

NEW BOOKS

The razor-edge of such a position is acutely felt on p. 71. "Shaftesbury is not saying that the experience of evil is itself something illusory, . . . he is saying that ultimately it has no place in the structure of reality."

Professor Whitehead is quoted in support: "In the absence of Truth Beauty is on a lower level, . . . in the absence of Beauty Truth sinks to triviality. Truth matters because of Beauty." But would the writer of these sentences claim that they are beautiful and, if not, that they are important?

It would be a pity if readers should be distracted from the historical merits of this book by its really irrelevant generalizations. E. F. CARRITT.

Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist. By WALTER A. KAUFMANN. (Princeton University Press: London, Geoffrey Cumberlege. 1950. Pp. xi + 409. Price 40s.)

This work seems to me to be a most thoughtful, fair and scholarly treatment of Nietzsche's philosophy. Professor Kaufmann believes that there is a coherent philosophy in Nietzsche's writings; and he shows how that philosophy developed and reached its final form. He insists, moreover, that the primary place where we should look for that philosophy is in Nietzsche's published writings and those which he prepared for publication. One should not, in other words, prefer the notes to the published writings. "It seems wholly preposterous to ignore the works which a philosopher has published, to claim that he did not really mean what he said in them, and to prefer to them the scattered scribbles which he penned on his walks." Serious scholars, as distinct from Nazi exegetes, have not gone so far as this; but many of them have supposed that books and notes were of equal value. The author points out, however, that even this is unjustifiable. Nietzsche left behind him many notes which were not utilized in published material for the very simple reason that he had not thought through and developed the ideas which had occurred to him and which he jotted down for reflection. We are not entitled to attach as much weight to notes of this type as to published matter, though they can certainly be used as evidence of Nietzsche's mind and line of thought.

Professor Kaufmann, then, takes the books as primary and the notes as secondary sources. In their interpretation he does not indulge in that intemperate use of the concept of "poses" or "masks" in which some writers on Nietzsche indulge. He is well aware, of course, that Nietzsche's utterances cannot always be taken according to their *prima facie* meaning and that they must be interpreted in the light not only of their context but also of the general development of the philosopher's thought and of his fundamental intentions. Indeed, his book is an excellent example of such interpretation. But he is also convinced that the main lines of interpretation must be sought in what Nietzsche actually wrote. One is not entitled to substitute for a philosopher's expressed views some esoteric philosophy which for some reason or other one chooses to attribute to him. In other words, Professor Kaufmann's approach is that of a scholar. It may be that he plays down too much certain aspects of Nietzsche's thought and it is possible that he tidies things up too much; but he always argues his interpretations and conclusions with care. His book is free from rancour and prejudice: it is also free from that sickening adulation which one occasionally meets with in literature on Nietzsche. I dare say that some people would find the book "pedestrian"; but scholarship combined with understanding, as it is with Professor Kaufmann, is an atmosphere that one can breathe without fear of suffocation.

The author's treatment of the growth and nature of Nietzsche's concept of

PHILOSOPHY

the will to power seemed to me particularly interesting. He shows, for example, that the theory of the will to power was not a metaphysical theory derived through revising Schopenhauer's metaphysics: it was fundamentally an hypothesis with, according to Nietzsche, an empirical basis, even if Nietzsche went beyond his brief in extending it by conjecture to the universe at large. He traces, too, the genesis and development of the interpretation of the will to power as self-overcoming. And this brings him to the discussion of the question whether Nietzsche's "monism," that is, his use of the theory of the will to power as a universal hypothesis, concealed a hidden dualism. The dualism of the two types of morality was overcome by the application of the will to power theory; but did the interpretation of the will to power as self-overcoming involve a dualism of spirit and nature or of reason and instinct? The author argues that it did not, making use of the concept of sublimation. I do not feel altogether happy about the contention that Nietzsche successfully overcame dualism; but the author argues his case well. As to the character of the will to power Professor Kaufmann exposes and demolishes in a conclusive manner the Nazi interpretation of Nietzsche.

The comparisons of Nietzsche with other philosophers are often illuminating. What the author has to say on Hegel seems to me particularly good. While rightly rejecting the idea that Hegel was a devout adorer of the State as the highest good, he makes clear the difference between the views of Hegel and Nietzsche concerning the State's relation to the highest forms of cultural life. He also gives special attention to Nietzsche's treatment and estimation of Socrates, showing that he was not the fanatical Socrates-hater which he is sometimes depicted as having been.

In his preface Professor Kauffman says that "the decision to write on Nietzsche was not inspired by any agreement with him." Nietzsche is for him primarily an "educator," standing for the uninhibited passion for truth and for culture considered as an affair of the "single one," who recreates himself and gives style to his character. But it is also possible, it seems to me, to see in Nietzsche primarily the diagnostician and the expression of the end of a culture, a man who put his shoulder to what he regarded as a tottering wall while he declaimed in shrill tones about the better wall which he could not build. I should also attach more weight than Professor Kaufmann perhaps does to Karl Jaspers' conception of Nietzsche as one of the limiting possibilities of *Existenz*. However, as the author says, Jaspers' picture of Nietzsche depends very largely on the acceptance of certain philosophical positions. And in any case what Nietzsche "means" for any individual is certainly not necessarily coincident with what Nietzsche himself meant. It is through his painstaking investigation of the latter theme that Professor Kaufmann has made a real contribution to Nietzsche studies.

FREDERICK C. COPLESTON.

Homo Faber: A Study of Man's Mental Evolution. By G. N. M. TYRRELL.
(Methuen, 1951. Pp. 205. Price 15s.)

Mr. Tyrrell, the author of two well-known books on psychical research, sets out in this volume to undermine what he calls "the scientific outlook." According to Mr. Tyrrell, the main tenets of this outlook to be challenged are (i) "that reality does not extend beyond the realm that the senses reveal"; (ii) "that the entire cosmos can be grasped in principle by the human intellect"; (iii) "that this intellect arose from a chance combination of material particles." He argues that the scientific outlook prevents men from discovering in the Universe the meaning and purpose which are everywhere to be found if sought in the appropriate contemplative states of mind.