of conferences and of articles in "Il Foligno," apparently of Vatican origin, but I was not able to obtain them.*

Stefani's bibliography gives a condensed overview of general reaction to Nietzsche in the preface:

. . . la maggior parte degli altri articoli condannano la filosofia nietzscheana come pericolosa e frutto di pazzia. Morselli, Tocco, Seth Pringle Pattison, Nemi, Panzini, Orano, concordano nel definire il pensiero di Nietzsche assurdo ed incoerente. Max Nordau (1896) si meraviglia della vuotezza, della "copia di stupidaggine" e "puerile ignoranza" racchiusa nelle idee di Nietzsche, mentre Ettore Zoccoli (1900), raccogliendo i consensi di Morselli e Tocco, accusa il filosofo di diletterantismo etico e di negativita, pur riconoscendogli l'attenuante di esser rimasto vittima di un'epoca di crisi. . . . (Stefani, 7)

Stefani does mention several critics who reacted positively to Nietzsche and who emphasized his geniality. The names Stefani mentions are Cortesi (1897) and Ulisse (1898). No publications from either of these critics was available through Interlibrary Loan. She continues with even more positive views held by others,

* These articles deal with Götzen-Dämmerung specifically, with Nietzsche's attitude towards religion and with his illness. The titles are to be found in the Internationale Bibliographie.

A favore di vari aspetti del pensiero nietzscheano si levano le voci del Sacchi (1904), di Rensi (1905), di Vitali (1907), Leo Sera (1907) e del Tripadali (1906) e Fulep (1910) che vedono in Nietzsche un **Kulturphilosoph**. (Stefani, 5)

As in Germany, a similar bent is followed in Italy: critics concentrate on his lack of a systematic philosophy, as for example, Tocco does reviewing L. Stein's Friederich Nietzsches Weltanschauung und ihre Gefahren (Tocco, 1894). They also stress his nihilism, which they see as his answer to both Schopenhauer and Kierkegaard. Ettore Zoccoli's Federico Nietzsche: La Filosofia Religiosa, La Morale, L'Estetica is according to the preface of the second edition (1901), a revised and augmented version of the first edition which appeared in 1898. He maintains that Nietzsche was in the beginning accessible only to those who could go to the original publications, which is how I interpret his phrase "vergine fonte originaria" (presumably he was referring to German texts and does not seem to include the French translations). But enough proof of Nietzsche's talent as a writer and as a thinker reached the public to cause an explosion of enthusiasm:

Ciò che vuol dire che dovette essere pensata e scritta quando il pensiero del Nietzsche era accessibile solo a quel chiuso cerchio di studiosi, cui era possibile attingerlo alla sua vergine fonte originaria. Appena qua e là, per la più grande maggioranza, era sospeso nell'aria qualche detrito de i suoi più stupefacenti paradossi, qualche grano del pulviscolo d'oro della sua brillantissima opera di pensatore e d'artista. Ciò che vuol dire quanto bastava, come bastò, per suscitare un fremito di curiosità ed una esplosione di entusiasmo. (Zoccoli, xxi)

The author does confirm later in his chapter on "The Public" that a large portion of the public was reading the French translations: "Ma potevo appena essermi illuso di avere ormai raggiunto lo scopo, quando la traduzione francese di tutte le opere del Nietzsche rinfresca, o meglio rinfiamma, anche in Italia, l' entusiasmo per le sue idee" (Zoccoli, xxiii).

Zoccoli, as one of the more prolific writers on Nietzsche at the time, seems aware of how critics in other countries are reacting to Nietzsche. He mentions and agrees with statements made by Tönnies, Stein, and De Wyzewa and Schure. Overall, Zoccoli is critical of Nietzsche's thought, but his assessment of the public's reaction seems to be accurate, although contradictions do exist. Zoccoli points out that in an earlier monograph on Nietzsche, he had determined that the large number of readers has by necessity caused considerable misreading of Nietzsche, whose popularity grows, and with it his bad reputation:

[colla rapida volgarizzazione delle idee del Nietzsche] sono anche cresciuti i falsi apprezzamenti intorno all' opera sua; ed i suoi principi, passando attraverso alle mani di tanti dilettanti, si sono venuti profondamente snaturando, spesso a vantaggio del Nietzsche stesso, ma spessissimo anche a suo danno. (Zoccoli, 1899, 10)

In the preface he states he will try to avoid bringing in Nietzsche's final mental condition, then basing his objection to Nietzsche solely on the mental state, "non si comprende come questa simpatia [per l'

uomo] potrebbe trattenere o alterare l' esame sereno dell' opera sua"

(13). Regarding the French,

Si conceda pure che altri nazioni, e particolarmente la Francia, si prendano cura di volgarizzare ciò che produce la Germania, mettendolo alla portata di un circolo più esteso di intelligenze. Ciò potrà benissimo soddisfare i bisogni intellettuali della Francia e magari, e purtroppo, dell' Italia. (14)

This statement which indicates that French activity of popularization was satisfying Italian intellectual needs, seems to contradict other assertions by Zoccoli of a broad indigenous reaction to Nietzsche. When he does mention specific names of critics, however, he keeps coming back to the same few.

