



# The Genealogy of Morals

*Friedrich Nietzsche , Talfourd Barnett Ely*

Download now

Read Online ➔

# The Genealogy of Morals

Friedrich Nietzsche , Talfourd Barnett Ely

## The Genealogy of Morals Friedrich Nietzsche , Talfourd Barnett Ely

Written in response to a book on the origins of morality by his erstwhile friend Paul Rée, the three essays comprising *The Genealogy of Morals* — all three advancing the critique of Christian morality set forth in *Beyond Good and Evil* — are among Nietzsche's most sustained and cohesive work.

In the first essay — starting from a linguistic analysis of words such as "good," "bad," and "evil" — Nietzsche sets up a contrast between what he calls "master" morality and "slave" morality and shows how strength and action have often been replaced by passivity and nihilism. The next essay, looking into the origins of guilt and punishment, shows how the concept of justice was born — and how internalization of this concept led to the development of what people called "the soul." In the third essay, Nietzsche dissects the meaning of ascetic ideals.

It is not Nietzsche's intention to reject ascetic ideals, "slave" morality, or internalized values out of hand; his main concern is to show that culture and morality, rather than being eternal verities, are human-made.

Whether or not you agree with all of his conclusions, his writing is of such clarity and brilliance that you will find reading *The Genealogy of Morals* nothing short of exhilarating.

## The Genealogy of Morals Details

Date : Published April 23rd 2003 by Dover Publications (first published 1887)

ISBN : 9780486426914

Author : Friedrich Nietzsche , Talfourd Barnett Ely

Format : Paperback 128 pages

Genre : Philosophy, Nonfiction, Classics, European Literature, German Literature

 [Download The Genealogy of Morals ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online The Genealogy of Morals ...pdf](#)

**Download and Read Free Online The Genealogy of Morals Friedrich Nietzsche , Talfourd Barnett Ely**

---

## From Reader Review The Genealogy of Morals for online ebook

## Jacob says

Imagine that you are in a nameless suburb, say California for example, and you stumble home drunk on bad whiskey and stoned off of cheap weed. This is purely hypothetical. You hover over the toilet and puke up the bad whiskey and some nameless food substance. The next morning you sit on the toilet reading this book. You read the lines "the complete and definitive victory of atheism might free mankind of this whole feeling of guilty indebtedness towards its origin, its causa prima. Atheism and a kind of second innocence belong together." You fall over laughing and underline the line in red ink. You underline yourself in red ink. There is no god! You puke on the floor and fall in it laughing. Suburban America and a second innocence? You can't stop laughing at this point.

peiman-mir5 rezakhani says

[illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible]

[illegible]

????? ? ???? ???? ???? ???? ? ???? ? ???? ???? ????... ????? ? ? ???? ? ? ? ?  
 ????? ???? ???? ? ? ???? ? ???? ???? ????... ????? ? ???? ? ???? ???? ? ? ? ?

?????? ?? ?? ?? ?? ?? ?? ??... ?????? ?????? ?????? ?? ?? ?? ?? ?? ?? ?????? ? ?? ? ?? ?? ?????? ???  
?? ?????? ?? ?? ????? ??????

-----  
????????? ?? ?????? ??? ?????????? ?????????? ?????? ?????? ? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ? ?? ??????  
?? ?? ?? ?????? ? ?????? ?? ??... ?? ?????? ?????? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?? ?? ? ??? ? ?? ?  
????????? ?????? ?? ?????? ? ?? ? ?? ?????? ?????????? ?? ?????? ?????? ? ?? ?????? ? ?????? ??????  
?<????? ?????? ? ??????>

---

## Nikos Tsentemeidis says

Απ? τα πιο ?ριμα ?ργα του Ν?τσε και πιο "επ?σημα" σε ?φος. Σ?γουρα χρει?ζεται κι ?λλη  
αν?γνωση, αφο? προηγηθo?ν τα πιο πρ?ιμα.

Δε χρει?ζονται πολλ? λ?για για τον Ν?τσε. Πρ?κειται για φιλ?σοφο με τρομερ? δια?γεια σκ?ψεων  
τις οπο?ες εκφρ?ζει με αξιοσημε?ωτη ευθ?τητα.

---

## Saleh MoonWalker says

?? ?????? ????

