

Zarathustra, Zhuangzi, and Zen:

The Challenge of Remaining Loyal to the Earth in the Time of Climate Change

Timothy J. Freeman

Here Zarathustra fell silent for a while and looked with love upon his disciples. Then he continued to talk thus: —and his voice was transformed.

“Stay true to the earth for me, my brothers, with the power of your virtue! May your bestowing love and your understanding serve the meaning of the sense of the earth! Thus I bid and beseech you.”

Thus Spoke Zarathustra, “On the Bestowing Virtue” (Nietzsche 2005, 66)

Since the early 1980s the work of Graham Parkes has been very influential, especially for a generation of his students, including myself, in emphasizing the importance of Nietzsche’s thought for environmental philosophy. Nietzsche’s project of a revaluation of all values, summed up in Zarathustra’s exhortation to stay “true” or “loyal” to the earth certainly suggests the relevance of Nietzsche’s thought in this time of climate change when the very future of life on earth, at least for human beings, has come into some doubt. Environmental philosophers, however, have sometimes challenged the relevance of Nietzsche’s thought for environmental philosophy. Some contend that even though Nietzsche may have sought a perspective that is loyal to the earth, his critique of truth and his perspectivism inevitably lead to an untenable relativism which undermines any basis for an ecologically sound philosophy.¹ There is also the widespread view, which Parkes calls attention to, that “Nietzsche is such a strong advocate of will to power as domination and exploitation that one cannot sensibly count him as a contributor to environmental philosophy” (Parkes 2005, 77).² Parkes attempts to meet both these objections to a “green” reading of Nietzsche, contending that “Nietzsche’s philosophy of nature, his

¹ See Garrard 2004, 90.

² Parkes is here referring to the view put forth in Acampora 1984.

understanding of the natural world and human existence as interdependent processes and dynamic configurations of will to power, can contribute to grounding a realistic, global ecology that in its loyalty to the earth may be capable of saving it” (Parkes 1999, 185).

One of the major themes that ties together diverse environmental philosophers is a common critique of the anthropocentrism that has characterized so much of Western culture, and Parkes has emphasized how much this critique is a central feature of Nietzsche’s thought.³ Parkes highlights “Nietzsche’s definitive pronouncement” criticizing this anthropocentrism in the late writings: “The human being is by no means the crown of creation: every creature is, alongside the human, at a similar level of perfection” (Parkes 2005, 85).⁴ Parkes also points to a passage from *The Genealogy of Morals* which he finds especially “ecologically prescient”: “Our whole attitude toward nature today is *hubris*, our raping of nature by means of machines and the unthinking resourcefulness of technicians and engineers” (Parkes 2005, 85).⁵

In addition to defending Nietzsche as an ecological thinker, Parkes has also been quite influential in exploring the affinities between Nietzsche’s thought and Asian philosophies, particularly Daoism and Zen.⁶ Here I wish to take up two lines of inquiry opened up by Parkes’s attempt to meet these objections to considering Nietzsche as an ecological thinker. In the first

³ Nietzsche’s critique of Western philosophy, along with the related polemic against Christianity, bears some resemblance to the thesis by historian Lynn White Jr. that “Christianity bears a huge burden of guilt” for the ecological crisis (White 1967, 1206). White’s paper became influential in the environmental movement after it came out in 1967, and it was quite controversial for its critique of Christianity. White emphasizes that “Christianity is the most anthropocentric religion the world has seen” and he traces the roots of the ecological crisis to the dualism of man and nature and the teleological view that “it is God’s will that man exploit nature for his proper ends” (White 1967, 1205).

⁴ Parkes’s translation from *The Antichrist* §14.

⁵ Parkes’s translation from *On the Genealogy of Morals* III, §9.

⁶ An interesting feature of White’s paper is that, toward the end, he praises the “beatniks” who “show a sound instinct in their affinity for Zen Buddhism, which conceives of the man-nature relationship as very nearly the mirror image of the Christian view” (White 1967, 1206). There has been a great deal of work exploring the relevance of Daoism and Zen in considering the ecological crisis in recent years. See, for example, Culliney and Jones 2017. For the affinity for Zen in the work of one of those “beatniks,” see Wirth 2017. Wirth 2019 also explores the relationship between Nietzsche’s thought and Zen in *Nietzsche and Other Buddhas*.

part, I will consider some resonances between Nietzsche's thought and Daoism, focusing on the problem posed by Nietzsche's perspectivism; and in the second, I will consider the comparison between Nietzsche's thought and Zen, focusing on the problem posed by Nietzsche's notion of the will to power.

Zarathustra and Zhuangzi

One of the more obvious resonances between Nietzsche's thought and Daoism, which Parkes has long drawn attention to since his seminal essay "The Wandering Dance: *Chuang Tzu* and *Zarathustra*" is a common critique of anthropocentrism.⁷ For the Daoist philosophers, the Confucian focus on human beings was too narrow, and thus they emphasize trying to take a wider view to see what is human in the perspective of the vast (*da* 大), the vastness of "the heavens and the earth" (*tiandi* 天地). In contrast to the view expressed in *Genesis* that the Earth and all of its creatures were created for human beings, Parkes points out that the Daoist philosophers emphasize that human beings are "irrevocably subject to the powers of Heaven and Earth" and thus must approach the task of governing by "following the ways of nature" (Parkes 2018, 79). In the *Daodejing*, the majority of similes for *dao*, as Parkes observes, are drawn from nature; human beings are encouraged to be more like water, thawing ice, or an uncarved block of wood. The Daoist view, Parkes concludes, "is not only that human beings will flourish if they emulate natural processes, but also that this happens primarily because the best ruler is the most consummate emulator—of water especially" (Parkes 2018, 82). Parkes draws an affinity between

⁷ It is worth noting that the sharp separation between human beings and nature, which is such a distinctive feature of Western thought, does not arise in Chinese philosophy because of what Roger Ames has called the "assumed mutuality and collaterality" of the "three powers" of Heaven (*tian* 天), Earth (*di* 地), and human beings (*ren* 人) in Chinese cosmology (Ames 2018, 259). The notion of Heaven, as Parkes explains, did not "signify a transcendent realm beyond this world, as in the dualistic metaphysics of the Platonist or Christian traditions, since the three powers were always regarded as belonging together" (Parkes 2018, 66).

this Daoist view and Nietzsche's project of re-naturalizing human beings, and thus overcoming the dualism that separates human beings and nature, as well as the anthropocentrism which conceives nature as existing to serve human interests. Parkes calls attention to a similar use of imagery drawn from the natural world, both in the Daoist texts and in *Zarathustra*. In "The Wandering Dance," Parkes emphasizes that *Zarathustra* and *Zhuangzi* are "first and foremost works of *imagery*" (Parkes 1983, 236). "Beyond being works of the philosophical imagination," Parkes continues, "both texts share the same kinds of images. The primary source of imagery is the natural world: the elements—sky, earth, fire, and water; the sun, moon, and stars; the climate, weather, and seasons; and the realms of plant and animal" (Parkes 1983, 237). Thus, just as the Daoist texts recommend emulating nature in a decidedly non-anthropocentric view, Parkes contends that *Zarathustra*'s teaching of the *Overhuman* is "profoundly relevant for ecological thinking" since it "signifies a way of being that is attained by 'overcoming' the human, which, as the rest of *Zarathustra* shows, requires that one go beyond the merely human perspective and transcend the anthropocentric view" (Parkes 2018, 81).

The most crucial question raised in Parkes's attempt to find resonances between *Zarathustra* and *Zhuangzi* concerns just what he means here in suggesting some kind of transcendence "beyond the merely human perspective." In a recent essay, Parkes suggests that his comparison between Nietzsche and *Zhuangzi* "might highlight aspects of their thought that have generally gone unnoticed—especially on the question of whether and how perspectives beyond the human might be attainable" (Parkes 2020, 61). Of course, one of the most distinctive features of Nietzsche's thought is his *perspectivism*. In the preface to *Beyond Good and Evil*, Nietzsche suggests that Plato's fundamental error, the error that made the history of Western thought the "history of an error," was the mistake of "denying *perspective*, the basic condition of

all life” (Nietzsche 1966, 3). Parkes turns to an important passage from the *Genealogy* in which Nietzsche emphatically emphasizes this basic condition of all life, highlighting the part where he goes on to suggest that the closest we can get to any objectivity is to multiply our perspectives:

There is only a perspective seeing, only a perspectival “knowing”; the *more* affects we are able to put into words about a thing, the *more* eyes, various eyes we are able to use for the same thing, the more complete will be our “concept” of the thing, our “objectivity.”⁸ (Parkes 2020, 71)

Parkes then wonders: “multiplying perspectives all around is enlightening—but can’t we thereby go further to some kind of perspectiveless experience?” (Parkes 2020, 71). One of the main themes of Parkes’s work in recent years has been the contention that, in both Nietzsche’s writings and in the *Zhuangzi*, one can find suggestions of just such an experience, one that would allow, as he puts it, “knowing things as they are in themselves” (Parkes 2020, 70). In support of this interpretation, Parkes highlights a few passages in the *Zhuangzi* describing an experience “in the broad light of Heaven,” comparing this with the experience described in the section titled “Before Sunrise” in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*.

Before examining Parkes’s reading of these passages, it is worth noting that in the early “Wandering Dance” essay we do not find the suggestion that there is ever any pulling away from perspectivism, either in Nietzsche’s writings or the *Zhuangzi*. There we find Parkes drawing the connection between Nietzsche, “who emphasizes experience is always necessarily perspectival,” and Zhuangzi, who “does not believe that we could ever attain a kind of ‘perspectiveless seeing’” (Parkes 1983, 242–43). It turns out the problem arises, not because we see things from perspective points of view, but only “when we become *fixated* in a particular perspective” (Parkes 1983, 241). Parkes notes that both thinkers address this problem through the dream. In the section titled “The Consciousness of Appearances” from *The Joyous Science*, Nietzsche

⁸ Parkes’s translation from *On the Genealogy of Morals* III, §12.

develops the notion of the philosopher as lucid dreamer: “I have suddenly awakened in the middle of this dream, but only to the consciousness of dreaming, and that I *must* continue to dream lest I perish, just as the sleepwalker must continue to dream lest he slip and fall” (Nietzsche 2018, 73). Zhuangzi also suggests the philosopher as lucid dreamer when he mocks Confucius and other philosophers who think they are awake, closing his riposte with the famous butterfly dream in which one can no longer distinguish between dreaming and waking life.⁹ In “The Wandering Dance,” Parkes embraces the perspectivism in both thinkers and explains that Zhuangzi’s butterfly dream makes the point, “relevant also to Nietzsche’s perspectivism, that when one is in a certain perspective it is impossible to see it *as a perspective*. Only when we are placed in a different perspective can we appreciate the limitations of our former standpoint” (Parkes 1983, 242). The problem is not that we are dreamers, but is rather, as Parkes explains, “the refusal to admit that we are dreamers, to become aware of the extent to which the ‘real world’ is projected by human needs and desires, and to celebrate this creative activity by both seeing through and playing with it at the same time” (Parkes 1983, 243).