Parallel to his book, Zoccoli wrote a series of articles on Nietzsche around 1900. He remains negative in his outlook, but mentions Nietzsche's death, and accounts in this way at least partially what he describes as a resurgence of public interest. I would find this debatable since each of Zoccoli's articles mentions a resurgence and, given the fact that Nietzsche's demise was in late August, it would be rather early for anyone that same year to determine the effects of his death on his readership. In other, later articles there is no mention of any effects Nietzsche's death may have caused, and E. Sacchi's 1904 verdict seems representative of those who were content to observe:

Ma è destino di Nietzsche, come del resto di tutti i grandi spiriti, di rimaner solo; solo nelle sue stravaganze, nei suoi paradossi, nelle sue invettive, nelle suoi sarcasmi,

nelle suoi bestemmie. I nietzscheani, in prosa o in verso, fanno sorridere, quando non generano disgusto. (353-354)

The number of studies on Nietzsche did remain strong as A. Franzoni states in 1905:

La Francia, come anche l' Italia, ha consacrato, dopo la Germania, i maggiori studi all' opera del Nietzsche: colà furono pubblicati parecchi lavori sul pensatore tedesco dal Wisewa al Lichtenberger, e delle opere complete si va pubblicando la versione sotto la direzione dell' Albert. (660)

The earliest study on Nietzsche's influence on Italian literature I found was the product of a 1907 conference of the Società degli Autori drammatici e lirici italiani: A. Manassero discusses a large number of contemporary Italian writers. To my knowledge none of these except for D'Annunzio, had been viewed before in terms of their use of Nietzsche's ideas. As he looks at their works, he explains in some detail the salient points of Nietzsche's philosophy they used (Manassero, 645-651).

By far the most striking difference between the Italians and the French in regard to my study is that Götzen-Dämmerung is mentioned with great frequency in almost all the articles on Nietzsche, even if the criticism does not deal with it specifically.

Zoccoli maintains that Götzen-Dämmerung, as well as any other books produced during Nietzsche's last two lucid years, are entirely devoid of any system, but he also points out that in his view all of Nietzsche's previous publications lack systematization (1899, 40-44).

An article in 1894 by E. Morselli mentions Götzen-Dämmerung, and the summarizes without approval the gist of Nietzsche's intentions. He mentions Nietzsche's aversion to that which hinders growth of strength (Pensiero Italiano, 24), that he sees the Democratic State as a symptom of the decline of political organization (25). In relation to Götzen-Dämmerung, Morselli mentions some of the truths Nietzsche wants destroyed such as the "Four Great Errors" (29). He starts the article by stating that Nietzsche does not recognize any intellectual authority and quotes a sentence from the book, "gli spiriti (Dostoevsky, Stendhal, Macchiavelli e Tucidide) piu vicini al mio [sono] fermamente risolti a . . . cercare la ragione nella realta, non nella ragione, meno ancora nella morale" (10). He describes Götzen-Dämmerung as follows:

In uno dei libri suoi più originali e più strani, intitolato: Il crepuscolo dei falsi dei, oppure La filosofia del martello (Wie man mit dem Hammer philosophirt), Federico Nietzsche traccia, in brevi e concisi periodi, la genesi e lo sviluppo della scienza, ponendo come coronamento la propria opera distruttice; e una rivelazione delle scienze alquanto diverse da quelle più in voga. (10)

The title Morselli uses in Italian indicates a strong possibility that he was familiar with the French translation of Götzen-Dämmerung. This would seem so from his translation of "Götzen" as "false gods" ("faux dieux," not "idols") and from his translation of the subtitle as "the philosophy of the hammer" ("la philosophie du marteau," not "with a hammer"). His summary of it, whichever version he read, is accurate. In the end his objections to Nietzsche's accusations against society

on the basis of their frankness (referring to Nietzsche's aphoristic style). Brevity gives them the appearance of truth and thereby Morselli ignores Nietzsche's frequent warnings that he will not defend theories that are born out of reason or morals:

Anzitutto il Nietzsche è uno spezzatore di idoli e dimostra la fatuità che si nasconde sotto certi nomi che godono il favore degli scienziati o del pubblico di mezzo; l'uomo da principio finge di non accorgersi di questi novelli iconoclasti, ma finisce poi coll'amarli, coll'accetarne le teorie. In secondo luogo egli combatte strenuamente la fiachezza, la debolezza sotto qualunque forma essa si manifesti; ha in orrore la menzogna ed esprime schiettamente e brillantemente tutti i suoi sentimenti senza eccitazione alcuna; e questo, in mezzo alla crisi morale che ci travaglia, rappresenta un merito grande ed un elemento di simpatia potentissimo. Questa schiettezza che si nota nelle opere di lui, serve a dare alle sue teorie un'apparenza di verità a ne aiuta con forza la diffusione. (Gazzetta letteraria, 57).

It is unclear, however, exactly who this "pubblico di mezzo" is. When he addresses the question of Nietzsche's influence among his contemporaries, he detracts from the value of Nietzsche's thought by presenting Nietzsche's mental condition as the culprit responsible for the egocentrism found in his books. He also quotes Nietzsche but out of context by re-quoting Plato ("It is to folly that [Ancient] Greece owes her greatness") in the same breath while talking about Nietzsche's mental condition! In other words, he confuses an irreversible nervous breakdown with the Dionysian philosophy of Antiquity.

Finally, none of these more prolific critics seem to have picked up on the theories of their now lesser known contemporaries who, according to Stefani, correctly interpreted Nietzsche as a philosopher of culture (Stefani, 5; see also p. 46 above). The whole theme of culture appears only infrequently in their treatises, and in relation to his alleged nihilism.