?? ?????? ??? ???. ?? ?????? ? ?? "?????? ?? ? ??" ?????? ?? ?? ? ?? ?????????? ?????? ?????? ? ?????? ?????? ??????  
?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?? ?? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?? ??????. ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??????  
????? ?????? ?????? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?? ?? ? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?? ?????? ? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?? ??  
?????? ?????????? ?????? ?????????? ?????????? ?? ??.

?? ?? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?? ?????????? ?? ?????? ? ?????????? ?????? ?? ?? ?????? ?? ?? ?? ??  
????? ?????????? ?? ?????? ?? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?? ??????  
????? ?? ?????? ?????? "?????? ?????? ?????????? ??????????" ?? ?????? ?? ?? "?????? ??????" ?????????? ?????? ?? ??????????  
?????? ?? ?????? ??????

?? ?? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? "?????? ?????? ? ??" ?? ?????? ? ?????? ?? ?????? ?? ???????.

????? ?? ?????? ?????? ? ?????? ?????? ? ?????? ??????. ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?? ?? ?????? ?????? ? ?? ??  
??? ?????? ???.

---

## Dylan Grant says

A truly delightful intellectual romp that is both entertaining and disturbing.

It is entertaining because Nietzsche is an outrageously brilliant writer who expresses his complex

philosophical ideas in a creative way, and who makes even the most cynical ideas sound beautiful. Nietzsche is truly blessed for having the analytical brain of a philosopher as well as masterful skill in sculpting beautiful phrases, like a poet.

It is disturbing because of Nietzsche's tremendous cynicism, which can often make one uncomfortable depending on how attached you are to a certain belief. There is no way around it: this book will probably offend you. If you are a Christian, it will offend you. If you are a leftist of any kind whatsoever it will offend you. If you are an atheist, someone who believes in the power of science, or an agnostic, it will offend you. If you believe in eastern philosophies, it will offend you. That is the real beauty of Nietzsche: he challenges your beliefs and offers a compelling alternative. The Genealogy of Morals is more full of Nietzsche's criticisms of ideas than his attempts to supplant them, though.

I cannot stress how well-written this book is. Nietzsche's words will annihilate your beliefs at the same time that they caress your mind.

It isn't quite up to par as Nietzsche's masterpiece, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, which is one of my favourite books. But it is still excellent. The only major flaw in this otherwise near-perfect book is that I find his argument is really scattered. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* was scattered as well, but it didn't hurt that work because Nietzsche was deliberately trying to be esoteric and hard to understand and that worked really well, since *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* is written as a kind of satire of religious scripture. But *Genealogy of Morals* is his most structured work, and it doesn't seem that Nietzsche is trying to be overly hard to understand here, so I can't forgive him on that one

Other than that small nit-picky detail, this is a truly excellent work of philosophy. Highly recommended to anyone who likes to read philosophy. It's very short, too.

**????? says**

????? ?????? ???? ? ????!! ?? ?????? ?????? ????? ? ???? ?? ?????????? ?????????? ?????? ???!

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

?????????? ???? ?????? ?? ?????? ??? ?????? ?? ?? ?????????? ?????? ??? ?????? ???.. ?????? ??? ??????  
 ?????? ?? ?????? ?? ?????? ?????? ??? ??????

[illegible]

?????. ??? ?????? ?????? ?? ?????? ?? ? ?? ????????????? ?????????? ??? ?????? ?????????? ?????? ????? ??????  
 ?????.

[illegible]

???

[illegible]

??????? ?????? ?????? ????? ?? ?????? ???.

[illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible]

???? ???? ??????? '?????????? ??????' ????????

[illegible][illegible]

?? ?? ?????? ?? ??? ?? ? ?? ?????????????? ????? ?????? ????? ?????? ? ?? ?? ????? ?????? ?????? ?? ?????  
 ???????" .

## Farnaz says

[illegible]

---

## Rowland Pasaribu says

*On The Genealogy of Morals* is made up of three essays, all of which question and critique the value of our moral judgments based on a genealogical method whereby Nietzsche examines the origins and meanings of our different moral concepts.

The first essay, "'Good and Evil,' 'Good and Bad'" contrasts what Nietzsche calls "master morality" and "slave morality." Master morality was developed by the strong, healthy, and free, who saw their own happiness as good and named it thus. By contrast, they saw those who were weak, unhealthy, and enslaved as "bad," since their weakness was undesirable. By contrast, the slaves, feeling oppressed by these wealthy and happy masters, called the masters "evil," and called themselves "good" by contrast.

