



# nietzsche

Conferencia Internacional / International Conference

el devenir de la vida the becoming of life

## Actas / Proceedings

**Body, Epistemology and Interpretation. The 'Corporeal Unity' of Friedrich Nietzsche's Philological, Philosophical and Physiological Investigations**

KRISTÓF FENYVESI

Jyväskylän Yliopisto

Finlandia

# Body, Epistemology and Interpretation. The 'Corporeal Unity' of Friedrich Nietzsche's Philological, Philosophical and Physiological Investigations <sup>1</sup>

KRISTÓF FENYVESI

Jyväskylän Yliopisto

Finlandia

Doctoral Student, Doctoral School of Hungarian Studies, University of Jyväskylä. The influence and reception of Nietzsche's works in the context of 20th century Hungarian philosophy and literature is his main research field. Editor and translator of the first Hungarian language reader on new media and game studies (Narratives, Games and Simulation in the Digital Media, Kijarat Publishing House, Hungary, 2008). Coordinator of two international and interdisciplinary conference series: [www.pecsikult.hu/page2009](http://www.pecsikult.hu/page2009), [www.keletnyugati.hu](http://www.keletnyugati.hu). Web Site: [www.kristoffenyvesi.hu](http://www.kristoffenyvesi.hu)

*"[...] often I have asked myself whether, taking a large view, philosophy has not been merely an interpretation of the body and a misunderstanding of the body?"*<sup>2</sup> – the Nietzschean question quoted here appears in the *Preface for the Second Edition* of *The Gay Science* dated 1886. It reports a problematic situation; what is more, it depicts a successive series of problematic situations that define the interest of the inquirer, in addition to suggesting his character in a clear way. Friedrich Nietzsche's recurring question is directed at the body: the place of body in the philosophical tradition. However, the question gains its crucial significance only by the stubbornness of the inquirer, or more precisely, by the stubbornness of the inquiring body itself. It is the stubbornness of the body that, driven by its own robustness, repeatedly violates and questions the boundaries of its own thinking. It is the stubbornness of the body that, driven by its own uncontrollable monstrousness upsets and gives no respite to its own thinking.<sup>3</sup> The body aggressively enters into the discourse, and with its unexpected, dramatic emergence (although it has always been imminent) from time to time it is wounding the tradition by turning it upside down and driving it into self-contradiction. "A corpus is not a discourse"<sup>4</sup>, says Jean-Luc Nancy in the opening sentence of his Nietzschean inspired lecture entitled "Corpus". "The body is but a wound."<sup>5</sup> Body as a "sign of itself and being-itself of the sign"<sup>6</sup>, as Nancy puts it, is the medium proper, the plurality in itself, the "*materia signata*" in the sense of Saint Thomas. It is something that can only be embodied by a metaphor, by a unique image activated through infinite reinterpretations and infinite misinterpretations. Hans Belting claims in his *Bild-Anthropologie* that "*the metamorphoses, the becoming to image and the embodiment are complementary acts*"<sup>7</sup>. Belting suggests that like for every image, the original birthplace of the metaphor is the *body*.<sup>8</sup> Which, as the primary medium and the primary message itself, enables the self to be activated in the context of the given. Therefore it is not a mere coincidence that the main concept of Hans Belting's anthropology of images is the *embodiment*.<sup>9</sup> In this sense our relations with imagery, language and culture, and with the tradition of using signs in general, designate our relationship to the body. First of all our relationship to our own body and to that of the body of the Other.

And because of the complementarity of these structures, any change in our relationship to our own body and the Other bodies as well, highlight fundamental changes in our own practice of using signs. The inescapable timeliness of Nietzsche's untimely question become comprehensible only from this reciprocal aspect.