This play with different perspectives is what the wandering dance is all about. Parkes draws attention to the notion of “wandering” (*yóu 遊*) in the title of the first chapter of the *Zhuangzi*, translated as “free and easy wandering,” “going rambling without a destination,” or “wandering far and unfettered” and also points out a connotation with “dance” in the cognate term (*yóu 游*) meaning “to dance, float, swim about in water” (Parkes 1983, 243–44). The stories in the chapter, Parkes explains, “conduct the reader through a variety of perspectives

⁹ “Once Zhuang Zhou dreamt he was a butterfly, a butterfly flitting and fluttering around, happy with himself and doing as he pleased. He didn't know he was Zhuang Zhou. Suddenly, he woke up and there he was, solid and unmistakable Zhuang Zhou. But he didn't know if he was Zhuang Zhou who had dreamt he was a butterfly, or a butterfly dreaming he was Zhuang Zhou” (Zhuangzi 2003, 45).

ranging from the vegetative through the animal to the human, all point up the limitations of adopting a fixed standpoint” (Parkes 1983, 243). In another essay a little later, Parkes explains that the point of Zhuangzi’s perspectivism is to get us to see that “all value judgements are relative insofar as they are made from a particular perspective, and that particular perspectives are by their nature narrow and limited in comparison with the openness of heaven or the way” (Parkes 1989, 86).

In the “Wandering Dance” Parkes emphasizes that Zarathustra is also a wanderer and a dancer. Throughout the narrative Zarathustra proceeds to wander, Parkes continues, “from place to place, trying out the perspectives of mountain top and valley, underworld and ocean” (Parkes 1983, 243–44). Parkes points out that the “tightrope walker” is literally a “tightrope dancer” (*Seiltänzer*), and this, he suggests, is one of the keys to the whole text: “This corresponds to the dance as a central image in *Zarathustra* and an indispensable capability of the overman. The overman must be dancer because through realizing the relativity of all perspectives, he knows that there is no longer any firm ground on which to take a stand” (Parkes 1983, 244). At this point Parkes seems to fully embrace a perspectivism in both Zhuangzi and Nietzsche in which it would not make sense to speak of a perspectiveless experience that would enable “knowing things as they are in themselves.”

In subsequent writings, Parkes seems to want to pull both Nietzsche and Zhuangzi back from perspectivism, at least a little, in emphasizing a “transperspective experience.” He begins to suggest this as he turns his attention to defending Nietzsche as an ecological thinker. In his characterization of the development of Nietzsche’s thought, Parkes sees a tension developing in the middle period of his writings where there is, on the one hand, a growing awareness of how our conceptions of nature are “conditioned by various kinds of fantasy projections,” and yet also

a recognition of the need to withdraw these projections. “The tension between a view that understands fantasy projection as an ineluctable (if occasionally see-throughable) aspect of the human condition and one that allows for a seeing of the world of nature as it is in itself, apart from human projections on to it,” Parkes explains, “persists to the time of *Zarathustra*” (Parkes 1999, 170). Parkes thinks Nietzsche is suggesting a “withdrawal of at least some kinds of projection,” when he suggests, in *The Joyous Science*, the task of naturalizing the human being “by means of the pure newly discovered, newly redeemed nature” (Parkes 1999, 169; Nietzsche 2001, 110). Human beings have misunderstood the relationship between human beings and nature because they have misunderstood both human beings and nature. The task of re-naturalizing the human being requires a new understanding of nature, and involves a twofold process, as Parkes explains, “to strip away the fantastic metaphysical interpretations of human origins that have obscured human nature, and to confront human beings with nature itself, similarly stripped of human projections” (Parkes 1999, 179). The key passage in *Zarathustra* Parkes turns to as also suggesting this experience of nature stripped of human projections is Zarathustra’s blessing in “Before Sunrise”: “But this is my blessing: to stand over each and everything as its own Heaven, as its round roof, its azure bell and eternal security” (Nietzsche 2005, 143). Parkes finds that Zarathustra’s blessing, in liberating all things from their bondage under purpose, “frees them from any universal teleology, whether stemming from divine providence or the projection of a scientific view of progress, in order to let them be—or rather, come and go—in what Nietzsche calls the ‘innocence of becoming’” (Parkes 1999, 172). As Parkes explains elsewhere: “‘Before Sunrise’ is of crucial importance since it seems to go beyond Nietzsche’s customary perspectivism and allows for an experience of the world that is

not merely ‘from our little corner’ but from a horizon that transcends anthropocentric views” (Parkes 2000, 192).

In a later essay, Parkes finds Zarathustra’s blessing to resonate with both Daoism and Zen in allowing things to be just as they are: “Just as the Daoist sage and the Zen master are able to experience events in the ‘self-so-ing’ of their spontaneous unfolding, so Zarathustra’s blessing lets each particular thing generate its own horizons, arising and perishing just as it does. In terms of environmental ethics, to experience in this way allows one to appreciate the intrinsic value of the natural world absolutely” (Parkes 2005, 89). Parkes finds this resonance with Zarathustra’s blessing in the ‘Autumn Floods’ dialogue in the Outer Chapters of the *Zhuangzi* where the sage is described as able to “penetrate the pattern of the myriad things” by “fathoming the beauty of heaven and earth” and thus have “a full view of heaven and earth” (Zhuangzi 1981, 148). Parkes also points to a passage in the Inner Chapters where Zhuangzi suggests the importance of knowing the difference between the human and Heaven: “To know what is Heaven’s doing and what is man’s is the utmost in knowledge. Whoever knows what Heaven does lives the life generated by Heaven. Whoever knows what a man does uses what his wits know about to nurture what they do not know about” (Zhuangzi 1981, 84). Parkes draws out the comparison with Zarathustra’s blessing: “Just as the Daoist sage (a precursor of the Zen master) is able to broaden his perspective to the point where he is able to ‘illumine all things in the light of heaven,’ and by acting in a way harmonious with heaven and earth can ‘help the ten-thousand things be themselves’, so Zarathustra’s blessing lets each particular thing generate its own horizons and be (or, rather, *become*: arise and perish) just as it is” (Parkes 2000, 192–93).

Sometimes Parkes seems to acknowledge that there is no transcending perspectivism in Nietzsche’s task of broadening perspectives: “This is not a transcending toward some God’s eye

perspective or view from nowhere, but rather a broadening of the human world view to include an appreciation of the perspectives of the natural phenomena with which we share the world” (Parkes 2005, 81). Yet in the very same text, Parkes goes on to emphasize that even though Nietzsche “is certainly concerned with our interpretations of and projections on to the natural world, but this does not mean that we can never know nature ‘as it is in itself’”¹⁰ (Parkes 2005, 87). In that essay and in the most recent one, Parkes thinks Nietzsche elaborates on the idea of knowing things as they are in themselves, rather than as human awareness construes them, when he writes, in the notebooks from 1881: “The task: to see things as they are!” (Parkes 2020, 70). Parkes seems to suggest here that Nietzsche’s task of seeing things “as they are” involves transcending perspectivism.

Parkes contends that Nietzsche’s task invites a comparison with Zhuangzi’s recommendation of the fasting of the heart-mind (*xin 心*). As Parkes explains this is a “matter of emptying the mind of what we human beings bring to our engagement with the world in the way of prejudices and preconceptions, inclinations and aversions, all of which get in the way of our experiencing what is actually going on” (Parkes 2020, 67). As Parkes puts it earlier, this fasting of the heart-mind “dissolves sedimented judgments and prejudices in the mind, and loosens habitual reactions in the body, so that the energies of heaven and earth can flow through, unimpeded and keep the practitioner on course” (Parkes 2013, 13). In the most recent essay Parkes suggests this fasting of the heart-mind allows for seeing things as they really are: “This fasting of the heart bypasses human prejudices and lets one experience through the openness of *qi*, ‘the presence of beings’” (Parkes 2020, 67). Drawing together these passages from Nietzsche

¹⁰ Parkes is responding to the view expressed in Martin Drenthen, “The Paradox of Environmental Ethics: Nietzsche’s View of Nature and the Wild,” *Environmental Ethics* 21 (1999): 163–75. 166.

and Zhuangzi, Parkes contends both thinkers suggest an experience going beyond merely seeing from multiple perspectives, to a “perspectiveless experience” in which one is able to know “things as they are in themselves, rather than as human awareness construes them” (Parkes 2020, 70–71).

As Parkes has made quite clear, Nietzsche surely does emphasize overcoming the narrow anthropocentric view that has shaped so much of the human comportment toward the natural world; and since the notion of the *Overhuman* involves overcoming the human in some sense, it is obvious that Nietzsche emphasizes overcoming the “merely” human anthropocentric perspectives. But does Parkes really mean to suggest something of a return to the notion of *nature as origin*, the view that is the target of the poststructuralist critique of the traditional notion of ‘nature’?¹¹ At one point Parkes explains that he is responding to the problem posed by the poststructuralist deconstruction of “nature,” the view, as he puts it, that “nature is always socially constructed, so we can never reach anything like ‘pure’ nature in itself, apart from human factors that condition all experience of it”¹² (Parkes 2013, 2). The problem, of course, is that the poststructuralist critique of the notion of *nature as origin* owes so much to Nietzsche’s thought.

In the preface to *The Joyous Science*, the text where Parkes finds Nietzsche suggesting the task of confronting human beings “with nature itself, similarly stripped of human projections,” Nietzsche makes a bit of a risqué joke calling into question the very notion of a

¹¹ This is the view, as Steven Vogel explains, of “nature” as “a stable world that precedes humans, ontologically prior to human activity and to the social structures (and the language) within which that activity takes place” (Vogel 1998, 170). As Vogel also explains, the poststructuralist project of deconstruction that begins with Derrida “is a project of taking that which appears to be original, foundational—in a word: natural—and revealing the complex processes of linguistic and social construction required to produce that appearance” (Vogel 1998, 170).

