Fall 2004

Nietzsche, the Kantian Self, and Eternal Recurrence

Philip J. Kain
Santa Clara University, pkain@scu.edu

Nietzsche, the Kantian Self, and Eternal Recurrence

Philip J. Kain

Santa Clara University

Abstract

Nietzsche's concept of the self grows out of Kant—and then attempts to subvert Kant. Nietzsche agrees that a unified subject is a necessary presupposition for ordered experience to be possible. But instead of a Kantian unified self, Nietzsche develops a conception of the self of the sort that we have come to call postmodern. He posits a composite bundle of drives that only become unified through organization. This subject *is* unified, it is just that its unity is forged, constructed, brought about by domination. But if the self is a bundle of struggling and shifting drives, how could it remain unified over time? Nietzsche concept of the self requires his doctrine of eternal recurrence, which promises that I will remain the same, exactly and precisely the same, without slightest change, not merely throughout this life, but for an eternity of lives.

I

Nietzsche tells us that the world is chaos in that it lacks all order, arrangement, and form.[1] He speaks of a "formless unformulable world of the chaos of sensations…"[2] He holds that reality is a "tremendous multiplicity." It is a ceaseless flux of coming to be and passing away.[3] Nothing remains the same, "what appears is always something new…"[4] "Every moment devours the preceding one…"[5]

It is not the case, however, that chaos is found merely in the world outside. If we turn within, we find chaos there too.[6] We might say that we have a chaos facing a chaos, except that chaos is not the sort of thing that can be separated and individualized so neatly. For Nietzsche, neither the ego nor the will are simple entities. They are structures, nothing but complex multiplicities of sensations. And the simplest sensation is something infinitely composite. The notion of the ego as a simple unified entity is the result of interpretation—that is, simplification and falsification.[7] Furthermore, Nietzsche repeatedly says that if there is no unified subject, then there can be no unified object.[8] In this he is like Kant.

Indeed, Nietzsche's entire epistemology and especially his concept of the self grow out of Kant. But then, I will argue, Nietzsche pushes beyond Kant, subverts Kant's conception of a unified self, and develops a conception of the self of the sort that we have come to call postmodern. Nevertheless, a self capable of giving us organized experience, Kant convincingly shows, requires more unity than such a postmodern self can make possible. On the other hand, Nietzsche's doctrine of eternal recurrence, I will argue, can solve this problem. It can explain the possibility of such unity without abandoning a postmodern self. That is what I hope to show in what follows.

II

Let us begin with Kant. In the Transcendental Deduction of the first edition of the *Critique of Pure Reason,* Kant says: "If each representation were completely foreign to every other, standing apart in isolation, no such thing as knowledge would ever arise. For knowledge is [essentially] a whole in which representations stand compared and connected."[9] For knowledge to be possible, the manifold of sensation must be run through and held together. Coherent experience, Kant argues, requires a threefold synthesis: a synthesis of apprehension in intuition, a synthesis of reproduction in imagination, and a synthesis of recognition in a concept. These are not three separate steps; they are inseparable moments of one synthesis. In the synthesis of apprehension, for Kant, the imagination takes up impressions, apprehends them, forms them into an image, and makes them modifications of the mind belonging to inner sense and thus subject to time. Inner sense is thoroughgoingly temporal. Our representations appear to us successively in time. They are ordered, connected, and related in time.[10]

This synthesis of apprehension, however, cannot by itself give us ordered experience. A second synthesis is also necessary. The mind must be able to reinstate preceding perceptions alongside subsequent ones and hold them together in a temporal series. We need to retain, remember, and reproduce perceptions. We need a synthesis of reproduction in imagination.[11] If I try to "think of the time from one noon to another," Kant tells us, and "if I were always to drop out of thought the preceding representations…[if I] did not reproduce them while advancing to those that follow," then, he says, "not even the…most elementary representations…could arise."[12] We must be aware that what we think is the same as what we thought a moment before.[13]

Otherwise we would have nothing but disjointed chaos. We would not be able to connect earlier with later perceptions of an event or object—they would not belong together for us. One sentence of a speech, even one word, since it would not be remembered, could not be connected with the next. We would have no experience that we would call experience.

Still, even this is not enough. Representations, if they are to give rise to knowledge, cannot be reproduced in any old order. The reproduction, Kant thinks, must conform to a rule according to which a perception is connected with some one representation rather than another.[14] The concepts or categories of the understanding provide these rules—rules for the necessary reproduction of the manifold.[15] A third synthesis, then, is also necessary. A synthesis of recognition in a concept is necessary to determine the specific order and relation of the reproduction of representations. The only way to grasp these successive and remembered moments in one cognition and the only way to unify these sensations into one object is through concepts that embrace, organize, and unify them. Without these concepts we would not have an object, but merely a disjointed series of isolated, remembered sensations.

