Nietzschean Wholeness
(DRAFT)

Gabriel Zamosc

(Forthcoming in: Paul Katsafanas (ed.) *Routledge Philosophy Minds: Nietzsche*)

1.

There is a familiar interpretation in the Anglophone literature on Nietzsche, perhaps best exemplified in Nehamas's work, that regards him as concerned with advancing an individual project of agential unity or wholeness. In Nehamas's version, the project consists in combining all our features into a harmoniously organized whole of the sort exemplified by literary characters (Nehamas 1985: 190-1, 195, 227).[1] On this model, having a self is not something given but *something achieved* through a process whereby one creates a unity for oneself out of the relatively disorganized psychic multiplicity one antecedently is.

While not all commentators subscribe to Nehamas's particular version of this Nietzschean self-creating project, under which it as a matter of forging a *narrative unity* of the self, it is safe to say, I think, that most of them understand Nietzsche's ideal to be *principally* a matter of achieving *mental integration or coherence*. To be sure, such mental integration will probably also translate itself into integrated activities in the course of a life (a life-plan), and should not be, therefore, construed purely as a psychic event. Still, as Janaway puts it, "the prevailing view is that 'unity of the self' is to be sought somewhere in Nietzsche's account of the psyche" (Janaway 2014: 116).[2]

---

[1] For an excellent discussion of Nehamas's views, see the essays by Pippin (2014) and Janaway (2014), as well as Nehamas's (2014) response in the recent symposium on the subject.

[2] For a sample of commentators who subscribe to different versions of this approach, see: Schacht (1992); Guay (2002); Reginster (2003); Richardson (2009); Risse (2007); Gemes (2009); Poellner (2009); May (2009); Katsafanas (2011); Anderson (2012). In what follows I challenge this interpretative trend. However, given my focus on Nietzsche's early work, it is possible to accept my account while denying

I do not deny that there is much to commend in this kind of approach. Preoccupation with it has led to important and interesting work on the vexed topic of Nietzsche's metaphysics of the self and the kind of agency (or lack thereof) that he thought we could enjoy. The approach also has a genuine basis on texts in which Nietzsche undeniably expresses concern with the execution of internal psychic tasks of some kind. These include GS 335, which recommends the project of creating oneself by purifying one's evaluative judgments with the help of science, and GS 290, which entreats us to give style to our character by reshaping our nature in accordance to an artistic plan that is governed by a single taste.[3]

In many such passages, however, it is unclear whether achieving the mental task recommended is equivalent to realizing an ideal of agential wholeness. In GS 290, for instance, Nietzsche does not explicitly say that the task of giving style to your character springs from a desire to become whole, nor does he suggests that its completion satisfies such a desire. And while some of the language might naturally invite the notion that giving style to one's character consists in integrating one's mental economy to make it "whole"—as, for instance, when Nietzsche tells us that such art "is practiced by those who survey all the strengths and weaknesses [of their nature] … and then fit them into an artistic plan" (GS 290)—, the only thing explicitly suggested by the passage is that the point of character-fashioning is to attain satisfaction with yourself. For all Nietzsche says, that self-satisfaction could be compatible with

---

that it applies to Nietzsche's mature philosophy. Still, charity requires that we read Nietzsche's philosophy as continuous until proven otherwise. I doubt the burden of proving the discontinuity in the case of Nietzsche's understanding of wholeness can be met. On the contrary, Nietzsche's later pronouncements about wholeness make better sense, I think, in the light of my reading of the early works. See Zamosc 2014: 20-22. In this connection, it is also worth remembering that the mature Nietzsche himself held the last two *Meditations* in high esteem and went as far as to call the fourth a vision of his future and to claim that the third contained, above all, *his promise* (EH, Untimely Meditations, 3). While revising this essay for publication I stumbled upon Church's (2015) valuable work, which in all essential aspects agrees with mine. He also argues for a strong continuity with respect to Nietzsche's understanding of wholeness (see specially his chapter 9).

[3] For references to and abbreviations of Nietzsche's texts see the beginning of the references section.

a mentally disunifed psyche. One could attain satisfaction with one's disunity if, as GS 290 has it, one uses it for "distant views" as a spur meant to direct one's future unifying efforts. As often happens with many of Nietzsche's aphorisms, they are vague enough to be recruited into different, often opposing, readings.

But leaving aside the issue of how to interpret such ambiguous passages, the reality is that if there is an ideal of agential wholeness in Nietzsche's philosophy, explicit references to it in the published works are relatively scant, with one big exception: Nietzsche's early works and, specifically, the *Meditations*, where the arguments advanced are saturated by talk of unity, wholeness, unanimity, totality, completeness, and the like. Here is where one finds Nietzsche suggesting that "we have an immensurable longing to become whole" (UM III.6, p.163). Here too we encounter the very important idea of culture as "unity of artistic style in all the expressions of the life of a people", which prevents said people from becoming fragmented by "[falling] wretchedly apart into inner and outer, content and form" (UM I.1, p.15 and UM II.4, p.80); and we learn that believing in culture is equivalent to saying:

> 'I see above me something higher and more human than I am; let everyone help me to attain it, as I will help everyone who knows and suffers as I do; so that at last the man may appear … who in his completeness (Ganzheit) is at one with nature, the judge and evaluator of things' (UM III.6, p.162-3).

Focusing on these and the like statements, I have argued elsewhere that the Nietzschean ideal of wholeness does not principally concern psychic integration, as is generally believed, but rather is about achieving *cultural integration* by pursuing the ideal of freedom and humanity in oneself and in all (Zamosc 2014). In this essay, I develop this argument further by exploring affinities between Nietzsche's ideal and Kant's ethics. In what follows, I am going to argue that,

for Nietzsche, an agent becomes whole when he necessarily guides his actions (or shapes his outward form) in accordance with those duties that befall anyone who aspires to belong to a genuine culture. Said duties spring from the idea of *humanity*, from the image we have of ourselves as endowed with the capacity to be the helmsmen of our lives, the capacity to be more than mere animals or automata. In this way, for Nietzsche, as for Kant, the norm that should guide our activities is the command to take the idea that we have of ourselves as the free originators of our actions as the true aim of those actions.[4]

My argument will proceed as follows: Section 2 succinctly recounts the main aspects of my interpretation of Nietzsche's ideal of wholeness. Section 3 provides an overview of the Kantian ethical framework I will employ to expand our understanding of Nietzschean wholeness. Section 4 analyses the way Nietzsche's ideal parallels those Kantian themes. Finally, section 5 briefly considers how Nietzsche's ideal of humanity differs form Kant's own.

2.

What, then, according to the *Meditations*, is the Nietzschean ideal of wholeness? Here I will limit myself to a broad survey of the main elements of Nietzsche's account.[5]

---

[4] This claim raises the thorny issue of Nietzsche's views on agency in ways that will seem controversial to some. The debate in the Anglophone literature on this topic seems divided into two main camps: on the one hand, those who believe that Nietzsche rejected any notion of autonomous agency on incompatibilist grounds, e.g. Leiter (2015) and Risse (2007); and, on the other, those who attribute to Nietzsche some version of compatibilism and thus of free agency, e.g. Guay (2002), Gemes (2009), Richardson (2009), Katsafanas (2011), Constâncio (2012); and also expressivist interpretations like those of Pippin (2010) and Acampora (2013). Since I am claiming that the early Nietzsche endorsed some kind of free agency my position aligns itself with this latter camp. However, unlike most commentators, I do not necessarily believe that the account of agency defended by Nietzsche must be understood in compatibilist terms or that he thought it needed to be reconciled with a scientific picture of the world. But this is too complex a topic and needs to be addressed on another occasion. German authors like Gerhardt (1992) and Stegmaier (1994), defend Nietzschean notions of freedom that are very much in line with—and place Nietzsche within—the Kantian tradition of autonomy in which I too place him. Cf. Church (2015), who also locates Nietzschean wholeness and freedom within this tradition.