Robert Gooding-Williams in his book, entitled *Zarathustra's Dionysian Modernism*<sup>10</sup> suggests that a critical interpreter's view on the significance of Nietzsche's philosophy is driven by the interpreter's prior personal choice among the different concepts of modernism and postmodernism.<sup>11</sup> This is also supported by the opinion that Nietzsche's works equally resist classifications based on "immanent" or contract-like structures<sup>12</sup> of identification.<sup>13</sup> The statements made by Gooding-Williams could perhaps be even more precise if he presented the Nietzschean project not only on the basis of a general concept of modernism and postmodernism. At the very beginning of his work, which presents the close reading of *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, he should have warned his readers that there are crucial differences between the *concepts of body* proposed by different, alternative modernist and postmodernist trends. He should have referred to the different judgments that define the places, the roles and the *interpretations* of the body, this complex and non-discursive alien, in relation to different discourses of modernism and postmodernism.<sup>14</sup> However, simply by considering his thesis<sup>15</sup> we may come to the conclusion that the inability to classify the Nietzschean oeuvre does not arise from the Nietzschean attitude of questioning "everything", even itself. Rather it clearly demonstrates that no work discussing Nietzsche's thinking may evade the answer of how the author views the Nietzschean questions regarding the repeated confrontations between the biological body and the cultural-philosophical tradition. In Gooding-Williams' book the limitations of the investigations of the body-centered nature of the Nietzschean standpoint illustrate that the cultural innovations of *linguistic* and *writing turn*, though absolutely indispensable, are not sufficient for demonstrating the traumatic significance of the *corporeal turn* as the Nietzschean catastrophe that "breaks into two" the whole history of thinking.<sup>16</sup>

"[...] just as from a plant growing in a certain place one can form conclusions as to the soil."<sup>17</sup> - writes Nietzsche in the *Philosophy during the Tragic Age of the Greeks*. So, if we wish to form some conclusions as to the Nietzschean soil where his question of the body springs from, then we should begin to identify the "specimens" of the "population of the Nietzschean statements" that present the dominant traditions of thinking as certain interpretations of the human body. How should we conduct an investigation like this? Nietzsche not only provides a demonstration, but also outlines a methodology of conducting such research: "It is possible to shape the picture of a person out of three anecdotes. I endeavor to bring into relief three anecdotes out of every system and abandon the remainder."<sup>18</sup> So, it seems that Nietzsche partially following the method of Diogenes Laertius, who was among his research topics between 1868 and 1870. Presents each philosophical system together with the personality of the given thinker, and depicts the personality of the thinker from the thinker's personal relationship to life, represented by some allegedly characteristic life situations. Following this particular philological practice used by Nietzsche in 1873, I will attempt to outline the relationship between the changes in Nietzsche's concept of corporeality and the changes in the state of Nietzsche's own body, recorded by himself in his various notes, letters and his works as well. In line with Nietzsche's intuitions, I

would like to recall three anecdotes that are crucial for the Nietzschean question I quoted at the beginning. The so-called “arche” for Nietzsche, as a “tragic”, and totally untimely post-pre-Socratic philosopher, is the human body. To be able to make sense of this statement, however, first we need to find and retell the three stories that equally rightly express Nietzsche's concept of the body and express his personality.

### **First story: Dionysos, or the sacral body of the philologist**

The construction of the figures of Dionysos and his complementary, Apollo appearing in the *Birth of Tragedy* published in 1872 as the result of an extremely complex series of research and experimentation. It was the outcome of an extraordinary interdisciplinary project. The renewal of hermeneutics and the Nietzschean surpassing of the nineteenth century academic philology go hand in hand. Nietzsche's main motive in this decisive change is the recognition of the characteristic heterogeneity of the classical philology as a discipline. In his inaugural speech held at the Basel University in 1869 (*Homer and classical philology*) Nietzsche presents philology as “an inorganic set of various academic activities”. Nietzsche says – following Seneca's intentions – that only the philosophical implantation of these diverging tendencies could improve this situation and could help to master this “strange centaur” called philology. This means that connected to a philosophical background we can give dimensions to philology's discoveries and thus make timely the “very essence of classical philology”. This would mean to practice philology as the “art of reading well”. This fusion where “sophia” (the wisdom) embraces the “logos” (the science), appears for the first time in *The Birth of Tragedy*, accompanied by strong metaphoric and corporeal, one may say sexual implications also in the figure of Dionysos and Apollo. Nevertheless, the perpetual differentiation of this endeavor and the improvement of the philosopher's vision and corporeal sensuality will create all the “applied philologies” that can lead to a genealogy of culture in a broader, a Nietzschean sense. One of that perspectives due to which nowadays cultural studies could free themselves from the epistemological framework of Kant's Anthropology. However, *The Birth of Tragedy* can only signal but cannot accomplish yet the Nietzschean move away from the modern and dominant anthropology of his age. Here Nietzsche can only tests the limits of the philosophical language of Kant and Schopenhauer and fills them up with his own poetic and rhetoric inventions and with some eccentric ideas of his contemporaries<sup>19</sup>. Nietzsche creates the figures of Dionysos and Apollo as the “super metaphor” of the body by which he can communicate all the insights that his concept of the Greeks is based on.<sup>20</sup> In Chapter 8 he describes the emergence of the dramatic phenomenon explicitly as the projection of emphatically bodily excitation and the epidemic spread of ecstasy.<sup>21</sup> Several other similar examples could be cited for how he attempted to enforce the corporeal approach experimentally, but perhaps this much will suffice to support the claim that *The Birth of Tragedy* is the so-called “metaphor-laboratory” in which the pronouncedly corporeal pattern of Nietzsche's thinking is born. Being the carrier of many different corporeal types, the Dionysos figure of *The Birth of Tragedy* can also be used to create corporeal typologies based on the gradual differentiation of each bodily pattern and on the study of the bio-psycho-social dynamics of bodies subjugated to any kind of power. When studying Nietzsche's early Dionysos concept and the roots of the modern concepts of