¹² Vogel addresses this concern, noting that there has been some anxiety among environmental philosophers since there is this “vague sense that ‘postmodernism,’ by turning the whole world into a text, denies the very existence of nature and therefore the significance of attempts either to understand the dangers to which it is currently exposed or to argue for the need to protect it” (Vogel 1998, 169).

“naked truth,” emphasizing that we “should cherish the *modesty* with which nature has concealed herself behind enigmas and iridescent uncertainties” (Nietzsche 2018, 13). One would be hard pressed to find a better, more succinct statement of the poststructuralist critique of the conception of nature as origin. One might also recall the famous fragment from Heraclitus, “Nature loves to hide” (Heraclitus 1979, 33), which Nietzsche is surely playing on here. One should cherish the modesty of nature, concealing herself behind enigmas and iridescent uncertainties; and, by implication, one should be more modest with respect to nature, giving up the “youthful madness” as Nietzsche puts it, to see nature stripped of her veils. What may be the most radical aspect of Nietzsche’s thought—and the one aspect most often missed—is the modesty of his thought. Is not the very notion of seeing nature, as it is in itself, exactly what Nietzsche is here finding indecent?

Nietzsche continues this play with the “woman-truth” in the preface to *Beyond Good and Evil* where he again makes fun of philosophers, this time portraying them as lovesick suitors, clumsy in their pursuit of the woman-truth, and left standing around all “dispirited and discouraged” because they never understood the woman-truth, never understood that “she has not allowed herself to be won” (Nietzsche 1966, 2). This is where Nietzsche goes on to suggest that the problem with these lovesick philosophers is that they were seduced by Socrates and thus fell into Plato’s error of “denying *perspective*, the basic condition of all life.” In contrast to this, Nietzsche’s “philosophers of the future,” returning now to the end of the preface to *The Joyous Science*, will be those who understand that they are artists.

In order to emphasize a transperspectival experience allowing for “knowing things as they are,” Parkes ends up deemphasizing the creative activity of the philosopher he had earlier celebrated in “The Wandering Dance.” In the latest essay he wonders, “what are we to make of

Nietzsche's occasional praise of creative experience and repudiation of 'mirror'-like perception?" (Parkes 2020, 78). The problem here is that Nietzsche's praise of creative experience hardly seems occasional, as the conception of the philosopher as artist seems so crucially important in Nietzsche's thought from *The Birth of Tragedy* to the last writings. Take, for example, this passage from *Beyond Good and Evil* in which Nietzsche uses an analogy drawn from painting to suggest the philosopher as artist: "Is it not sufficient to assume degrees of apparentness and, as it were, lighter and darker shadows and shades of appearance different 'values,' to use the language of painters? Why couldn't the world *that concerns us*—be a fiction?" (Nietzsche 1966, 46–47). The modesty of Nietzsche's thought emphasizes that the world that concerns us is a fiction, a product of an active interpretation. There may be narratives, stories we tell ourselves about the point of it all and the nature of nature, but there is no "ultimate and real" story or "metanarrative."¹³

The emphasis on art from the earliest to the last writings is indicated by the prominence of the figure of Dionysus in Nietzsche's thought. In what might be regarded as his last words, the closing line of his autobiography *Ecce Homo*, Nietzsche writes: "Have I been understood? — *Dionysus against the crucified one*" (Nietzsche 2007, 95). One might get some sense of what he means by this opposition from what he says about *The Birth of Tragedy* in the preface that he attached to the second edition fourteen years after the initial publication. There he makes clear that his first book is opposed to the Christian teaching which is "hostile to art" because of its "vengeful antipathy to life itself: for all of life is based on semblance, art, deception, points of

¹³ This suggestion that we should understand that the world that concerns us is a fiction anticipates Lyotard's famous characterization of the postmodern condition as an "incredulity toward metanarratives" (Lyotard 1979, xxiv–xxv). This is also what Derrida meant by the controversial phrase "*There is nothing outside of the text [il n'y a pas de hors-texte]*" (Derrida 1974, 158), often misunderstood as the claim that there is nothing outside of language. What the phrase really says is that "there is no outside-text" or, in other words, there is no truth without veils, no access to a reality that is not already a product of interpretation.

view, and the necessity of perspectives and error” (Nietzsche 1967a, 23). At the end of his career, in *The Antichrist*, Nietzsche condemns the Christian interpretation of the meaning of the “life of Christ” for its arrogance in assuming that its narrative is the “truth” and not just an interpretation. In that narrative, the meaning of the life of Christ is symbolized by the image of the crucified one—the death on the cross was the promise of eternal life in heaven for the believer.¹⁴ The “crucified one” in Nietzsche’s last words is perhaps an image both for the Christian interpretation expressing the longing for another world, and also for this hostility to art, this inability to recognize its own interpretation as an interpretation. Against this denial of art, Nietzsche’s last words point to “Dionysus,” a figure always connected with art, indeed, with the highest aim of art in Nietzsche’s thought. Nietzsche’s last words would then suggest that if one wants to understand him, one must understand this opposition between “Dionysus” and “the Crucified”—the opposition between the philosopher as artist, modest with respect to the woman-truth, in contrast to the philosopher who longs to see nature stripped of her veils.

The Birth of Tragedy is often regarded as merely illustrating Nietzsche’s youthful Romanticism when he suggests that the Dionysian experience reveals the truth of reality behind the veils. It may offer a preview of his mature thought, however, in the suggestion that what the Dionysian experience reveals is not the truth of reality as it is in itself—*nature as origin*—but rather, the abysmal truth that there is no truth of reality as it is in itself. In the crucial passage, Nietzsche explains that in the Dionysian experience “*Excess (Das Übermass)* revealed itself as truth” (Nietzsche 1967a, 46; 1987, 46). All of our truths, Nietzsche suggests, are the result of the Apollonian drive to carve the figure out of the stone—the drive to make sense of the chaos of

¹⁴ Against this narrative Nietzsche offers a different interpretation: The “kingdom of heaven” is a state of the heart—not something that is to come “above the earth” or “after death.” . . . The “kingdom of God” is nothing that one expects; it has no yesterday and no day after tomorrow, it will not come in “a thousand years”—it is an experience of the heart; it is everywhere, it is nowhere” (Nietzsche 1977, 608).

existence; Dionysian insight, however, reveals truth as *excess*—despite all our attempts to make sense of existence, it always exceeds all those attempts as it is always capable of being interpreted otherwise. Here is nature, not as origin, but as abyss. The preview of Nietzsche’s mature thought lies in confronting the abyss that is revealed in the Dionysian experience.¹⁵

Later, Nietzsche’s confrontation with this abysmal truth is developed most powerfully in the “death of God,” a metaphor for the collapse of the traditional notion of truth as ground that has served as a foundation of Western thought since Plato. As this notion of truth is symbolized by the sun in Plato, the “death of God” is like unchaining the earth from its sun, opening up an abyss in which we are falling, without direction, “as through an infinite nothingness” (Nietzsche 2018, 133-134), or like an “eclipse of the sun,” that leads inevitably to the collapse of “our entire European morality” (Nietzsche 2018, 225). The nihilistic consequence of this leads some environmental philosophers to dismiss Nietzsche as an ecological thinker; and this may be what leads Parkes to want to pull Nietzsche back from his perspectivism, back from the emphasis on art and creative experience, back from confronting this abyss. In the “Wandering Dance” essay, however, Parkes draws attention to Zarathustra’s confrontation with the abyss in the teaching concerning the Overhuman. There Parkes points out that the tightrope walker must be a dancer because he knows there is no longer any firm ground upon which to stand, because “every apparently firm ground (*Grund*) is, for Nietzsche, an abyss (*Abrgrund*)” (Parkes 1983, 244).

Parkes emphasizes what Zarathustra says at the edge of the abyss: “Courage also slays dizziness

¹⁵ John Sallis suggests this preview of Nietzsche’s mature thought in *The Birth of Tragedy* in the “shimmering shining” which results when the Apollonian and Dionysian are brought together in Greek tragedy: “Tragedy both reveals and conceals the Dionysian abyss. And yet, such revealing and concealing are no longer simply binary opposites, nor is the disclosure thus to be thought as a mere mean between these opposites. In the determination of tragedy Nietzsche is under way to a thinking of disclosure that would differentiate it decisively from mere uncovering (limited by a symmetrical opposite). For it is a matter of a disclosure of the abyss, of that which withdraws from any presentation, of that which cannot as such be present (or absent, as long as absence is considered merely the complementary opposite of presence). It is a matter of a disclosure in which, nonetheless, the unrepresentable is brought to shine in the distance as sublime” (Sallis 1991, 100).

at the edge of abysses: and where would the human being not stand at the edge of abysses? Is to see not itself—to see abysses?” (Parkes 1983, 244).¹⁶

Seeing is seeing abysses, Nietzsche emphasizes, because seeing always involves perspective points of view, and the world is always interpretable otherwise. Nietzsche suggests this in another well-known passage from *The Joyous Science*: “the world has once more become “limitless” (*unendlich*) to us, in so far as we cannot deny the possibility that it *contains limitless interpretations*” (Nietzsche 2018, 272; 1982, 271). In the aphorism just prior to the madman’s announcement of the “death of God,” Nietzsche suggests the sea as an image for this “infinity” or “limitlessness” of perspectivism: “We have left dry land and put out to sea! . . . there will be hours when you realize that it is infinite, and that there is nothing more terrible than infinity (*Unendlichkeit*). (Nietzsche 2018, 133; 1982, 137). Instead of turning to an experience of things as they are in themselves, Nietzsche’s response to the crisis opened up by the “death of God” is to suggest the courage needed at the edge of abysses, the courage also of an intrepid seafarer venturing out into the open sea:

In fact, we philosophers and “free spirits” experience the news that “the old God is dead” as if illuminated by a new dawn; our hearts are overflowing with gratitude, astonishment, presentiment, expectation—at last the horizon seems free again, even if it is not be bright; at last our ships can set sail again, ready to face any danger; every venture of the knowledge-seeker is permitted again; the sea, *our* sea, lies open again before us; perhaps there has never been such an “open sea.” (Nietzsche 2018, 226)

Nietzsche’s response to the crisis of nihilism is then this courage of the seafarer, the courage to continue to venture out into the open sea and attempt to make sense of existence, all the while knowing that all around us there is only the open sea and no solid ground, since the world is always capable of being interpreted otherwise. We must continue seeking knowledge,