[5] For further support of this view, see Zamosc (2014).

Although the *Meditations* tackle a multiplicity of themes, raging from issues about music, education, and history, to ones concerning philosophy, art, science, politics, and the like, underlying these diverse discussions is Nietzsche's overarching preoccupation with the theme of culture. As previously indicated, at the heart of Nietzsche's idea of culture is the problem of wholeness for, as the above quote has it, a culture just is the unity of a people or their capacity to form a single living entity in which content and form do not contradict, but rather correspond to one another (UM II.4, p.80).[6]

Now, perhaps what is most significant about Nietzsche's analysis of culture is that it is conducted from the individual's perspective and not from an impersonal standpoint. This emphasis on individuality springs partly from the fact that, in Nietzsche's thought, the theme of culture itself is dominated by an existentialist undercurrent concerned with the problem of the justification of life, a problem that, according to Nietzsche, is not addressed to mankind as a whole but to each individual human being who is confronted by the question: "to what end do I exist?" (UM II.9, p.112; UM IV.7, p.222). For Nietzsche, successfully answering the summons to give purpose to your life is equivalent to taking control of it and, thus, corresponds to the realization of a kind of agential autonomy.[7] As he puts it:

---

[6] Although I cannot fully explain here what this correspondence amounts to, one way to approach this idea is to think of a culture's content as being composed of the individuals and the institutions operating within society, and of its form as the characteristic activities those people and institutions are engaged in. Of course, one of the principal claims of the *Meditations* is that freedom is what makes us genuinely human. So to imagine a genuine culture in which content and form correspond to one another is to imagine a society in which all institutions, whether political, academic, artistic, and the like, are structured so as to enable and encourage their participants (the individuals within society) to become free or whole (what they genuinely are).

[7] As I will argue in a moment, though, not every purpose will count. In fact, the early Nietzsche thinks that only one purpose can successfully realize our freedom: the aim of culture, which is the production of the genius in ourselves and in all. In effect this means that we must engage in activities that allow us to become self-reliant, free-thinking individuals; ones who know their true needs (i.e. those corresponding to their freedom) and attempt to meet them in action, all the while helping others do so as well and become the same. Since here I am limiting myself to a brief recount of the main elements of Nietzsche's position, I cannot fully substantiate these claims.

> The fact of our existing at all in this here-and-now must be the strongest incentive to us to live according to our own laws and standards … we are responsible to ourselves for our own existence; consequently we want to be the true helmsman of this existence and refuse to allow our existence to resemble a mindless act of chance (UM III.1, p.128).

By taking on the goal of genuine culture we become free, thereby satisfying the desire to be in charge of our existence. This goal, according to Nietzsche, is the production of the genius in oneself and in all (UM III.3, p.142, 146; III.5, p.160; III.6 p.163-4, 176). But the genius itself is a kind of ideal or "higher" self, who represents—perhaps paradoxically—our authentic self and our own productive uniqueness. This is why Nietzsche suggests that our true nature does not lie concealed within us, but immeasurably high above us, or at least above what we usually take ourselves to be (UM III.1, p.129; III.6, p.163); and it is also why he insists that resolving to promote culture's goal is equivalent to the "heroism of truthfulness" of one who seeks to realize an existence that cannot be denied and which is itself without falsehood (i.e. genuine) (UM III.4 p.153-5). Such a truthful existence is one lived in freedom. Hence Nietzsche's complaint against the hypocrisy of his age which, while commending the "free personality" to the four winds, at the same time ensures "that history does not make any personality 'free' that is to say truthful toward itself, truthful toward others, in both word and deed" (UM II.5, p.84).

The link between freedom and truthfulness implies that becoming whole requires self-knowledge: we must come to know our true (higher) selves. Initially, such self-knowledge manifests itself as a kind of self-alienation made audible through the voice of our conscience that calls to each of us: "Be your self! All you are now doing, thinking, desiring, is not you yourself" (UM III.1, p.127). This self-contempt is the root of all genuine culture because it awakens in us a profound desire for the genius (UM III.3, p.142; III.6 p.162-3; UM IV.7, p.222). This desire

springs from our love for our true educators, who are those great individuals who are free and whole, and who thereby serve as models for the kind of genius we too could one day become.[8] But this self-alienation is only the first step towards culture. It leads the person to "read off the aspirations of mankind as a whole" and thereby take the second step that is demanded of him by culture: namely, "an act, that is to say a struggle on behalf of culture and hostility towards those influences, habits, laws, institutions in which he fails to recognize his goal: which is the production of genius" (UM III.6, p.163). As we learn from Nietzsche's discussion of Wagner, this act consists in an effort "to bring together into unity that which was formerly thought to be set irreconcilably asunder" (UM IV.5, p.214). Importantly, this means that the individual's act takes the character of a struggle for unity in the world. The act, then, that makes us whole consists in fighting against the divisive oppositions that keep societies and individuals fragmented, i.e. separated from their true selves and from each other. For example, in Wagner's case the struggle consisted in uniting once again language and music, which, having been torn asunder in the culture, served only to confuse our feelings, thereby making us incapable of finding our true selves and becoming free (i.e. of hearing the summons to realize the genius in ourselves and in all).[9] The individual's struggle, then, is an outward directed struggle for

[8] Thus, Nietzsche's joy at discovering in Schopenhauer "a whole (ganzes), complete, self-moving, unconstrained and unhampered natural being" (UM III.2, p.136).

[9] See Zamosc 2014: 14-17. It is worth emphasizing that although, under this scenario, in their struggle to unify themselves people can pursue different aims, some artistic, some political, some philosophical, and so on, those different aims cannot really conflict because they are all guided by the overarching aim of fighting against the things in the world that stand in the way of the goal of culture, which is the production of the genius (of individual wholeness) in oneself *and in all* (UM III.3, p.142; III.5, p.160; III.6, p.163-4, 176). Thus, all these disparate aims will converge and, in the end, will lead to a suprapersonal collective unity (what Nietzsche calls the republic of genius) organized and integrated around the ideal of human freedom.

wholeness in the world, for the perfecting of autonomy, or, as I will argue shortly, of our humanity.[10]

Thus, wholeness is not a matter of harmonizing the various elements in an agent's mental economy.[11] Instead, it consists in the correspondence between a person's innermost nature (loosely: his free agency) and his external form (loosely: his actions); a correspondence that is genuinely achieved when the person is guided by the ideal of making the world whole, of engaging in acts that seek to preserve or bring about that higher community of geniuses that Nietzsche calls genuine culture, thereby unifying all of humanity. We get further confirmation of this reading if we reflect on Nietzsche's claim that one's true inner or "higher" nature is something "completely incapable of being educated or formed … your educators can only be your liberators… Culture is liberation" (UM III.1, p.129-30). I take the claim that one's true nature cannot be formed as indicating that making ourselves whole is not about organizing our mental or spiritual furniture, but instead about making our mind organize the external world, something that can only happen when we liberate that productive uniqueness at the heart of our spirit by pursuing the ideal of culture: the production of the genius in ourselves and in all.