The second essay, "'Guilt,' 'Bad Conscience,' and the like" deals with (surprise, surprise) guilt, bad conscience, and the like. Nietzsche traces the origins of concepts such as guilt and punishment, showing that originally they were not based on any sense of moral transgression. Rather, guilt simply meant that a debt was owed and punishment was simply a form of securing repayment. Only with the rise of slave morality did these moral concepts gain their present meanings. Nietzsche identifies bad conscience as our tendency to see ourselves as sinners and locates its origins in the need that came with the development of society to inhibit our animal instincts for aggression and cruelty and to turn them inward upon ourselves.

The third essay, "What is the meaning of ascetic ideals?" confronts asceticism, the powerful and paradoxical force that dominates contemporary life. Nietzsche sees it as the expression of a weak, sick will. Unable to cope with its struggle against itself, the sick will sees its animal instincts, its earthly nature, as vile, sinful, and horrible. Unable to free itself from these instincts, it attempts to subdue and tame itself as much as possible. Nietzsche concludes that "man would rather will nothingness than not will."

Nietzsche is difficult to read because he demands that we overturn or suspend many of the assumptions that our very reasoning relies upon. He is one of the Western tradition's deepest thinkers precisely because he calls so much into question. If we can come to understand Nietzsche's genealogical method, his doctrine of the will to power, and his perspectivism as all linked, his arguments will become much easier to follow.

In Nietzsche's distinction between a thing and its meaning, we find the initial doubt with which Nietzsche unravels so many of our assumptions. We are generally tempted to see things as having inherent meanings. For instance, punishment is at once the act of punishing and the reason behind the punishment. However, Nietzsche argues, these things have had different meanings at different times. For instance, the act of punishment has been at times a celebration of one's power, at times an act of cruelty, at times a simple tit-for-tat. We cannot understand a thing, and we certainly cannot understand its origin, if we assume that it has always held the same meaning.

Central to Nietzsche's critique, then, is an attempt at genealogy that will show the winding and undirected route our different moral concepts have taken to arrive in their present shape. Morality is generally treated as sacred because we assume that there is some transcendental ground for our morals, be it God, reason, tradition, or something else. Yet contrary to our assumption that "good," "bad," or "evil" have always had the same meanings, Nietzsche's genealogical method shows how these terms have evolved, shattering any illusion as to the continuity or absolute truth of our present moral concepts.

Because they can have different, even contradictory, meanings over the course of their long life spans, Nietzsche does not believe that concepts or things are the fundamental stuff that makes up reality. Instead, he looks beneath these things to see what drives the different meanings that they adopt over time. Hiding beneath he finds force and will. All of existence, Nietzsche asserts, is a struggle between different wills for the feeling of power. This "will to power" is most evident on a human level, where we see people constantly competing with one another, often for no other purpose than to feel superior to those that they overcome.

That a thing has a meaning at all means that there is some will dominating it, bending it toward a certain interpretation. That a thing may have different meanings over time suggests that different wills have come to dominate it. For instance, the concept of "good" was once dominated by the will of healthy, strong barbarians, and had the opposite meaning that it does now that it is dominated by the will of weak, "sick" ascetics.

According to Nietzsche, then, a belief in an absolute truth or an absolute anything is to give in to one particular meaning, one particular interpretation of a thing. It is essentially to allow oneself to be dominated by a particular will. A will that wishes to remain free will shun absolutes of all kinds and try to look at a matter from as many different perspectives as possible in order to gain its own. This doctrine that has deeply influenced postmodern thought is called "perspectivism."

Nietzsche's inquiries are thus conducted in a very irreverent spirit. Nothing is sacred, nothing is absolute, nothing, we might even say, is true. Our morality is not a set of duties passed down from God but an arbitrary code that has evolved as randomly as the human species itself. The only constant is that we, and everything else, are constantly striving for more power, and the only constant virtue is a will that is powerful, and free from bad conscience, hatred, and resentment.

Nietzsche's main project in the *Genealogy* is to question the value of our morality. Ultimately, he argues that our present morality is born out of a resentment and hatred that was felt toward anything that was powerful, strong, or healthy. As such, he sees our present morality as harmful to the future health and prosperity of our species. While the "blonde beasts" and barbarians of primitive master morality are animalistic brutes, at least they are strong and healthy. On the other hand, our present ascetic morality has "deepened" us by turning our aggressive instincts inward and seeing ourselves as a new wilderness to struggle against. Nietzsche's ideal is to maintain this depth and yet not be ashamed of our animal instincts or of the life that glows within us.