Quite contrary to Tocco's conclusions, for example, is the 1896 speech given by Dr. Giovanni dal Monte in a conference: "Filosofia e letteratura fin de siècle -- Federico Nietzsche," reproduced in the Accademia olimpica d' agricoltura, scienze, lettere e arti. The chosen topic is Nietzsche and D'Annunzio. He begins with a description of Nietzsche's more famous books. In mentioning Götzen-Dämmerung he affirms:

Così proprio in quella terra tedesca che dava vita e discepoli a Marx e a Lasalle, sorgeva e si imponeva Federico Nietzsche, uno degli ingegni più robusti del nostro tempo, certo il pensatore più ardito e originale di questa fine di secolo. Francia e Germania, i due più luminosi centri intellettuali d' Europa, si uniscono oggi a salutare in lui l' apostolo del nuovo avvenire: e mentre a Parigi si costituisce una regolare scuola diretta all' apostolato delle sue idee, in Boemia e in Sassonia i professori d' Università pongono ad epigrafe delle loro lezioni i suoi aforismi, e il mondo scientifico tedesco e l' artistico attendono con ansia la comparsa degli scritti inediti e delle memorie autobiografiche, di cui la pietosa sorella sta in questi giorni provvedendo alla pubblicazione.
(21)

Dal Monte does not give any source for this information but it is interesting to note that he, too, even being an enthusiastic follower of Nietzsche, is quite taken by Elizabeth Förster-Nietzsche's

endeavors.* If he was aware of her personal philosophy, he does not note any contradictions between that philosophy and her brother's work. As a literary date for the beginning of reaction to Nietzsche's influence, he places it after the last novels of D'Annunzio; of this influence he says: "strani davvero furono la forma e la misura di questa sua notorietà" (22).

Giovanni Papini, on the other hand, attacks Nietzsche viciously in his 1906 book entitled Il Crepuscolo degli Filosofi (Milano-Societa Editrice Lombarda). He places the responsibility for his failure as a thinker on his alleged mental illness, even going so far as to declare that "dal 1870 fino alla morte la salute del Nietzsche e statto molto cattiva" (226) and that

Malgrado le immagine e le allegorie, malgrado gli ampi orizzonti scenografici e i crescendi delle sinfonie il secreto di Nietzsche è stato scoperto. In una parola - in una sola e piccola parola - stà il secreto di Nietzsche, nella parola **debolezza!** (225)

He does not explain whether the reader should interpret Nietzsche's

* Nietzsche had made reference several times to his sister's husband, B. Förster (a known Anti-Semite), with considerable disapproval. It was also known at the time that Elizabeth Förster moved in the same circles as the Wagners, even after Nietzsche's well-publicized break with R. Wagner. Therefore, it is somewhat surprising to note that no critics at the time noticed this contradiction in personal philosophies between Nietzsche and his sister. Several decades later it was determined by Karl Schlechta that much of what Elizabeth published under her brother's name were forgeries or altered notes of his.

"weakness" as physical or whether it is the cause of his failure as a thinker. Götzen-Dämmerung is only mentioned once:

La bella poesia non basta per salvare la cattiva filosofia.
Può essere un attenuante ma non tale da ottenere la grazia ed
io non mi sgomento minimamente a preparare la sentenza contro
l' eterno convalescente che ha scritto, fra tanti libri, anche
un Götzen-Dämmerung. (242)

He does not mention Götzen-Dämmerung in the book again nor does he ever explain why he singled it out. He suffers from the arrogance of which he accuses Nietzsche when he concludes with the comment: "Io vado, per altri cammini, alla conquista della mia divinità!" (280) But he has warned the reader at the outset: "Questo non è un libro di buona fede. E un libro di passione e perciò di injustizia. . ." (no page number) His attack is for the most part atypical. Finally, beyond the chronological scope of this this project, is Lichtenberger's 1924 translation of Götzen-Dämmerung. In the preface, H. Lichtenberger gives the standard bibliographical information and adds, regarding Nietzsche's life, "Quasi mai lo si vede in lotta con se stesso" (9). Late as this appears, the preface does not contain any really new information or views on Nietzsche; Lichtenberger does, for the first time to my knowledge, present the theory that Götzen-Dämmerung, as well as his other short books produced during that year, represents only an interruption of his larger work, Umwertung aller Werthe; in other words, that Götzen-Dämmerung is a tangential amusement:

Il Crepuscolo degli Idoli o Come si filosofa a martellate appariva a Nietzsche come una specie di intermezzo satirico con il quale si riposava della preparazione della sua grande opera sulla "transmutazione dei valori". Si diverte a provare col martello la solidità degli "idoli" che gli uomini adorano. (27)

Publications by Lichtenberger (Mercure de France, for example) are not infrequent, so it is disconcerting to read that "All' estero qualche intelligenza eccezionale, Burckhardt in Svizzera, Taine in Francia, Brandes in Danimarca, cominciano ad apprezzarlo. In Germania nessuno si occupa di lui" (36), unless this was written several years earlier, a date which would coincide with the bulk of Lichtenberger's writings as well. I could not determine whether or not this was the case. A few pages later he states "E quale crudele ironia della sorte nel fatto che Nietzsche, misconosciuto, ignorato, abbandonato da tutti, solitario fino alla fine della sua vita di pensatore, si trova ora illustre, letto, e discusso dal miglior pubblico d' Europa" (39). It is unclear, as was the case with Zoccoli's mention of the "pubblico di mezzo", who this "miglior pubblico" is.

