

368

in the Church

and in the Crisis of Theology and Philosophy

lv

Eugen Rosenstock- Huessy

- new
- I. The unity of health and madness as a/historical phenomenon.
 - II. The conquest of space from 1100 to 1900 :
Thomas , Cusanus, Paracelsus, Descartes.
 - III. Nietzsche 's program for the conquest of time
 - IV. Nietzsche 's masks as the price for his program
 - V. The Deification of Man in the Church
 - VI. Blasphemy and Madness, ~~as the~~ ~~Blasphemy and Madness~~
 - VII. Theology and Philosophy have changed rapiers.

I

Nietzsche is controversial. And his significance has so many facets that Charles Andler dealt with five different aspects of his work in five separate volumes. A short paper on such a historical mountain can be of value only by the severity of its discipline and method. I shall, therefore, not speak of Nietzsche's place in the history of German thinking, in the crisis of Humanism in the narrower sense of its worship of Greek and Roman antiquity, nor even of his place in the decline of Europe, or in the evolution of biography.

My topic is Nietzsche's function in the Church and in the crisis of theology and philosophy.

I shall not deal with origins and developments of his single notions or ideas; on the contrary, I shall credit him with his achievement in its most mature and final form.

In a first part, we shall set off his task against the ~~XXXX~~ ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ success of the West, during the last eight hundred years, to master nature scientifically. In a second, we shall see him propose a new method to conquer man, by a new method.

When we have our ~~own~~ vision sharpened by the contrast, we will be able to see to what extent he himself became the victim of the period ~~which~~ the end of which he anticipated. That he had at his disposal the tools and instruments of an age to which he himself no longer belonged, led to the tragedy of his mind. We shall not ~~divide~~ divide him up into the healthy and the mad Nietzsche. Both, health and insanity, to me, are indissolubly one and the same historical phenomenon. Through Nietzsche, madness has become a category of history. Whether he contracted his insanity by contagion, or whether he went mad, from social and intellectual influences, will never be decided. However, I hope to make it clear that even an externally contracted illness should still ~~to be~~ be considered as something which he put in the service of humanity.

The world may sneer at such an assumption; historians of the Church hardly can react in this manner. If the gallows could become the foundation of the Church, it would be more than pharisean to put a bane on the transfiguration of ~~into~~ madness. It, too, is a part of God's creation. And the sacrifice of the mind would belong into the history of sacrifices. And is not, by and large, the history of the Church the history of sacrifices?

Of course, to introduce such an unheard-off form of sacrifice, ~~must~~ ^{should} sound scandalous to many ears- not so much of pious souls as of clever minds. And so, in a last part, we shall place Nietzsche face to face with the intellectual/ty of theologians and philosophers. We shall try to explain why both, theology and philosophy, have "changed rapiers," in the scuffling, like Hamlet and ~~Escherich~~, ~~in the~~ ^{similarly to the duel between} ~~the~~ ^{on one side} monster, genius, child, decadent, imbecile, heroic, Friedrich Nietzsche, and his ~~time~~, the period before the two World Wars, ^{on the other} recognizing themselves in the light of this duel, neither theology nor philosophy can carry on as they did before,

II

Let me begin with the well known story of the two English pilots who were seen in a New York Night Club furtively exchanging glances at two o'clock a. m. They were asked which secret they had; blushing, the younger man replied: "Oh nothing; only 24 hours ago, we were over Essen."

This story is circulated under the slogan: the annihilation of space. If we wish to gain perspective for Nietzsche, the best manner of doing it is to compare the annihilation of ~~time~~ ^{space} with his great task: The annihilation of time. I propose to enlarge on this contrast until some very simple contour lines can be seen. My first obligation, in preparing this comparison, is, of course, to remind you of some fundamental historical events the chain of which made possible the conquest or annihilation of space which we witness today.

How long did it take to conquer space? From the invention of wheel and barge, the history of technical civilization may seem to be one continuum. For the sake of simplification, however, it is more adequate to focus attention on that moment from which downward to us the annihilation of space ceased to be an accident. There is a certain epoch when the conquest became the universal dream and therefore the common reality of Western Man.

Now, ~~to~~ the dream, program, planning, belong to this undertaking as much as the calculations of later physics and the applications of the latest technology. And so it is fair to say that the task of conquering space was exalted into a task of religious, political and human significance, in the eleventh century of our era. In 1048, to employ one example, the party of Reform in the Church declared that the Church could not be renovated unless the pope would be elected by all the bishops of the orb in one common conclave or election. Their vision conceived the whole earth as one constituency.

I prefer this example to the Crusades, to the organisation of the Curia, ~~XXXXXX~~ Romana, etc., because the ideal of the whole earth as one constituency has not come true even today. The Italians still form one half of the conclave. All the more may we appreciate the immensity of the conception, at that time.

With such hopes for the salvation of mankind, the means of conquering space could no longer be left to accident or individual luck. The West began to inquire into the conditions for the conquest of matter. And whereas the technical steps came so much later as when the Crusader Christopher ~~de~~ Columbus landed in America, yet, was the conquest organised in the time of the Crusades. *)

The theologians and philosophers discovered the premises on which the world of space might be united. I shall restrict myself to a small number of attributes which we ~~must~~ ^{had to} "attribute" to space if it should become conquerable.

*) More material on this interest in the orbis, space, which befell the Churchmen, is gathered in "Out of Revolution", Autobiography of Western Man, New York 1938, 531ff.

I shall name four; ^{which} ~~and~~ were contributed by Thomas Aquinas, Nicolaus von Cues, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~, Theophrastus von Hohenheim (Paracelsus), and Descartes .

Thomas showed that space had to be accepted as being One , and Single, if it should obey any organisation by sciences. Nicolaus Cusanus saw that the exploration of space depended on a clear notion of the infinite, not just the indefinite. This requires some explanation. The modern model of the atom is, as you might know, a solar system in a nutshell. The infinitesimal small and the infinitesimal big have become interchangeable in our experiments and our thoughts; ~~xxx~~ mathematics is ~~xxxx~~ an analogical science of smallness and bigness. Before Cusanus, the identity of big and small parts of space was not basic; ~~xxx~~ typical was a reasoning which gave the pope ^a/thousandfold more splendor than the emperor because the sun was many thousand times bigger than the moon. *) We are unfair if this way of thinking strikes us as naive. The relative equality of all bodies, big and small, rests on the notion of an infinity of space, in the same manner as the equality between human beings, big and little, vanishes if man is not made in the image of God's infinity. The infinite created ^{relative} equality among the finite : this ^{was} its unestimable fruitfulness ^{**} ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

Two further ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ "Attributes to space" ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ were needed if space should yield its secrets. They were conditions on the side of the conquerors of space. They had to submerge any enmity or rivalry or subjectivity into a solidarity of purpose all over the globe.

*) Jean Bodin still used this method of reasoning, "Out of Rev." p. 545 f.

**) Cusanus, De Docta Ignorantia, ~~xxx~~ which was written from December 1439 to February 1440. ~~The~~ thought runs through all three books. Best edition ~~the~~ by Klibansky.

Before they did not speak, in their data, in the name of the whole earth, their data were still pre-scientific. Einstein, in our days, has formulated this solidarity of the observers, for his special field. "The observer", is an abstraction in which distances on our earth are deliberately overlooked. It does not seem to be known that the solidarity of the observers in any part of the globe was the vital idea of Hohenheim and of the 16th ^{over} century, with its correspondants for the ^{new} (academies, *) from all the earth.

The fourth step was the extrapolation of this "observer" from the space so observed. This step was taken by Descartes. The observing mind has not any extension in space, no sentimental ties to the objects observed in this space. On the other hand, all objects which can be observed are treated as though they were extended and in space. The radical emancipation of subject mind, and object ~~XXXXXXXX~~ body, was Descartes' feat. How unnatural this ~~XXXXXXXX~~ separation is, becomes clear when you will remember that the very word 'body' originated with human beings and later was attributed to the stars who were imagined as living ~~xxx~~ souls with bodies. Only after 1600, has the term body come to mean a physical body, a corpse, first, and a living body, a Corpus, secondarily only.

These ~~four~~ notions : 1. Oneness of the world of space, singleness of "Nature" or "World", 2. infinity as a basis for the equality of all bodies, 3. solidarity of all scientists all over the earth/ and 4. the extrapolation of these observing minds qua minds from the observed world of bodies, were not in existence in 1048. They

*) Theophrastus von Hohenheim, ¹⁶⁰⁸ Paracelsus, Werke (ed. Sudhoff 11, (1928), 26ff. English translation of the main passage in my A Classic and a Founder (1937) p. 24ff. Hohenheim wrote this in 1537.

came into existence in history. ^{the} And they are as you know, under attack today as wholly uncertain, ambiguous, and dubious. Bertrand Russell assures us that Nature is not One. Thomas Aquinas knew this as well as Lord Russell, and wrote: "A plurality of worlds can be supposed by those who do not posit some ordering wisdom as the cause of the world and assume it to be the result of an accident."*) ~~XXXXXX~~ Since the scientists behave as emancipated from metaphysics, the plurality of worlds ^{again become a} is a more correct assumption; the unity of Nature ^{had been the Farly sical} ~~was a scientific~~ postulate.

Similarly, space is admittedly indefinite, but its infinity is under great suspicion again.

^{also,} The solidarity of all observing minds is under violent attack from Bolsheviks, for economics, and from Nazis, for mathematics.

And the separation of mind and body may still be believed by specialists, or theologians. The general public has abolished the dualism as ^{the} nonsense, which it is, and which the Body of Christ with its belief in incarnation it always knew to be.

This survey shows that unity and infinity of Nature or space collapse with their theological basis, the faith in God. And solidarity and extramundane nature of the mind collapses with our faith in the unity of Man, before our eyes.