corporeality, one should not disregard the fact that according to the notes and letters documenting his intellectual inquiry Nietzsche pursues intensive studies in Greek and contemporary materialism and studied Democritus between 1866 and 1868. One of his most determinant philosophical readings this time is Albert Lange's *Geschichte des Materialismus* (1865). Parallel with that, he is studying the influence of Kantian philosophy on the philosophic and scientific concept of the "organic" and concurrently engaged in working out a critique of teleological thinking supported by Schopenhauer's views. Nietzsche's divergent preliminary studies, using radically opposing systems of argumentation, confront him with the most contradictory issues of the thinking of his time and force him to establish his own viewpoint. His freshly acquired information and knowledge and the heterogeneous set of concepts at first mostly manifest themselves in his philology: all of these elements can be identified in Nietzsche's innovative image of the Greek. He writes with enthusiasm in his notes and letters about the exceptionally intensive sensitive abilities of the Greek, and to capture this characteristic he uses the term "*Reizbarkeit*", which clearly means irritability with a strongly bodily connotation.<sup>22</sup> While his inventions are incorporating into his cultural concepts and autobiographic texts, he reconstructs and begins to use two kinds of concepts for health, confronting the defensive, restrictive concept of health with the definition of a "robust" health based on surplus energy and explosive vitality.<sup>23</sup> In the meantime, he experiments with translating his inventions into the terminology of modern medicine and actualizing this new diagnostic lexicon in a kind of cultural criticism. These inventions by Nietzsche are in opposition not only with the Winckelmannian tradition of understanding the Greek based on harmony, but also with the earlier classical conception of aesthetics based on the fundamental work by Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten, entitled *Aesthetica*. While Winckelmann builds his aesthetic concepts on the idealization of body, Baumgarten builds his system on the suppression of any kind of cultivation of somatic phenomena. It is important to note that the highlighting of the same "syndrome", namely the copresence of physical wildness, carnal lust and orgiastic instincts in the body are that which leads Baumgarten (the master of Winckelmann and Kant) to the exclusion of body from his aesthetic system, and these are exactly the same components which call Nietzsche's attention to the importance of systematically focusing his studies on the somatic effects. Soon after the publication of *The Birth of Tragedy*, the Nietzschean figure of the philosopher is ultimately associated with the figure of the physician-physiologist diagnosing cultural symptoms and curing cultural "diseases" and dysfunctions. For now, it appears to be sufficient to refer to a draft essay from 1873 entitled *The philosopher as cultural doctor (Der Philosoph als Arzt der Kultur)*. The diagnostic lexicon used in theoretical analyses and programmatic Nietzschean texts reaches its culmination in 1875, namely in Nietzsche's private correspondence. The personal awareness of the effects of changes in the corpus on the level of his individual bodily state and the elaboration of his theory of corporeality go hand in hand. Due to his worsening health problems, Nietzsche's letters gradually become flooded with reports on various health complaints and their possible treatment using technical, medical language. The analysis meant to translate the vocabulary of medical history emerging in personal narrative into philosophical discourse from the point of view of corporeality should meet a complex system of requirements. Here, we can not go into a discussion of this issue, one simple example should be sufficient to illustrate this phenomenon. In

his letter dated January 2, 1875 Hans von Bülow, Nietzsche's friend recommends cold bath cures to Nietzsche in Steinabad to cure his complaints. And how does the years of training in the methodology of cold baths turn into methodological considerations regarding the Nietzschean style of aphoristic writing and his thinking? Well, in aphorism §381. of Nietzsche's book, *The Gay Science* we read the following: "*I approach deep problems like cold baths: quickly into them and out again.*"<sup>24</sup>