Furthermore, this threefold synthesis requires a unity of consciousness—Kant calls it the transcendental unity of apperception.[16] For Hume, there was no fixed, stable, unified self that could be experienced. When we turn to inner sense, we experience nothing but a flux of shifting and changing ideas, images, impressions, feelings, and so forth.[17] Kant agrees with Hume that we never *experience* a unified self.[18] But for Kant there must be a unified self. If not, then the diverse multitude of sensations, the temporal flux that constitutes inner sense, would not belong to a single consciousness and thus could not

belong to me. The flux must be unified within a single self for experience to be possible—or else this flux of images could not be *my* flux of images. It could not be *my* experience.[19] As Kant puts it in the second edition, it must be possible for an "I think" to accompany all my representations.[20] If not, I would have no experience—"merely a blind play of representations, less even than a dream."[21]

At the very same time, there is also a second unity involved here—that of the object. For the manifold of sensations to be unified as one object, it is also the case that this manifold must be contained in a unified self. If we cannot presuppose a transcendental unity of apperception, there is no way to understand the possibility of a unified object. The transcendental unity of apperception through the categories forms a unified object. Thus the transcendental unity of apperception is an *objective* condition of all experience. It is not merely a subjective condition that I require in order to have experience of an object. It is an objective condition under which representations must stand in order to become an object for me.[22] Representations for their part must be capable of association; they must have what Kant calls an affinity. They must be able to enter the mind, conform to the unity of apperception, and be subject to the rules of the categories.[23]

This might all seem to be just a bizarre problem that idealists are stuck with and that other philosophers can avoid. But that is not the case at all. Kant, it is true, suggests that our experience is constructed out of unconnected elements. This might seem to be an unacceptable view, but for it to be right, we must see, it need not at all be the case that things in themselves are unconnected. Let us assume, as even a materialist or a realist might, that things are fully organized and connected independently of our perception. Nevertheless, we must still *apprehend* these things, and in doing so we would have to

organize and connect *our various representations*—whatever the character of the thing itself.

Suppose a house exists before us. We apprehend a foundation, walls, roof, chimney, windows, doors, and so forth. Even if they are organized and connected in themselves as for the best realist, we must still organize and connect them *in our apprehension,* or for us there would only be disconnected chaos. Each shingle on the roof, brick of the chimney, pane of the window, panel of the door—all the way down to the minutest aspects of the manifold of sensation—would have to be grasped in our apprehension, reproduced in memory, subsumed under concepts, and brought under the unity of apperception. If not, we would have unconnected chaos.[24] Our senses separate things. We apprehend the roof separately from the foundation; we can fail to remember one aspect of a perception as connected with preceding perceptions. We must organize each of these representations in our inner experience—whatever the world in itself might be like. A threefold synthesis and a transcendental unity of apperception are necessary presuppositions of any ordered experience—for any sort of theory of experience.

Postmodern theorists have attacked the notion of a unified self. I do not think, however, that they can get away with simply rejecting Kant's notion of a unified self. It is true that selves may have more than one identity they are torn between or undecided about. They may also feel socially pressured toward a single identity as if it were supposed to be their essence and such that other parts of the self are denied, repressed, or marginalized. We may even admit that the self is undermined and subverted by an unconscious. Nevertheless, Kant convincingly shows us that there has to be enough unity in the first place for this self to have experience sufficiently organized to then go on to

say that it wavers between multiple identities, feels pressured toward one and marginalizes others, or is undermined by an unconscious. We cannot dismiss Kant, though we can decide that things are more complicated than he thought they were.

What follows from the Kantian notion of a unified self, for Nietzsche, is that if all connection, unity, and organization are dependent upon and constituted by a unified ego, then, if it turns out that the unity of this ego exists only as illusion, all organized objects too would only be illusions. Objects might appear unified, but really there would be total absence of connection, unity, and organization in things—all would really be chaos. This is Nietzsche's view—and I want to work toward showing that it is. He says in *Will to Power:* "If we give up the effective subject, we also give up the object…"[25] Nietzsche agrees, I think, that a unified subject and a threefold synthesis (or something very close to it) are necessary presuppositions for ordered experience to be possible.[26] Nevertheless, he thinks that a unified subject is a fiction and that the threefold synthesis falsifies reality. He says:

> If our "ego" is for us the sole being, after the model of which we fashion and understand all being: very well! Then there would be very much room to doubt whether what we have here is not a perspective illusion—an apparent unity that encloses everything like a horizon.[27]

> We need "unities" in order to be able to reckon: that does not mean we must suppose that such unities exist. We have borrowed the concept of unity from our "ego" concept—our oldest article of faith. If we did not hold ourselves to be unities, we would never have formed the concept "thing." Now, somewhat late, we are firmly convinced that our conception of the ego does not guarantee any actual unity.[28]

Once we see that the subject is a fiction, much else follows. Nietzsche says in *Will to Power* that it is only on the model of the subject that we have invented the reality of things and projected them into our experience. If we no longer believe in this subject,

then belief will disappear in things.[29] It will also disappear in causes which produce things. In *Beyond Good and Evil,* Nietzsche tells us that while belief in the truth of causal judgments, or (to use Kant's language) synthetic a priori judgments, is necessary for the preservation of creatures like ourselves, nevertheless such judgments are "nothing but false judgments."[30]

III

We must also notice that forgetfulness plays a very central role in Nietzsche's epistemology. In appropriating Kant's threefold synthesis, Nietzsche makes a very interesting addition. Kant, we have seen, made memory central to the constitution of experience. The mind must be able to reinstate preceding perceptions alongside subsequent ones and hold them together through time. We must be aware that what we think is the same as what we thought a moment before. Otherwise experience would dissolve into disjointed chaos. Nietzsche too admits that such reproduction is necessary,[31] but he thinks that memory alone is only part of the story. We do not and cannot remember the myriad flux of sensations we are continually bombarded with. We would be overwhelmed. We must forget. We must reduce and simplify—or all we would have is chaos. As Nietzsche puts it:

> Imagine the extremest possible example of a man who did not possess the power of forgetting at all and who was thus condemned to see everywhere a state of becoming: such a man would no longer believe in his own being, would no longer believe in himself, would see everything flowing asunder in moving points and would lose himself in this stream of becoming….it is altogether impossible to *live* at all without forgetting.[32]

A unified self must be able to hold together all its experience. Experience must appear to me as *my* experience. If not, if things are too complex, if I were overwhelmed

by a chaos of sensations, if I could not unify the object, then I could not experience anything as *my* experience, and if I could not do that I would not be able to believe in myself. After all, as Hume showed, we have no *experience* of the self.[33] The most basic indication I can have of my self comes through the organization of experience as *my* experience. If I fail to do that, if things are too complex, what indication would there be that there is a self behind the chaotic flux of inner experience?[34] For the self to be sure of itself, it must reduce, simplify, forget enough so that it can construct the object as *its* experience.

In fact, in the *Genealogy of Morals,* Nietzsche even makes forgetfulness the more basic faculty. Memory, of course, is necessary for the moment to moment holding together and reproduction of perceptions, and longer term memory is also necessary for responsibility—the keeping of promises. For the latter sort of memory to develop it must overcome our basic tendency to forgetfulness. It is Nietzsche's view that overcoming forgetfulness is not easily accomplished. It requires some doing. A memory must actually be "burned" into human beings over a long period of time.[35] This suggests that forgetfulness is the more powerful faculty.

Moreover, Nietzsche thinks that forgetfulness is necessary even for memory itself to be possible: "memory is possible only with a continual emphasizing of what is already familiar, experienced.—Before judgment occurs, the process of assimilation must already have taken place…"[36] We must forget the new and different, we must reduce the chaotic multiplicity of becoming, we must assimilate, we must establish the familiar. Until we do so, it is impossible to remember.

Nietzsche even thinks "there could be…no *present,* without forgetfulness."[37] If nothing remains the same, if "what appears is always something new," if every "moment devours the preceding one,"[38] if memory itself presupposes forgetfulness, then to hold a present out from the stream of becoming, to remember the present long enough for us to apprehend it, we must reduce and simplify, we must forget.