This is only to show that we live today in the afterglow of this ^{the people's} ~~mythological~~ creation of a natural science which originated with ~~man's~~ faith in God and Man. The majority of scientists became ignorant of their own foundations, ignorant of the fact that the foundations of any science of nature, of bodies or space, ~~cannot~~ never be scientific themselves. Is the premise of anything ever in the nature of this thing? The baby is a complete being, yet it cannot do the one thing on which its own existence depends: mating. Similarly, the one thing, ~~xxxx~~ science cannot ^{the people} ~~xxxxxxx~~ do for itself, is the creative love between God and ~~man~~ so that they should believe in a lawful universe and should think it worthwhile to pay scientists for exploring its laws in particular, should believe in ~~xxxx~~ the minds of men as being capable of solidarity, should juggle with big and small in one mathematics of the infinite.....

*) Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae ~~ix~~ I, 47,3 Respondeo (Ottawa edition 302b)

At last, these undemonstrable things are the premises for the continuous process of scientific research. Before this process could start, the people had to be filled with faith in the unity of all science, the unity of all scientists, the unity of all bodies, the unity of space.

It is true that these undemonstrabilities become ^{very} so much our second nature; ^{and in the joyful tumult of this anything} that a few years ago, the notorious but important book by Lewis, "Time and Western Man" could appear. It might have borne the title: "Time be Damned; Space suffices for us." It was a psalm to Western Man as he inhabits his self-made space unshaken and unshakably, and laughs at time.

Then this vain self-glorification ^{of Western Man} was printed, Nietzsche's precedent had forced all ^{the} serious mind all over the West to take up a new line of thought, pointing at the conquest of time.

"Time has become the topic of all serious thinking in our days.*)"

*) I only list three names: Bergson, Rosenzweig, Heidegger, ~~Reich~~ ^{Raus} Recommendable ~~was in the line~~, Karl Loewith, Temporality and Eternity, Philosophy and Phenomenological Research III(1942), 53 ff. who treats Heidegger and Rosenzweig. He does ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ ignore and yet feign to understand the Christian position, ~~its~~ proceeding from eternity into time, and he does overlook that time cannot be known in the manner of space, but must be "existed": Nisi esset anima, non esset tempus! Loewith thinks that time can be an object or topic of discussion without doing something about it. Nietzsche, of course, holds this Christian position, without however defining it clearly since his components, the Jewish and the Pagan, first had to become existent, in Rosenzweig and Heidegger, before discussion is possible. ^{Discussion, after all, presupposes clear points.}

III. Conquest of time.

Nietzsche began to conceive of the next great venture of humanity, the annihilation of time. His remark no longer is untimely. ^{To prove this,} I might read out a long list beginning with ~~mind you of~~ Henry Adams who challenged the American historians to look out for a mastery of time, in the approaching catastrophe of speed, i. e. of progress overdone. However, I shall rest my case after ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ one ^{more} ~~single~~ ~~xxxxxx~~ suggestion. Go and see Thornton Wilder's play "The Skin of Our Teeth", In Nietzsche's vein, Wilder treats time as annihilated. The hero, Mr. Anthrobus, lives in all ages at the same time. He is in the ice age and in Mr. Hitler's contemporary, he is Chesterton's Man Everlasting, but ~~has~~ the power of knowing ^{this} it, too, and disposing of all times.

You will think this ^{crazy.} ~~funny~~. ^{and, it is true, although But is it as simple as this?} We do not burn witches today as when space was conquered, ^{do I mean pronounce} ~~We~~ declare the adventurer of ^a the new idea ~~chapter in the deification of Man,~~ a lunatic and force a nervous breakdown upon him. Then, he is discredited. The witches whom we burned ~~take~~ a terrible vengeance today: their offspring are our psychiatrists and psychologists who triumphantly declare insane anybody who still believes in God or Devil, in growth and miracles, in creation. ^{invokes a new chapter in the deification of Man. He} N. knew that he would be called a fool and

a madman because he chose to blend eternity and time in ecstasy and to start from the Dionysian experience before he would coolly and scientifically analyze this very same experience. Emotion made him inventive about the ways ^{on which} man may experience time.¹⁾ He simply applied the old Aristotelian rule : Nisi esset anima, non esset tempus. Any expert on time, then, had to give the reins to the ^{anima,} soul, first before time could become real and analyzable at all. Nietzsche makes the ecstasies of Jesus scientifically respectable, and he calls this aspect of Christ, the Dionysian experience.

That this ^{aspect of Christ should come to the fore} ~~experience~~ in our times must be universalized, has practical as well as theoretical reasons. Wilder's play is called, "By The Skin of Our Teeth", from Job, because it is crucial for us to become the masters of time. ^{of our} ~~or~~ we cannot ^{master} ~~escape~~ the ^{which is provoked by the speed with which our own tools of living run away with us} present catastrophe. But if the Conquest of Time is understood

to be meant as the only escape from the firetrap of the present ~~XXXXXXXX~~ necessity of a conflagration, the ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ of Nietzsche becomes clear. There is no frivolity or arbitrariness in his ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ undertaking. *He came in the nick of Time*

Conquerors of time can do little or nothing with the four principles which Thomas, Cusanus, Paracelsus, Descartes had ~~xxxx~~ made the scientists believe. Let us take up one after another.

1) Beautifully said by Charles Lindber, vol. II, p. II f.

Nietzsche agrees with Thomas that the laws of Nature are the shadows of God in our thinking.¹⁾ Since the "God of Nature" ~~exists~~, this space-phantom of Anselm : God as the biggest thing which can be imagined, is ridiculous to Nietzsche as it probably is for you, ^{as historians} ~~this time~~ ^{of times} explorer only knows of the God in ~~man's~~ ^{man's} bosom. But God in our own bosom ^{is God} ~~exists~~ in his pre-legal state, not as law but as legislator. As a result, new laws can be given any minute. Man is the one who abolishes the laws of nature. And is this not simply true through history?²⁾ What else is history but the giving of new laws which later on become our second nature.²⁾ Man, therefore is divine because he abolishes the laws of nature. He decided not to marry his mother, not to kill his father. If you give a moment of thought to the most unnatural character of our incest rules, you will see that a ^{conqueror of time} ~~man who wishes to live in~~ the stone age and in the future, at the same time, must press the point of the ^{fleeting} ~~accidental~~ character of natural laws. ^{The good and evil of any} ~~one of time~~

Point two: infinity.

A Jesuit, in a book published

1) George Morgan, What Nietzsche Means 1941, p. 282

2) "illud omnibus, quae capitis possint, majus." Anselm, ~~liberproinspicite~~ ~~Prologion~~ ~~caput~~ ~~et~~ ~~passim~~. It is noticeable that in his first state ment, Anselm alleviated the shock by speaking to God directly about his his grandeur: ~~Prologion~~ ^{III and passim.}

four years ago,^{π)} emphasized that geology and prehistory may well make us dizzy with regard to time as Copernicus did with regard to space. These millions of years make the event in the little corner of Palestine in the midst of time look pretty shadowy.

From 6000 years, man's history has increased immeasurably. ^{Personally} I ~~am~~ ^{happened}

to be a complete unbeliever in the ^{play with colossal} ~~new large~~ ^{recommended to} figures ^{given us} *) for

this history. However, I do admit that these ^{millions of years} are the lunatic fringe

around ^{irresponsible} ~~an~~ new feeling for vast time spans, thousands of years. Not

in objective figures but in our subjective feeling, ^a ~~the~~ change ^{does}

take place. While we may have learned to keep our equilibrium

in the vastness of space, we have not yet learned what discipline

"millions of years" may impose on us. Nietzsche scents that to

think of those time spans, will take a much more ascetic discipline.

The matters of Man must cease to be, in Cotton Mather's

phrase, the matters of one age, "res unius aetatis." Space-thinking

makes time at best a fourth dimension of space, and so time has

only the one dimension of the immediate present, of this generation

and it may be called "monogenic," ^{chronic} ^{of one time} Nietzsche invites us to think

in "polygenic," ^{chronic} through many generations.

*) I have always held that the oldest date of history was not before 2778, and I am delighted to find that H. E. Winlock has

→ H. von Balthasar, Die apokalypse der deutschen Seele III (1939), 435 ff.

For this purpose, we have to imagine time as infinite. Otherwise, our little life, one man's biography, and the life of the ages, can not be squared. If Jesus, a man who walked in the public eye for three years, and the ^{endless} history of mankind, shall be ~~incommen-~~surable, the infinitesimal small and the infinitesimal big ~~XXXXXX~~ chunks of time must behave identically. Biography of the individual and history of the race must reflect the same laws.

As a result of this new interest, space may become finite with Nietzsche and with modern science; time takes over the quality of infinity.

3. So, Thomas and the Cusanus ~~are~~ ^{being} superseded. what about the solidarity of the ~~XXXXXX~~ observers, all over the globe? It is emphatically denied. Each man, in his lusting for power, construes the world from his own center, with a peculiar perspective. No two pairs of eyes see alike.***) To measure is already to use our own power. If this ~~surprises you~~, this denial of an identity of perspective ^{shocks you}, you have only to compare Paracelsus' starting point with the one ^{of} Nietzsche, and you will understand. ~~XXXXXX~~ Hoffenheim certainly knew of the fight for survival far more from experience than Nietzsche. However, he defined research for doctors trying to help their patients all over the globe. The so-called objective standards of our natural sciences were developed in the refinement of the ~~so-called~~ professions. Now professional service means that a man deliberately foregoes his immediate own will to power in the service of his patient, client, pupil, etc.
***) George Morgan, What Nietzsche Means p. 282 with ample references.