---

## **Brad Lyerla says**

When I was an undergraduate, I tried some Nietzsche. I read *BEYOND GOOD AND EVIL*, *THE GAY SCIENCE* and *THE BIRTH OF TRAGEDY*. This was reading that I did on my own and not as part of a class. I don't remember how I chose those books, but I can report now with no embarrassment that my reading was superficial and that I did not genuinely understand much, if any, of it. More surprisingly, I did not like Nietzsche. He is too much work. He uses words in idiosyncratic ways that are confusing and force multiple re-readings. He relies on clever aphorisms and allegories that seem calculated to appear profound, but always remain at least partly unexplained. He is not expository. He rarely asserts a proposition and then defends it with evidence and reason in the conventional way. Instead, he asserts something and generally cannot be bothered to defend it. He would rather discuss the consequences of his assertions than examine their accuracy as the threshold question. This irritates me now, and I can remember being irritated by it all those decades ago too. I lost interest in Nietzsche.

Several years ago, I read Curtis Cates' biography of Nietzsche. Ugh. I do not remember why I picked that biography. I have a vague recollection of seeing it in the sale bin at a used book store. Whatever drove me to pick it up, it was not a good choice. Nietzsche's life was boring and Cates' intellectual history was not insightful. I lost interest in Nietzsche again.

Then, in a random conversation with a friend whose opinion I value, he mentioned that he had given a talk on *ON THE GENEALOGY OF MORALS* at a local college and thought it was worthwhile. I did not run out and buy a copy, but I also did not forget his comment. I made a mental note to read it when I had time. Some years passed . . .

This past spring, I had the time and inclination to finally read *THE GENEALOGY*. Before I began, I was encouraged to learn that many regard *THE GENEALOGY* to be Nietzsche's most conventional book, and quite a few consider it his best book. That seemed promising. I thought that a conventional presentation of his ideas might make him understandable to someone like me. I began to look forward to digging in and gaining enlightenment. I had to admit that I would love to understand why Herr Nietzsche is held in such high regard.

*THE GENEALOGY* is written as three distinct essays and I will discuss them as such, though I am going to touch on highlights only. If you want the full down and dirty, you will have to read *THE GENEALOGY* yourself. It's short and, at times, insightful and fun. At others, it is very frustrating.

In a brief introduction, Nietzsche explains that he intends to investigate the origin and value of morality. He seems to want to understand the degree to which compassion, self-denial and self-sacrifice promote and benefit humankind.

The first essay is Nietzsche's explanation of the difference between the "good vs. bad" dichotomy in comparison to the "good vs. evil" dichotomy. He seems to see these distinctions as a refutation of 'utilitarianism' which he disdains. (At this point, I was already confused. In the introduction, Nietzsche talks of the value of morality in terms of its benefits to humanity. This is utilitarianism talk. Yet, he starts out almost immediately by disparaging utilitarianism. This annoyed me and seemed a sort of classic Nietzschean maneuver.)

In the case of good and bad, Nietzsche asserts that 'good' is associated with the noble class and 'bad' is associated with the peasant class. He offers as proof for this the fact that the German word for bad, 'schlecht', has a common root with the German word for peasant-like, 'schlicht'. He notes that Greeks referred to nobles applying the Greek word for 'true'. And the Romans used a word that also meant 'warrior' to refer to the noble class. There. Now are you convinced? Per Nietzsche, the words 'good' and 'bad', in some languages, at a distant time in the hoary past, were terms for different social classes and some of that meaning lingers . . .

Next, Nietzsche considers what happens when the ruling class is made up of priests instead of warriors. Priests value purity whereas warrior aristocrats value health, strength, beauty and power. These are the things that are 'good'. Priests stand the warrior values on their head. To priests, the weak, poor, suffering and ugly are the truly 'good' people. Nietzsche calls this morality "slave morality" and in a passage that does nothing to endear Nietzsche to me, he attributes slave morality to Jews. Though it was the martyrdom of Christ that "baited" the world into accepting slave morality, assuring the dominance of a priestly value system.

In the priestly value system, God is defined as good and the opposite of evil. Evil is identified with the strong, the noble and the beautiful. Therefore, in slave morality the world becomes ugly and banal because

the beautiful is evil. Nietzsche does not oppose kindness, humility and forgiveness per se. He does want us to understand that they are transformations of the impotence, submission and cowardice of the slave class.