Forgetfulness is also necessary as a part of the third moment of the threefold synthesis. For Kant, the only way to grasp successive and remembered moments in one cognition and the only way to unify these sensations into one object is through concepts that organize and unify them. But for such categorization to occur, Nietzsche insists, there must be identical cases.[39] Since we are confronted with chaos, which hardly contains identical cases, we must again forget differences and exceptions. We must reduce and simplify. We must construct the identical.[40] Nietzsche tells us that "what appears is always something new…", but we only include the new "to the extent that it is similar to the old…"[41] We reproduce the image that we have produced many times before. We do not register what is new and different.[42]

IV

Nietzsche's epistemology follows from Kant's. To have ordered experience we must assume a unified self. If there is no unified self, there can be no unified object, no subsumption under categories, no judgment, no thinking. How, then, do we know there is a unified self? We have no experiential evidence for it. For neither Hume nor Kant can it be experienced. There must be a unified self, Kant argues, because that is the *only* way to explain the possibility of organized experience.[43] But, then, what if we were able

to offer an explanation of such experience without assuming a unified self? What if we were able to offer a different explanation? Then Kant's explanation would not be the *only* possible explanation—and his justification of a unified self would collapse.

And, indeed, Nietzsche *is* able to give us an alternative explanation. It is the case, for Nietzsche much as for Kant, that the manifold, the flux of experience, must be apprehended, reproduced, and categorized. It has to be held together as *my* experience for it to be experience. It must be possible for an "I think" to accompany all my representations. But it is not the case that this requires the sort of unified self that Kant thought it did.[44] Nietzsche argues:

> a thought comes when "it" wishes, and not when "I" wish, so that it is a falsification of the facts of the case to say that the subject "I" is the condition of the predicate "think." *It* thinks; but that this "it" is precisely the famous old "ego" is, to put it mildly, only a supposition, an assertion, and assuredly not an "immediate certainty."….[A]nd perhaps some day we shall accustom ourselves, including the logicians, to get along without the little "it" (which is all that is left of the honest little old ego).[45]

Nietzsche writes, "The subject: this is the term for our belief in a unity underlying all the different impulses….'The subject' is the fiction that many similar states in us are the effect of one substratum…"[46] For Nietzsche, this subject is a "fiction."[47] The ego is a "fable."[48] He suggests instead:

> The assumption of one single subject is perhaps unnecessary; perhaps it is just as permissible to assume a multiplicity of subjects, whose interaction and struggle is the basis of our thought and our consciousness in general? A kind of aristocracy of "cells" in which dominion resides…*My hypothesis:* The subject as multiplicity.[49]

Instead of a unified self, Nietzsche wants to posit a composite bundle of drives that only become a self through organization. He says: "It is our needs that interpret the world; our drives and their For and Against. Every drive is a kind of lust to rule; each

one has its perspective that it would like to compel all the other drives to accept as a norm."[50] We must envision the sphere of the subject as "constantly growing or decreasing, the center of the system constantly shifting; in cases where it cannot organize the appropriate mass, it breaks into two parts. On the other hand, it can transform a weaker subject into its functionary without destroying it, and to a certain degree form a new unity with it."[51] The best way to think of subjects, Nietzsche tells us, is "as regents at the head of a communality…"[52]

Postmodern thinkers who reject the notion of a unified subject are correct in pointing out that individuals have many identities or personas. Nevertheless, Kant has done a persuasive job of showing us that we cannot have the ordinary experience we do have without a unified self. I must hold experience together from moment to moment or the chair I am about to sit on will not appear as the same chair. I must retain and reproduce it. And that means that I must remain unchanged. I can have different identities, adopt different personas, play different roles, develop a different personality, but I must remain myself. I cannot change into something else or some other self, or the chair would not be retained, reproduced, and remembered by *me,* thus would not by *my* experience, thus would not amount to *experience,* thus would not appear as a *chair*.

Nevertheless, for Nietzsche as for Hume, we have no experience of a fixed self, certainly not of a transcendental self. Kant merely insists that it is an assumption necessary to explain the possibility of organized experience. But is it? The self, I think we have to admit, must have a *certain* amount of unity for experience to hold together from moment to moment, but does the self need to be *really* unified, does it need to be unified *in itself*? It certainly need not be a transcendental or noumenal self. Wouldn't a

powerful drive dominating and organizing other drives, a regent at the head of a communality, give us plenty of unity, enough so that I am able to retain and reproduce the chair I am about to sit on as the same chair? Wouldn't such a dominant drive give us a subject with sufficient unity, as Nietzsche puts it, to "comprehend enough of the calculable and constant for [us] to base a scheme of behavior on it."?[53] Such a unified subject, for Nietzsche, would thus be much like the unified object, a multiplicity held together, organized, and dominated. This subject *is* unified, it is just that its unity is forged, constructed, organized, brought about by domination.