¹⁶ I have altered the translation, combining Kaufmann’s translation, which Parkes uses here, slightly altered with Parkes’s own later translation (Nietzsche 2005, 135).

knowing full well that the world that concerns us is a fiction, that we are artists, that we are dreaming and must continue to dream lest we perish. The notion of the philosopher as lucid dreamer—“I must continue to dream lest I perish” (Nietzsche 2018, 73)—is echoed in another, much discussed line from the late notebooks: “We possess *art* lest we *perish of the truth*” (Nietzsche 1968, 435). In those notes Nietzsche emphasizes art as the “countermovement to nihilism” (Nietzsche 1968, 419, 452), and in this we hear an echo of the thesis of *The Birth of Tragedy* that art is the “saving sorceress” necessary to go on living after Dionysian insight into the abysmal, tragic character of existence.¹⁷

Considering the play with lucid dreaming in the *Zhuangzi*, the notion that Zhuangzi thinks a “perspectiveless experience” is possible seems questionable. One might wonder, first of all, whether the very notion of the “mutuality and collaterality” of “heaven and earth” and human beings precludes the very possibility of seeing “heaven and earth” as it is in-itself? The passage from the Outer Chapters where Parkes wants to emphasize the notion of having a “full view of Heaven” seems to really only emphasize overcoming the anthropocentrism that reduces “heaven and earth” to a mere resource for human use. In the passage from the Inner Chapters where Parkes wants to call attention to Zhuangzi’s emphasis on knowing the difference between

¹⁷ “Here, when the danger to his will is greatest, *art* approaches as a saving sorceress, expert at healing. She alone knows how to turn these nauseous thoughts about the horror or absurdity of existence into notions with which one can live” (Nietzsche 1967a, 60). This is, at least in part, why Nietzsche suggests that the high point of Greek culture was not Socrates and Plato, but rather, Aeschylus and Sophocles. Socrates and Plato had a naively optimistic view that it was possible to awaken from the dream and discover the truth about the nature of things, while Aeschylus and Sophocles had the courage to face the abysmal absurdity of existence. The key to understanding how art is this countermovement I have earlier described as the shimmering shining when both the Apollonian and Dionysian art drives are brought together in tragedy: “Thus, in the coming together of the Apollonian and Dionysian in Greek tragedy there is a continuous cycling reciprocal movement in which the shining forth of beautiful illusions is necessary in order to deal with the Dionysian insight into the abysmal nature of existence; and then the Dionysian insight is necessary in order to tear through those Apollonian veils of appearance, shattering the dream and its beautiful illusions. This, in turn, must inevitably be followed again by the further shining forth of images. So, there is in the work of art that was Greek tragedy as Nietzsche understood it, this repeating cycling of the two opposed movements of drawing and withdrawing, figuring and disfiguring—what Sallis refers to as the ‘abysmal effect’ that spaces Nietzsche’s discourse—so that the shining forth of the figure that comes forth is a shimmering shining” (Freeman 2013, 59).

Heaven and the human being, Zhuangzi goes on to admit there is a problem here: “So how could I know whether what I call the Heavenly is not really the Human? How could I know whether what I call the Human is not really the Heavenly” (Zhuangzi 2009, 38–39). Isn’t the point of knowing the difference between Heaven and human beings to emphasize the modesty we should have in all our efforts to understand the vastness of “heaven and earth”? This notion of the vastness (*da* 大) of “heaven and earth” draws a comparison with Nietzsche’s imagery of the limitlessness (*Unendlichkeit*) of the sea and the modesty of the philosopher as lucid dreamer. When Zhuangzi ridicules Confucius and others for thinking they are awake when they are still dreaming, he admits “when I say you’re dreaming, I am dreaming too” (Zhuangzi 2009, 19).

In the passage from the notebooks where Parkes emphasizes the task of seeing things as they are, Nietzsche explains that the means to do this is “to be able to see with a hundred eyes, from many persons!” (Parkes 2020, 70). Here Nietzsche seems to suggest that seeing “things as they are” involves recognizing that we only see things as they are from perspective points of view. Rather than contrasting with the perspectivism in which Nietzsche emphasizes that there is “only a perspective seeing,” this passage is consistent, emphasizing that the means to seeing things as they are, is to see from multiple perspectives. As Parkes had explained in the “Wandering Dance” essay, if one becomes fixated in one perspective one can fail to recognize it as a perspective. One might be deluded into thinking that one sees reality as it is in itself apart from its appearance. The more we are able to see from different perspectives, the more we will be able to recognize that we only see from perspective points of view.¹⁸

¹⁸ David Jones also draws this resonance between Nietzsche and Zhuangzi: “Nietzsche’s decentered approach to the world’s unfolding resonates with Zhuangzi’s vision of *it* and *other* and placing oneself at the axis of *dao*, which is the fluid perspectival perspective that knows itself as a perspective amongst innumerable competing perspectives that are constitutive of everything” (Jones 2005, 238).

As mentioned earlier, Parkes suggests that Zarathustra's blessing, as well as the teachings of the Daoist sage and Zen master, open up an experience which "allows one to appreciate the intrinsic value of the natural world absolutely" (Parkes 2005, 89). Nietzsche, however, seems to explicitly reject the very notion of "intrinsic value": "Whatever has *value* in the present world has no intrinsic or natural value (*das hat ihn nicht an sich*)—there is no such thing—but rather the value which has been given (*gegeben*) and bestowed (*geschenkt*) upon it, and it was *we* who gave and bestowed! We alone have created the world *which is of any concern to man!*" (Nietzsche 2018, 194; 1982, 189). This passage anticipates not only the passage from *Beyond Good and Evil* where Nietzsche suggests that the "world *that concern us*" is a fiction, but also the play with giving and bestowing which is such a central theme in *Zarathustra*, most crucially in the exhortation to remain loyal to the earth. This theme of the gift, of giving and bestowing, shines forth in the text through the image of the golden sun. The sun always gives or bestows its light; and gold, Zarathustra explains, has the highest value only as an image or "allegory of the highest virtue" which he goes on to explain is "the bestowing (*schenkende*) virtue" (Nietzsche 2005, 65; 1968a, 93). At least in part then, this gift-giving virtue involves understanding that there are no intrinsic values, no value in itself, as value is a gift that is given or conferred upon things, and that we are these givers and bestowers.¹⁹ It would thus seem that Nietzsche's relevance as an ecological thinker has to be thought together with his insistence that we are the givers and bestowers of value.

¹⁹ Throughout *Zarathustra* Nietzsche plays with the fact that both *geben* and *schenken* can mean to "give," "present," "bestow," or even "confer." *Geschenk* can be rendered as "gift" or "present," and thus when Zarathustra explains at the beginning of the Prologue that the reason he has come down from the mountain is to bring human beings "*ein Geschenk*," Parkes renders this as "a present" whereas Kaufmann uses "a gift." Parkes translates *schenkende Tugend* as "bestowing virtue" and Kaufmann uses "gift-giving virtue." In the passage from *The Joyful Science* above when Nietzsche explains that there is no value in itself because value "has been given (*gegeben*) and bestowed (*geschenkt*) upon it," Nietzsche's text goes on to say "*und wir waren diese Gebenden und Schenkenden*" (Nietzsche 1982, 189) that might more literally be rendered "and *we* are these givers and bestowers."

When Zarathustra implores us to stay true to the earth “with the power (*Macht*) of your virtue” (Nietzsche 2005, 66; 1968a, 95), it should be clear that this power of this gift-giving virtue is what he had earlier introduced when he had explained that the values of a people—the tablets of good and evil—are “the voice of its will to power (*Willens zur Macht*)” (Nietzsche 2005, 51; 1968a 70). The notion of the will to power is thus crucial to understanding Zarathustra’s exhortation to remain loyal to the earth, and Parkes emphasizes this in defending Nietzsche as an ecological thinker when he explains: “it all comes down to a question of will to power, conflicts between competing interpretations and world-views” (Parkes 1999, 185). In the most recent essay, Parkes explains that Nietzsche’s conception of will to power entails that everything is “a configuration of interpreting will to power” and thus “is at every moment construing all other things and is the product of their manifold interactions” (Parkes 2020, 72). Such a dynamic conception of existence as interpenetrating configurations of will to power would seem to be incompatible with the notion of a perspectiveless experience in which one is able to know things as they are in themselves.

It is unlikely that Parkes really means to suggest a return to the notion of nature as origin in Nietzsche’s task of seeing things as they are. In that same recent essay, Parkes goes on to suggest that what Zhuangzi and Nietzsche allow us to do is “go beyond our customary, restricted, all-too-human perspectives, and get a sense of the whole.” He further explains that this is “not a transcendence to a God’s-eye-view, nor a view from everywhere or nowhere, this drive to the heart of things, or withdrawal to the center, may let us see ‘the world from the inside,’ as Nietzsche puts it when he writes of ‘the world as will to power—and nothing besides’” (Parkes 2020, 73). To better understand what Parkes may be getting at, it is time to turn to a deeper

consideration of the problem posed by notion of the will to power, taking up some possible resonances between Nietzsche's thought and Zen.

Zarathustra and Zen

It is well known that Nietzsche had a pessimistic understanding of Buddhism. In *The Antichrist* Nietzsche expresses the hope that his condemnation of Christianity has not involved an injustice toward Buddhism. He says that Buddhism is “a hundred times more realistic than Christianity” in that the concept of “god” had already become irrelevant, and in its psychological approach to the problem of suffering as opposed to the “struggle against sin” (Nietzsche 1977, 586–587). It is also much healthier than Christianity in showing no signs of *ressentiment*. Of the Buddha, Nietzsche writes that “he does not ask his followers to fight those who think otherwise: there is nothing to which his doctrine is more opposed than the feeling of revenge, antipathy, *ressentiment*” (Nietzsche 1977, 587). And yet, because Nietzsche understood *nirvāṇa*, as Schopenhauer thought, to be the final goal of extinction, he concluded that Buddhism was like Christianity in being nihilistic, hostile to life, a religion of *décadence*, and thus not loyal to the Earth. In *Beyond Good and Evil*, Nietzsche describes the thought of eternal recurrence as a joyful affirmation of the world as it is, contrasting this with the “most world-denying of all possible ways of thinking,” which he sees in the philosophy of Schopenhauer and the Buddha (Nietzsche 1966, 68).