*) continuation from p. 11:

proven the shorter era (2773 B. C.) in his magnificent study The origin of the Ancient Egyptian Calendar, Proc. American Philos. Soc. 83(1940), 447-464. Simultaneously, Sidney Smith in 1940, following Thureau-Dangin's publication in the Revue 'd' Assyriologie 34(1937), reduced the Mesopotamian chronology, thereby correcting the current as f. i. used in the Cambridge History. It is disappointing to see theologians now cater to the public by bowing before the endless dates of science. They certainly have forgotten to ~~see~~ ^{see} the ~~representatives of eternity within an hour.~~

Nietzsche starts from the opposite end. He bewails the specialist attitude which the better it is may save the idiot, the decadent, the weak, by their very services, and may lose sight of the norm, the strong, the healthy. All the professions make sense by having their members abdicate in the service of somebody else. Nietzsche is concerned with this somebody else. He protests against pushing this somebody else into a dark corner. ~~That~~ This is the goal of creation, is the right kind of man, the man whom the specialists serve, but who is at his best when he does not need them.

How can he have identity of perspective with anybody else since God moves him to new shores? Is not God eternally original? But Nietzsche makes up for this destruction by giving ~~xxxx~~ his hero solidarity through the ages. He may not ^{overstep at the moment} ~~xxxxxxx~~ be-
cause ~~we~~ ^{he} must have all times equally vigorous ~~at all times~~.

Nietzsche wishes us to possess the whole course of time in its total ~~xxxxxx~~ immeasurable extension. Not only shall the whole future be *ours*; the whole successive process in its plenitude shall be carried over into the new realm.

This solidarity with all times is abhorrent to the product of our education. History ^(-m. Aug) ~~has~~, by its scientific turn, ~~base-~~strangled the young from the past. "I am a senior in College, in 1940; I think that the boys of the class of 1917 were fooled; And with this conviction that I am far beyond them, I shall concern myself with a man who died in 428 A. D. (St. Augustine, that is)? Why?" This is neatly put the wisdom of the century of progress, from a genuine student's paper. Ours is a mentality of contemporaries. We rely on simultaneity with the current events and the spirit of the times. At the same ^{time} all men try to think the same or at least to argue about the same even though they may split on its Yes or No. Against this immersion into one's own time, Nietzsche reacts violently by proposing solidarity with men not of our time.

1) Όσους βασιλεύουν, ἀναπαύσεται

The kings or rulers of all ages have solidarity. Those who acquire power, can recognize each other in a realm of peace.

This ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ implies that human solidarity cannot be based on the concepts and thoughts of ~~the~~ minds. For, the mental process proceeds and changes incessantly. Concepts are for contemporaries, and conceptual agreements between Plato and the Platonists through the ages, do not really connect Plato with the correspondingly powerful thinker of another age, do not link men of the same rank through the ages. Hence, Nietzsche ~~ignores~~ ^{recognizes} his own disciples.

He asks for a relation with men of his rank. These will have to deny his concepts simply in order to be of his rank.

You see Nietzsche apply this
This is the ~~XXXXXXXX~~ cerebral, intellectual ^{the principle} application of the "Love thine enemies" which ^{the} offers a new degree of integration and of vitality by creating higher contradictions, and the Church who accepted the command of the love of the enemy, and later founded the occidental universities on the principle of having two men teach in the same place on the same topic opposing opinions, may simply take stock of this further application of her old vitalizing principle, by Nietzsche.

If mentality can't serve as mortar in binding the men of all times together, some other tie must be developed. The legislator is connected with any other legislator through the sufferings of the change which he wills. This power to legislate Nietzsche calls superhuman. Nietzsche proclaims the superman who can legislate, abolish some allegedly cosmic law according to which people were divided into good and evil ones. The legislator is, by necessity, beyond the good and evil of the existing order. When Moses crushed the first two tables and was offered a better nation than Israel for a new start, he certainly was beyond his own good, ^{the} identity with Israel.

Nietzsche's immoralism is meant on this level of Moses' legislative choice. One minute before the promulgation of the new law, the legislator is outside the old good and evil and outside the new division as well. Man lives between two ethics.

This "outside" is Zarathustra, is the Dionysian ecstasy, is the tragedy of any hero of humanity.

If the power to forfeit contemporaneity is the feature of the valuable man, it may be permitted to coin a special term for it. I have proposed and used the term "distemporaneity" for it. It is not a Nietzschean term.

The term "distemporary," however, marks the progress made in our dealing with "time", on the basis of Nietzsche's pioneering. For Nietzsche, this power meant divinity, and ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXX~~
~~XXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ he hoped to see the time ~~de~~ when anybody and everybody would confess with Theages in Plato(126A) that he wished to be a God.

For those who
trust inwardly,
the invisible soul
enters its minds
and bodies,
and the difference
between mind
and body becomes
zero.

[illegible]

~~The insanity of the much quoted mens sana in corpore sano~~
is obvious to him, and the division between body and mind is
left behind; but with it, the unity of the scientific mind, too.

None

~~Let us stop here~~ since the steps of natural science and of a future
"time" science" are ~~now~~ comparable. Thomas, Cusanus, Hohenheim,
Descartes, ~~had~~ said: unity and singleness of space; infinity;
identity of all observers; opposition of subject mind and object
body, or, more precisely, one universal mind ^{in whom} all minds share
~~of~~ the universe.

Against every one of these great stratagems for the domination of space, Nietzsche turned: No two spaces are alike; space is finite; every observer has another perspective; man does not gain significance by ruling the bodies of space, a bodyless mind, but by incarnating his divine, everlasting power into mind and body.

This comparison may help to show the reasonableness of his program for something neither Thomas nor Descartes had dreamt of. On the other hand, we must hasten to stress the utter unfairness of this comparison.

On one side we have nine hundred years from Berengar of Tours to whom for the first time, the world of space broke away from the mental sphere, down to Dewey and Einstein, and on the other hand one man, and one man only, preparing a new start into an altogether new direction.

This does not make the comparison meaningless because the very principle of infinity allows to see in Nietzsche's ten years of new science the seed of a millennium as long and as fruitful as that which started with Berengar and Anselm's theism.

If not meaningless, ^{an} the comparison ^{reveals} stresses the inevitable tragedy. Long and well established forms of thought are merciless to embryonic beginnings. They will always declare that the embryo comes "too early". They made Nietzsche into a "posthumous" man. "May the living forgive me if at times they seem to me shadows", he exclaimed.

Of his distemporaninity, he was acutely conscious. The decadence of European nationalism, the catastrophe of a war between Germany and the rest of the world, the abolition of Christianity by Germany, the witches sabbath of all free and merely free thinkers, ^{would have} ~~had~~ to precede his day, the day of Zarathustra. Anybody trying to line up with him, ^{earlier} was bound to misread him since he would not be steeped in the same dread of a complete catastrophe, before the world would come to its senses. The Foerster-Nietzsche's, the Oehlers, the Andlers ~~xxxxxx~~ and the Brintons, fill this "in-between" time which does not believe in prophecy, neither in his prophecy nor in prophecy in general, least of all the Church. Nobody, except Nietzsche and Jehovah's Witnesses, believed in an immediate end of the world, during the last sixty years.

While Schweitzer and ~~xxxxxx~~ Dodd labored to ~~restate~~ ^{redefine} the belief of early Christianity in an end of the world, and

called the foundation of the Church by the technical term: "Eschatology Realized," Nietzsche simply lived this faith in the end of his world, and realized ^{of} eschatology. And much as a sober reasoning about the Church became possible only after the fall of Jerusalem, the Crisis of the West from 1905 to our days of 1942 was needed before we can talk business on Nietzsche.

There were no ~~followers~~ of Nietzsche, in the mean time, but only preparers of his proper function. This proper function is the establishment of distemporaninity within a society gone mad with contemporaninity. Nietzsche was the first medicine man for the Great Society of all mankind. Since he came seventy years before society was forced to become One, he had to prepare the new office in an impractical, a mad, manner. However, if ever mankind should ~~economize~~ economize its forces for unity, it seems obvious to me that she will need some such office as all old tribes retained, in a form of inspirer and guardian, ~~as~~ carrier of all the spiritual germs as well as immunities, by which groups can survive. The medicine man, the man who forces distemporary elements into the fabric of current events, will have an indispensable, though untimely function.

We were unfair to Nietzsche because of the time ^{disparity} elements involved. We shall not commit the greater unfairness of using his nomenclature which was wholly dependent on his environment and his opponents. For instance, he keeps the singleness of the world, and of nature ~~7~~ - I counted more than 370 places in which the two terms are used, and in the singular always - although he has no right to this inheritance from theism; on the other hand, he nowhere discusses the singular M A N, in his relation to the plural M E N. His term "Life" is the go-between, so to speak, between the space-singular, "Nature" or World or Space itself, and the ~~vision which he has of One M A N~~, through the ages. All the time must he make use of the terminology and language of the centuries which he attacks. ✓

A nowhere articulated Singular of

such a time.
✓ "Life" ^{is} a Singular
like "World", ^{one in rel.} and alive
like Men, a big misleading
compromise.

of universal
medicine man

between the work of
one millennium and
his one life.

For our mental health, and our power to speak, we depend on collaboration and fellowship, and Nietzsche knew it. His mind died, so to speak, from blood poisoning, having to use all the tired phrases which his contemporaries would understand in their own frame of reference. As George Morgan in his careful study *What N. Means*, says: "Nietzsche uses 'truth' like many of his terms, in two senses, an old one which he denies, and a new one which he affirms. " *)

Because of this constant ambiguity, probably

/I never was attracted by Nietzsche's works, his trustworthiness comes from his placing himself between two eras, and allowing us today to chart our course perhaps in time to escape from the fate of the European continent, ^{warned} by his pyre.