But is there enough unity here to satisfy Kant? All we have, for Nietzsche, is a bundle of drives that have been ranked and organized. Each drive, Kant would insist, is other, outside the rest of the drives, heteronomous. How can we get an unified and autonomous self out of a bundle of heteronomous drives? However we understand the subject, as the dominant drive, the regent, or as all the drives, the whole bundle, the self will be made up of heteronomous drives. The "I" will be made up of elements either that are simply not me or that at least are other than parts of me. If so, then how can I speak of an "I" that persists? How can I say that I am and remain myself throughout my life if I am nothing but a bundle of struggling, shifting, and changing drives dominated and organized merely to one degree or another?

For Nietzsche this is not a problem at all. We do not need the sort of autonomous self Kant would try to convince us we need. We were never able to experience such a self anyway. Thus we do not *know* that it is there. All we experience is a flux of drives, feelings, images, and so forth. We do not experience a single, unified, autonomous self, and we do not actually experience any of our drives, feelings, or images as heteronomous

either. We only *infer* their heteronomy from the fact that they would be outside an autonomous self—and we assume there must be an autonomous self. But why make that assumption? A regent at the head of a communality gives us all the unity we need.

But still, Kant would insist, we have not explained how I can say that I am and remain myself throughout my life if I am just a bundle of struggling and shifting drives. The subject, as Nietzsche understands it, is nothing but a simplified and falsified flux of chaotic becoming. There is no explanation for how it remains the same over long periods of time. Regents, after all, can be can be weakened, forced to share power, even overthrown. Kant insists that the only explanation possible requires the assumption of a unified transcendental self. Nietzsche has an alternative explanation. Nietzsche's doctrine of eternal recurrence will explain how the self remains the same. But before we get to eternal recurrence, we should say just a bit about will to power, which is also designed to explain how unity can be achieved in a subject understood as a bundle of drives.

V

Will to power is a theory designed to deal with chaos and to explain the possibility of a composite self. It explains how, given that reality is chaos, the appearance of order is possible. And it explains how a composite self can be formed and hold together through the consolidation of such order.

Will to power, as Magnus points out, implies no transcendent unity lurking behind the world—as, for example, did Schopenhauer's conception of will.[54] Nietzsche develops his doctrine of will to power as an alternative to traditional metaphysics. There are no

substances, no things, no selves, no regularity, no laws—there are no unities in the traditional sense. All is isolated. Nevertheless, will to power asserts a radical principle of unity—a principle, however, compatible with chaos:

> My idea is that every specific body strives to become master over all space and to extend its force (—its will to power:) and to thrust back all that resists its extension. But it continually encounters similar efforts on the part of other bodies and ends by coming to an arrangement ("union") with those of them that are sufficiently related to it: Thus they then conspire together for power. And the process goes on—[55]

> All "purposes," "aims," "meaning" are only modes of expression and metamorphoses of one will that is inherent in all events: the will to power.[56]

To view the world in terms of power, it generally seems helpful to break things down as far as possible and then try to understand how such elements combine to form complexes—that was certainly Hobbes's approach in *Leviathan.* For Nietzsche, reality consists of dynamic centers of force—pure drives or affects—each of which is related to all others in struggle. Each drive is a "kind of lust to rule," each "construes all the rest of the world from its own viewpoint, i.e., measures, feels, forms, according to its own force." Each drive has a "perspective that it would like to compel all the other drives to accept as a norm."[57]

Nietzsche rejects the traditional notion of a cause behind things. A quantum of force is nothing other than precisely a driving, willing, or effecting. There can be no separation into neat causes and effects, agents and results, doers and deeds. There is nothing but the acting. To posit a cause, agent, or doer is merely to project a fiction into the process much as the popular imagination separates lightening from its flash as if the former existed apart from and produced the latter. The being behind the deed is a mere fiction added to the deed.[58]

For Nietzsche, there are no unified entities that are stable in themselves, merely changing configurations arising from the interaction and struggle of power quanta. This model applies in nature, in society or culture, and in individual consciousness—or, given that there is considerable disagreement on this matter, one can at least find texts and commentators which suggest that it applies in each of these areas.[59] Each configuration or structure seeks to discharge its strength and to reach its maximal power. Increases in power result from struggle between structures. One structure confronts another as an obstacle, overcomes it, and assimilates it. One drive dominates and organizes others. Higher levels of power require higher organization.[60] For Nietzsche, "the thinking that rises to *consciousness* is only the smallest part…—the most superficial and worst part…" of what goes on in us.[61] In his view, "our intellect is only the blind instrument" of one drive or another.[62]

VI

Nietzsche embraces the doctrine of eternal recurrence for the first time in *The Gay Science:*