## **Second story: Zarathustra, or the poetic body of the orator**

The renewal of the Greek figure of Dionysos, the *par excellence* mask that represents – we could say that *masks – all the masks*, has an outstanding significance not only in recreating the full corpus of corporeality as the language of corpus, awaiting catalog and typology. The discourse on the Dionysos figure construed by Nietzsche is not only a discourse on body but is also the scene for creating a discourse on the transition, on the crossing of borders between spheres defined by the senses, on anthropological formations and on cultural institutions. Nietzsche sees the ability to use metaphors as the vehicle for transgressive traffic between sensory, anthropological and cultural spheres. Metaphor, this trope of language that works on the basis of transubstantiation, transfiguration and embodiment has corporeal implications for Nietzsche in the first place, to which he attaches a central role from the aspect of linguistic theory, rhetoric, stylistics and epistemology alike. When Nietzsche as early as 1873 in his fragment entitled *On Truth and Lies in a Non-moral Sense* discussing the somatic embeddedness of the process of "double metaphorization" that constitutes the basis of his language theory, he talks about neural excitation and a series of organic, perceptive and communicative transformation processes as well and puts that the effects of bodily reactions can be directly related to the classical issues of interpretation and epistemology. These insights are compatible with several claims of some of his earlier studies of materialism in the Antiquity. The direction of Nietzsche's progress clearly shows that he can conceive of the philosophical background of his cultural philosophy only on a special bio-psycho-social ground and in terms of the tripartite notion of body-epistemology-interpretation relationship.<sup>25</sup> Through this he enters into a productive dialogue with an alternative discourse of modernity that has set its anti-Cartesian, anti-Kantian and anti-Christian-Platonic position, though with a changing dynamics at to a varying degree, along the corporeal concept of modernity, and has implemented its scientific, philosophical and artistic program in relation to this ideology. The text on *Zarathustra's going-under* and the series of works paving the way for the "advent" of Zarathustra are closely related to Lock, Condillac, Diderot, and the most popular work written in this model, Stendhal's *De l'Amour* (1822). The Nietzschean critique, which is plentifully fed by these views and is meant to reassess the entire history of culture from this perspective, sets no less ambitious goals in the *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* than to express the Dionysos-concept imbued with the materialist, sensualist ideology of radical biologism in the space of the language and rhetoric of sacred texts and commandments. Because Nietzsche, being a skilled philologist, fully aware of that, by virtue of the thousand years old structures of the tradition of textual cultures, it is only a certain kind of language, rhetoric, syntax, rhythm and metaphoric system can provide the parameters for the textual configuration of body and the key for

coding and decoding it, and can stipulate the certain rules of how to raise the corpus into the discourse. The suffering of body presented through the figure of Dionysos in *The Birth of Tragedy* is still an existential, ontological feature of human existence; however, in Zarathustra, following the tendency of philosophical investigations that paved the way for Zarathustra, it appears as a result of different kind of violence, aggression, cruelties that are inseparable from biological facts, social practices and their system, namely the moral. The policies of life and death, joy and sorrow, the sexes, power and subjugation are presented as different concepts of the hermeneutics of body and are evaluated in the oratorical speeches of Zarathustra who advocates a post-neo-sensualist ideology of creating new values. So, in this sense Nietzsche's Zarathustra does not merely ridicule or speaks ironically about the systems that are in the way of creating new values. Rather, Zarathustra actually implements the transfiguration of everything that is relegated by these systems of values by culturally conditioning violent refusal and psychosomatic resistance to the lowest level. Naturally, the tool of transfiguration in this case is again the activation of the metaphoric potential.<sup>26</sup> With the use of this whole arsenal of metaphors Nietzsche describes the body as a "multiple", directed by nervous functions, or as a "concert" (*Zusammenspiel*) of forces. In a chapter of Zarathustra, called *The Despisers of the Body*, the "I" (the "Ich") is represented as the *persona*, the *mask* of the Self (the "Selbst"), while the Self is represented as the *persona*, the *mask* of the Body. In this bodily founded "double masking" process the consciousness is as a mere *competence* of the body construed by the structure of "double metaphorization", described above. So, the analysis of the body-concept of Zarathustra also calls attention to the fact that the theories pushed into the foreground by the linguistic and writing turn that are meant to construe and multiply identity can not escape openly accounting for the concepts of the body and the sexuality at work in the background.