---

[10] The great man, Nietzsche tells us "is contending against those aspects of his age that prevent him from being great, which means, in his case, being free and entirely (ganz) himself" (UM III.3, p.145).

[11] I grant that, on the account provided, it is still possible that such mental harmony might be a common result of achieving wholeness, but the important point is that it need not be and that wholeness does not necessarily consist in its realization. In this regard I detect an important difference (though mostly of emphasis) between my account and that of Church, who displays a tendency to characterize the achievement of wholeness and perfection in the genius as being principally a matter of embodying a beautiful type of free person: one in which drives, desires, beliefs, and such are made to cohere and harmonize in an exemplary way that synthesizes within oneself the experiences of humanity (e.g. Church 2015: 74, 77, 83, 164-5). Again, in my view, Nietzsche's emphasis is less on this kind of internal harmony than in the correspondence between a person's innermost essence or freedom, and his actions in the world. Said actions should be, thus, expressive of much more than just the person's attempt to transform his own personality and way of life; they should principally manifest his efforts to transform the actual world so as to bring about societies, institutions, works, laws, etc., that can actually foment freedom (his own and that of others as well).

Wholeness, then, is a matter of manifesting our free personality outwardly; it is about a kind of coherence between our autonomous (higher) self and its bodily movements.[12]

I now want to further develop this picture by focusing on the way in which Nietzschean wholeness integrates notions of freedom and necessity. According to Nietzsche, the realization of wholeness coincides with the realization of "the true concept of form as shape *necessitated* by content, which has nothing to do with 'pleasing' or 'displeasing' precisely because it is *necessary* and not arbitrary" (UM IV.5, p.216; emphasis added). I take this definition of genuine form to imply that the unity characteristic of wholeness is realized through a process whereby the person's content comes to *necessarily govern* or *guide* the shaping of his outward form. But what type of necessity is this? I suggest that we should think of it as a type of *normative* or *practical necessity* of the sort encountered in Kant's moral philosophy. To be clear: in pursuing this comparative strategy I am not trying to establish a direct causal link.[13] My aim is not to argue that Kant actually influenced Nietzsche, but to explore resonances between the outlooks of these two philosophers by using the Kantian moral framework as a foil with which to better understand

---

[12] In this respect, I am in agreement with Tanesini's claim that what is characteristic of the type of wholeness at stake in Nietzschean self-constitution is its diachronic dimension: our ability to rationally govern future behavior and engage in temporally unified activities (Tanesini 2012: 654, 658-64). Still, Tanesini's account is too wedded to a psychologistic understanding of unity as simply a matter of integrating an agent's personal preferences and desires over time. Accordingly, she fails to notice that the type of norm that Nietzsche thinks guides our future behavior when we become whole, while not exactly equivalent to Kant's Categorical Imperative, is nonetheless—contrary to what she claims—universalizable to all agents since it consists in the ideal of humanity or free agency itself (2012: 663).

[13] For a good discussion of Nietzsche's knowledge of Kant, see Bobjer (2008). Bobjer claims that there is no strong evidence that Nietzsche read Kant directly, though he read at least the *Third Critique* while planning a dissertation on the topic (Bobjer 2008: 36-40). Many commentators have explored the relations between Kant and Nietzsche, focusing often on the metaphysics/epistemology angle, e.g. Green (2002). Others, like Hill (2003) also emphasize connections along an ethical axis. However, Hill claims that young Nietzsche was not interested in Kant's ethics and that his engagement with it in his mature phase is mostly antagonistic (Hill 2003: 23, 26, 111). Again, while I am not trying to establish this kind of connection, to the extend that my account uncovers real resonances between Nietzsche's position and ethical Kantianism, it provides circumstantial evidence suggesting—contra Hill—a real Nietzschean engagement, whether directly or indirectly, with Kantian ethics at the early stage. For a relatively recent collection of essays in German exploring various aspects of the relation between Nietzsche and Kant, see Himmelmann (2005a).

what Nietzsche is saying. In order, then, to explore this connection we must take a brief detour into Kant's ethics.[14]

3.

As is well known, for Kant, the moral law is a categorical imperative involving a type of necessity he described as inescapable and unconditional, a transgression of which is ultimately a disrespect for oneself as an autonomous individual. This feature of the moral law distinguishes the commands of morality, which Kant calls *our duties*, from commands of prudence: "*Giving counsel*", he tells us in the *Groundwork*, "does involve necessity, which, however, can hold only under a subjective and contingent condition […] the categorical imperative, on the contrary, is limited by no condition and, as absolutely although practically necessary, can be called quite strictly a command" (4:416, 69).[15] This partly means that only by following the dictates of the moral law can agents act in ways that are not subject to the whimsical arbitration of their sensible natures. The commands of prudence, after all, also seem practically necessary: they confront the agent with a force that he cannot contravene on pain of not getting what he wants. Thus, if I want to make friends, I am required not to go about insulting people. But the necessity of not insulting others holds sway for me only if I am amicably disposed, a condition that is entirely contingent on historical (and presumably also biological) factors that have shaped my sensibility, the total collection of my likes and dislikes. Accordingly, for Kant, the "necessity" of the counsels of prudence turns out not to be really practically necessary, since it rests on arbitrary features of the agent that result from chance and dumb luck. In the case of the moral law, by contrast, the agent

[14] The following reconstruction of the Kantian view borrows from work done by Velleman (2006) on the subject.
[15] The references to Kant's works are, first, to the standard Academic Edition, and then, to the page number in the Cambridge Texts edition.

feels necessitated to action in a way that he cannot forestall, either by recognizing that he himself happens not to have the disposition required to fulfill the moral command (i.e. that he is not inclined in its direction), or by thinking of the command itself as grounded on such a subjective condition, and, therefore, as not being really objectively required of *all agents* (4:420, 72).

In the previous paragraph I suggested that for Kant a person's sensibility is contingent because it rests on chance historical features that could have been different. But strictly speaking, of course, those features are not truly contingent, even for Kant, since they are in fact the result of causal mechanisms operating in nature and are, thus, governed by deterministic laws that make it, metaphysically speaking, impossible for them to have been otherwise. From a Kantian perspective, the sensible constitution of the agent is part of the phenomenal world of experience and must be regarded, by the understanding, as subject to the same sort of deterministic mechanisms that it uses to have knowledge of the workings of nature in general. How, then, can Kant claim that acting on the basis of one's sensibility is tantamount to acting on a contingent condition? Is this only rhetorical flourish on his part?—Maybe not.