I shall only give two examples of his predicament because they are of practical importance for our own ^{situation} work. The one is the choice of his title: Thus Spoke Zarathustra. In one way, it was a stroke of genius. Before Plato and Socrates, here was a legislator, singer, seer, ignorant of the divisions we make between science, religion, law, politics, music, poetry. *) The choice was the best under the circumstances. #)

And yet, it was a mask and led to the first threatening split of personality as described by N. himself

Um Mitternacht, Aus Eins da wurden zwei

Und Zarathustra ging an mir vorbei.

Here is the mask, the mask which is followed by another and again another mask, the masks which haunt the primeval tribesmen whose dances Nietzsche invoked, the mask which makes man unable to become himself. believed and

Theism/knew that ~~xxxxxx~~ the world is one only if God has created it. Nietzsche did not ~~xxxxxx~~ know, but he believed all his life that man is one only if God loves him. When he destroyed his ^{intellectual} access to his own belief, (that man becomes a person because *) Harvard University Press 1941, p. 50

**) I share Brinton's feelings on this point:

**) The picture ~~xxxxxx~~ of Zarathustra entertained by N. and still by Soederblom, is very distorted. Johann Hertel is the best guide, now. Note especially that the Persians had no philosophy of history. What Soederblom and N. considered to be old, came into existence a thousand years later, under Christian influence. Nietzsche's thesis is expressed in "Werke" XV, 303:

Zarathustra, posthumous fragment § 117.

he ~~is~~ loved,) he came under the curse of his own time which thought of man as divine because he had a mind. This curse, born by lesser souls, killed him since he was out to prove that the mind did not make the person or the man. He shouted that mind does not make for unity. The proof offered by him did not miscarry. I think he proved his point, but the many masks under which he tried to prove it, drove him into the abyss of madness. ~~my 9~~

The second example is his attack on Platonism. He wished to uproot the theistic aspect of God according to which he ~~was~~ ^{and best} a first cause, the prime mover, the ~~biggest~~ ^{biggest} of all, and replace it by the eternal divinity of which men are the times. He might have said -but he never did- that men are times. He did, however, once say that the human soul was a harp, with a unique melody. However this may be, he lived at a time when Western Man screened themselves carefully ~~against~~ ^{against} the unity of their fate from 1100 to 1900, from the Crusades to Einstein, by playing up the ~~reception of Plato as the origin of modern science~~ ^{the conflict of Aristotle and Plato}. Our mental home is papered with Aristotle when we should say Thomas, and with Plato when we should say Descartes or Cusanus or Kant. Nietzsche had to kill the Platonic aspect of Christianity, in its second millennium*) ^{the conflict of Aristotle and Plato}. Most of the time, *) "Résolu à défricher le sol à jamais de tout foisonnement de Platonism, il en extrêpe notamment la souche la plus souterraine et résistante, la croyance Chrétienne." Charles Andler, Nietzsche I, p. 11.

and he talked of Socrates with such violence when in fact he wished to lead the road from the second thousand years of our era forward to a possible third ~~xxx~~ lease on life, for mankind, under the Cross. Seemingly pushing us backward from Socrates to Dionysos, he actually opened a door from the desolation of Grover/Whalens World's Fair into a new inspiration.

*) E. O.'Brien, "Son of Morning", 1932, has rightly shown that N.' masks were as mad in 1872 as in 1888. Cosima's ~~Amphix~~

husband Buelow called himself Theseus, and spoke of her as Ariadne; Wagner being Dionysos. Poor N. is so impotent that he ~~fancied~~ ^{what} himself as Dionysos, Wagner as Theseus; a satire.

and he also is one of his last diaries gotten down: "Reputation of God. Reputation is only the moral God." In other words, he knew at brain intervals, that the God of Plato and Aristotle was the adversary, not the living God of Job and Jesus.

~~borrowed from Bülau!~~ and fancied himself as Dionysos, Wagner as Theseus; a satire.

- there are some other moments- he is convinced that The God of Christianity was the Platonic God. He never realized that the whole trinity ~~xxxxxxxx~~ campaign was a victory over Plato and Aristotle, and that Christianity can survive in a complete divorce from humanism, that this indeed is its ~~eternal~~ ^{above} hope of survival. ¹⁴

greek paganism

But ^{SI} since the Occident had discovered the world of space with the help of Porphyrius, ~~xxxxx~~ Seneca, Cicero, Aristotle, Plato, in this order (which means in an order opposite to historical sequence) , Nietzsche leaned over the raft of Christianity ^{above} into the flood of time. ^{he} ~~and saw~~ the pre-platonic world ^{of Dionysos} ~~as equally~~ well equipped to analogize and illuminate the life of Man deified. *He found in him a better analogy than in Plato, he found that Man wished not to be rational like Socrates, but to be deified.*

V. The Deification.

Is the Church attacked when Man is deified? The deification of Man was the ~~explicit~~ ^{purpose} of the Church of the Saints. *) With the Historical Reality of this Church of the Redeemed Nietzsche nowhere comes to grips. Those giants and sons of God are simply unknown to him; how unknown , shows his ~~indign~~ ^{ignoble} rage against Paul . Here ^{he} is trapped by the indescribable stupidity of his contemporaries, especially Overbeck. He never asked himself the simple question how it came that he, Nietzsche , was able to rival Jesus, to destroy Plato, to enthrone Dionysos. All three acts , he owed to Paul, and one might almost feel tempted *) "The Godhead , the principle of deification by which those who shall become Gods, do become Gods." Pseudo~~isidore~~ Dionysios, the Areopagite, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia Cap. I., # 4, Migne, Patrologia Graeca, III, 375.

Strange

as the abuse of
into the old T

by humanism

I often think that he simply picks up a strand left

When Cusanus speaks of the vision of God, he stresses

ness and succession may well coexist. Once the human condition is understood, the way is clear. ³⁾ One and the same problem.

2) Nicholas of Cusa, *The Vision of God*, J. M. Dent 1928, p. 51

4) Thomas, Summa Theologiae I, quaestio 13 Art. XI.

**) On the history of these Platonic errors, F. Rosenzweig,

- Kleinere Schriften, 1937, pp.182 to 198.

We Christians should have given more thought to this before. But the resuscitation of the writings of the Fathers can only bring life. So much about the Church of Man Deified, of the Redeemed.

VI Blasphemy and Phronesis

or
Theology and Philosophy change means

*Capitulum before
the work.*

Obviously, Nietzsche is completely irreconcilable with standardized theology and philosophy. "Theology has choked God", he exclaims. And philosophy has evaporated the world. To both, something irrevocable has happened which divides their existence into pre-Nietzschean and post-Nietzschean.

In a majority of cases Theology today is the science of somebody else's God. It is Philosophy and History and Psychology of Religion. In the Divinity School at which I taught, there was one single man who did not prefer his standing in the Department of either History or Philosophy ~~or Literature~~, to his rank in Divinity. *In 1907* These men wished to be scholars, and you can't be a scholar with an ordered route. The topic of the modern scholar may be circumscribed as New or Old Testament or Church History. ~~But not his judgments anticipated.~~ *in his material must be left free.* Practically, this is what has happened. Theology is the logic of some "objective" concept of God, as found in Church or Bible or all the World Religions. Which means that God is absent, and the one quality of God which made theology in the last thousand years possible, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ his omnipresence, is incompatible with the new critical attitude. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Anselm of Canterbury knew that his theistic speculation was a makeshift for the time in which God forsook him; his dialectics were based on a theory of ~~God forsakenness~~ *personal*; this means, it presupposed fuller moments in the life of the theologian where he was full to the brim of the Divine Life. *) The *relative* emptiness of the theological state is forgotten; ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Prof. ~~Smith~~ *or 4* thinks that when he speculates, he is nearer to God than in any other state. *) Monologion, Caput I.

*To me this is blasphemy and
madness.*

In our midst

God now belongs to the world ^{of things} which can be discussed. Reasonably, we may speak of God as long his name remains a power in our personal survival, and not one minute longer. The rest is philosophy. The theologians belong today to Philosophy, and its departments, with the special connotation that their worldly material is Bible, Creed, Church etc. of the so-called Christians and Jews. Christianity is the subject matter of theology, nothing more.

~~XX~~
~~XX~~

Now, in a parallel movement, philosophy has outgrown the condition of its existence. Which is this condition? That the philosopher, being faced by Chaos, suffered from the irrational character of the universe, and in this suffering, he emerged with the pearl from the bottom of the sea which immersed most minds, and put sense into this Chaos. The philosopher was important for the world. He was a special case of mind, unnaturally troubled with by Chaos.

This effort has spent itself. The philosophy of common sense has seen to this. The world is seen by everybody alike, The Pragmatists tell us that the mind is a tool, an instrument to satisfy the common man. Everybody can understand the world, nobody is driven crazy by its abnormality. The World is justified beforehand. It is believed in, as divine and orderly. Philosophy has become a theology of the good, true, beautiful world. Common sense philosophy is theology. ~~And~~ Theologians ceased to follow the rules of their game when they began to speak of other people's Gods. Philosophers ceased to function when they began to speak of everybody's world. Without The "God, My God, why hath thou forsaken me", over the theologian's desk, and without the parallel inscription: "The World is out of joint," over the philosopher's headquarters, the two sciences as we have known them, disappear. "As if some lesser God had made the world and had not force to shape it as he would," now becomes the watchword for the theologian; and for the world, we get the deistic blasphemy of Browning: "God's in his heaven- All's right with the world!" Is it not strange that Tennyson and Robert Browning should have written the epitaphs for these ^{heroic} ~~pair of~~ ^{since} twins, ~~but~~ degraded to a philosophy of "religion" and a theology of the world as it is?