### **Third story: The Man, or Nietzsche's medi(c)al body**

So far we have attempted to outline the emergent history of the Dionysian pattern that rewrote the concept of corporeality first by construing Dionysos as a sacral figure and second, by the analytic deconstruction of this super metaphor with the subjectivized figure of Zarathustra. However, since for Nietzsche parallel motive of this innovative tendency from the very beginning related to the Dionysian figure has been the individualization and the elaboration of a linguistic, rhetorical and cultural set of tools that is necessary for the linguistic expression, designation and presentation of his own body – as demonstrated by the philosophical examples of biographical narratives –, the work presenting Nietzsche "the Human", the *Ecce Homo* should by all means seen as an exceptional piece in terms of the alternative concept of corporeality expounded before.<sup>27</sup> In *Ecce Homo* Nietzsche analyzes and reinterprets his own philosophical oeuvre, or put it differently, his entire *own corpus*, and he does so by using the consistent methodology of a philologist equipped with an exceptionally wide range of physiological criteria. „And so I tell my life to myself"<sup>28</sup> – says the prologue in *Ecce Homo*. Considering the transfigurative and narrative turns in the Nietzschean oeuvre, Nietzsche's "narrated life" might as well be an illustration of theories regarding the dynamics of Paul Ricoeur's concept, the *narrative identity*<sup>29</sup> created at the intersection

of the dimensions of the referential, the communicable and the self-understanding. However, the parallel reading of Nietzsche's *Ecce Homo* and Ricoeur's study may clearly show that the ability of a biological phenomenon to take a look at itself and its situation, whereby its narrative identity is established, is emphatically an ability given, controlled and influenced by the body. "Life" in a "pre-narrative" state is organized around the body, it receives its primary form from the body. The body as a primary medium, has a direct and critical influence on the referential, communicable and self-understanding dimensions. So, maybe with stronger emphasis than Ricoeur did, we need to posit a *narrative corporeality* at work behind every construction of narrative identities, and Nietzsche's *Ecce Homo* is especially suitable for drawing attention to this idea. And what is more, Nietzsche's presentation of body as a bio-psycho-social "multitude" is capable of opening up a new dimension for narratology interested in studying the body from an interdisciplinary perspective. The interdependent relationship between the event of creation and the "creative state" of the body is a recurrent question for Nietzsche. What we can see for example in the *Twilight of the Idols*, written not long before *Ecce Homo*, as the diagnostic description of the corporeal state of creation<sup>30</sup> is transfigured into a corporeal description of Nietzsche's own creative art of style and state in the autobiographic space of *Ecce Homo*<sup>31</sup>. For Nietzsche, the human body with its competence, called consciousness is no more and no less in itself than the only exceptional and exclusive medium for experiencing life, thinking, creation, sovereignty, social action, sexuality, gentleness and violence, joy and suffering, health and illness. And as a medium, it is suitable not only for building up these corporeal states but also for medially transmitting and redeeming them, for epidemically transmit, receive and interpret these states. For Nietzsche, one's own body is, first of all, a primary medium, and therefore the goal of the metaphoric nature of the language created to capture that is not to cover up the shameful nudity of body – in accordance with Christian-Platonic tendencies. Quite the contrary, the goal is to push language over the taboos of domination that possess body, to construe a new body through language and thinking, to expose the body concealed by language through language. The closing, summary section of *Ecce Homo* says the following: "The concept of 'God' invented as a counterconcept of life [...] The concept of the 'soul,' the 'spirit,' finally even 'immortal soul,' invented in order to despise the body, to make it sick, 'holy'; to oppose with a ghastly levity everything that deserves to be taken seriously in life, the questions of nourishment, abode, spiritual diet, treatment of the sick, cleanliness, and weather"<sup>32</sup>