The answer to the problem, I think, is found in the realization that, when Kant speaks about the contingency of our sensible nature and the counsels of prudence, he is doing so from the standpoint of our *practical*, rather than our *theoretical*, reason. Only from the perspective of an agent that is trying to figure out what he has most reason to do, can the subjective conditions of one's sensible makeup seem contingent.[16] The reason is that, when an agent engages in practical reflection, he appears to stand in a place that is detached from his particular set of

[16] This formulation is merely for expository purposes and not meant to suggest that agents engaged in practical reflection must necessarily pose this question to themselves whenever they act. I agree with Velleman's view that practical reflection is a multitasking faculty; a view that strikes me as quite kindred in spirit to Nietzsche's own philosophical positions, which depict phenomena like the will as unities only in word (BGE 19). Sometimes this faculty takes on the role of deliberating explicitly about what to do, but sometimes it may simply oversee the action, or at other times it might criticize it, or yet at others perform any other number of reflective functions.

desires and motivations, and from which he can appraise and evaluate them. From that standpoint, he seems capable—at least in his own eyes—of disavowing any of his motivations, partly because he can imagine himself as having a different sensibility from the one that he actually has. Because he can reflectively question the support his desires lend to some particular course of action, the agent seems capable of *withdrawing his own support* to those desires, by refusing to be moved by them, or—on the contrary—capable of *adding his own support* to them by acquiescing to be moved in the direction they incline him toward.[17] An agent inhabiting the practical standpoint seems capable of deciding whether he wants to be moved by his desires or not. But on the basis of what will he make up his mind? On the basis of some evaluative assessment of the merits and demerits of the desires in question and the action they recommend. The problem, of course, is figuring out the type of assessment needed here and, in particular, why it could not be one that simply harkens back to the assessments the agent's own desires themselves seem to embody. The desires, after all, could be understood as giving the agent an evaluative judgment that *recommends* the action they incline him toward by showing it to be something that would be good or pleasant to do.[18] Could not the agent's evaluative assessment simply consist of his weighing of the various value judgments represented by his desires, in order to figure out which of them presses against his mind more forcefully, and then acting in a manner that is consequent with his recognition of its greater weight? In that case, whatever the agent has most reason to do would be simply equivalent to whatever the desire that impresses itself most forcefully to his reflective awareness is recommending that he do.

---

[17] Cf. Velleman's "What Happens When Someone Acts?" in Velleman (2000).

[18] I do not mean to necessarily endorse this way of rendering desires. I adopt this formulation for the purpose of explaining what I take to be at stake in the Kantian view. For an account that endorses this way of conceptualizing desires, see "Intending" in Davidson 1980; and for one that opposes it, see "The Guise of the Good" in Velleman (2000).

The reason this will not suffice, for Kant, is that it would make the evaluative assessment of the agent purely subjective, i.e. governed by criteria that apply only to him. But practical reflection does not call for this kind of assessment—or so Kant thinks. Instead, from the standpoint of practical reflection, the agent can be regarded as facing *a tribunal* of sorts to whom he must justify his course of action. For this tribunal of reason, which Kant also calls *the conscience*,[19] the agent's answer that what he has most reason to do is whatever the strongest desire tells him to do will seem deficient. It would be analogous to a child who answers the parent's query, "why did you hit the dog?" with a "because I felt like it". The parent is searching for the reason why the child thinks that hitting dogs in this or in any other case is okay. The child's answer, that it is okay because he felt like it, is the wrong sort of answer to give to this parental authority. It makes the child's hitting of the dog, in the parent's eyes, *purely arbitrary* and the resulting action *capricious*. For Kant, the agent stands, with respect to himself, in something like the relation that a parent stands in with respect to his child. The agent is possessed of an authoritative voice that, on some occasions at least, asks him about the justification for his proposed (or actual) course of action, and for whom an answer of the sort "because I feel like it" would hardly suffice. This means that the sort of justification an agent is looking for, when he speaks to himself in this voice, is one that should stand the scrutiny of other agents and, therefore, be *public* and not simply *private* in nature. But this means that the evaluative assessment we are looking for is one that should yield answers that are *objective* and *universally valid* for all agents, including ones that might not find themselves with the same type of inclinations that the person carrying out the practical reflection in this case has.

[19] See Kant's *Metaphysics of Morals*, 6:438-40, 559-62. In his essays "The Voice of Conscience" and "A Rational Superego", Velleman defends an account that reconstructs, with the help of Freudian ideas, Kant's categorical imperative as the voice of conscience; see Velleman (2006).

For Kant, the only thing that can provide this sort of criterion is the moral law. It is this feature that makes the necessity of the moral law's commands *rational* in kind, as opposed to being simply a species of causal necessitation of the sort operative in nature. The necessity, after all, is derived from objective laws that reason recognizes as authoritative *for all*, and not from mere empirical antecedent conditions of the sort discoverable by scientific observation. That is why, in the Kantian view, the categorical imperative is intimately bound up with the notion of autonomy, and, in particular, with the notion of acting on principles that the agent has placed himself under, by recognizing that they are authoritative for all agents (principles that are self-legislated). Indeed, according to Kant, the moral law presupposes the agent's autonomy: even though the agent can recognize that something is *rationally necessary*, or inescapably required of him by force of reason, it does not automatically follow that he will necessarily do it; he must *freely choose* to follow the commands of the moral law, and he can fail to do so. This would be impossible if the moral law were simply a species of the sort of causal laws operative in nature, for in that case the requirements of reason would be causally necessary, and following them would be thereby immediately entailed: i.e., it would be entailed that one will actually do as they say one ought to do.

4.

But let us not stray too far afield. My purpose in digressing into Kant's views was only to use them to help us understand the sort of necessity that Nietzsche thinks is involved in the definition of genuine form as *a shape that is necessitated by content*. Previously I suggested that

this statement implies a kind of necessitation that bears close resemblances to Kant's notion of normative or practical necessity.[20]

In what sense, then, is Nietzsche's usage of "necessity" in this context similar to Kant's? In answer to this question, notice, first, that Nietzsche's definition of genuine form echoes an important idea contained in the Kantian view. Prior to giving us his definition, Nietzsche says that it is the antithesis of the common understanding of form as mere pleasing appearance (UM IV.5, p.216). But this latter notion of form consists in the idea that the individual's activity should be shaped by the likes and dislikes of society, religion, national culture, the state, or any other such source of authority. It is the form that is demanded by such authorities if the individual is to be allowed standing within their inner circle of activities and not be expelled or denied entrance altogether. But this means that they ground an individual's form *arbitrarily* in something like the Kantian sense just discussed: the form that they demand from their subjects rests on historically contingent factors that have whimsically structured the sensible makeup of these authorities. Even though their demands have the force of "necessity", they are strictly speaking not truly necessary since the person can realize that they are not objectively required of all, but only of those who happen to want to continue to subject themselves to the authorities that issue them. In that sense, they are like the counsels of prudence that Kant thinks are "necessary" only so to speak.

Obviously, from this Nietzschean standpoint, similar considerations should lead us to conclude that *our own* inclinations and aversions are equally suspect and do not serve as a legitimate basis on which to ground our activities. Not only are those inclinations the result of

[20] In this respect I disagree with Rutherford's claim that Nietzsche sought to distance himself from the Kantian understanding of autonomy by incorporating into his own version of it notions of "fatalism" and "universal necessity" (see Rutherford 2011: 513). On the contrary, Nietzsche's use of "necessity" in this context draws him close to Kant, whether intentionally or not.

biological and historical processes (many of which are culturally shaped), thus making them subject to the purely contingent nature of becoming, but they are also the things that bind us to that aspect of our being that, in the *Meditations*, we are being tasked to transcend precisely by pursuing the goal of culture: namely, our animality (UM III.4, p.150; III.5, p.157-8). Insofar as our inclinations have not yet been restructured with an eye to what belongs more truthfully to us (i.e.—as I will argue shortly—our humanity or free agency), they provide measures that, should we follow them, would make our lives false and inauthentic.[21] Thus, a Nietzschean should arrive at the same sort of position attributed to Kant: that of seeing a person's sensibility as providing reasons for the agent to act, but not necessarily as providing definitive reasons. Just like the external authorities, these internal authorities are contingently subjective and cannot, by themselves, ground demands that would hold for all agents. [22] The necessity of their commands can be at any moment called into doubt.