VII

There can be no theology without the risk of blasphemy and there can be no philosophy without the risk of madness.

Philosophers and theologians will not see this connection; Nietzsche took its burden upon himself.

Nobody ever achieved anything in theology or philosophy without this risk. What made Jonathan Edwards into a great theologian if not that by his revivals, he had come more than near to blasphemy?

And William James; all his life, insanity and madness tempted this greatest of American secular thinkers.

They were not so secure as the moderns who discuss finite Gods and finite spaces. And where do these same people go mad? about their college team, and about railroad bonds and about themselves. Where a man sees red, you know his God. Its usually he himself. Without desecration, no consecration.*)

Fear of

fear of

/Blasphemy because God is treated as absent, and/madness because the world is a labyrinth which offers no orientation, are the reasons for the existence of the special activities, called theology and philosophy. In his time, Nietzsche was the only man who knew both these truths, and he suspended them over his life as well as his thought, as stars and judges.

If you wish to judge him, judge him in their light.

*) Nietzsche, Werke 16, 170

"God is not absent from my speech; and I am not unimportant for the orientation of the world", he tried to say at a moment when people loved to assert: I am just a human being, that is when they withdrew from God and World, by this very expression, ~~then~~ they gave up to be the dator legis.

"Nicht nur die Vernunft von Jahrtausenden, auch ihr Wahnsinn bricht an uns aus". Not only the wisdom of milleniums, their madness, too, bursts forth, in us !*) In the face of these "human beings", without Gods or Worlds, he spoke the truth, and identifying himself with these dying souls he brought their madness out into the open, himself.

Again, let it be said that he had to live in a number of ages, simultaneously, if he should find a new time-continuum: ~~a~~ he was the victim of the conquest of space, and he called himself the decadent of this era, his own time. ~~b~~ He foresaw that others would rebel, not in words as he, but in terrible convulsions, and he identified himself with the peoples now at war. ~~a~~ Finally he threw his soul far ahead over the abyss of these wars, when a united mankind could implant the virtues of war into its unity, Zarathustra. The man who said that madness broke out, is not simply the man who went mad. By saying it, he survives his and his time's lunacy, a reconvalescent.

By this poly~~graphic~~^{chronic} character of Nietzsche's thought, his "torn-to-pieces-hood", the nature of man is revealed as crucified. In our old papermaker's product, the foolscap, you could see a fool's cap and bells engraved as watermark. And for ~~four~~ Pre-nietzschean eyes, ~~he~~^{Nietzsche} wore the fool's cap and bells. But for those who know what Eschatology Realized means, in reality, behind the foolscap and bells, another watermark, indelibly engraved in the human heart, becomes legible: the cross. The Cross is not only a historical, it also is a,worldly fact, it is the truth about man's nature.

From a revealed dogma which seemed inaccessible to natural reason, the Cross has become, through Nietzsche, a fact of nature and of the new science of time and man. *) Man has one feature which sets him apart from World or Nature as much as from God, the Cross in his heart which makes him into a distemporal.

The World ^{of science} is ~~xxx~~ space; and if you object that after all time is mentioned in science, Nietzsche and all the modern time-thinkers will reply: No, not the genuine time,; science sees time as a poor fourth dimension, as an afterthought, and in a curtailed perspective as seen from the view point of space.

God is eternal .

Man is polychron. Men are ~~xxxxx~~ ^{monochron} when they are blind and cowards. They are polychron , divine, if they are willing to pay the price, to suffer the Cross of being and of not being a member of their own time. Nobody can be forced to do this. **) Nobody is obliged to believe this. But the new situation is that from now on, everybody may know it as the simple truth about human nature.

All ideas about a human mind superior to the human body, about a timeless reason in man, about an unshakeable self-reliance in man's character, ~~our~~ natural reason, have come to nought.

The "carrier" of philosophy whom we presupposed following the Greek standards of the sober man, is a fiction. Man has one nature, to be incalculable, to be unstable, to be torn, to be suspended between past and future. His greatest triumph of integration is not to become whole like a little globe or monad but to get himself so much together, ^{as} ~~at least~~, to avoid a complete disintegration, a mere confusion and split personality inside; the perfect man and most normal reason would still have to be a cross ^{bearer} ~~bearer~~ and a crucial reason simply because we are times and suspended between past and future, between the beginnings of the stone man and the end of all times.

Thus maddened by the world, and blaspheming ^{God}, Nietzsche transformed belief into fact, secularized the teachings of revealed religion about man's nature into universal facticity.

*) This is the important result of the three volumes of

von Balthasar, S. J., Die Apokalypse der Deutschen Seele, 1957/9
 *) "Esse actum filius dei esse, non ~~esse~~ necessitate ^{sed} potestate", Hilarius, De trinitate I, 16

Doing this, he wrote a new lease on life since theology and philosophy, both, can now develop new standards, an unbelieving theology, so to speak, and a believing philosophy.

Man has his own nature, the cross which he shares with neither God nor World. The reciprocal life of the three indivi/dualities, Man, God, World, enters, then, into a new phase of "perichoresis," of "circumincession" as the old doctrines call it. And the Morris dance of these three elementary components of reality, God , Man, World, ~~isxthe~~ asks for the full orchestral ~~sceme~~, for the conquest of time, all the more urgently the more thoroughly the conquest of space may come to its orderly solution, in some form of economic organisation of the globe.

It is very difficult to conceive of a state of man in which wars and frontiers have disappeared. It is ~~XXXXXX~~ ~~this day only~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~full~~ ~~impact~~ ~~of~~ ~~Nietzsche's~~ ~~program~~ however, for this very day that Nietzsche prepared. Then, *the* lose usage of men and man, singular and plural, in arbitrary alternation, will have to cease. We will have to become ~~xxx~~ much more precise in our handling the delicate question when M A N and when men are in their right element, and since their element is time, when they are at the right moment and at the right time.

Whatever we may think of Nietzsche, let us grant him that he came at the right moment and at the right time.

From a revealed dogma, ^{This/} ~~it~~ has become, through Nietzsche, a scientific fact. *) Man/ ^{has} ~~acquired the~~ one feature which sets him apart from World and God, the Cross in his heart which makes him a distemporary. The world is space. God is eternal, Man is polychron if he pays the price of this ~~his~~ power to become divine, if he suffers the Cross of being and of not being a member of his time.

Thus, he ^{made the Cross a certainty} ~~came into his own~~, the child of the ^{legislator of} ~~world~~ and the ^{believer} ~~son of~~ God, and the next millennium opens in a purified atmosphere in which Man is not Nature and Nature is not God, but God, World, and ~~Nature~~ Man, may complete their "perichoresis", the reciprocal life of their "circumincession", in restored ~~order~~ ^{individuality}.

Nobody is obliged to believe this, or to shift from the gospel of the common man to the Gospel of the legislator. It is beyond necessity, it is as all great things a matter of freedom, quod totaliter excedit necessitatem salutis **) Nietzsche was not a theologian, not a saint, not a philosopher. But he did quod totaliter excedit necessitatem salutis, he ^{wrote a new lease on life} ~~prepared a new lease on life~~ ^{in Scholastic theology} ~~acting~~ This ~~state~~ beyond necessity, is called the status supererogationis ***) . ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ And ~~XXXX~~ Man's power of supererogating plays a necessary role in the economy of our salvation.

- *) ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ This is the thesis of the book by U. G. von Balthasar, a Jesuit, quoted above p. 11 note *
 **) Thomas Aquinas, 4 sent. 4.3.3.2 ad 3.
 ***) L. c. 15.3.1.4.

after 16 and before 23

368

Nietzsche's Masks.

Nietzsche said of himself that the Christianity of his forbearers drew to its ultimate conclusion in himself, that ~~the~~ the incorruptible honesty drilled into him by Christianity, now turned against Christianity.

At the same time, he complained that he ^{was} to wear many masks, of the fool, the prophet, the philologist, ^{to wit} the prophet, the Devil, the Saint, the child, the camel, the lion. Is there a connection between the two statements?

I think, indeed, that there is an important relation between the histrionic features in Nietzsche and his inherited Christianity. And since all modern man, more or less, are exposed to this danger, it seems worth while to state this relation between the comedian and the Christian. It will be a detour, for a superficial judgment. However, as a figure in the history of the Church, Nietzsche cannot be done justice, otherwise.

Theatre, and tragedy, were the two central experiences of his soul. The tragic aspect of life was the Dionysian truth which he tried to impress on a world which ran away from tragedy into enlightenment and progress. And the old Church had compared Christ to the tragic hero. In the Greek Churches, the parts of the Sanctuary are named after the parts of the Athenian stage, even today.

The Easter ceremonies replaced the tragedy of the dying and rising God which had prevailed for more than two-thousand years around the whole world. Everybody, before Christ, knew that God died, that men slew the God. Everybody before Christ, had celebrated the rhythm of ecstasy and mania, and fall and depression, which marks our lives. Only the last two centuries of our era, had introduced an arhythmical concept of time, a mathematical time, without highs or lows.

Our lunatic asylums bear witness to the fact that man cannot live without manias and depressions, and when they are denied him in public, he will still try to create them, against the lack of rhythm of the machine age.

Of course, nobody can create the rhythm of society alone.

Hence, the modern individual ^{frequently} breaks down under his manias and depressions. The dying and resuscitation of the God ~~of inspiration~~ is an event of social history. There, it has its place as the perpetual rythm of revolutionary ^{the} inspiration and evolutionary realization of new creation into old nature.

Nietzsche, then, was right when he stressed the ecstatic and depressive phasing of the soul's life in society. He unearthed an undisputed feature of the original Church. A God who does not die and rise again, cannot become man. Because we have our ups and down, we cannot preserve the peaks of our own experience. Our inner life is composed of ^{the} revolutionary ecstasy and ^{the} patient, indefatigable labor to unfold the germ then sown into us.