In Italy, both academicians and better educated layman seemed to have paid attention to Nietzsche. Despite not having direct access to his works, they were in sufficient contact with them so as to discuss them at considerable length. On the whole, Italian critics seem to have been more concerned with the work itself and possible influences on their own culture, rather than on origins of influences -- a marked contrast to what the French studies emphasized. A variety of studies dealing with Nietzsche as a philosopher or Nietzsche as a

writer, or with his influence on Italian culture flourished in relation to his works in quick succession. Zoccoli's overall assessments, added to the reports of literary conferences dealing with Nietzsche, give a vivid picture of flourishing academic activity centered on his philosophical influence. It must however be stressed that of all geographical areas treated here, Italy is the one offering the most contradictory data as to Nietzsche's overall popularity. The scope of groups devoting attention to him from serious academic journals (like reports of conferences) to religious (such as Il Foligno or Civiltà Cattolica) and political magazines to weekly publications (Rivista di Roma) catering to the less academically inclined reader. Götzen-Dämmerung is frequently alluded to, and, in general, the overall reaction to Nietzsche was enthusiastic. The lack of deeper analyses of the work may be partly due to the fact that the Italians did not possess their own version until 1924.

CHAPTER VI

SPANISH REACTION

My principal sources for this section are G. Sobejano (Nietzsche en España) and U. Rukser (Nietzsche in der Hispania). Both published the results of their research independently in the '60s with almost identical sources and conclusions (Sobejano, 11-12). I have made use of both books, but will refer more frequently to Sobejano's since his focus is on Spain exclusively. Any contradictory data between the two did not pertain to Götzen-Dämmerung or to the period covered by this study.

Between 1890 and 1910 the intellectual climate in Spain differed sufficiently from that of either France or Italy to present a unique case. An entirely new generation of artists had burst on the scene, and as G. Sobejano correctly points out, instead of looking within Spain for inspiration, they eagerly followed the various European movements, predominantly those generated by Zola, Tolstoy, Ibsen, Nietzsche and Verlaine (Sobejano, 20). Soon enough this numerous group would become known as the generation of '98. All of them would follow one of the new literary currents in the face of intense criticism from the previous generation, which did not subscribe at all to "imported" ideas. As in other countries, Nietzsche's writing immediately became the object of long debates, and many of those who

were exposed to his oeuvre in any degree viewed his thought negatively. Nonetheless, it is quite apparent that in Spain his influence was profound. Slightly beyond my chronological scope, in 1918, Jose M. Salaverria wrote,

En España, los escritores modernos, desde el 98 en adelante, son nietzscheanos. Ningun autor, en los ultimos treinta años, ha influido con la fuerza de Nietzsche. . . . Los adeptos del famoso visionario aleman son los debiles, los decadentes de todo el mundo, y principalmente los artistas, escritores y diletantes que ven en el a un mago del estilo, a un zahondador de misterios imaginativos y psicologicos; al escritor, en fin, mas moderno, mas atormentado, mas inquietador y delumbrante. (Sobejano, 134)

Because the new intellectual movements (whose focal point was in Barcelona, Catalonia) were not building on the traditions of their predecessor, they found themselves considerably disorganized. This produced a sudden demand for books or translations of relevant works. Consequently, more than one translation would appear, and no particular chronological order was followed. This is particularly true in Nietzsche's case: Devouring the French journals such as Mercure de France, Revue Bleue, and others, Spanish intellectuals published their own with excerpts of Nietzsche's works. Many of these journals were extremely short-lived, leading in this study to difficulties in availability or confusion of sources. In the early 1890s Zarathustra is mentioned in several publications, and this date coincides roughly with the appearance in French publications. In other words, both countries are proceeding at approximately the same

pace in absorbing Nietzsche's ideas. However, in contrast to French scholarship, Spain's introduction to Nietzsche is more haphazard; witness the publication dates: In 1900 Asi hablaba Zarathustra (Sobejano, 67 ff.), El ocaso de los idolos and El origen de la tragedia (Sobejano, 74) all appeared in translation. Zarathustra, as Nietzsche's best known work, and Götzen-Dämmerung follow each other relatively closely, but Die Geburt der Tragödie is Nietzsche's first important book, having appeared some 15 years before Götzen-Dämmerung. Still, the three were translated in the same year. Furthermore, in France Nietzsche was definitely associated to a large degree with Wagner* whereas in Spain the association almost does not exist (Sobejano, 82).

Both authors coincide in naming the year Nietzsche was first mentioned in Spanish intellectual circles as 1893: in February 1893 Joan Maragall, a poet, mentions him.** In general, as elsewhere in Europe, the first reactions are of horror or enthusiasm; Some saw him as an "anarquista intelectual" (Sobejano, 33). However, unlike elsewhere, the focus in Spain on Nietzsche's thought is not so much on the Antichrist concept, the death of God, or his philosophical predilections. Nor is his lack of a philosophical system an issue.

* This is in reference to p. 32 of the French section.

** Sobejano points out in footnote 56, p. 82 that before Maragall, Nietzsche had been mentioned in Ricardo Wagner: Ensayo biografico-critico (Barcelona, 1878). This book was written by J. Marsillach and Nietzsche is mentioned in connexion with the Bayreuth festival.