Apart from all of its eccentricities, Nietzsche's experimental "body criticism"<sup>33</sup> is worth for a profound reassessing, especially when we see the infinitely growing number of researches on various different scientific fields which committed themselves to work on a better understanding of the several cultural interpretations and misinterpretations of body. Much beyond the perspectives of the nineteenth century physiology<sup>34</sup>, Nietzsche improved a very hardly accessible, however generally inconsistent philosophical and ideological framework. This lets the inquirer not only to put outstandingly important questions about the body, and suggest new, unusual research fields, which gained a significant interest only in the recent decades. Nietzsche's ideas sometimes surprisingly sound like for example the newer inventions of cultural anthropology and body studies. That is why his oeuvre is also worth for several re-reads

from this bodily-based point of view which I tried to present in this paper. There is still so much in it to think about.<sup>35</sup>

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper was presented on 4 November 2009, at the "Nietzsche and the becoming of life" Conference, organized by Dr. Vanessa Lemm and the Institute of Humanities of Diego Portales University, Santiago de Chile. I would like to thank Dr. Beáta Thomka (Pécs University, Hungary), Dr. Jolán Orbán (Pécs University, Hungary), Dr. Tuomo Lahdelma (University of Jyväskylä, Finland), Dr. Tarmo Kunnas (University of Jyväskylä, Finland), Dr. Roger Griffin (Oxford Brooks University, Great Britain) for their professional assistance and the Lukács György Foundation for supporting my participation.

<sup>2</sup> Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*. Walter Kaufmann trans. (New York: Vintage Books, 1974), 34-35.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Margrit Shildrick, *Embodying the Monster. Encounters with the Vulnerable Self* (London: Sage, 2002).

<sup>4</sup> Nancy, Jean-Luc. "Corpus," Claudette Sartiliot trans. In *Thinking Bodies*. Juliet Flower MacCannell and Laura Zakarin eds. (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1994), 17-31, 17.

<sup>5</sup> Nancy, 22.

<sup>6</sup> Nancy, 21.

<sup>7</sup> Hans Belting, *Bild-Anthropologie: Entwürfe für eine Bildwissenschaft*. (München: W. Fink, 2002), 94.

<sup>8</sup> Hans Belting holds a similar view in this question on the border of cultural anthropology, anthropology of arts and visual studies as Laurence J. Kirmayer has on the interdisciplinary borderland of psychiatry and cultural anthropology, cf. Kirmayer, Laurence J. „Healing and the Invention of Metaphor: the effectiveness of symbols revisited." *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry* 17 (1993 / June): 161-95, 189.

<sup>9</sup> Body and related corporeal topics gained a significant interest on various fields of humanities in the recent decades. In 1975 the *Association of Social Anthropologists* (ASA) organized a conference on the anthropology of the body (cf. John Blacking eds., *The Anthropology of the Body*. (London: A. S. A. monograph 15, 1977). The philosophical approach behind the anthropologist's recent body studies were mostly inspired by Maurice Merleau-Ponty's *Phenomenology of Perception* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970). And then by the postcolonialists (e. g. Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White masks*. [London: Pluto, 1986.]), later by the feminists (e.g.: Donna Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. [New York: Routledge, 1991]); Elizabeth Grosz, *Volatile Bodies. Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. [Bloomington: Indiana University Press], 1994); Elizabeth Grosz, *Bodies. Space, Time and Perversion: Essays on the Politics of Bodies*. [New York: Routledge, 1995]), by the disability studies (Benedict Ingstadt and Susan R. Whyte eds., *Disability and Culture* [Berkeley: California University Press, 1995]), and by the anthropology of religion as well (e. g.: Thomas J. Csordas, *The Sacred Self. A Cultural Phenomenology of Charismatic Healing* [Berkeley and Los Angeles: California University Press, 1994]). Steven Van Wolputte provides a specific overview mainly on the period between 1990 and 2004, cf. Van Wolputte, Steven. „Hang on to Your Self: Of Bodies." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 33 (October 2004): 251-69, 252.