The ancients enacted annual tragedies by wearing masks. the masks allowed for rythmical ecstasy, for ~~unembarrassed~~ the unembarrassed embrace of the divine, in high moments. To wear a mask, to play a role, ~~was~~ man's training for his heroic qualities.

Now, when the Church replaced the theatre by the ^{Mass} ~~Church~~ and Dionysos by Christ, the only thing that went, was the mythical character of the tragedy. The crucifixion was a real tragedy, no play. The ~~martyrs~~ were real, no actors. The play became brutal fact. Every man found his role, his identity, his singleness, in his experience of dying, like the first Christian. Whereas Osiris or Linos, or Adonis or Dionysos or Marduk invited the faithful to wear his, the God's mask, the Christian as far as he died to the world, made his own face the true face for the divine which could shine through him, in his victory over the world. The masks of wood and paint gave way to the human face itself as the mask of God. In this sense, God appeared in Jesus. And it may be said without blasphemy, that Jesus was God's mask, on the Cross.

In the Byzantine Church, it was forbidden to depict the Father or the Spirit, at first. The Son alone was God's appearance on this earth. And for this reason, art painted him, not the Father. The Russian Church broke this rule, in the Renaissance only, and with the greatest reluctance. She should never have given in.

It was a wise rule. Until the Renaissance, Man carried his face as the only mask for God. As long as people believed in incarnation, in the embodiment of the Spirit, they preserved the power to become integrated by one ray from God, into their own definite personality. A real person is God's mask on earth.

One of them.

Ever since we count the years from the coming of Christ, man were in a position to deify themselves by liberating ^{themselves off the mask} themselves from any one specific social cast or rank or class or title or family name, by piercing ~~through~~ hereditary, legal, conventional, wooden and iron masks, brass hats, red tape, and however we call the hindrances between our face and the light of uniqueness shining on it. Christianity replaced these masks of material by living images of God. and yet, The masks of tragedy, of Bali dancers, of red-painted warriors or idolized ~~gods~~ heros, of ancestors and kings, were not abolished. Only we fools of our so-called individualism can opine that something so deeply sprung from man's imagery and zest for imitation could be or even should be extirpated. Not at all. The faces of all those on whom the light had rested, became available as temporary windows into eternity: Every new ~~xxxxxxx~~ comer entered a pantheon, an assembly of deified men, the saints. To give a simple but poignant example. When the Saxons ~~had xxxxxxx~~ were Christians for exactly fifty years, a young Saxon princess became abbess. And her own brother, an abbot, he, compared her in his dirge with eleven saints of the Old Testament, in this distichon,

" Sara, Rebecca, Rachel, Debora, Noemi, Ruth et Anna,
Holla, Susanna, Judith et simul Hester.... *)

And Puritan England did the same all over, as well as New England.

Luther thought of himself as Paul, and Innocence III as the Christ himself. St. Francis begot the stigmata in imitation of his Lord.

In the very years in which fell the birth of Nietzsche, the world was full of young men who applied this Christian method to their secular appetites. We are told that in the cafeterias, in 1841 and 42, megalomaniac adolescents would speak of themselves as Huss redivivus, as Mahomed, reborn, as the second Cromwell, Alexander Cesar. One. Ernst Rohmer, was the newborn Jesus himself. If this is method, there is method in it.

But as far back as the dawn of the Renaissance, shows symptoms of a secular imitation of the "Imitation of Christ". The same Cola di Rienzo, of which Nietzsche's great tempter Wagner wrote the opera, said of himself, in 1350, that he "for the sake of abolishing the errors of partisanship and for reading back the nations into unity, he "ebrius ex ardore cordis urentis"; (he drunk from the ardor of a burning heart,) made himself into a jester, clown, actor, grave now,

*) A. D. 874: Agio Obitus Hadermodae Monumeta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores N, 181

††) He quoted Luke 22, 15 and applied this great sentence to himself.

That we should count the years of a new era with the coming of this power, makes sense because ever since Jesus did it, men retained the power to throw off the mask of their specific nation, caste, title, family name, religion, property, nobility, they pierced the legal, hereditary, conventional, normalized wooden or iron masks, brass hats, red tape, lingos, group egotisms, their political maskerades, or however you like to call the hindrances between our face and the light of uniqueness shining upon it.

The time-worn phrase of the image of God becomes transparent when we remember that Christianity replaced the material masks of wood or linen by this power of letting the light shine through the human face itself: Image instead of mask.

And ^{so} ~~through~~, in our era, the masks of tragedy, of red-painted warriors, of Bali dancers, disappeared. Even on the stage, the Kothurn was abandoned, and men were finally no longer required to act the parts of women, in a play.

On the other hand, the Church was not so insipid to deny the deep-seated urge in all of us to be educated for this supreme liberty of becoming an image oneself. Before we can receive the full light ourselves, we must learn to discriminate between mask and image, by looking upon others. Hence, the faces of all those who, in the pressure of danger, showed the power to let the light through, formed a ~~glorious~~ ~~series~~ ~~of~~ ~~windows~~ row of windows into eternity. The saints surrounded every new comer as an assembly of deified men. To give a poignant example. When the sturdy Saxons finally became Christians, their princes built monasteries. It was only fifty years after the conversion that the young princess Hathumoda became an abbess. Her brother, an abbot, he, ten miles away, comforted the nuns over her death by comparing Hathumoda with eleven saintly women in the Bible, in this distichon: "Sara, Rebecca, Rachel, Debora Noemi, Ruth et Anna,

Holda, Susanna, Judith, et simul Hester . . . "

The tribal gallery of ancestors was replaced by this host of souls. In Puritan England as well as in New England, this was repeated many centuries later. Martin Luther thought of himself as St. Paul redivivus. Pope Innocence III spoke to his ecumenic Council as though he were the dying Lord, in the words of Luke 22, 15. Francis of Assisi received the stigmata of Jesus in his body.

In a purely secular manner, this habit was in full swing in Nietzsche's youth. In cafeterias, the literati would salute each other in deadly earnest as the new Cromwell, the new Mahomet, the new Alexander of Euripides. Ernst Rohmer, in the year when Nietzsche was born posed as the new born founder of the Church himself. If this was ~~madness~~, madness, there was method in it. Men started their role in life by trying to play the role of somebody else.

True enough, these plays of the imagination degenerated . But even so they testify to the bold imagery which allowed the offspring of some sectional, narrow group, town, family, to chose among the infinite multitude of souls through all times, for his own growth.

In between the Saxon religious discipleship of Biblical Saints, and the cynicism of Nietzsche's own times in ad pting any sponsor for one's own soul, I would like to quote an intermediary voice from the dawn of the Renaissance. The heros of the Renaissance were favorites with Nietzsche. One of them, the Roman Cola di Rienzo, is the hero of a Wagner opera. This Rienzo confessed of himself ~~that~~ that in his devotion to the restoration of Roman splendor,*⁰ "I was drunk (ebrius) with the ardor of a burning heart to abolish the errors of partisanship and to lead back the peoples into unity. And so, for this purpose of Charity, I would enact ~~the~~ histrionically the jester , the grave man or the simpleton. now play the astute , and again the passionate, or the timid, here the stimulator and there the dis simulator. And so I handled myself like David who danced before theark, and acted the madman before the king, or like Judith who stood before Holfernes, cajoling, astute, and garded! Or like Jacob who received the blessing by a cheat."

~~a simpleton, then, now asrtute, now pas-ionate, now timid, now a stimu-
lating, now dissimulating, for this aim of charity! And so I handled my-
self like David who danced before the arch, and acted the madman before
the king, or like Judith who stood before Holofernes, cajoling, astute
and cautious. *) "~~

*) Konrad Burdach and Paul Piur, Briedwechsel des Cola di Rienzo, Berlin
1902, p. 245

In this hero of the earliest Renaissance, the Histrionic ^{element} - this term
is used in the Latin by Cola himself - is obvious, and it is excused
by Biblical examples. The Saints are no longer models but excuses.

Nietzsche, as we said first, considered himself the last stepping
stone out of Christianity into the future. He sang of himself that he
"Lest his blessedness oppress you, took upon himself the mask of
the devil's dress, fraud, and spite. But don't be deceived; inside
their shines the face of holiness."

Nietzsche wore two masks, before his own inner consciousness.
Both masks, of course, are central, for understanding his real role.
One mask was made necessary by his soul's experience, the other
by his mind's fate.

A man's soul is in his love. And he receives his true love from
that which he loves, which, in other words, is his cosmic affinity.
"It is my soul which calls upon my name", Romeo rightly says, in a
verse worthy of the New Testament.

What was the name which came to Nietzsche from his soul's love?

In 1869, he met Richard Wagner and Cosima Liszt. Cosima had left her
husband Buelow and their common children, and had ran away with
Wagner. She was Nietzsche's age. He fell in love with her. Her
free situation made this a not impossible impulse. On the other
hand, obviously, Cosima was now with more than matrimonial chains
chains bound to Wagner: her ~~whole~~ moral existence was at stake; he,
Wagner, had to be the God. (When Wagner died, she cut her hair and
put it in his grave.) Nietzsche had not a chance, either during
Wagner's life or afterwards since this would have ~~ruined her~~
disqualified Cosima's sacrifice for the God.