The real focus, whether it be enthusiastic or not, is on the overall ability of his work to pave the way for creation by means of destruction. Spanish Modernism took many directions, but all had some Nietzschean aspect. One Spanish critic, the first to affirm that Nietzsche's influence touched everyone of that generation, affirms as well that it was Nietzsche who introduced them to three distinctive attitudes: anti-romanticism, the destructive impulse, and lack of sentimentality (Sobejano, 138-139). These three characteristics go against Spanish tradition, particularly anti-romanticism and lack of sentimentality. The abandoning of them, therefore, leads to the creation of Spain's new literature. Whether or not this desire to create was viewed as part of Nietzsche's "Kulturphilosophie" will be briefly discussed when I deal with the specific reaction to Götzen-Dämmerung. Maragall promptly predicted Nietzsche would be an influence:

Muy pronto sera el filosofo, el sociologo poeta a la moda. . . .
[su nombre y sus libros] representan una idea nueva o,
cuando menos, remozada, de la vida: una idea
trascendentalmente sana y optimista que beberan avidamente las
resecas inteligencias de nuestra generacion trabajadas por
pesimismos y sutilezas. (Sobejano, 38-39)

Not many reacted with Maragall's insight. Most, though recognizing Nietzsche's talent, warned against destroying a well established system. Miguel de Unamuno criticizes the new ideas, describing them as "doctrinas [que] las han adoptado luego, como quien adopta un nuevo modelo de corbata, algunos señoritos de Paris, y, por lo que veo, hay

españoles que creen que el extranjero no es mas que Paris" (Sobejano, 121). This harsh attack against intellectuals of his own generation uses the same turn of phrase that Bourdeau made use of six years later.* It also presumes that any influence Nietzsche might have been having was fleeting.

Despite negative voices, many were only too eager to read anything by or about Nietzsche, leading Clarin (also known as Leopoldo Alas) in 1900 to state that "Un pensador, que suelen leer mucho los jovenes de ahora, [es] el celebre y desgraciado Nietzsche, del que se habla demasiado, generalmente por referencias . . ." (Sobejano, 124). Anarchistic publications were the most receptive to Nietzsche's work. G. Sobejano mentions La Revista Blanca specifically but, as in Germany and to a lesser extent France, one must question how carefully Nietzsche was being read by members of like-minded groups given Nietzsche's antipathy for such tendencies. Of special value is the Sobejano's emphasis on Pio Baroja's change of opinion regarding Nietzsche. In 1899, when Baroja published an essay, "Nietzsche y su filosofia," he concluded that Nietzsche was only "a decadent artist whose ideas would never be popular in Spain" (Sobejano, 62 ff.). But in 1901, after receiving fragments of Nietzsche's personal correspondence, there is a complete reversal, and he publishes

* Bourdeau does not mention Unamuno at all in the excerpt on p. 38-39 of the French section.

articles analyzing Nietzsche's success, which he now views more favorably and whose impact he now recognizes:

Es extraño el éxito de Nietzsche. Por todas partes; en revistas, libros y periodicos, . . . Quizá fuera necesario escribir una psicología completa del tiempo actual, para poderse explicar con lógica el éxito de Nietzsche, que en la actualidad llena todo el mundo de la inteligencia. (Sobejano, 105)

After the first translations of Nietzsche's books appeared in 1900 it was only a matter of months before his impact increased ever more noticeably as translations, original articles and translations of foreign articles and dissertations multiplied.

In the year of Nietzsche's death the first translation of Götzen-Dämmerung was printed: El crepusculo de los idolos by J. Garcia Robles (Sobejano, 74-76). A second edition was published in 1903, "esmeradamente corregida," under the name of Rafael Urbano, which turned out to be a nom de plume of J. Garcia Robles. Here Sobejano and Rukser differ: the former states the second edition was put out by the Editorial Viuda de Rodriguez Serra while the latter credits the Editorial A. Marzo. Neither of these publishing houses is responsible for the first edition, which according to Sobejano, was Palma Altra.* Luciano Mantua presumably published his translation in 1904. Apparently it is of slightly better quality than that of J. Garcia Robles (Sobejano, 75). It is not clear whether Sobejano's

* Sobejano's information (74-76) differs from that of Udo Rukser. Rukser's data on the different translations is found in his bibliography (359-361).

comparison includes both editions by Garcia or just the first. And finally, within the scope of this project, Pedro Gonzalez Blanco published yet another El crepusculo de los idolos in 1905.* This one seem to be the poorest of them all since the translator stands accused of leaving out entire quotations, the lack of which leads to mistaken interpretations of the work. None of these versions was available to me.

There do not seem to be nearly as many critical reactions to Götzen-Dämmerung as there are to Zarathustra or Die Geburt der Tragödie despite the availability of an early translation. This I do not think can be explained away by saying that Zarathustra represents a more important book as far as Nietzsche's philosophy was concerned nor, in the case of Geburt der Tragödie, by virtue of its emphasis on aesthetics. Quite the contrary, the Barcelona circle, regardless of the problem of poor translations, seems to have had a more intuitive sense of the value of Götzen-Dämmerung than other contemporary readers. Perhaps due to the lack of a connection with Wagnerism, the focus was on the content rather than the title of the book. In any case, the existence of one translation with two editions and of a second translation at such an early stage points to a strong interest on the part of Spanish intellectuals. Sobejano does observe that the Spanish translations of Nietzsche's works lead one to the following

* Rukser gives 1905 as the date of Pedro Gonzalez Blanco's translation (360). Sobejano states the year of Gonzalez Blanco's translation was 1906 (80).

general conclusions: that the publishing centers were three (Madrid, Barcelona and Valencia in order of importance) and that the translators (frequently using a nom de plume) were careless out of disinterest for the philosopher, but willing to put out his works because of "intense" demand (Sobejano, 85). We never hear from the public, which might account for the lack of reception. There is no reason not to apply Sobejano's general conclusions to Götzen-Dämmerung specifically.