Nietzsche believes that the conflict between “good and bad” vs “good and evil” reflects two value systems. The latter has been predominant in recent times.

The second essay is mostly a discussion of conscience, justice and punishment.

According to Nietzsche, humans are unique in that they can make promises. This presupposes a continuity of purpose that animals lack. In humans, that purpose is opposed by a tendency to forget. This is healthy. Memory loss prevents a lingering sense of failure and disappointment in humans. It makes it possible to be hopeful about the future.

Conscience is an instinct to carry out responsibilities. Societies have invented means to instill the habit of keeping promises. But Nietzsche insists that a bad conscience is not a fear of punishment. In fact, originally punishment had no connection with what we now call conscience. Rather, punishment originated as a form of repaying a debt. The debtor would repay his creditor by suffering. The creditor was repaid in the form of the pleasure that comes from enjoying the suffering of another. This pleasure is connected to the human experience of power. (Are you rolling your eyes at this? At least a little?)

Nietzsche goes on at length about punishment and suffering. Among other conclusions he draws, he offers the theory that God was invented to make human suffering meaningful. Relatedly, he wonders if free will was invented to make the world more interesting to God.

Nietzsche then returns to the subject of justice and offers a definition that justice is payment by a transgressor of what he owes to the community. Nietzsche thinks that societies move through stages of justice, including a stage where a legal system will be devised to impose justice. Such a system will include elements of mercy, a luxury of the strong.

Nietzsche concludes the second essay by acknowledging that he has been harsh in his criticisms of Christianity. But he feels that the “disease” of “bad conscience” warrants a harsh response. Christianity has associated guilt with feelings that are fundamental and unavoidable as a part of our nature. This creates a desire for otherworldliness or purity that Nietzsche considers nihilistic. He argues that humanity requires an upheaval of values so that moral condemnation no longer attaches to things that are a natural part of earthly human life. He sees Zarathustra, of his earlier writings, as the embodiment of the upheaval that humanity needs.

The third essay addresses asceticism. Nietzsche discusses the attraction asceticism holds for women, the psychologically ill and priests, among others. Women find it enhances their charms, says Nietzsche. (He must have been a fun date.) Psychotic people find asceticism attractive because they wish to withdraw from the world. Priests are drawn to it because it gives them power. These differences suggest a shared fear of nothingness and a corresponding urge to find meaning, Nietzsche believes. (And folks, isn't that a weird inference to draw? Or is it just me?)

Nietzsche then considers the case of Richard Wagner and his opera Parsifal, which praises chastity. Why would Wagner, a master of sensuality, praise asceticism? He may have felt a need to embrace and associate with respectability. To this end, Wagner accepted Schopenhauer and his special metaphysical category of music—as an expression of the basic nature of the universe.

Nietzsche then offers a discussion of Schopenhauer's personal psychology and his need for enemies. (Sort of like a guy elaborating on an old girlfriend, "she could never get along . . .")

Nietzsche thinks that philosophers generally like asceticism for the independence it brings. Poverty, humility and chastity free one from desire. At one time, irrationality, cruelty and violent emotions were considered virtues. But now the opposite is true, resulting in the ascetic ideal becoming associated with priests, something Nietzsche seems mildly unhappy about. The essay then discusses how asceticism is both a symptom and a cure of poor psychological health. Little of this discussion seems plausible.

Finally, Nietzsche concludes the third essay with the observation that asceticism is a "will to nothingness" and 'nothingness' is a purpose for humans to cling to. The alternative is to live with no purpose at all and that provides no meaning to one's will. Humans would rather have nothingness for a purpose than have no purpose at all.

So, wow. That's a lot of stuff to wrap your head around. But for me, it was filled with unsubstantiated and unlikely speculation. Much of his speculation could have been checked empirically, but Nietzsche makes no effort to do that. That would involve genuine scholarship and would be hard work. Seemingly, he would rather just prattle on like an over-caffeinated undergraduate on a late night study break.

I don't get it.

To be fair, there are nuggets buried here and there. And Nietzsche is provocative in a way that engages us. But for me, he lacks credibility. Often, his argument amounts to nothing more than "because I say so" or, perhaps, "it must be so because it sounds so clever". Which is far worse. Plus, he is stubbornly cryptic for my tastes. Are these points of his meant to be accurate descriptions of reality? Or are they thought experiments meant to challenge us without necessarily resembling the real world?