Despite Nietzsche's negative view of Buddhism, Parkes has drawn affinities between Nietzsche's thought and the Buddha's central teachings of interdependence (*pratītyasamutpāda*), impermanence (*anitya*), and “no-self” (*anatman*), and especially with Mahāyāna Buddhism, with which Nietzsche was unfortunately not aware. When *nirvāṇa* is understood, not as a liberation from this world, but rather, as another way of being here, there is, as Parkes puts it, a

“consequential reverence for this world,” and this is where “the interesting resonances with Nietzsche’s thinking begin” (Parkes 1996, 373). Bret Davis has challenged Parkes’s attempt to find a resonance between Nietzsche’s thought and Mahāyāna Buddhism, and Zen especially, finding Nietzsche’s central idea of will to power to be incompatible with the “standpoint of *śūnyatā*” in Zen. As Davis puts it, “In Nietzsche’s affirmation of the egoism of will to power, then, we run up against a formidable limit to the search for ‘ironic affinities’ with Buddhism” (Davis 2004, 113). Davis argues that it is the Buddhist path, particularly the way of Zen, which offers “a great affirmation of living *otherwise than willing*” (Davis 2004, 89). Davis explains that the standpoint of *śūnyatā* “demands first of all a radical negation of the will” (Davis 2004, 98). The standpoint of will to power, Davis contends, thus falls short of the standpoint of non-ego on the field of *śūnyatā*, which “requires breaking through all such transmutations of self-centered willing” (Davis 2004, 105). The crux of Davis’s reading that Nietzsche falls short of Zen is his understanding of will to power as the willful craving that the Buddha had identified as the cause of suffering: “To the extent that the will to power could be understood as a form of *tanhā*, a critique of the will to power would lie at the very heart of Buddhism” (Davis 2004, 108).²⁰

Parkes contends that Davis has misunderstood Nietzsche “as advocating the ‘egoism of will to power’” and that this misunderstanding has led him to “consistently overlook or ignore

²⁰ In the background of the exchange between Parkes and Davis on Nietzsche and Zen is the long engagement with Nietzsche’s thought by the Kyoto School philosopher Keiji Nishitani. Davis echoes Nishitani’s reading in *Religion and Nothingness* in which Nietzsche’s thought “remains a standpoint of ‘will,’ not the standpoint of *śūnyatā*” (Nishitani 1982, 265). Nishitani’s reading itself echoes Heidegger’s reading that Nietzsche’s thought, in remaining within the subjectivism of modern thought, falls short of overcoming nihilism. Parkes draws more attention to Nishitani’s earlier work, *The Self-Overcoming of Nihilism*, which Parkes co-translated and which was composed before Nishitani traveled to Freiburg in the late 30s to study with Heidegger. In that work, Nishitani found a close affinity between Nietzsche’s thought and Buddhism, especially Mahāyāna Buddhism, “in such ideas as amor fati and the Dionysian as the overcoming of nihilism” (Nishitani 1990, 180). Davis calls attention to this passage, and remarks that there are “indeed profound points of resonance between Nietzsche and Buddhism, Zen in particular,” but notes that Nishitani goes on to develop a “sympathetic critique” of Nietzsche, and for Davis the crucial issue “comes down to the question of the will, that is to say, to a confrontation between Nietzsche’s radical affirmation and Buddhism’s radical negation of the will” (Davis 2004, 89–90).

key aspects of his [Nietzsche's] thinking that are consonant with Buddhist ideas" (Parkes 2014a, 42–43). As Parkes explains, "a major theme of Nietzsche's psychology, from *The Birth of Tragedy* to *Twilight of the Idols*, is the rejection of the ego as a convenient but ultimately unnecessary fiction" (Parkes 2014b, 87). "Throughout his career," Parkes points out, "Nietzsche regards the I as something that stands in the way of one's becoming what one is" (Parkes 2014a, 44). The crude reading of will to power as a desire for power can be rejected because the "will" in "will to power" is not a self-conscious ego. Although he was concerned about the negative consequences, the *décadence*, that can result from the "disintegration of the ego," Nietzsche "never talks about the task of constructing an ego" (Parkes 2014a, 43).

There is no point in even considering whether there is an overcoming *of* will to power in Nietzsche's thought, Parkes explains, because "the will to power is the whole world, and '*there is nothing outside the whole!*'" (Parkes 2014a, 54). Parkes here calls attention to the famous passage from the notebooks where Nietzsche describes the world as a dynamic play of forces and then concludes "*This world is the will to power—and nothing besides!* And you yourselves are also this will to power—and nothing besides!" (Nietzsche 1968, 550). This conception of the entire world as "will to power and nothing besides" is not "an instance of anthropocentrism," Parkes explains, "since Nietzsche has just desubstantialized the 'soul' into a configuration of forces ('a social structure of the drives and affects') . . . and demonstrated 'will' to be a complex function of forces issuing from a social structure of multiple 'souls' within the body" (Parkes 2005, 84). In undermining the concept of a substantial self, Nietzsche echoes the no-self doctrine in Buddhism. As Parkes explains, "[a]ll this corresponds to the idea of 'no-self' (*anatman*) that is central to Buddhism and which, on the basis of a radically relational ontology, applies equally to the *I* and to things" (Parkes 2014a, 44). Nietzsche's various passages on the will to power

suggests that the universe as a whole, and all living things within it, from the smallest organisms to the most complex human beings are this play of forces.²¹

Perhaps the most challenging passage in thinking through the resonances between Nietzsche's thought and Zen, and the relevance of Nietzsche's thought for environmental philosophy, is the passage from *Beyond Good and Evil* where he emphasizes that "life simply is will to power" (Nietzsche 1966, 203). Davis cautions against "any postmodern or comparative attempt to skip lightly over such passages" (Davis 2004, 113). Just prior to this passage, at the opening of the chapter, Nietzsche writes that "truth is hard" (Nietzsche 1966, 201). One might find what he says next too hard, too dangerous a plant to handle; nevertheless, one might easily provide an analysis explaining the whole climate catastrophe as the result of this hard truth: "life is *essentially* appropriation, injury, overpowering of what is alien and weaker; suppression, hardness, imposition of one's own forms, incorporation and at least, at its mildest, exploitation (*Ausbeutung*)" (Nietzsche 1966, 203; 1984, 179).²² He continues on to say that this "exploitation" is not a character of primitive societies that humanity has evolved out of; nor is this true only of corrupt societies, aberrations from the refined norm of modern advanced civilization. This "exploitation," Nietzsche explains, "belongs to the *essence* of what lives, as a basic organic function; it is a consequence of the will to power, which is after all the will of life."

²¹ Nietzsche's conception that this play of forces that is the will to power is at once the whole universe, but also at play in human beings and the smallest organisms, suggests the fractal patterning which Culliney and Jones have called attention to in their work, *The Fractal Self*. They draw on the metaphor of Indra's Net from the *Avatamsaka Sūtra* in which the universe is depicted as a net of jewels stretching infinitely in all directions, and that when one examines each jewel one finds "each of the many of them reflects the light of every other" (Culliney and Jones 2017, 2). They go on to describe this fractal patterning in the emergence of the cosmos: "This fractally structured emergence subsequently enabled development of the cosmos' complex forms and behaviors in ways that we are just beginning to understand. Complexity in the cosmos organized itself from the bottom up and built, across scale from nanometers to parsecs and through billions of years, worlds so wondrous that they intersect with dreams" (Culliney and Jones 2017, 30).

²² One might do well to recall what Nietzsche writes to a friend in the summer of 1888: "It is not at all necessary or even desirable to side with me; on the contrary, a dose of curiosity, as if confronted with some unfamiliar plant, and an ironic resistance would be an incomparably *more intelligent* position to adopt" (Hayman 1982, 320).

All of life, he explains, strives “to grow, spread, seize, become predominant” precisely because “life simply *is* will to power” (Nietzsche 1966, 203). One might like to resist this thought and argue that Nietzsche was wrong in this supposition that all of life is this will to power; but when one considers the totality of the human impact upon the earth, it is hard to really avoid the conclusion that Nietzsche may have been right in this hard truth about life. When one considers the human impact upon the earth, it is easy to see that the life of human beings—the near exponential population growth, continual depletion of resources, the appropriation and overpowering of alien, that is, non-human and weaker species for food and other resources, the constantly increasing need for energy, and thus the ever increasing release of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere—might be the perfect expression of this force of exploitation that Nietzsche describes here as will to power. In short, one might say that the very notion of the Anthropocene is a confirmation of Nietzsche’s hard truth about life. If life is the will to power as Nietzsche describes in this passage, how does human civilization not inevitably end up causing a collapse of the global ecosystem leading to another mass extinction of life on earth? How could it even be possible to heed Zarathustra’s exhortation to remain loyal to the earth if Nietzsche was right that life is will to power as he describes it in this passage?

It seems the only recourse in resolving this tension in Nietzsche’s thought lies in the possibility of some kind of transformation of will to power, from this basic exploitative will to power to one capable of remaining loyal to the earth. As Parkes explains, since “nothing can twist free from the world ‘as the will to power and nothing besides’ and still be,” what is needed is “a transformation of the interpreting will to power” (Parkes 2014a, 51). Zarathustra’s teaching concerning the Overhuman, the continual overcoming or evolution of human beings, is not about an extinguishing of will to power, but rather, it’s constant overcoming. The will to power in

human beings, from which the bestowing love and understanding comes forth, shaping our values and our truths, by which the world that concern us is created, must become capable of serving the meaning of the Earth.