Given the ubiquity and apparent inescapability of these various authorities, an agent who realizes their contingent nature could feel that he has been placed in an existential bind: he might see himself as subject to the whimsical arbitration of authorities that could have been different,

---

[21] It is in the light of these remarks that we should interpret Nietzsche's statements in the important passage in UM III.4 that includes the following phrase: "In becoming, everything is hollow, deceptive, shallow and worthy of our contempt; the enigma which man is to resolve he can resolve only in being, in being thus and not otherwise, in the imperishable" (UM III.4, p.155). A bit further down Nietzsche writes: "the heroic human being despises his happiness and his unhappiness" (ibid.); here we can read: his own likes and dislikes.

[22] By putting it this way, I do not mean to suggest that for Nietzsche the quest for wholeness requires that the agent follow an abstract, impersonal formula of universality, in the way Kant requires. The universality expressed here is arrived at in a derivative manner from a duty that is profoundly personal: the quest for wholeness, which is a quest to organize our activities around that aspect of our being that is essential to our personality (i.e. necessary). But, since, as will be argued bellow, this aspect turns out to be our freedom or our humanity, it is one that belongs essentially to *anyone* capable of autonomous self-governance. Thus the demand to become whole holds for a person irrespective of his historical, biological, or cultural particularities, and, in this way, it is one that would hold for any and all agents. This formal (universal) demand, however, will be differentially realized according to each person's talents. In that way it also betrays its fundamentally personal character. Some, like Wagner, will become whole by creating music in which genuine feeling is made audible again, others might pursue political conquests of unification or transvalue values, and so on. See Zamosc 2014: 27-8, n31.

and whose demands are questionable in principle, and, yet, somehow unable to escape their jurisdiction (i.e. enslaved to them) and therefore condemned to model his pursuits in accordance with their dictates. In this way, he might come to the realization that his life is not really in his own hands, and is, therefore, devoid of significance. His life might then become, in his own eyes, absurd and meaningless, a *mindless act of chance*.

How can a person avoid this result and make his activities follow from demands that are truly necessary and not arbitrary? How can he achieve a real unity of content and form? Here, again, Nietzsche's answer bears some interesting similarities with the Kantian framework. For he suggests that the requisite necessity is provided by the agent's recognition of what Nietzsche calls *a new circle of duties*, and his resolve to guide his activities in response to them. As he puts it:

> These new duties are not the duties of a solitary; on the contrary, they set one in the midst of a mighty community held together, not by external forms and regulations, but by a fundamental idea. It is the idea of *culture*, insofar as it sets for each one of us but one task: *to promote the production of the philosopher, the artist and the saint within us* ***and without us*** *and thereby to work at the perfecting of nature* (UM III.5, p.160; the stress within the italicized phrase is mine).

In this passage, Nietzsche suggests that the new duties that the agent recognizes as required of him, spring from *an idea*, or—perhaps better put—from *an ideal* that the person recognizes as authoritative for him in a way that the demands of the external authorities I mentioned earlier (including that of his own egoistic sensibility) are not. This is, I think, what makes the necessity of their commands *rational*, in a way that parallels the Kantian sense outlined above: they are commands that the person recognizes as *objectively required of everyone*, thus, also of himself,

no matter what; i.e., no matter what sensible makeup he happens to have, or what age he is born into, or under what nation state, native culture or society he happens to find himself living, and so on. These duties provide a rational guidance that the agent feels he must not forestall, provided he is thinking clearly and acting consequently with his recognition that the ideal that they spring from is one that he cannot fail to have. The agent's recognition of these duties and his attempt to meet them in action, in his activities, would be then what makes him unified and whole.

But what is this ideal, and why can the agent not fail to have it? Although not immediately apparent in the passage I quoted, the short answer is that it is the ideal of autonomy itself, what Nietzsche in these works calls the genius and what he sometimes also refers to as *humanity*, for instance, in this other passage where he disparages of the dangers that stand in the way of this ideal and asks:

> Who is there then, amid these dangers of our era, to guard and champion *humanity*, the inviolable sacred treasure gradually accumulated by the most various races? Who will set up the *image of man* when all men feel in themselves only the self-seeking worm and currish fear and have thus declined from that image to the level of the animals and even of automata? (UM III.4, p.150).

The parallel to Kant, I hope, should again be evident.[23] For Kant thought that the ideal of autonomy was also equivalent to the ideal of humanity as an end in itself. Whether deliberatively

[23] Notice, again, that the quote suggests that what is characteristic of Nietzschean autonomy is not just its opposition to automatism, but also to animality. This once more reinforces the connection to Kantian themes: as in Kant, the type of freedom characteristic of us is one that is often exercised in opposition to animal inclinations, which is partly why Nietzsche thinks that it can redeem nature "from the curse of the life of the animal" (UM III.5, p.157-8). Hill claims that Nietzsche thought that there was something fundamentally right about this aspect of Kant's account of agency (Hill 2003: 217), but since he has a blind spot about early Nietzsche's possible engagement with ethical Kantianism (see note 13), he cannot detect the presence of this theme in the early works, and fails to see that Nietzsche's views appear to be

or not, Nietzsche seems to be following in these Kantian footsteps and arguing that the requisite necessity we have been searching for is to be found in our idea of ourselves as endowed with personhood, with the capacity to be the helmsmen of our lives, the capacity to rise above and be more than mere animals or automata.[24]

Earlier I claimed that, from the standpoint of practical reflection, our sensible makeup has a purely contingent status partly because we can imagine having desires different from those we actually have, so we must realize that our desires cannot provide us with definitive reason for doing what they incline us to do; we ourselves must come to their aid (or, on the contrary, oppose them) on the basis of our evaluative assessment of their worth as motives for action. I am now claiming that, for Nietzsche, as for Kant, the criterion on which we conduct this assessment is our ideal of humanity, or our idea of ourselves as autonomous. The norm that can guide reflection, and our evaluative assessment of our motives, is the command to take the idea that we have of ourselves as free originators of our actions, as the true aim (or, perhaps, at the very least, as part of the aim) of those actions.

---

continuously affirmed throughout his philosophical development (e.g. in GM III.6-8 where Nietzsche discusses the good side of the ascetic denial of sensuality as a *bridge to independence*). Assuming this continuity, my account is obviously at odds with Risse's (2005 and 2007) defense of a Nietzschean freedom that reasserts an animal psychologism that is completely hostile to Kantian autonomy. But, my view is also opposed to that of commentators like Sachs and Katsafanas, who, while defending positions that are friendlier towards autonomy, see in Nietzsche a rejection of the Kantian model that puts autonomy in conflict with animality or sensuality (see Sachs 2008: 95-6 and Katsafanas 2011: 103).