The only contemporary article available to me on Götzen-Dämmerung is one written by Pompeyo Gener, and published in the short-lived Joventut of Catalonia (Gener, 14). Gener is frequently said to be one of Nietzsche's predecessors since his own work (in the early 80s and 90s) contained many elements of Nietzschean thought. In this article he writes about Le Crepuscule des Idoles, having come across it (in French translation) in the Mercure de France. Along with "Humain, trop humain" he pronounces it to be,

. . . obra de gran valor, que revela la gran potencia critica y la clara visio de las cosas del filosof avans citat, que avuy es el que mes serveix de guia a tota la joventut intelectual europea . . . (14)

Clearly, Gener sees Nietzsche as a positive influence on Europe's youth, and likes the fact that Nietzsche does not attempt to institute a new moral code, that he abstains from proselytizing:

Lo mes bonich d' aquest pensador es que no dona ni un plan tancat del Univers, ni una doctrina de reforma absoluta del

Mon, ni una recepta pera la Felicitat. Lo altamente simpatich d' ell, es que no vol fer prosselitisme . . . (14)

He does, however, interpret Götzen-Dämmerung as an attack on Wagner, albeit it is, in his view, a work conducive to thought:

El Crepuscle des Idoles es una obra ja mes fonda, y va esser publicada en alemany en 1888. En ella hi ha resumit el perque va atacar a en Wagner. No es cap motiu personal, sino un motiu filosofich: el cambi que havia fet en Wagner. (14)

Sobejano accuses Gener of reading Nietzsche incompletely and of not understanding him properly. Gener does seem to have relied a bit too much on the French view, in that he insists on the connection with Wagner, but he is beyond seeing the book as only a personal attack. His overall view of Nietzsche, though limited, is not inaccurate. He concludes by recommending the book and thanking the Mercure for an important contribution: a foreign influence in the "esperit castella" (15).

From the beginning of Nietzsche's influence in Spain in 1893 to the year the translations started being published, there was heavy reliance on French, Italian and probably some German scholarship. After Nietzsche's death, however, and until 1910 (my chronological limit), his impact was unstoppable and he became probably the most influential force in Spanish literature. Due to entirely new developments in Spanish intellectual circles, he was quite well known, but little actual scholarship was carried out. Instead, almost all the focus was on applications of his thought by artists. Even those who personally disliked Nietzsche or disapproved of some aspect of his

philosophy, viewed him objectively as a force to be reckoned with and they acknowledged the power of his influence. His philosophy was taken as a means for personal amelioration, and its applications affected the development of Culture directly. Still, there is no indication that his work in general was categorized as "Kulturphilosophie." Thus, Spain is unique in her not having focused on his personal tragedy or only on the more scandalous portions of his philosophy. Götzen-Dämmerung was popular, judging by the number of translations which appeared, but insufficient evidence exists as to the exact source of this popularity.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

Many French critics liked Nietzsche and his works were widely discussed in intellectual circles. Studies emphasized his philosophical origins, and his method of reasoning. Negative criticism remained at the philosophical level. Publications were very clear and of substantial depth. There is emphasis on Nietzsche's relationship with the French moralists and culture. Götzen-Dämmerung did not receive a broad reception. Nietzsche's most discussed books in France were Also sprach Zarathustra and Menschliches, Allzu-Menschliches, judging by frequency with which Nietzsche's works were discussed individually.

In Italy there seems to be a greater divergence between a reading public and the critics who published in established journals. Most critics did not like him even though their sources and related studies appear to be of French origin mostly. There is considerable contradiction among critics regarding the extent of his popularity. Negative criticism is not only philosophical in nature, but also takes a religious turn. Perhaps because he did suffer attacks of insanity in Italy, too much emphasis is placed on his physical condition.

Götzen-Dämmerung was consistently mentioned among his works and discussed in some detail.

In Spain Nietzsche exerts a strong influence at a particularly productive time. Much was done in academic circles that were unfortunately all too short-lived. Discussion of Nietzsche's work is not found in journals to the extent as in those in France and Italy, probably because the overall socio-political climate was more restrictive. Götzen-Dämmerung was extremely popular, given the number of translations that appeared.

Nietzsche seems to have judged his popularity accurately in Germany. Too many diverse groups (such as nationalists, feminists, anarchists and communists) used and **misused** him too extensively to suspect he was not widely read. In any case, there was much misunderstanding and considerable bias on the part of "cult" groups. There is no record of Götzen-Dämmerung having been read, despite accounts that the book sold briskly.

Götzen-Dämmerung is meant as a summary of Nietzsche's thought, and, if understood, it provides the transition to "Umwertung." Its style does not make allowances for the reader untrained in Nietzschean thought. Perhaps in anticipation of criticism of his thought, Nietzsche includes in this book all the necessary rebuttal, although this did not prevent his being misunderstood and stereotyped by extreme ideologists.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albert, Henri. "Nietzsche et George Brandes." Mercure de France 10 (1894): 70-76.
- Batault, Georges. "Nietzsche Prophète." Mercure de France 80 (1909): 406-416.
- Bianquis, Geneviève. Nietzsche en France: l'influence de Nietzsche sur la pensée française. Paris: Librairie Felix Alcan, 1929.
- Bourdeau, Jacques. Les maitres de la pensée contemporaine. Ed. Felix Alcan. Paris: Baillière, 1904.
- Dreyfus, Richard. "La philosophie du marteau." Le Banquet (1892): 66-68.
- Franzoni, A. "Sul Nietzsche." Rivista Filosofica 5 (1905): 649-668.
- Fuchs, Carl. Letter to Friedrich Nietzsche. 22 Jun.-4 Jul. 1888. Letter 549 in Nietzsche-Briefwechsel. III, 6: 211-236.
- Gener, Pompeyo. "Bibliografia." Joventut (1900-1901): 14-15.
- Grupp, G. "Nietzsches Bedeutung für unsere Zeit." Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland (München, 1898?): 89-100; 176-185.
- Köselitz, Heinrich (= Peter Gast). Letter to Friedrich Nietzsche. 20 Sep. 1888. Letter 581 in Nietzsche-Briefwechsel. III, 6: 309-310.