<sup>10</sup> Robert Gooding-Williams, *Zarathustra's Dionysian Modernism* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2001).

<sup>11</sup> Gooding-Williams, 2.

<sup>12</sup> For the concept of 'contract' as a literary act, see: Lejeune, Philippe. „Le pacte." In *Le pacte autobiographique*. (Paris: Seuil, 1975), 13-49.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Gooding-Williams, 3.

<sup>14</sup> My main source for the reinterpretation of the role of the body in modernism: Griffin, Roger. „Social Modernism in Peace and War 1880-1918." In *Modernism and Fascism: The Sense of a Beginning under Mussolini and Hitler*. (Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007) 130-59.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Gooding-Williams, 117.

<sup>16</sup> Cf.: „Denn ich bin stark genug dazu, die Geschichte der Menschheit in zwei Stücke zu zerbrechen." Friedrich Nietzsche's letter to August Strindberg. 8 December 1888, Torino.) and cf. Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things. An Archeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), 341.

- 
- <sup>17</sup> Nietzsche, Friedrich. "Philosophy During the Tragic Age of the Greeks." In *The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1911), 71-170, 73.
- <sup>18</sup> Nietzsche, "Philosophy," 74.
- <sup>19</sup> E. g. Ludwig Andreas Feuerbach, Jakob Moleschott, Ludwig Büchner and others.
- <sup>20</sup> Cf. Friedrich W. Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 19.
- <sup>21</sup> Nietzsche, "*The Birth of Tragedy*", 50.
- <sup>22</sup> Cf. Pasley, Malcolm. "Nietzsche's use of Medical Terms." In: Malcolm Pasley eds., *Nietzsche: Imagery and Thought*. (London: Methuen, 1978), 126.
- <sup>23</sup> Pasley, 126.
- <sup>24</sup> Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*. Walter Kaufmann trans. (New York: Vintage Books, 1974), 343.
- <sup>25</sup> This opinion is worth to compare with the conclusions of the above referred article of Kirmayer. Kirmayer's analysis totally independently from Nietzsche's thoughts outlines a modern interdisciplinary metaphor theory which meets with Nietzsche's views on several points: Kirmayer, 170.
- <sup>26</sup> Eric Blondel, *Nietzsche: The Body and Culture. Philosophy as a Philological Genealogy*. Seán Hand trans. (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1991), 15.
- <sup>27</sup> The presented three levels in Nietzsche's main concept of the body have some productive parallels with the medical-anthropological discourse on the body, cf. Nancy Scheper-Hughes and Margaret M. Lock's research which distincts 1. the individual, 2. the social body and the level of 3. the body politics: Scheper-Hughes, Nancy and M. Lock, Margaret. "The Mindful Body: A Prolegomenon to Future Work in Medical Anthropology." *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Mar., 1987), 6-41. Returning to the article of Laurence J. Kirmayer, these three aspects can be combined in the sphere of the metaphorization, in which the coherent narratives of the myth, the bodily-given of the archetypic, and the transitive structures of the metaphoric level work together, cf. Kirmayer, 170.
- <sup>28</sup> Friedrich Nietzsche, *Ecce Homo*. Walter Kaufmann trans. (New York: Vintage Books, 1989), 221.
- <sup>29</sup> Ricoeur, Paul. "Life in Quest of Narrative." In David Wood eds. *On Paul Ricoeur. Narrative and Interpretation*. (London, New York: Routledge, 1991), 20-33.
- <sup>30</sup> Nietzsche, Friedrich. "Twilight of the Idols." Judith Norman trans. In Aaron Ridley and Judith Norman eds. *The Anti-Christ, Ecce Homo, Twilight of the Idols, and Other Writings*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 197.
- <sup>31</sup> Nietzsche, "Ecce Homo," 265.
- <sup>32</sup> Nietzsche, "Ecce Homo," 334.
- <sup>33</sup> Cf. Barbara Maria Stafford, "Body Criticism. Imaging the Unseen in Enlightenment Art and Medicine." (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1993).
- <sup>34</sup> Cf. Brown, S. G. Richard. "Nietzsche: 'That Profound Physiologist'." In Gregory Moore and Thomas H. Brobjer eds. *Nietzsche and Science* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.)
- <sup>35</sup> Cf. Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, 81-82.