[24] Since I take Nietzsche's views on freedom to be largely continuous throughout his philosophical trajectory (see previous note), I disagree with Hutter's suggestion that Nietzsche's rejection of the dualism between nature and reason in favor of a stricter natural monism constitutes the real turning point between his early and late philosophy (see Hutter 2005: 153). Of course, the clash against animality in the early (and the late) Nietzsche should not be understood "transcendentally", in the way Hutter tends to characterize it when he presents it as the real weakness in Nietzsche's early thought (2005: 157-8). The redemption of nature that is achieved with the use of our reason and "against" our animality, constitutes a "divinization" of nature that, in good Dionysian fashion, springs from within nature itself and is not derived from some transcendental realm located outside of nature. For both the early and the late Nietzsche, to be "no-longer-animal" *does not mean* to be "no-longer-natural".

But could we not also stand in a logical space apart from our autonomy and imaginatively see ourselves as deprived of it, say, by thinking of ourselves as dogs or simply as aliens from outer space that lack humanity? And does that not mean that our humanity too is contingent, after all, and not really the source of the requisite necessity we are looking for? There are different ways to answer these questions. One could be to note that when an agent imagines that his sensible constitution might have been different, what he is imagining is that he could have been a different agent from the one that he knows himself to be. But when a person imagines that he is or could have been a dog, what is he imagining? Perhaps he is simply imagining himself as a four-legged creature that enjoys doing things characteristic of the canine species. But he could also be imagining that he is doing those things while endowed with a stream of self-reflection that allows him to imaginatively entertain different conceptions of himself, including the conception that he is not a dog but his owner instead. In that case, the person would be imagining that the dog is capable of asking questions about what he has most reason to do, i.e., that he is capable of practical reflection; but then what the agent is imagining is not a dog, after all, but rather a person entrapped in the body of a dog. He has, for all effects and purposes, endowed the dog with humanity and with the concurrent ideal of autonomy. Perhaps such an imaginative performance has practical implications for an agent, but if it does, it is due to the notion of humanity that has been imaginatively infused into it. That is why, unlike our particular desires, our humanity cannot be contingent for us, but very much an essential, necessary, and, indeed, constitutive feature of the practical standpoint itself that we come to inhabit in our role as agents.[25] Thus, the ideal of humanity is *necessary*, not because the person cannot logically distance himself from it, by imaginatively thinking that he lacks it, but rather because the person

[25] In this regard, I think that authors like Katsafanas (2013) are right in finding constitutivist elements in Nietzsche's philosophy. However, if my interpretation is correct, the notion of autonomy might be generating more normative content in Nietzsche's ethics than Katsafanas allows (2013: 242).

cannot practically escape his humanity, which will follow him like a shadow even as he actively tries to run away from it, say, by attempting to behave like a dog.[26] The ideal is also necessary because in recognizing that he cannot really escape it, in the way he might be able to escape his desires, the person must also realize that this ideal applies to all agents insofar as they are such; he thus recognizes it as an ideal that is objective and universal in scope.

Since my humanity is essential to me, guiding my outward activities so that they conform to it, and in particular, to the higher image of it I may entertain in my mind (to its idealized version), would be equivalent to guiding those activities by standards that are necessarily my own. In doing so, I would be refusing to let my life be the plaything of nature and of alien forces and become instead its helmsman: a person who organizes most of his activities around and aspect of his being that belongs necessarily (i.e. more truthfully) to him. In this way, my life would become a living unity of content and form, and everything that springs from it would thereby become, in Nietzsche's terms, a piece of fate or primal law for the present and for everything that is yet to come, i.e. a model of autonomy that can actively bring others together into the single line of ascending humanity within which we can feel identified and united with each other.[27]

5.

[26] The practical inescapability I am referring to is an ontological property of us: we cannot stop *being* human (i.e. practical reasoners) while we are alive and active in the world. We can, of course, stop being human in the relevant sense through things like suicide, or by falling into a coma in which the part of our humanity that allows us to be agents in the world shuts down, even while other parts persist. But that kind of escape exiles us from the space of reasons for acting one way or another: in those scenarios, there is no life any more that could be arbitrarily or necessarily governed *by us*.

[27] In UM IV.6, 221, Nietzsche connects the notion of being necessary with that of being a piece of fate or primal law while discussing the appearance of genuine music in his century.

Some may find that my reading of Nietzschean wholeness strains credulity. For one thing it presents us with a picture that may sound much too rationalist and universalist to be (even young) Nietzsche's own. Moreover, given my emphasis on the early works, it might be thought that the more appropriate line of affinity is the one that runs through Schopenhauer, and not—as I have it— through Kant.

While Schopenhauer's influence on Nietzsche's early thinking is indisputable, it is also often exaggerated in the literature. Moreover, in many ways Nietzsche's early writings make use of Schopenhauerian terminology as a rhetorical instrument for turning Schopenhauer's philosophy on its head. Fully defending this claim would take me too far afield. But, in this connection, it is worth emphasizing that, with respect to the Nietzschean concept of necessity I have analyzed here, Schopenhauer's stance runs opposite to Nietzsche's usage. Schopenhauer is hostile to the very notion of normative necessity that Nietzsche upholds in these early works. Indeed, a substantial part of his criticism of ethical Kantianism consists in denying Kant's fundamental idea that there is a species of necessity that is as real as causal necessity, but which is practical in kind: the necessity of an "ought" not an "is". For Schopenhauer, practical necessity is a fantastical construct, implying the contradictory notion of a necessity in which the inevitability of the effect could fail to appear (OBM, p.67).

As I have shown, Nietzsche's account in the *Meditations* is completely at odds with this Schopenhauerian posture and closer to Kant (whether intentionally or not). For Nietzsche, the necessary relation between a person's content and his form is never an inevitable occurrence, but always *a demand* expressed by the agent's conscience to which he must acquiesce out of his own volition (UM III.1, p.127). In line with this, Nietzsche departs from the purely passive conception Schopenhauer has of the conscience as a kind of self-knowledge that tells us the sort

of person we are condemned to be and continue being (OBM, p.196). Although the conception of conscience as a type of self-knowledge is not foreign to Nietzsche, he understands it, against Schopenhauer (and, again, in kinship to Kant), as a fundamentally *active* and *practically efficient* faculty: the conscience does not simply hold up to a person an image of who or what he truly is—in Nietzsche's case, a free personality—it also urges him to become that thing, because he is in constant peril of loosing his authentic (higher) self and of becoming someone else (a fragmented personality).