> *The greatest weight.*—What, if some day or night a demon were to steal after you into your loneliest loneliness and say to you: "This life as you now live it and have lived it, you will have to live once more and innumerable times more; and there will be nothing new in it, but every pain and every joy and every thought and sigh and everything unutterably small or great in your life will have to return to you, all in the same succession and sequence—even this spider and this moonlight between the trees, and even this moment and I myself. The eternal hourglass of existence is turned upside down again and again, and you with it, speck of dust!"
>
> Would you not throw yourself down and gnash your teeth and curse the demon who spoke thus? Or have you once experienced a tremendous moment when you would have answered him: "You are a god and never have I heard anything more divine." If this thought gained possession of you, it would change you as you are or perhaps crush you. The question in each and every thing, "Do

> you desire this once more and innumerable times more?" would lie upon your actions as the greatest weight. Or how well disposed would you have to become to yourself and to life to *crave nothing more fervently* than this ultimate eternal confirmation and seal?[63]

There is much that could be said about eternal recurrence that need not be rehearsed here.[64] What we must see here is that if all things are chaos, if we have nothing but conflicting drives, each seeking to dominate, absorb, and channel the others, if there is no subject except as a regent at the head of a bundle of drives, if there is really no object and no cause behind things, if there is just chaos, well so what, what difference does it make? This is not a problem at all—if every single detail of our lives will return, over and over again eternally, in exactly the same way, with exactly the same meaning, without the slightest change.[65] Eternal recurrence allows chaos to remain chaos and will to power the configuration of chaos, yet provides us the highest possible order—eternal order.

If I am just a bundle of struggling and shifting drives, how can I hold that I am and remain myself over time? If the subject is nothing but simplified and falsified chaos, how can we explain how it remains the same throughout its life? Eternal recurrence promises that I will remain the same, exactly and precisely the same, without the change of the slightest detail, not merely throughout this life, but for an eternity of lives, indeed, that I have already done so through an eternity of past lives. Eternal recurrence provides the highest possible order. Every image, every feeling, every representation, every detail of the temporal flux of inner sense is determined, is fated, is absolutely necessary, can be no other way than it is, and will repeat, has already repeated—for eternity. The self, for Nietzsche, is not just a radically unstable postmodern self. It is such a self, but it is not *simply* such a self. It also has a stability, sameness, and unity that goes far beyond anything Kant ever imagined in his wildest dreams.[66]

Is eternal recurrence a convincing doctrine? That is something that can be discussed elsewhere.[67] Here we need only see that to undermine Kant's argument for the necessity of a unified self, all we need is a possible alternative to such a self. I do not think we can deny that Nietzsche has given us a possible alternative. Kant claims that we must assume the existence of a unified transcendental self because that is the *only* way to explain the possibility of organized experience. If *another* way to explain the possibility of organized experience can be suggested, then we have lost our reason for assuming the existence of a unified transcendental self. While a postmodern conception of the self is in fact an alternative conception of the self, it alone gives us insufficient unity. It cannot explain how the self remains sufficiently the same for it to organize experience over long periods of time as the experience of a single self. I must remain myself. I cannot change into something else or some other self or the object of my experience would not be retained, reproduced, and remembered by me, thus would not be my experience, thus would not amount to experience, thus would not remain the object before me. But, on the other hand, a postmodern conception of the self *together* with a doctrine of eternal recurrence is quite capable of explaining how the self remains exactly and precisely the same. Indeed, we might even say that the commitment to a postmodern conception of the self *requires* eternal recurrence if we are to be able to explain the possibility of organized experience over long periods of time. At any rate, I do not see how we can deny that Nietzsche has suggested *another* way to explain the possibility of organized experience

Notes

[1] I have used various translations of Nietzsche and, for the German, *Nietzsche Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe,* ed. G. Colli and M. Montinari (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967ff.). I will cite the page of the translation but also the section so that any editions, English or German, may easily be used. *The Gay Science* (hereafter *GS*), tr. W. Kaufmann (New York: Vintage, 1974), §109, p. 168.

[2] *The Will To Power* (hereafter *WP*), tr. W. Kaufmann and R.J. Hollingdale (New York: Vintage, 1968), §569, p. 307.

[3] *WP,* §§518-20, pp. 281; also §489, p. 270; also §12A, pp. 12-3.