We are introduced to Zarathustra in the opening scenes of the Prologue, first through his greeting of the morning sun, and then in his encounter with an old man in the forest after he begins his descent from his mountain solitude. The old man addresses him: “Zarathustra is transformed, Zarathustra has become a child, Zarathustra is an awakened one: what do you want now among sleepers” (Nietzsche 2005, 10). In a note to his translation of this passage, Parkes draws attention to the fact that the “awakened one” is a common epithet for the Buddha. How might this awakening in Zarathustra be compared to that of the Buddha? Considering Nietzsche’s lucid dreaming and the Buddha’s reticence to pursuing metaphysical questions, one should pause before imposing a metaphysical interpretation of this awakening. For Zarathustra and the Buddha, it is not like Plato’s cave-dwellers awakening from the dreamworld of “mere appearance” to a “true world,” but rather the more practical, existential awakening to a different way of being in this world, in this present moment. Even in the first teaching concerning the four noble truths, *nirvāṇa* can be understood as another way of being here when one understands that what is extinguished in *nirvāṇa* is not existence, but rather the cause of suffering. Still, even if the will to power is not the willful craving (*taṇhā*) that is the cause of suffering as Davis has assumed, there remains the question of whether there is something like this extinguishment of craving in Zarathustra’s awakening. A similar question is raised in considering the *Fire Sermon*, the third of the Buddha’s discourses. There *nirvāṇa* might also be understood as another way of being here if one understands that the point of the teaching is not extinguishing the fire, but

rather, changing the fuel with which we burn.²³ But then the question remains whether there is anything like the “detachment” (*virajjati*) that is the way to liberation in the Buddha’s teaching in Zarathustra’s awakening.²⁴

Although the notion of *nirvāṇa* as another way of being here may already be the point of the Buddha’s teachings in the *Pali Canon*, it becomes a distinguishing feature of Mahāyāna thought after Nāgārjuna’s famous declaration that *nirvāṇa* is not fundamentally different from *samsāra*.²⁵ The notion of a profound transformation in the depths of the soul or self, changing the fuel with which we burn, is also emphasized in Mahāyāna. Nietzsche’s explorations of the depths of the soul, and the suggestion of a transformation of will to power in those depths, draws a comparison with a transformation in the depths of the ocean of consciousness in Yogācāra Buddhism. As Parkes has emphasized, the play of forces that is will to power in human beings operates to a significant extent below the surface of consciousness. In *Composing the Soul*,

²³ In the PBS documentary *The Buddha: The Story of Siddhartha*, two contrasting interpretations of *The Fire Sermon* are presented, and in these two views the fundamental question concerning Buddhism may be brought to light. D. Max Moerman, Professor of Religion at Barnard College, explains “We’re on fire. We may not know it, but we’re on fire and we have to put that fire out. We’re burning with desire, burning with craving, everything about us is out of control.” In this same documentary, the poet W.S. Merwin offers a different take, suggesting that we have to find a way to turn the three poisons around to their opposites: “The Buddha goes on to talk about the three poisons, greed, anger, and ignorance, and how the three poisons are what is making the fire, and the way out of doing this is, not to deny the three poisons, but to recognize that if you turn them around, you come to their opposites; instead of greed you have generosity, instead of anger you have compassion, and instead of ignorance you have wisdom.”

²⁴ After explaining what is all that is burning (the six internal and external sense bases, the consciousness (*viññāṇa*) that is contingent on those sense bases) the Buddha goes on to say that when a learned and noble disciple sees this, he becomes “dispassionate” or “disenchanted” (*nibbindati*) with regard to all these processes of the self, and through this disenchantment he becomes “detached” (*virajjati*) and through this detachment he becomes “liberated.” (Rahula 1974, 95–96).

²⁵ This is the startling conclusion of Nāgārjuna’s examination of *nirvāṇa* in the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*: “There is not the slightest difference/Between cyclic existence and *nirvāṇa*. There is not the slightest difference/Between *nirvāṇa* and cyclic existence” (Garfield 1995, 331). In the commentary on his translation Jay Garfield explains this point: “Another way of distinguishing between *samsāra* and *nirvāṇa* is to think of them somehow as different places, as Earth and Heaven are often conceived in Western religious traditions and then to think that upon attaining *nirvāṇa* one leaves this place—disappears—and goes there. Of course, if one thinks at all about the historical career of the historical Buddha Shakyamuni, that would entail that upon attaining enlightenment, he would have disappeared. This would make something of a hash of the Buddhist canon. But Nāgārjuna is emphasizing that *nirvāṇa* is not someplace else. It is a way of being here” (Garfield 1995, 332).

Parkes explores in great depth this play of forces that compose the soul in Nietzsche's psychology, and there he points out that "the ocean is a major premise in *Zarathustra*" and "the sea is a fine analogue for the complex relation of the individual soul to the play of will to power that makes up the world" (Parkes 1994, 149–151).

The notion that the world which concerns us is a fiction might be compared with the distinctive Yogācāra doctrine of *vijñapti-mātra* (perception or cognition-only).²⁶ But the crucial question concerning Yogācāra concerns just what the point of the practice (*ācāra*) of yoga might be. It is often understood that the practice of yoga leads to a state in which the discriminating mind (*vijñāna*) ceases, and one is able to see reality as it is, in its suchness (*tathatā*), apart from all interpretation.²⁷ Yogācāra had a profound influence upon Zen, and the question of just what is meant by *tathatā*, this "seeing things as they are," is perhaps the fundamental point of Dōgen's Zen, famously expressed in the "Genjōkōan" fascicle of the *Shōbōgenzō*: "To study the Buddha

²⁶ This is expressed in Vasubhandu's classic summary of Yogācāra teaching in the *Thirty Verses*, where he explains how the metaphors of "self" and "nature" takes place in the transformation of consciousness: "This transformation of consciousness (*vijñāna*) is a discrimination (*vikalpa*), and as it is discriminated, it does not exist [in-itself], and so everything is perception-only (*vijñapti-mātra*)" (Anacker 1984, 187). Of course, this doctrine of *vijñapti-mātra* is often understood as a sort of Buddhist Idealism; but perhaps it might be better understood in drawing the comparison to the view Nietzsche already expressed in the early essay, "Truth and Lie in a Nonmoral Sense," in which he explains that "the intellect unfolds its principal powers in dissimulation (*Verstellung*)" (Nietzsche 1979, 80). (The Sanskrit *vi* is equivalent to *dis* in English and *Ver* in German.) Nietzsche's point is that the intellect does not unfold its powers in simulation, copying reality; it is instead always adding, selecting, interpreting reality from particular perspectives. Even in this early text, Nietzsche suggests this process takes place, to some extent, below the surface of consciousness, and this anticipates his mature view that the will to power interprets.

²⁷ Dan Lusthaus challenges the interpretation of *vijñapti-mātra* as a metaphysical idealism emphasizing that "no Indian Yogācāra text ever claims that the world is created by mind." He goes on to describe correct cognition as "the removal of those obstacles which prevent us from seeing causal conditions in the manner they actually become." He further explains that correct cognition is "euphemistically called *tathatā*, 'suchness,' which Yogācāra texts are quick to point out is not an actual thing, but only a word (*prajñapti-mātra*)." Nevertheless, Lusthaus concludes: "Yogācārins describe enlightenment as resulting from Overturning the Cognitive Basis (*āśraya-paravṛtti*), i.e., overturning the conceptual projections transforms the basic mode of cognition from consciousness (*vi-jñāna*, discernment) into *jñāna* (direct knowing). Direct knowing was defined as non-conceptual (*nirvikalpa-jñāna*), i.e., devoid of interpretative overlay" (Lusthaus 2002, 534–537).

Way is to study the self. To study the self is to forget the self. To forget the self is to be actualized by the myriad things.”²⁸

This issue is a focal point in Dōgen’s reflections in the “Mountains and Waters Sūtra,” another fascicle of the *Shōbōgenzō*, which has been described as a commentary on the ‘Genjōkōan.’²⁹ In one of the crucial passages, Dōgen emphasizes the Yogācāra notion of *vijñapti-mātra* at play in all our seeing:

In general, then, the way of seeing mountains and waters differs according to the type of beings [that sees them]. In seeing water, there are beings who see it as a jeweled necklace. This does not mean, however, that they see a jeweled necklace as water. How, then, do we see what they consider water? Their jeweled necklace is what we see as water. Some see water as miraculous flowers, though it does not follow that they use flowers as water. Hungry ghosts see water as raging flames or as pus and blood. Dragons and fish see it as a palace or a tower, or as the seven treasures or the *mani* gem. [Others] see it as woods and walls, or as the Dharma nature of immaculate liberation, or as the true human body, or as the physical form and mental nature. Humans see these as water. And these [different ways of seeing] are the conditions under which [water] is killed or given life. (Dōgen, 2018, 29)³⁰

Dōgen seems to be suggesting something similar to Nietzsche’s view that we only see things from particular perspectives. But neither in Nietzsche’s thought nor Dōgen’s does this perspectivism entail that we should rest content with our limited perspectives. For Dōgen, the different ways of seeing are not all the same, not equally valid, as they are the conditions under

²⁸ David Loy’s translation of the famous lines from the “Genjōkōan.” There he translates “Genjōkōan” as “Actualizing the Fundamental Point” (Loy 2016, 88). Shohaku Okumura explains “actualization” as a translation of *genjō*: “in each moment of change or movement, the reality of all beings is manifested.” He goes on to explain that *Gen* “means ‘appear’ when used as a verb; as an adjective it means ‘present,’” while *Jō* means “‘to become,’ ‘to accomplish,’ ‘to achieve,’ or ‘to complete.’” The “Genjōkōan” is thus a kōan on the “present becoming present” or, as he explains, when the characters are put together, “*Genjōkōan* is a manifestation of universal, eternal reality at this moment within time, space, and function, in oneness with all beings” (Okamura 2018, 178–179).

²⁹ Okamura explains that the “Mountains and Waters Sūtra,” is “like a commentary on ‘Genjōkōan,’ using mountains and waters as examples of *genjō* and *kōan*” (Okamura 2018, 178). The “mountains,” Okamura explains, “is a metaphor of the network of interdependent origination in which we are coming and going” while “water” is “a metaphor of Buddhadharmā.” In traditional commentaries, Okamura further explains: “this water is called *hosshō-sui*, or Dharma-nature water. *Hosshō* (Dharma nature) is a translation from the Sanskrit word *dharmatā*, the way all beings really are, and is used as a synonym of *tathatā* (thusness), *buddhata* (buddha-nature), and *dharmakāya* (Dharma Body)” (Okamura 2018, 155).

³⁰ Okamura explains that Dōgen is introducing here “an example used in Yogācāra called ‘the four views on one and the same water’” (Okamura 2018, 161).

which all things—the ‘water’ in Dōgen’s reflection—are killed or given life.³¹ Surely, we have to become aware of the consequences of our perspectives, and thus, perhaps, become capable of changing our perspectives; but does Dōgen ever suggest a “perspectiveless experience” in which one is able to see “things are they are in themselves, rather than as human awareness construes them” (Parkes 2020, 70–71)? Dōgen raises this very question: “although we say there is water of various types, it would seem there is no original water” (Dōgen 2018, 29).³² Dōgen does not stop there, however, suggesting a “liberation of water.”³³ Dōgen goes on to explain: “The Buddha has said, “All things are ultimately liberated. They have no abode” (Dōgen, 2018, 30).