Again, by these remarks I do not mean to deny the real influence of Schopenhauer in the young Nietzsche. That influence is importantly present, among other places, in the idea that wholeness is a matter of transcending one's egoistic interests and identifying with humanity's interests. However, in Schopenhauer's case, the identification is really with the metaphysical Will, and consists in a kind of mystical operation of the highly developed intellect through which it escapes its subservient role to the empirical will-to-live, and tries to redress the error of having entered into its individuated existence by "returning"—in ascetic self-renunciation—to the undifferentiated state of oneness that constitutes its more truthful being (e.g., WWR II, chs. 14-15, 18-19, 22). Here, again, we can see Nietzsche's ironic handling of Schopenhauerian themes. For, whereas Schopenhauer locates our true being in the subterranean realm of the suprapersonal metaphysical thing-in-itself that is the innermost essence of nature, Nietzsche locates our genuine self in a *higher plane* that transcends nature but in an *upward-directed movement* aimed at realizing nature's own metaphysical goal, which is—in self-knowledge—to redeem itself from the cursed life of the animal by transfiguring itself in the aesthetically beautified form of an ideal humanity, of a more complete *physis* (i.e. of genuine culture) (UM III.5, p.157, 159, 169). In this way, the renunciation of the ego that Nietzsche recommends is not a denial of the will-to-live,

but an assertion of it in its highest form; one that—contra Schopenhauer—helps us bind ourselves more genuinely to life and its infinite striving, i.e., to the world of phenomena. Thus, unlike Schopenhauer, Nietzsche argues that the final goal of self-knowledge is not a denial of life, but an artistic (cultural) affirmation of it.[28]

Nietzsche's idea that our imperishable (eternal), true being is the result of our own artistic fashioning, provides a good segue to end our reflections by briefly considering the way in which Nietzschean wholeness departs from Kant's ethics. And with this I return to the charge that the Nietzsche uncovered in my analysis is too much of a rationalist and universalist to count as being truly Nietzschean. I think that these features of Nietzsche's position are genuinely found in the works discussed, but they are also greatly mitigated by his aristocratism and his naturalistic/historicist leanings. Although *every* human being possesses a dormant productive uniqueness (genius) that can be liberated by culture, and although we are all urged to realize the production of the genius *first in ourselves* and through ourselves *in everyone* (UM III.1, p.127; III.3, p.142-3; III.5, p.160, 162-3), it is clear from Nietzsche's account that most individuals will fail to take up the goal, and that even those who strive to achieve it will only realize it with varying degrees of success. In this respect, I am in agreement with Bailey's observation that Nietzsche's particular brand of Kantian ethics differs from the standard version "in admitting different degrees of agency and therefore moral significance among agents … thus substantially modifying the egalitarianism or universality standardly required by a Kantian moral judgment" (Bailey 2013: 151).

[28] It is in light of these remarks that we should understand Nietzsche's claim in *Birth* that "art is the highest task and the true metaphysical activity of this life" (BT, Foreword; also, BT 24). A claim whose echoes we encounter also in the *Meditations*, e.g. UM II.7, p.95-96, II.10, p.120; III.1, p.127, III.5, p.157-60, III.7, p.177-8; IV.4, p.212-3, IV.11, p.252. This is a topic for another occasion.

The reason for this difference is rooted, in my view, in Nietzsche's naturalistic tendencies, which drive him away from the strict transcendental rationalism characteristic of Kant.[29] For the latter thought that humanity was an ahistorical, a priori idea that was antecedently given to us in our practical reflection, and meant to guide it from a place unchanged and eternally fixed. That is why Kant seems to think that normative necessity is reducible to a kind of conceptual necessity and attempts to derive the content of morality from an analysis of the very idea of duty itself. For Nietzsche, on the other hand, the notion of necessity at stake in wholeness, is not simply equivalent to that of conceptual necessity, and is thus not reducible to it in this way; and this is partly because Nietzsche is highly critical, even at this early stage in his philosophical career, of the overestimation of reason (more so of a concept of "pure" reason) that lies at the center of the German Idealist project.[30] His naturalistic leanings push him towards a more historical understanding of the ideal of humanity. That is part of what I think he is getting at with the aforementioned suggestion that humanity is a "sacred treasure" that has gradually

---

[29] For an interesting study of the tensions between Nietzsche's naturalism and his transcendentalism, see Gardner (2009). I think that my account of Nietzschean wholeness militates somewhat against Gardner's conclusion that for Nietzsche there is nothing that makes our "non-naturalistic" self-representation true (Gardner 2009: 28). For the Nietzsche of the *Meditations*, at least, our self-conception as autonomous represents a metaphysically "truer" version of ourselves partly because we legislate it to the world and not just to ourselves: our non-naturalistic self-understanding makes itself true by transforming nature so as to make it conform to our self-image. It constitutes, then, a type of self-knowledge that actively produces the facts that make it true. Perhaps this is also partly what Nietzsche means by suggesting that his Zarathustra is "one who first *creates* truth, a *world-governing* spirit, a destiny" (EH Zarathustra, 6).

[30] I thus disagree somewhat with Himmelmann's claim that Nietzsche remained skeptical about the constructive power of reason and that his one-sided (perhaps obsessive) focus on the destructive and merely critical function of reason meant that he truncated and only partially realized the project of Enlightenment, at least as this was understood by Kant (Himmelmann 2005b: 43). In my view, Nietzsche has confidence in the constructive power of reason, but he wants to divest reason of the mantle of "purity" with which thinkers like Kant had enshrined it. In this respect, I see my position as aligned with that expressed by authors like Heit (2005). Rather than having an ambivalent relation to Enlightenment, as Himmelmann tends to portray, Nietzsche can be regarded as its radicalizer, in the sense that he sought to show that reason and science are profoundly entangled with and very much responsive to our human all too human needs. Thus, Nietzsche ultimately drives the Kantian revolution in thought forward to what would be its logical consequence: with the help of reason and science, to construct the world in accordance with our real needs and values, so that we can put an end to that rule of chance and nonsense that has been our history until now (see Heit 2005: 53).

accumulated through time and the most various races, and that there can be different images of personhood that are contained in this ideal (UM III.5, p.150-3). What humanity means, what autonomy entails, is something that has to be learned in life, and that, as a species, we have been learning and relearning together throughout our history.

In claiming that we have been learning what humanity or autonomy is, I do not simply mean to say that our autonomy was antecedently "out there" as a fact of nature awaiting our discovery in order to be employed for the guidance of our actions. I do think Nietzsche means something along those lines, since he thought there was a naturalistic story to be told about how creatures like us came to develop the capacity to be in control of ourselves, or at least to imagine ourselves to be so capacitated.[31] But, in my view, he also means to say that we have *invented* our autonomy in the course of living up to the idea itself, and that we are constantly *reinventing* it through each successive generation. In this sense, Nietzsche's morality incorporates an idea of moral development, change, and experimentation, that appears to be absent from the letter of the Kantian view, though it may not be altogether absent form its spirit.[32]

We can now appreciate another meaning behind Nietzsche's talk of necessity. For in fashioning the ideal of humanity through time and applying it, both retrospectively and prospectively, universally to ourselves, we are constantly wrestling this idea from chance and the endless, blind, unguided stream of becoming; we are, as Nietzsche would put it, perfecting nature in ourselves and making it necessary, by turning it into the product of our self-chosen and self-

---

[31] In Zamosc (2012), I offer a reading of some of the elements in Nietzsche's story.