- . Letter to Friedrich Nietzsche. 4 Oct. 1888. Letter 585 in Nietzsche-Briefwechsel. III, 6: 318-319.
- . Letter to Friedrich Nietzsche. 8 Oct. 1888. Letter 587 in Nietzsche-Briefwechsel. III, 6: 321-325.
- Kunne-Ibsch, Elizabeth. Die Stellung Nietzsches in der Entwicklung der modernen Literaturwissenschaft. Assen: Van Goram, 1972.
- Lichtenberger, Henri, trans. La Philosophie de Nietzsche. Paris, 1898.
- . Il crepuscolo degli idoli ovvero come si filosofa a martellate. Milano: Casa Editrice Sociale, 1924.
- Manassero, A. "Influenze nietzscheane nelle letteratura italiana." Italia Modena I, 6 (1907): 645-651.
- Mercure de France 10 (1902).
- Monte, Giovanni dal. "Filosofia e letteratura fin de siècle -- Federico Nietzsche." Accademia Olimpica d'agricoltura, scienze, lettere e arti 30 (1896): 20-50.
- Morselli, Em. "Federico Nietzsche." Pensiero Italiano (1894): 23-29.
- . "Federico Nietzsche." Gazzetta letteraria 18 (1894).
- Mügge, Maximilian. Friedrich Nietzsche. His Life and Work. London: T. F. Unwin, 1908.
- Naumann, Georg Constantin. Letter to Friedrich Nietzsche. 22 Feb. 1887. Letter 436 in Nietzsche-Briefwechsel. III, 6: 23-24.
- Nietzsche-Briefwechsel. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Eds. Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari. 3 vols. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984.

Referred to here as the Nietzsche-Briefwechsel, only the 3rd volume (Bände 5-6) is used.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. Also sprach Zarathustra. Vol. 19 in Gesammelte Werke. Musarionausgabe. 23 vols. München: Musarion Verlag, 1920-1927.

---. Ecce Homo. Vol. 21 in Gesammelte Werke. Musarionausgabe, 23 vols. München: Musarion Verlag, 1920-1927.

---. Götzen-Dämmerung. Vol. 17 in Gesammelte Werke. Musarionausgabe. 23 vols. München: Musarion Verlag, 1920-1927.

---. Letter to Franz Overbeck. 30 Aug. 1887. Letter 900 in Nietzsche-Briefwechsel. III, 5: 138-141.

---. Letter to Jakob Burckhardt. 14 Nov. 1887. Letter 952 in Nietzsche-Briefwechsel. III, 5: 198-199.

---. Letter to Carl Fuchs. 9 Sep. 1888. Letter 1104 in Nietzsche-Briefwechsel. III, 5: 413-416.

---. Letter to Heinrich Köselitz. 12 Sep. 1888. Letter 1105 in Nietzsche-Briefwechsel. III, 5: 416-418.

---. Letter to Georg Brandes. 13 Sep. 1888. Letter 1107 in Nietzsche-Briefwechsel. III, 5: 419-420.

---. Letter to Meta von Salis. 14 Nov. 1888. Letter 1144 in Nietzsche-Briefwechsel. III, 5: 470-472.

---. Letter to Heinrich Köselitz. 22 Dec. 1888. Letter 1207 in Nietzsche-Briefwechsel. III, 5: 545-546.

Papini, Giovanni. Il crepuscolo degli filosofi. Milan: Società Editrice Lombarda, 1906.

- Rukser, Udo. Nietzsche in der Hispania. Ein Beitrag zur hispanischen Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte. München: Francke Verlag, 1962.
- Sacchi, E. "L'immoralismo di Nietzsche giudicato da A. Fouillàe." Rivista Filosofica (1904): 325-354.
- Salin, Edgar. Jakob Burckhardt und Friedrich Nietzsche: der Nietzsche-Briefwechsel. Basel: Verlag der Universitätsbibliothek. 1938.
- Sanchez, Andres Pascual, trans. Crepusculo de los idolos. 2nd ed. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1975.
- Seillère, Ernest. "Nietzsche dans le roman français." L'opinion (25 Jul. 1908): 15-16.
- Sobejano, Gonzalo. Nietzsche en España. Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1967.
- Stefani, A. Nietzsche in Italia: Rassegna bibliografica 1893-1970. Roma: Assisi, 1972.
- Taine, Hippolyte. Letter to Friedrich Nietzsche. 14 Dec. 1888.
Letter 627 in Nietzsche-Briefwechsel. III, 6: 386-387.
- Thatcher, David. "A Diagnosis of Idols, Percussions and Repercussions of a Distant Hammer." Nietzsche-Studien 14 (1985): 250-268.
- Thomas, R. Hinton. Nietzsche in German Politics and Society: 1890-1918. Dover, N. H.: Manchester UP, 1983.
- Tocco, F. Rev. of "Friedrich Nietzsches Weltanschauung und ihre Gefahren." By Ludwig Stein. Rivista italiana di filosofia I (1894): 223-227.