[4] *WP,* §521, p. 282; see also §715, p. 380. *Human, All Too Human, I* (hereafter *HAH, I),* tr. G. Handwerk, in *The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche* (hereafter *CWFN*), ed. B. Magnus (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995), III, §11, pp. 21-2; also §19, p. 30. "On Truth and Lies in a Nonmoral Sense" (hereafter *T&L*), in *Philosophy and Truth: Selections from Nietzsche's Notebooks of the Early 1870's,* tr. D. Breazeale (Amherst, NY: Humanity Books, 1999), §1, p. 83.

[5] "The Greek State," in *The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche,* ed. O. Levy (New York: Russell & Russell, 1964), II, 8.

[6] *Beyond Good and Evil* (hereafter *BGE*), tr. W. Kaufmann (New York: Vintage, 1966), §224, p. 151.

[7] BGE, §12, p. 20; §§16-19, pp. 23-7. *Twilight of the Idols* (hereafter *TI*) in *Twilight of the Idols* and *The Anti-Christ,* tr. R.J. Hollingdale (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977), "The Four Great Errors," §3, pp. 48-50. *WP,* §§476-90, pp. 263-70; §523, pp. 283-4. *Unpublished Writings from the Period of Unfashionable Observations,* tr. R.T. Gray, in *CWFN,* XI, 106.

[8] *TI,* "'Reason' in Philosophy," §5, pp. 37-8; also "The Four Great Errors," §3, pp. 48-50. *WP,* §485, pp. 268-9; §560, pp. 302-3; §569, p. 307; §635, p. 338.

[9] I. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason* (hereafter *CPR*), A97 (brackets in the original); I have used the N. Kemp Smith translation (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965) and, for the German, *Kant's gesammelte Schriften,* ed. Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1910 ff.) but cite the standard A and B edition pagination so that any editions may be used. For a very good historical discussion of what Kant means by a deduction, see D. Henrich, "Kant's Notion of a Deduction and the Methodological Background of the First *Critique,*" in *Kant's Transcendental Deductions,* ed. E. Förster (Stanford, CA: Sanford University Press, 1989), 29-46.

[10] *CPR,* A98-A100, A102, A120-A121.

[11] *CPR,* A100-A101, A121.

[12] *CPR,* A102.
[13] *CPR,* A103.
[14] *CPR,* A121.
[15] *CPR,* A103, A106; also B233-A201.
[16] *CPR,* A106-A107.
[17] *A Treatise of Human Nature,* ed. L.A. Selby-Bigge (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), Book I, Part IV, Section VI, pp. 251-63.
[18] *CPR,* A106-A107.
[19] *CPR,* A112, A122, B132-B133.
[20] *CPR,* B131.
[21] *CPR,* A112.
[22] *CPR,* A105, A108, A111-A112, A125, B138-B139, B143.
[23] *CPR,* A122. For a more extended discussion of Kant's influence on Nietzsche, see M.S. Green, *Nietzsche and the Transcendental Tradition* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002), esp. 36-57.
[24] See also my "Kant and the Possibility of Uncategorized Experience," *Idealistic Studies,* XIX (1989), 163, also 158-63. Allison also makes this point; see H.E. Allison, *Kant's Transcendental Idealism: An Interpretation and Defense* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 141-2.
[25] *WP,* §552c, p. 298.
[26] *WP,* §483, pp. 267-8, §487, p. 269; §485, pp. 268-9. *CWFN,* XI, 148. Also see, J. Stambaugh, *Nietzsche's Thought of Eternal Return* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), 74-5.
[27] *WP,* §518, p. 281.
[28] *WP,* §635, p. 338; also §483, pp. 267-8. Also see *BGE,* §54, p. 67.
[29] *WP,* §552b, p. 297.
[30] *BGE,* §11, p. 19.
[31] See *CWFN,* XI, 148.
[32] *On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life,* in *Untimely Meditations,* tr. R.J. Hollingdale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), §1, p. 62.
[33] *Treatise of Human Nature,* Book I, Part IV, Section VI, pp. 251-63.
[34] See, e.g., *CPR,* A108, B133-134.
[35] *GM,* II, §§1-3, pp. 57-61.
[36] *WP*, §532, p. 289; also §520, p. 281.
[37] *GM,* II, §1, p. 58.
[38] *WP,* §521, p. 282. "The Greek State," p. 8.
[39] *WP,* §512, p. 277.
[40] *WP,* §568, p. 306. *T&L,* §1, p. 83.
[41] *WP,* §521, p. 282.
[42] *BGE,* §192, p. 105. See also, *TI,* "The Four Great Errors," §§4-5, pp. 50-1.
[43] *CPE,* A97, A94, A116.
[44] For a good discussion of these matters, see D. Owen, *Nietzsche, Politics and Modernity: A Critique of Liberal Reason* (London: Sage Publications, 1995), 21-32, esp. 27.
[45] *BGE,* §17, p. 24. Also *WP,* §483, pp. 267-8.