[32] It is important, however, not to confuse this idea of moral development with the Hegelian understanding of the progressive unfolding of reason with ironclad necessity toward more perfect freedom, of which Nietzsche is often critical (e.g. UM II.8, pp.104-5). For him, there is no necessity of that sort since the process is precarious at best and is in constant peril of being derailed for each living generation, and perhaps of perishing from this earth. Nietzsche articulates this latter, ominous possibility poetically in *Zarathustra* through the metaphor of the "Last Man" (see, Z, Prologue 5). To be sure, even in the event of the ideal's "death", its resurrection would always be within reach for as long as humanity continues to exist and there are agents in the world capable of practical reflection.

determined idealization. After nature has, by chance, blindly endowed us with autonomy, we wrestle the notion out of nature's jaws and appropriate it for ourselves. We thus guide our actions in the world (or at least some of those actions) by an aim or purpose that is the result of our free fashioning and which we collectively construct, and are continually in the process of formulating and reformulating together. Accordingly, the pursuit of our ennobled humanity makes us whole because it lends a certain coherence and imperishability to our individual lives, by making them part of a collective project that is perpetually in the making and by means of which we become necessarily connected to each other for all eternity.[33]

[33] I am very grateful to Paul Katsafanas for his invaluable feedback and editorial advice. Any remaining faults and shortcomings are exclusively my own.

REFERENCES

All my citations from Nietzsche's texts use the standard abbreviations for their titles in English translation.

UM for *Untimely Meditations*
BT for *Birth of Tragedy*
GS for *Gay Science*
Z for *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*
BGE for *Beyond Good and Evil*
GM for *On the Genealogy of Morals*
EH for *Ecce Homo*

I have used the Cambridge edition of Nietzsche's works. The numbers following the abbreviation refer to section, book, chapter, and/or part numbers. In the case of the *Meditations* I have also provided page numbers to facilitate access to the citation.

Acampora, C.D. (2013), *Contesting Nietzsche*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, L. (2012), "What is a Nietzschean Self?", in C. Janaway and S. Robertson (eds.), *Nietzsche, Naturalism, and Normativity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bailey, T. (2013), "Nietzsche the Kantian?", in J. Richardson and K. Gemes (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Nietzsche*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bobjer, T.H. (2008), *Nietzsche's Philosophical Context: An Intellectual Biography*, Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Constâncio, J. (2012), "'A Sort of Schema of Ourselves': On Nietzsche's 'Ideal' and 'Concept' of Freedom" in *Nietzsche-Studien* Vol. 41: 127-62

Church, J. (2015), *Nietzsche's Culture of Humanity: Beyond Aristocracy and Democracy in the early Period*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davidson, D. (1980), *Essays on Actions and Events*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gardner, S. (2009), "Nietzsche, the Self, and the Disunity of Philosophical Reason", in K. Gemes and M. Simon (eds.), *Nietzsche on Freedom and Autonomy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gemes, K. (2009), "Nietzsche on Free Will, Autonomy, and the Sovereign Individual", in K. Gemes and S. May (eds.) *Nietzsche on Freedom and Autonomy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gerhardt, V. (1992), "Selbstbegründung: Nietzsches Moral der Individualität" in *Nietzsche-Studien* Vol. 21: 28-49.

Green, M.S. (2002), *Nietzsche and the Transcendental Tradition*, Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Guay, R. (2002), "Nietzsche on Freedom", in *European Journal of Philosophy* 10: 302-327

Heit, H. (2005), "Wozu Wissenschaft? Nietzsches Wissenschaftskritik als Radikalisierung Kants", in B. Himmelmann (ed.) *Kant und Nietzsche im Widerstreit*, Berlin: de Gruyter.

Hill, R.K. (2003), *Nietzsche's Critiques: The Kantian Foundations of his Thought*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Himmelman, B. (2005a), (ed.) *Kant und Nietzsche im Widerstreit*, Berlin: de Gruyter.
—— (2005b), "Kant, Nietzsche und die Aufklärung" in B. Himmelmann (ed.) *Kant und Nietzsche im Widerstreit*, Berlin: de Gruyter.

Hutter, A. (2005) "Die Anstachelung des Gedankes: Zum Naturverhältnis der Vernunft bei Kant und Nietzsche", in B. Himmelmann (ed.) *Kant und Nietzsche im Widerstreit*, Berlin: de Gruyter.

Janaway, C. (2014), "Self and Style: *life as Literature* Revisited", in *Journal of Nietzsche Studies*, 45(2): 103-117.

Kant, Immanuel, (1997), *The Cambridge edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant: Practical Philosophy*, M.J. Gregor (ed. and trans.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Katsafanas, P. (2011), "The Concept of Unified agency in Nietzsche, Plato, and Schiller", in *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 49(1): 87-113.
—— (2013), *Agency and the Foundations of Ethics: Nietzschean Constitutivism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leiter, B. (2015), *Nietzsche on Morality* (2nd ed.), London: Routledge.

May, S. (2009), "Nihilism and the Free Self", in K. Gemes and S. May (eds.) *Nietzsche on Freedom and Autonomy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nehamas, A. (1985), *Nietzsche: Life as Literature*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
—— (2014), "Nietzsche, Drives, Selves, and Leonard Bernstein: A Reply to Christopher Janaway and Robert Pippin" in *Journal of Nietzsche Studies*, 45(2): 134-146.

Pippin, R. (2010), *Nietzsche, Psychology, and First Philosophy*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
—— (2014), "Self-Interpreting Selves: Comments on Alexander Nehamas's *Nietzsche: Life as Literature*" in *Journal of Nietzsche Studies*, 45(2): 118-133.

Poellner, (2009), "Nietzschean Freedom", in K. Gemes and S. May (eds.) *Nietzsche on Freedom and Autonomy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reginster, B. (2003), "What is a Free Spirit? Nietzsche on Fanaticism", in *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 85: 51-85.

Richardson, J. (2009) "Nietzsche's Freedoms", in K. Gemes and S. May (eds.) *Nietzsche on Freedom and Autonomy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Risse, M. (2005), "Warum Kantianer Nietzsches Moralkritik sehr ernst nehmen sollten", in B. Himmelmann (ed.) *Kant und Nietzsche im Widerstreit*, Berlin: de Gruyter.
—— (2007), "Nietzschean 'Animal Psychology' versus Kantian Ethics", in B. Leiter and N. Sinhababu

(eds.) *Nietzsche and Morality*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rutherford, D. (2011), "Freedom as a Philosophical Ideal: Nietzsche and his Antecedents" in *Inquiry*, 54 (5): 512-540.

Sachs, C. (2008) "Nietzsche's Daybreak: Toward a Naturalized Theory of Autonomy" in *Epoché* 13: 81-100.

Schacht, R. (1992), "On Self-Becoming: Nietzsche and Nehamas's Nietzsche", in *Nietzsche-Studien* 21: 266-280.

Schopenhauer, A. (1969 [1819]), *The World as Will and Representation* [WWR] in two volumes, E.F. Payne (trans). New York: Dover Publications.
—— (1995 [1841]), *On the Basis of Morality* [OBM], Payne (trans). Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Stegmaier, W. (1994), *Nietzsches >Genealogie der Moral< (Werkinterpretationen).* Darmstadt: Wissenschatfliche Buchgesellschaft

Tanesini, A. (2012), "Nietzsche on the Diachronic Will and the Problem of Morality", in *European Journal of Philosophy* 23(3): 652-75.

Velleman, D. J. (2000), *The Possibility of Practical Reason*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
—— (2006), *Self to Self: Selected Essays*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zamosc, G. (2012), "The Relation between Sovereignty and Guilt in Nietzsche's *Genealogy*" in *European Journal of Philosophy* 20 (S1): E107-142.
—— (2014), "Nietzsche's Ideal of Wholeness" in *Revista de Filosofía de la Universidad de Costa Rica* Vol. 53 (137): 9-31.