Here Dōgen brings together the central teaching of the Buddha, the teaching of the interdependence (*pratītyasamutpāda*) of all things, with the fundamental teaching of Mahāyāna Buddhism taught in the *Heart Sūtra*. It is precisely because everything arises and passes away in interdependence that liberation from suffering is possible. Everything changes and thus suffering is not a permanent condition; it too can pass depending on the conditions. To say that all things have no abode is Dōgen’s expression of the teaching of *śūnyatā*, the profound wisdom (*prajñāpāramitā*) taught in the *Heart Sūtra* by the bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara that everything

³¹ Okamura explains that Dōgen is reflecting, again influenced by Yogācāra thought, on the awareness that we only see things from particular perspectives that are the result of our karmic consciousness. Okamura further explains: “Dōgen’s purpose here is to confuse us, to deconstruct our ready-made, fixed views. He’s not trying to offer another fixed view; he is trying to destroy our views. That’s how we become released from our fixed perspective” (Okamura 2018, 165).

³² Okamura reflects on this passage: “Which is real: the water before being perceived by beings, or the various perceptions of water by various beings? Is there an original water that is the true thing, while our views are illusory? How can we know whether there is such a fixed, original water? How can we go beyond our perspectives and see it? And if there is no original water, then what?” (Okamura 2018, 166).

³³ “Nevertheless, the various waters in accordance with the types [of beings] do not depend on the mind, do not depend on the body [of these beings], they do not arise from [different types of] karma; they are not dependent on self; they are not dependent on other. They are liberated dependent on water” (Dōgen, 2018, 29). Okamura explains that this means, “Water is simply being water, and this is its complete liberation. Not only water but everything is liberated from everything” (Okamura 2018, 167).

that exists, all *dharmas*, are empty of inherent existence (*svabhāva*).³⁴ To understand this emptiness of all things is liberating in breaking the attachment that is the cause of suffering, and thus in allowing for the overcoming of the fixed perspectives that are the result of karmic consciousness.³⁵ But does this enable one to see the original water? Dōgen closes the section on waters in the “Mountains and Waters Sūtra” with the following remark:

When those who study Buddhism seek to learn about water, they should not stick to [the water of] humans; they should go on to study the water of the way of the buddhas. We should study how we see the water used by the buddhas and ancestors; we should study whether within the rooms of the buddhas and ancestors there is or is not water. (Dōgen, 2018, 32)

Not sticking to the water of humans means overcoming those narrow anthropocentric perspectives that are the result of our karmic consciousness, but what is “the water of the way of the buddhas”?³⁶ If all things have no abode, then it doesn’t seem that “seeing things as they are,” seeing “the water of the way of the buddhas,” could mean seeing “things as they are in

³⁴ Avalokiteśvara explains the *prajñāpāramitā* to the venerable Śāriputra: “They should correctly view those five aggregates also as empty of inherent existence. Form is emptiness, emptiness is form. Emptiness is not other than form; form is not other than emptiness. In the same way, feeling, discrimination, compositional factors, are empty. Śāriputra, in that way, all phenomena are empty” (Lopez 1988, 19). Okamura draws the connection between the “Mountains and Waters Sūtra” and the *Heart Sūtra*: “Dōgen and the *Heart Sūtra* are saying nothing is fixed, and this is liberation” (Okamura 2018, 170). In drawing together the *prajñāpāramitā* of the *Heart Sūtra* and the Buddha’s teaching of interdependence, Dōgen is following Nāgārjuna’s famous declaration: “Whatever is dependently co-arisen (*pratītyasamutpāda*)/That is explained to be emptiness (*śūnyatā*)/That being a dependent designation,/is itself the middle way” (Garfield 1995, 304).

³⁵ Okamura explains: “This is Dōgen’s expression of emptiness, with no fixed and permanent self-nature. Everything is completely interdependent origination; nothing is fixed. This is the reality of all beings according to Dōgen. Everything dwells in its Dharma position at this moment. But even though we dwell in this Dharma position, at the same time we are liberated from this position. We cannot stay here; in the next moment, we go somewhere else. This constant flowing, according to Dōgen, is the reality of our life.” Okamura goes on to describe this as an incredibly liberating view: “It allows us to release our fixed concept of ourselves, our idea of human life, our point of view, and our system of values” (Okamura 2018, 168).

³⁶ Okamura explains that Dōgen is expressing a view put forth in the *Lotus Sūtra* that all buddhas appear in this world “to show us the true reality of all beings and allow us to live in accordance with that reality.” Normally, we only see the water of humans, “only the forms (*nāmarūpa*) seen by human eyes.” But what is “the water of the way of the buddhas?” Okamura explains: “Dōgen is saying that we should see water as a true reality of all beings. This means to see water just as it is. Then we need to ask if there is such a thing as ‘water as it is’ before being seen by beings. Even if there is ‘water as it is,’ how can we see it? How can we make certain that what we see is the true reality of water, instead of another, new *nāmarūpa*? When we reach this point, all we can do is open the hand of thought and just sit” (Okamura 2018, 186).

themselves,” or seeing the “original water” as Dōgen puts it.³⁷ It is important to recall that the starting point of Zen is Bodhidharma’s insistence that one should not look outside the mind for the buddha, and thus it would seem that to study the “water of the way of the buddhas” one also has to look within the mind.³⁸ Here is where the “Mountains and Waters Sūtra” helps to explain the “Genjōkōan.” To study the Buddha Way is to study the self. One has to begin by becoming aware of the self and all the ways one has come to see things as a result of karmic consciousness. But then one has to forget this self, not stick to the water of humans, but study the water of the way of the buddhas—to understand that all things have no abode, are empty of inherent existence, existing instead in interdependence with all things. Seeing the water of the way of the buddhas is not about seeing the original water, but rather looking upon all things with the compassion of Avalokiteśvara, the bodhisattva who teaches the perfection of wisdom in the *Heart Sūtra*.

The problem of climate change makes it obvious that human beings are burning up the planet, burning down the forests which provide oxygen to breathe, and burning up so much fossil fuel that the very future of life on earth is imperiled. There is no doubt that if we are to survive, we do have to change the fuel with which we burn, both in the literal sense of the fuel that is powering modern industrial civilization, and also in the metaphorical sense of changing the fuel within, the fuel with which the heart is burning, the fuel that drives the will to power in the depths of the soul. The task of remaining loyal to the earth depends on whether our bestowing

³⁷ Garfield offers this view of seeing things as they are in Nāgārjuna: “To be in saṃsāra is to see things as they appear to deluded consciousness and to interact with them accordingly. To be in nirvāṇa, then, is to see those things as they are—as merely empty, dependent, impermanent, and nonsubstantial, but not to be somewhere else, seeing something else” (Garfield 1995, 332).

³⁸ In the “Bloodstream Sermon” Bodhidharma explains: “Beyond this mind you’ll never find another buddha. To search for enlightenment or nirvana beyond this mind is impossible. The reality of your own self-nature, the absence of cause and effect, is what’s meant by mind. Your mind is nirvana. You might think you can find a buddha or enlightenment somewhere beyond the mind, but such a place doesn’t exist” (Bodhidharma 1987, 9).

love and understanding can serve the “sense” or “meaning” of the earth. The problem, in Nietzsche’s diagnosis, is that the values of the past, the products of that bestowing love so far, have not served the sense of the earth, but rather, have been expressions of the longing for another world, and have reduced this world to a mere resource for human use. The key to remaining loyal to the earth suggested by Nietzsche’s Zarathustra involves, first of all, taking responsibility for being the bestowers of values by which the world that concern us is shaped. But then it involves a transformation or overcoming of the self, overcoming the longing for another world, and overcoming the values which have shaped the world that concerns us.

As this transformation of human being—Zarathustra’s teaching of the *Übermensch*—involves an overcoming of the will to power below the depths of the surface consciousness, it has to involve something deeper than mere argument. This is why Parkes emphasizes, in the “Wandering Dance” that *Zarathustra* is first and foremost a work of imagery. As Parkes puts it, “a philosophy presented in images works on the reader’s psyche by inviting the kind of participation in their play that effects a psychical transformation more radical than just a change of mind” (Parkes 1983, 239). In *Zarathustra*, this transformation of human being is expressed in fiery alchemical imagery.³⁹ The most prominent image is that of the golden sun, the image which shines forth in Zarathustra’s opening and closing discourses, and which marks key points in the

³⁹ It is the fire imagery that links Zarathustra with Dionysus, and thus through which the Dionysian power of transformation is evident in the text. The imagery of fire and lightning are prominent in ancient Greek narratives of Dionysus. Dionysus was the god born of fire and lightning. There is also the scene from Sophocles’ *Antigone* that connects Dionysus with fire and lightning. At the end when the chorus calls upon Dionysus to come and save Thebes, they call upon the god “whose torches of lightning storm the mountains,” the god who sets the hearts and minds of his followers “afire with ecstasy,” the “god of the heavens of fire-pulsing stars that throb like hearts” (Sophocles 1999, 235). In his classic book on Dionysus, Kerényi explains: “Fire is a Dionysian weapon” (Kerényi 1976, 78). What Dionysus does with this weapon, in setting hearts aflame, in burning down to ashes whatever he touches with his lightning torches, is to bring about a transformation of the self. Fire and lightning also connect Zarathustra with Heraclitus, the Presocratic thinker with whom Nietzsche often expressed an affinity. In one fragment Heraclitus describes the cosmos as an “ever-living fire” (Fragment 30), and in another (Fragment 64), he explains, “a thunderbolt steers all things” (Culliney and Jones 2017, 133–134).