But Nietzsche was in love. And Buelow visited him in Basel, and
told him that he, Buelow, was the earthly king Theseus whose wife
Ariadne was stolen by Dionysos = Wagner. However, Buelow added:
She ruined me; she will do the same to him. From that day on, it
seems, Nietzsche considered himself as the future Dionysos of
Ariadne - Cosima. We know that he prided himself ~~on~~ for keeping
the secret of this name, Ariadne. His first outburst from his
masked life, his madness, was condensed in a telegram to Ariadne-Cosima,
confessing his love. And as Cosima's husband, he marched into the
clinic. *)

*)

His Ariadne secret, then, marked him, in his own mind as Dionysos. Whereas Buelow-Theseus had admitted that the great magician Wagner came as the God Dionysos into Buelow's terrestrial home, for Nietzsche, Dionysos was torn to pieces on this earth, had no foothold on this globe. The tragic Dionysos, is the Dionysos whom he had to impersonate. On earth, Wagner-Theseus reigned.

The second inner identity and jealousy centered around Jesus. His Ecce Homo is but one hint to the extent of this mental rivalry with the founder of the Church. Often enough, he would poke fun at any Messianic ambition, at any Christ-Complex. However, the more he attacked all the fruits of Christianity, the more did he compare his own task to the millennial attainment of its Lord. Again, his end - as in the case of Cosima, revealed the truth. He signed himself, in his last pronouncements, as the crucified. It not in vain that he had chosen the title: Ecce Homo, and the Anti-~~Anti~~ christ. Here he was to start ^{another} epoch. We have it from his own pen that in September 1888, the new era began which was to put an end to the Christian era. In this era-statement, his intellectual ambition came out in the open.

We have called the two masks of Dionysos and the Crucified the inner masks under which he posed to himself. Both had to be kept silent before the world. And Nietzsche did not appear to the world as completely mad as long as he kept enough self-control to know that he had to conceal these two equations from all and everybody. If these masks, in themselves, betray madness, he was mad during the whole period of his highest creativity. If, on the other hand, madness only means the loss of that cleverness by which we keep our secrets to ourselves, he went mad only in 1889.

The obvious truth seems to me that Nietzsche represents the admixture of madness and sanity which holds up so many people. Most men are to themselves somebody quite different from that which the world attributes to them. Nietzsche, it is true, represents this universal discrepancy between the inner and the external "mask", to the extreme. But he who wished to bring out the riddle of our human torn-to-pieces-hood, took, of course, the most extreme position. This does not mean that we all may not be enlightened by his flagrant example.

When you ask yourself in how many social forms you share in internecine wars of mankind, you will see how multifarious you are. A farmer, a catholic, a father, of a future doctor and a future daughter-secretary, a New Englander, an American, a Republican: and this is a mild list of conflicting interests. Starting from this basis of a multitude of conflicting interests, we may ask for a road to integration. And here we may learn from Nietzsche.

F

Nietzsche

The Annihilation of Time

The story of the two fliers in the New York Night Club twenty four hours ago we bombed Essen. Space, then, seems to be annihilated. Ubiquitousness of Man has something divine.

Nietzsche has to do with the annihilation not of space but of time. If man could be all times, he would acquire a sempiternity which would seem divine. For, man belongs to one time, by his nature. And he would redeem his nature if he could belong to all times. But to do that he must become conscious that even he himself is of more than one time. This the decadent knows because he is too little wedded to his own time or passion so that he can wink at the moment and say All is vain. The fact of decadency means that a man overlooks the mortality of his own season and, usually, is paralyzed thereby. The decadent does not act any longer except from boredom, in a half indifferent or snobbish fashion. This is the starting point for Nietzsche: How to heal the decadent. How to induce him to keep his refined consciousness of the manifoldness of times, and yet make him live, within the universe of all times and seasons, the duties of each season to the full?

The external masks of Nietzsche were many, in his writings. Critic, thinker, poet, jester, politico, theologian, historian, etc., etc. But substantially, Dionysos wore three permanent masks which he did not simply chose, but which were inherent to his existence. We may call these three his existential masks.

One was the professor emeritus, the physically weak and decadent Nietzsche. He acknowledged this decadence profusely. He added that whereas the times in which he lived were decadent unknowingly, he recognised the evil, being more heavily visited by it than most of them.

As a decadent who knew that his time and he himself were degenerate times of the end, before a terrible catastrophe, he affirmed his fate which had made him a recluse at 34. He ceased to belong to his time. And indeed, he did not find seven readers for his most powerful book when it appeared. He was as he called it a posthumous man.

From necessity we must coin a new term for this true fact that Nietzsche has come into his own long after his mental and physical death. Nietzsche is the prototype of an important possibility in all of us who have been schooled by Christianity. We all are distemporaries. We do not exhaust our existence by being contemporary, by being a current event. Nietzsche, abandoning currency and contemporaneity, coined the ~~idea of~~ eternal re-currence, as his medium. Without going into this special doctrine here, it sheds light on the fact that he, in a sense in which Jesus was the contemporary not of Caesar Augustus but, if at all, of perhaps the emperor Constantine or even the emperor Charles the Fifth, was the distemporary of the years 1870 to 1900, the decades in which "God died", from the hands of those who were satisfied to be purely contemporaries and to be found in the "Cavalcade" of the day, to be in the news.

The second mask was the brutal Nazi-Nietzsche. Withdrawing from his own era of progress, he foresaw the end of this era of mere exploitation, of the "last man", and foreseeing it, he had, to some extent, identify himself with the generation of violent destroyers who would smash these decadent decades. He foresaw the terrors of an indescribable explosion. It was, to him, inevitable by the very fact that his "con-" temporaries had invested their all and everything in their own time, that the tragic element had disappeared from life. Nobody believed in an end of this world. Hence, it could not survive.

Again, he shared here the source of all the strength ever found among Christians, that the end of this world was on hand, that this world had to pass away so that the kingdom might begin. Jesus anticipated the fall of Jerusalem, later, the fall of Rome was anticipated. Eschatology realized was the heart and soul of all real faith, in the Church. But from 1800 on, the Church, except for Millerites, or Jehova's Witnesses, had throttled this belief. Right after Nietzsche broke down, Johannes Weiss rediscovered the eschatological element in Jesus. Today, the work of the English man Dodd has made common property this rediscovery of

9
"eschatology". By this highfaluting term simply is meant the fact that Jesus and the apostles believed that they had to realize the end of their world. To the Liberal theologian, this comes as a shock. One of them, Kirsop Lake, naively wrote that this fact was proof enough that no modern man could be a Christian since no modern man could believe in such bosh. All the worse for the modern man whose world, currency, prosperity, profits, laws, all vanish, before our eyes. Not because these his orders are especially bad. But because men have given themselves over to their own time and state without any reserve, without any posthumity, any reservation for a new and better kingdom to come. Longing for an other state of affairs is the condition for even preserving that state of a civilisation already attained.

Nietzsche, at a time when no theologian, no official Christianity showed any ~~faith~~ in an end of time, believed in it, acted accordingly. Here, the very fact that Ariadne could never become his in this world, must have helped him immeasurably, as Dante's Be -

atrice had to remain unattainable lest the Divina Commedia never be written.

However, back to his identity with the destroyers, the Fascists, the carriers of the hammer, the Nazis. Insight obliged Nietzsche, to admit this type of man. The world was ripe to be buried. Could he dissociate himself from the craft of the gravediggers?

Intellectual honesty forced him to share with them the responsibility. He was too clean not to know that thoughts are as responsible as acts. If he thought the end of Europe, how could he deny that somebody had to bring it about, and that they were relatively as right as he, in his mere thinking. The false intellectual of today may affirm that his writings are less dynamite, less murderous than the soldiers or the revolutionaries bombs. For such bookkeeping, Nietzsche was too robust.

In this sense, then, his second mask was that of a contemporary to the wars of destruction which would shake Europe and lead to the abolition of Protestant Christianity in Germany.

However, he lived a third tense. Before the catastrophe the decadent, in the catastrophe the preacher of the hammer, after the end - Zarathustra. Zarathustra, of course, is the mask which is best known of Nietzsche. He himself called it a duplication of his personality when he "met" Zarathustra. "Out of one two arose". Zarathustra

stra is the third mask, the mask which enabled Nietzsche to set foot on the new soil, after the great flood. Zarathustra is the legislator of a new world order in which time will again be linked to eternity, in eternal recurrence.

It was a stroke of genius, this thrust beyond the catastrophe, into the future after the World Wars, as the medicine man of a united mankind, of a denationalized humanity which he foresaw. What could keep such a monster society of world size alive inside if not a medicine man who would represent to the rulers and chieftains of the day, the eternal energies of all ages, and all times lest the present again overwhelmed the contemporaries as during the 19th century?

Nietzsche, as Zarathustra, is the first medicine man of a Great Society in which the recipes of all tribes of old are put to new and better use.

It was a masterstroke of Nietzsche to choose Zarathustra. Historically, we know more of Zarathustra now since Johannes Hertel has destroyed many myths current in Nietzsche's days. Zarathustra led nomadic tribes to their first settlement under the Persian protectorate. He lived before the division of prose and poetry happened, before speech and song separated. He lived outside the Platonic orbit of Greece and Rome. He made modern man free from the prayer to Socrates and Plato which Erasmus of Rotterdam had intoned and which all American Colleges implicitly prayed until this last war.

Nietzsche went back behind Greece in order to go forward. I have shown elsewhere that mankind lives its historical future with a mask before his eyes of reclaiming a more and more remote past. Christianity has given us the power to fulfill our lives by reaching out, at the same time, and for this very purpose, into deeper and deeper layers of our evolutionary past. Zarathustra links up with the modern passion for prehistory, anthropology, primitivism.

Zarathustra enabled Nietzsche to claim the next step by opening up a step back of Plato and Socrates and Aristotle, the deities of the academic mind.

However ingenious, however, this name was, for the purpose, it was a mask, an external mask. Jesus did not have to play on history or prehistory ~~in the same manner~~ in the same manner. He simply was the second Adam, the final man, the man as God had had him in mind from the beginning of the world. Nietzsche's rivalry to Jesus would have been very

childish , indeed, if Zarathustra was all for which he stood. A literary figure, a learned rediscovery, a renaissance , perhaps. But not a person himself.