Tönnies, Ferdinand. Der Nietzsche-Kultus Eine Kritik. Leipzig:
Reisland, 1897.

Vaihinger, Hans. "La philosophie de Nietzsche." Congrès
international de philosophie. Histoire de la philosophie.
(1902): 474-528.

Wright, Willard Huntington. What Nietzsche taught. New York:
Huebsch, 1915.

Zoccolli, Ettore. Federico Nietzsche. La filosofia religiosa, la
morale, l'estetica. 2nd ed. Torino: Bocca, 1901.

---. "Federico Nietzsche." La Vita Internazionale 14 (1899):
40-44.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

UNAVAILABLE MATERIAL

The arrangement is by country and chronologically within a national group.

German

Falckenberg, R. Über die gegenwärtige Lage der deutschen Philosophie.

Leipzig: Veit, 1890.

Grottewitz, K. "Die Kultur der Persönlichkeit." Freie Bühne 2

(1891): 233-236.

Hansson, O. "Friedrich Nietzsche und der Naturalismus." Die

Gegenwart 39 (1891): 275-278.

Lauenstein, A. "Der Ruf nach Individualität." Magazin für Litteratur

des In- und Auslandes 60 (1891): 407-410.

Carrier, M. "Ein Philosoph am Altar des unbekanntes Gottes." Beilage

der Allgemeinen Zeitung 68 (1893).

Dehmel, R. "Zur Wiederkörperung in der neuesten Litteratur." Sphinx

17 (1893): 276-279.

Eisner, K. "Über und unter Nietzsche." Magazin für Litteratur des

In- und Auslandes 62 (1893): 555-560.

Hockermann, R. "Christentum im Streit mit dem Nietzscheanismus auf

der Bühne." Deutsches Protestantblatt 26 (1893): 117-118.

- Johannes, W. "Feuerbach, Stirner, Nietzsche." Berliner Tageblatt 7 (1893).
- Meysenburg, Malwida von. "Aus meinem Tagebuche -- Erinnerungen an Friedrich Nietzsche." Neue Freie Presse 16 (1893).
- Steiner, R. "Alte und neue Moralbegriffe." Zukunft 2 (1893): 71-74.
- Weigand, W. Friedrich Nietzsche: Ein psychologischer Versuch. München: Franz, 1893.
- Zerbst, M. Nein und ja! Antwort auf H. Türcks Broschüre "Nietzsche und seine philosophischen Irrwege". Dresden: Druckerei Glöss, 1893.
- Förster-Nietzsche, Elizabeth. "Jakob Burckhardts und Friedrich Nietzsches Briefwechsel." Neue deutsche Rundschau 10 (1899): 151-161.
- Glaserapp, G. Kosmopolitische Studien zur Poesie, Philosophie und Religionsgeschichte. Riga: Janc and Poliewski, 1899.
- Strauss, R. "Die tragische Schuld." Dramaturgblatt 1 (1899): 256-266.
- Horneffer, E. Nietzsches letztes Schaffen. Eine kritische Studie. Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1907.
- Zweig, Stefan. Der neue Pathos. 1909.
- Klewitz, S. "Freideutsche Jugend." Akademische Blätter (Zeitschrift des Kyffhäuser-Verbandes des Vereins Deutscher Studenten). 3 Dec. 1913.

- Dautheney, M. Gedankengut aus meinen Wanderjahren. 1913.
- Clement, F. Die Dichtung der neuen Generation. 1918.
- Levy, Oscar. Nietzsche im Krieg. 1919.
- Diesz, Gisela. Die Entwicklung des Nietzsche-Bildes in Deutschland.
Würzburg, 1933.
- Kraus, K. "Die dritte Walpurgisnacht (Hammer Thors)." 1933.
- Grunsky, K. "Nietzsche-Bibliothek." Blätter des Bayreuther Bundes
(1942): 23.
- Oehler, R. ed. Nietzsche-brévier. Leipzig: Insel Verlag.
- Kuehn, P. Das Nietzsche-Archiv zu Weimar. Darmstadt: A. Koch.

French

- Valbert, G. "Le docteur Friedrich Nietzsche et ses griefs contre la
société moderne." Revue des deux mondes 113 (1892): 677-689.
- Anon. "Autobiographie inédite de Nietzsche." Revue philosophique de
la France et de l'étranger (1936).

Italian

- De Vita, Gaspare. Nella fine del secolo. Conference. 1901.
- Petrucci, N. "Gli ultimi anni di Nietzsche." Il Concilio I, II
(1923-1924).
- Necco, G. "Pagine scelte." Leonardo II (1926): 254.

Spanish

Baroja, Pío. "El éxito de Nietzsche." El Globo (1902). Reprod. in

El Tablado de Arlequín (1904).

Sánchez, J. "A propósito de la correspondencia de Nietzsche."

Religión y cultura 19-24.

VITA

Alexandra Ghica was born in Caracas, Venezuela on May 28, 1963. She attended the German-speaking school there and graduated as a Bachiller en Humanidades in 1981. In Fall of that year she moved to the U. S. and attended the University of Tennessee, Knoxville and obtained a Bachelor of Arts degree in August 1985. She accepted a Teaching Assistantship in the fall of 1985 and completed her Master of Arts in March 1988.

The author intends to pursue a Doctor of Philosophy degree in German Medieval Literature and Language along with further language studies.