narrative of Zarathustra's transformation. There is perhaps a double sense of the bestowing or gift-giving by which Zarathustra implores us to remain loyal to the earth. We have to take responsibility for being the bestowers of values; but in order to remain loyal to the Earth, Nietzsche gives us this image of the golden sun as an image for a love that is a gift, a gift that is given without expectation of a return on an investment. This comes through in that scene from the Prologue when Zarathustra encounters the old man in the forest on his way down from the mountain. When the old man asks Zarathustra why he is coming down, Zarathustra responds "I love human beings" (Nietzsche 2005, 10). The old man responds that he does not love human beings; he loves God instead because human beings are too imperfect for him. He wants something back in return for his love. He hopes to get the greatest return on his investment in eternal life in the next world. Zarathustra responds that his love is a gift. Such a love would seem to require the surrendering of the self-centered willing that Davis found lacking in Nietzsche's thought and would also seem to involve overcoming the exploitative will to power that has led to climate change and the environmental catastrophe that is now impending. It is with this love that Zarathustra implores us to remain loyal to the earth, and as Parkes explains, this love leads to a new health, the great health, that wants "to embrace all things, so that it can bestow and contribute to the world with no egoistic thought of thanks or return" (Parkes 2014b, 87). Parkes draws the resonance with the teaching of the *Heart Sūtra*: "It is the same with the bodhisattva: the attainment of wisdom, which involves the realization of emptiness of the self through its interrelatedness with all things, naturally leads to an abundant generosity and a re-engagement with the world" (Parkes 2000, 183). Parkes suggests that this transformation of human being opens up "the possibility of a radically new way of being for the human"; and this, Parkes emphasizes, "is profoundly relevant for ecological thinking" (Parkes 2005, 81). This, it seems to

me, is the most valuable suggestion in Parkes's work in defending Nietzsche as an ecological thinker and drawing the resonances between Zarathustra, Zhuangzi, and Zen.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ This theme of the gift is the thread running through Derrida's reflections in *The Politics of Friendship*. Toward the end of the text, Derrida turns to the section "On the Friend" in which Zarathustra says, not once but thrice, that "woman is not yet capable of friendship" (Nietzsche 2005, 50). But, as Derrida points out, Zarathustra goes on to say that this is also true for men: "Confirming what has just been pronounced on women, Zarathustra suddenly *turns towards* men—he apostrophizes them, accusing them, in sum, of being in the same predicament. Woman was not man, a man free and capable of friendship, and not only of love. Well now, neither is man a man. Not yet. And why not? Because he is not generous enough, because he does not know how to give enough to the other. To attain to this infinite gift, failing which there is no friendship, one must know how to give to the enemy. And of this, neither woman nor man (up until now) is capable" (Derrida 1997, 283). Derrida goes on to point out the irony of the resonance of Zarathustra's teaching of this gift of friendship with the message of Jesus: "For is not what has just been repeated, doubled, parodied, perverted and assumed also the Gospel message?" (Derrida 1997, 284). The problem—and this Derrida suggests is Nietzsche's critique of Christianity—is that the Gospel message of love still conceived love as an investment rather than a gift. This is the reason for Derrida's rueful reflections on the future of democracy, as the key to democracy, it turns out, is also this gift-giving love. It seems the problem at the heart of democracy is also the challenge of remaining loyal to the earth: can human beings become capable of this gift?

References

- Ames, Roger T. and David L. Hall. 2010. *Dao De Jing: A Philosophical Translation*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.
- Ames, Roger T. 2018. "Roger T. Ames Responds." *Appreciating the Chinese Difference: Engaging Roger T. Ames on Methods, Issues, and Roles*. Ed. Jim Behuniak. Albany: State University of New York Press, 259–262.
- Anacker, Stefan. 1984. *Seven Works of Vasubandhu: The Buddhist Psychological Doctor*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Bodhidharma. 1987. "The Bloodstream Sermon." *The Zen Teachings of Bodhidharma*. Translated by Red Pine. New York: North Point Press.
- Culliney, John L. and David Jones. 2017. *The Fractal Self: Science, Philosophy, and the Evolution of Human Cooperation*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Davis, Bret. 2004. "Zen After Zarathustra: The Problem of the Will in the Confrontation Between Nietzsche and Buddhism." *Journal of Nietzsche Studies* 28: 89–138.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1974. *Of Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques, 1997. *Politics of Friendship*. Translated by George Collins. London and New York: Verso.
- Dōgen, Eihei. 2018. "Sansuikyō." *The Mountains and Waters Sūtra: A Practitioner's Guide to Dōgen's "Sansuikyō"*. Ed. Shohaku Okumura. Translated by Carl Bielefeldt. Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications.
- Freeman, Timothy J. 2013. "The Shimmering Shining: The Promise of Art in Heidegger and Nietzsche." *Comparative & Continental Philosophy* 5.1: 49–66.
- Garfield, Jay L. 1995. *The Fundamental Wisdom of the Middle Way: Nāgārjuna's Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garrard, Greg. 2004. *Ecocriticism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Grubin, David. 2010. *The Buddha: The Story of Siddhartha*. PBS.
- Hayman, Ronald. 1982. *Nietzsche: A Critical Life*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Heraclitus. 1979. "The Fragments." *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus: A New Arrangement and Translation of the Fragments with Literary and Philosophical Commentary*, edited by Charles H. Kahn, 27–86. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Jones, David. 2005. "Crossing Currents: The Over-flowing/Flowing-over Soul in *Zarathustra* and *Zhuangzi*." *Dao: A Journal of Comparative Philosophy* 4.2: 235–251.
- Kerényi, Carl. 1976. *Dionysos: Archetypal Image of Indestructible Life*. Translated by Ralph Manheim. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lopez, Jr., Donald S. 1988. *The Heart Sūtra Explained: Indian and Tibetan Commentaries*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Loy, David. 2016. "Shushōgi Paragraph 1." *Engaging Dōgen's Zen: The Philosophy of Practice as Awakening*. Eds. Jason Wirth, Brian Schroeder, and Bret W. Davis. Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications.
- Lusthaus, Dan. 2002. *Buddhist Phenomenology: A Philosophical Investigation of Yogācāra Buddhism and the Ch'eng Wei-shih lun*. London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. 1984. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Translated by Geoffrey Bennington and Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1966. *Beyond Good and Evil*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Vintage Books.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1967a. *The Birth of Tragedy*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Vintage Books.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1967b. *On the Genealogy of Morals and Ecce Homo: How One Becomes What One Is*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Vintage Books.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1968. *The Will to Power*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann and R.J. Hollingdale. New York: Vintage Books.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1968a. *Also sprach Zarathustra: Ein Buch für Alle und Keinen*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1977. *The Antichrist in The Portable Nietzsche*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Penguin Books.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1979. "Truth and Lies in a Nonmoral Sense." *Philosophy & Truth: Selections from Nietzsche's Notebooks of the Early 1870's*. Ed. Daniel Breazeale. Humanities Press.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1982. *Die Fröhliche Wissenschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Insel Verlag.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1984. *Jenseits von Gut und Böse*. Frankfurt am Main: Insel Verlag.

- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1987. *Die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik*. Frankfurt am Main: Insel Verlag.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1996. *On the Genealogy of Morals*. Translated by Douglas Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1998. *Twilight of the Idols: or How to Philosophize with a Hammer*. Translated by Anthony M. Ludovici.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 2001. *The Gay Science*. Translated by Josefine Nauckhoff. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 2005. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for Everyone and Nobody*. Translated by Graham Parkes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 2007. *Ecce Homo: How To Become What You Are*. Translated by Duncan Large. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 2018. *The Joyous Science*. Translated by R. Kevin Hill. New York: Penguin Classics.
- Nishitani Keiji. 1982. *Religion and Nothingness*. Translated by Jan Van Bragt. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nishitani Keiji. 1990. *The Self-Overcoming of Nihilism*. Translated by Graham Parkes and Aihara Setsuko. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Okamura, Shokaku. 2018. *The Mountains and Waters Sūtra: A Practitioner's Guide to Dōgen's "Sansuikyō"*. Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications.
- Parkes, Graham. 1983. "The Wandering Dance: *Chuang Tzu* and *Zarathustra*." *Philosophy East and West* 33.3: 235–250.
- Parkes, Graham. 1989. "Human/Nature in Nietzsche and Taoism." *Nature in Asian Traditions of Thought*. Eds. J Baird Callicott and Roger T. Ames. Albany: State University of New York Press, 79–97.
- Parkes, Graham. 1994. *Composing the Soul: Reaches of Nietzsche's Psychology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Parkes, Graham. 1996. "Nietzsche and East Asian Thought: Influences, impacts, and resonances." *The Cambridge Companion to Nietzsche*. Eds. Bernd Magnus and Kathleen M. Higgins. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 356–383.

- Parkes, Graham. 1999. "Staying Loyal to the Earth: Nietzsche as an Ecological Thinker." *Nietzsche's Futures*. Edited by John Lippitt. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 167–188).
- Parkes, Graham. 2000. "Nature and the human 'redivinized': Mahāyāna Buddhist themes in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*." *Nietzsche and the Divine*. Eds. John Lippitt and Jim Urpeth. Manchester: Clinamen Press, 181–199.
- Parkes, Graham. 2005. "Nietzsche's Environmental Philosophy: A Trans-European Perspective." *Environmental Ethics* 27.1: 77–91.
- Parkes, Graham. 2013. "Zhuangzi and Nietzsche on the Human and Nature." *Environmental Philosophy* 10.1: 1–24.
- Parkes, Graham. 2014a. "Will to Power as Interpretation." *Journal of Nietzsche Studies* 46.1: 42–61.
- Parkes, Graham. 2014b. "Zarathustra and Asian Thought: A Few Final Words." *Journal of Nietzsche Studies* 46.1: 82–88.
- Parkes, Graham. 2018. "The Art of Rulership in the Context of Heaven and Earth." *Appreciating the Chinese Difference: Engaging Roger T. Ames on Methods, Issues, and Roles*. Ed. Jim Behuniak. Albany: State University of New York Press, 65–90.
- Parkes, Graham. 2020. "In the Light of Heaven before Sunrise: Zhuangzi and Nietzsche on Transperspectival Experience." *Daoist Encounters with Phenomenology: Thinking Interculturally about Human Existence*, Ed. David Chai. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Rahula, Walpola. 1974. *What the Buddha Taught: Revised and Expanded Edition with Texts from Suttas and Dhammapada*. New York: Grove Press.
- Sallis, John. 1991. *Crossings: Nietzsche and the Space of Tragedy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Vogel, Steven. 1998. "Nature as Origin and Difference: On Environmental Philosophy and Continental Thought." *Philosophy Today* SPEG Supplement, 169–181.
- White Jr, Lynn. 1967. "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis." *Science* 155: 1203–1207.
- Zhuangzi. 1981. *Chuang-tzu: The Seven Inner Chapters and other writings from the book Chuang-tzu*. Translated by A.C. Graham. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Zhuangzi. 2003. *Zhuangzi: Basic Writings*. Translated by Burton Watson. New York: Columbia University.
- Zhuangzi. 2009. *Zhuangzi: The Essential Writings: With Selections from Traditional Commentaries*. Translated by Brook Ziporyn. Indianapolis: Hackett Classics.