It would not have meant more than a Plato redivivus meant in the Renaissance.

But Nietzsche was one and Zarathustra was one. And the Professor or emritus was a third reality. The tension between the three tenses of these three, that was Dionysos, that was the Crucified, that was Nietzsche's Ecce Homo. The decadent who knew that he and his time were the end, the destroyer who knew that his thought was as cruel as plough and hoe and hammer of material steel , the legislator after the destruction, - these three tenses make a man into a person, into a human being.

This is the true gospel, lived again, by the circumstances of a godless time, by one man alone since the others had abolished the death of civilisation , let alone the belief in resurrection.

Nietzsche re-instated, through his masks, the triunity of human life between past and future, as the transition for which we are made. Man is not a thing, man is nothing. He is the change. At least, in this manner only does he attain reality, personality, deity.

The three existential masks of Nietzsche make him into a live before , in and after a tremendous catastrophe, the end of Europe. To some extent, every human being is required to think of himself as being in the same situation, before the end of the world which he has inherited, in the moment in which this world must be buried, and ~~after~~ after the ~~in~~ burial, as the lawgiver of the future. Any girl who marries , could realize this tri-unity, if she took her getting married seriously ~~enough~~ enough.

For the carrier of the masks, in a world crisis of the first order, the pressure proved too much, and one man alone cannot bear that which fellowship can ~~carry~~ carry. It is the proof, and not the refutation of Nietzsche that he broke down, lost self-control and died mentally, from his masks, from the gap between inner and outer masks, eleven years before his body passed away. If it had not proved to be so unhuman, neither his distemporanity, nor his tri-unity would have stood the test of being true.

Failure, so called, in his case , was success. No man can carry his masks as Nietzsche did, without ever integrating them before God's sight into one human face. But he did prove that man, by his nature, is not one . That only by good grace, can we reduce our infinity of masks which society allows us to ~~have~~ ^{don}, to the essential and existential tri-unity of our past , our future, our present. Man , as long as he lives, never ^{carries only} ~~is~~ one.

on the other hand, he cannot stand

~~nor can he stay~~ many. Man can neither be a joiner of all roles and social functions, nor pretend to be a hero. The psychology of the human person which thinks that unity is normal for man, and schizophrenia a disease, is quite mistaken. Man is not a unity by nature. He is one when he is a corpse. As long as he lives, he must distinguish between his dead and his future elements, and thereby he is made into three functionaries of his own life. He must be in part his own gravedigger, in part his own prophet. Triunity, is the most we can achieve. Then, we are as near to divinity as we may hope to come. This cross of our distemporaneity, of our polychrony is our indelible water mark as human beings.

This cross by which man is nailed to the tree of time, between the past and the future, with the inner man prophesying and longing for the new legislation, with the external man looked upon by the outside world as though they knew him completely already, this cross of the real man - or as I have named it: the cross of reality, is not one historical event in Palestine, but a scientific fact of general knowledge, since Nietzsche.

The Cross, after having been a unique revelation for 2000 years, now is a matter of science, of the new science of man. Only because man is the carrier of space and time, in setting limits to past and future, in his inner and outer masks, is the revelation of man's nature by Jesus ~~xxxx~~ true.

I hear you cry out: but this is a sophistic abuse of the term "Cross". The execution of a rebel by the Romans, the action of one day, is by this your trick suddenly identified with man's whole situation between the cradle and the grave. You see any man suspended between past and future, in an inner space of his own terminology and in an external space where is classified by the onlooking world. What has your "Cross of Reality" - supposed it is true - to do with the historical cross around which the Church is built.

The objection is perfectly sound for the modern mind who has been fed on an alleged "Life of Jesus", to which the Crucifixion became a regrettable ending, and the resurrection an unbelievable hieroglyph or apocryph about which people shrug their shoulders.

The four first writers of the news on Jesus, however, are decidedly on my side, against you ~~dear~~ believer in a life of Jesus. They never intended their gospels to be biographies. Biographies were quite well known, in their days. Plutarch was their master. The evangelists, on the other hand, planned "thanatographies."

To them, the crucifixion began in the crib, when no place could be found for the new born child in the hostel. And Herod continued immediately this crucifixion when he drove him into Egypt. Life was seen exclusively from the view point of dying, and at the same time, fulfilling. Dying into a better future created by this process, fulfilling the past of the law and thereby allowing it to come to an end.

And the old Church is on my side, against the modern philosophy of Christianity as a timeless sermon on the mount. They celebrate Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, as the three decisive forms of the Divine in this world. But these three central incisions, simply constitute the three existential masks of every deified soul. As a child born into an old world of inheritance, inheriting its promises and defects; man is a Christmas present and an heir of all the good things of old; as Nietzsche was the heir of the unfathomable honesty of two thousand years of Christianity.

As a man entering into the consequences of old defects, and forced into the destruction of the Temple as it stood for too long already: Easter. Jesus knew that his anticipation of the kingdom destroyed the Temple at Jerusalem in the spirit as definitely as the Roman soldiers of Vespasian did in the flesh, one generation later. Being no intellectual, he never doubted that thoughts were as real as arms. His cross was unavoidable because he anticipated the fall of the Temple.

As a creator and founder he began the new Jerusalem, a new order which became fully clear in its purport after the year 70, a whole generation after his crucifixion. Pentecost signifies this his creative power for that time in which the "times" would have caught up with his spirit, when, in other worlds, he would have ceased to be a posthumous man as Nietzsche called it, or to be a dis-temporary as we preferred to dub man as a victor over current events.

Nietzsche's decadence is synonymous with his miraculous career as a university teacher. He was made a full professor at 25. In this sense he seemed to fit into the old world to perfection.

His brutal attacks against this same world as doomed took him out of this same world, made living with him intolerable for every one of his friends, deprived him of participation in the outer world.

His anticipation of decay plus explosion threw him beyond into a kingdom of ends, of new ends, after this period from 1914 to 1944 as General Smuts rightly unified these thirty years in which Europe ceded its leadership over the world.

It would be more than bad taste, it would be wrong, to call this situation of Nietzsche between the times, between three times, with the old, venerable names of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost.

It makes a great difference whether a man pays with his blood, or with his brain. And Nietzsche remains in the area of mental inheritance, mental rebellion, mental legislation. His adventure

was confined to the fight against mental fallacies. He did not reveal human nature as completely different from the nature of the world, for the first time. But he proved this revelation scientifically, by interposing himself as the living guinea-pig.

The equation between his new scientific proof of the Cross as the water mark of Man, and Christianity, is something like this.

Outside Christianity, man had appeared as a "character", a coined entity, by birth, property, cast, nation.

Jesus revealed that no man was one, once he started on the road to deification. The divine in man was his triunity, his mastery of time by living in more than one time, and in more than the external world. He presented us with the insight into life's fullness between two orders of society, the old and the new, and two sets of values, the inner and the outer. Jesus made it clear, in one single case that the real man was not a coined character but a suffering transformer.

Nietzsche abandoned all reverence to faith or revelation. He jumped out of the circle of theology as far as he could. And he rediscovered that even though he might forego all the fellowship and all the traditions of the Church, he still would find himself suspended between cradle and grave, on the same cross.

Jesus showed how a man acquired the right of being called the image of God, the master of all times. Nietzsche showed what happened when a man did not acquire this mastery: he went to pieces.

Both, Jesus and Nietzsche stood against the fallacy of all paganism, all natural science, that man is as much "one", as a table or a fish or a rock. Both knew that man had to fight for his integration from the infinite ~~number~~ of not by pretending to be a unit - as most contemporaries do - but by organising the infinite number of impulses, talents, gifts, into the discipline of a sequence. Both discovered that the conflict between the One and the Many could not be healed by calling man either a bundle of nerves, a split personality, a cog on the wheel, a mass-man ruled by stimuli, on the one hand, or on the other hand, by idealising him into a personality of unshakeable virtue, a hero of courage, and a genius of infallibility. If man would ~~reject~~ both these temptations of which our times are filled: the mass-man temptations according to which man is that whatever the day requires, the ideal-temptation according to which man can attain perfection, he would regain his true freedom: to rule over times, to become a distemporal, to become a transformer, to become a legislator.

A man who cannot bear this suspense, lacks personality. In the Christian era, we say, he lacks faith. After Nietzsche, we are allowed to add that he lacks knowledge.

Man, saved by Jesus from his slavery to time, acquires with Nietzsche an objective knowledge of the fact that man cannot

kn
become known through any science of space.

Man must be dealt with by a science of time. Man, in his unnatural, human quality appears not at all in the rationalisations of science. Because man creates sciences for his purpose of distinguishing between past and future. His natural sciences ~~only~~ allow him to dispose of the encircling gloom, and to see clearly the things on his road. But the faith and courage to be more than a thing himself, marks the MAN, among scientists as well as among other people.

Nietzsche's masks are everybody's masks. Nobody appears to himself exactly as he appears to his neighbor or to the statistician in Washington, D. C. We all, however, are in a more advantageous position than he in his loneliness. His masks were the most desperate ones, the gap between his past and future ~~and~~ ^{between} his inner evaluation of his role and his outer appearance was wider than in any thinkable case after him.

The extreme case is necessary for any scientific proof. We rightly conclude that "if even X behaves in this manner, how much more will Y and Z behave similarly." And so we conclude that since even Nietzsche reorganized his innumerable masks around the three tenses of Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, or of finding, fighting, founding, and since he, the weakest of all men, alone survives from all the thinkers before the World-War Revolutions, the Cross of Reality must be the scientific truth about man. For it made him strong, it made him important, it made him last.