[46] *WP,* §485, pp. 268-9. See also, *BGE,* §12, p. 20.

[47] *WP,* §552, p. 297. See also, *GM,* I, §13, p. 45.

[48] *TI,* "The Four Great Errors," §3, p. 49.

[49] *WP,* §490, p. 270.

[50] *WP,* §481, p. 267

[51] *WP,* §488, p. 270.

[52] WP, §492, p. 271. We must also recognize, Nietzsche says, "the dependence of these regents upon the ruled" and also "an order of rank and division of labor…" Moreover, the "relative ignorance in which the regent is kept concerning individual activities and even disturbances within the communality is among the conditions under which rule can be exercised. In short, we also gain a valuation of *not-knowing*,…of simplification and falsification… [Ibid]" See also, *BGE,* §12, p. 20; also §19, pp. 26-7. For a lengthier discussion of the bundle theory of the self, see Hales and Welshon, 157-82.

[53] *WP,* §480, p. 266.

[54] B. Magnus, *Nietzsche's Existential Imperative* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978), 22.

[55] *WP,* §636, p. 340.

[56] *WP,* §675, p. 356.

[57] *WP,* §481, p. 267; also §636, pp. 339-40.

[58] *BGE,* §21, p. 29. *GM,* I, §13, pp. 44-5. *TI,* "The Four Great Errors," §§1-4, pp. 47-51. *WP,* §531, pp. 288-9; §§550-1, pp. 294-7; §624, p. 334; §631, p. 336.

[59] There is considerable disagreement as to whether will to power applies beyond the realm of human psychology to the natural world in general. Texts that suggest it does are the following. *BGE,* §36, pp. 47-8; also §259, p. 203. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* (hereafter *Z*), tr. W. Kaufmann (New York: Viking, 1966), II, "On Self-Overcoming," p. 114; also III, "On the Vision and the Riddle," §2, pp. 157-9. *GM,* II, §12, pp. 77-8. *WP,* §619, pp. 332-3; §675, p. 356; §704, pp. 374-5. Kaufmann thinks that the projection of will to power beyond the human sphere to the cosmos is an afterthought on Nietzsche's part unsubstantiated by the evidence and at variance with Nietzsche's own critical principles; see W. *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist,* 4th Edition (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1974), 420. Clark thinks Nietzsche's concern is the human world, not the cosmos; see M. Clark, *Nietzsche on Truth and Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 209-10. Magnus thinks there is little evidence for extending will to power to cosmology ; see B. Magnus, "The Use and Abuse of *The Will to Power,"* in *Reading Nietzsche,* ed. R.C. Solomon and K.M. Higgins (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 226-7. On the other hand, see M. Haar, "Heidegger and the Nietzschean *'Physiology of Art'*," in *Exceedingly Nietzsche: Aspects of Contemporary Nietzsche-Interpretation,* ed. D.F. Krell and D. Wood (London: Routledge, 1988), 26.

[60] *BGE,* §13, p. 21. *GM,* III, §7, pp. 107-8. *WP,* §46, pp. 28-9; §633, p. 337; §636, pp. 339-40.

[61] *GS,* §354, p. 299. See also, *BGE,* §3, p. 11; §32, p. 44. Also, *WP,* §478, p. 265; §523, p. 283.

[62] *Daybreak,* tr. R.J. Holingdale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), §109, p. 65. See also, *BGE,* §6, p. 13.

[63] *GS,* §341, pp. 273-4. See also, *Z,* III, "On the Vision and the Riddle," §2, pp. 157-9; "The Convalescent," §§1-2, pp. 215-21. *WP,* §§1057-67, pp. 544-50. For a discussion of earlier approximations to the doctrine of eternal recurrence in the history of philosophy, see Magnus*, Nietzsche's Existential Imperative,* 47-68.

[64] E.g., see my "Nietzsche, Skepticism, and Eternal Recurrence," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy,* 13 (1983), 365-87.

[65] See also, M. Haar, *Nietzsche and Metaphysics,* tr. M. Gendre (Albany: SUNY Press, 1996), 121-2.

[66] Shapiro thinks eternal recurrence entails a radical dissolution of selfhood. I think that is only one side of the story. See G. Shapiro, *Nietzschean Narratives* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 86.

[67] See my "Nietzsche, Skepticism, and Eternal Recurrence."