Unraveling Nietzsche is exhausting.

It is possible, of course, that I am not reading Nietzsche in the right way. It might be that I am holding him to a standard that should not be applied to him. For example, when Plato or Aristotle or Augustine offer strange theories or recite tall tales, I ignore it and look for the larger meaning. Perhaps, that is how to read Nietzsche too. His prose displays no sense of accountability for the accuracy of details - historical or otherwise. So maybe I should not expect accuracy in the details with Nietzsche. Perhaps, I should focus on the big picture.

If I were to do that, I might conclude that Nietzsche does not like the bourgeois spirit of Europe in the latter half of the 19th Century. He does not like the mediocrity and egalitarianism of the rising middle class. He does not like the comfortable and smug thing that Christianity had become. He longs for greater creativity and beauty. He thinks that the creators of beauty should be treated as special and that they should be encouraged to think courageously, to act vigorously and to take risks. The creators of beauty should be free to pursue their vision and not be held back by the passive, careful and mundane attitudes that are the hallmark of the middle class. Nietzsche may be saying that provocative projects in art and literature should be valued by the rest of us, even when they challenge or frighten us.

In this way of thinking about Nietzsche, he may have foreshadowed one of the great quandaries of the 20th century, namely, what is the role of elitism in a world that no longer has an aristocracy? Who will lead us in matters of artistic and moral judgment when everyone's opinion is just as "valid" as everyone else's? Clearly, we are not meant to conclude that the popularity of the vulgar Two and a Half Men means that we are to take it as seriously as we do Shakespeare or Beethoven or Goethe? But if popularity is not the metric, then what

is? Nietzsche may be saying that who decides is even more important than identifying what should be the standard.

Those are interesting and important things to be thinking about. But if that was Nietzsche's project, then why didn't he simply say so?

??????? ?????? says

[illegible]

??? ????? ???? ???? ???? ???? ????? ?????

[illegible]

৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭ ৭৭ ৭৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭৭৭ ৭৭ ৭৭৭৭৭৭ ৭৭ ৭৭৭৭ ৭৭ ৭৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭: <https://www.goodreads.com/review/show...>  
 ৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭৭৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭৭৭৭৭ ৭৭ ৭৭ ৭৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭৭৭ ৭৭ ৭৭৭৭৭৭৭৭  
 "৭৭৭৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭৭৭ ৭৭ ৭৭ ৭৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭৭৭ ৭৭ ৭৭৭৭ ৭৭ ৭৭৭৭৭৭ ৭৭ ৭৭ ৭৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭৭৭... ৭৭ ৭৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭৭৭ ৭৭ ৭৭৭৭  
 ৭৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭ ৭৭৭৭৭৭"

??? ?? ??? ??????? ??? ?????

[illegible]

??? ????? ?? ???? ???? ????? ???? ????? ?? ??? ??? ????????? ??????? ??????? ?? ?? ????????? ?? ???? ?? ?????.

[illegible][illegible]



## Edward says

*Chronology*

*Introduction & Notes*

*Note on the Text and Translation*

*Further Reading*

--Preface

--First Essay: 'Good and Evil', 'Good and Bad'

--Second Essay: 'Guilt', 'Bad Conscience' and Related Matters

--Third Essay: What Do Ascetic Ideals Mean?

*Notes*

---

## Roy Lotz says

For all his brilliance, Nietzsche was not one for exposition or systematic investigation. He writes in impassioned bursts rather than extended thoughts—a style in keeping with his abhorrence for all things stale, academic, and ‘English’. This quality is evident right from the preface, which is divided into several shorter prefaces. These frequent breaks are maintained throughout the book, each essay being divided into chunks too short for subchapters, but too long for aphorisms.

On one level, this is a mere trifle of formatting. But on another (as I alluded to above), these frequent bursts hint at Nietzsche’s thought as a whole. Nietzsche, in his characteristic way, flipped the traditional Western preoccupation for truth on its head—explaining it as a weakness rather than a strength. To be sure, this is a fascinating idea. But this also helps to explain why Nietzsche wrote the way he did.

Instead of a scholarly treatment, which would be a manifestation of the traditional ‘will to truth’ which he so detested, Nietzsche’s mind skips along the inquiry like a flat rock on the surface of a pond. He dips in quickly, just enough to get his fingertips wet, and then recoils. To pick another analogy, he is somewhat like a fencer: he searches for a problem’s weakest point, makes a stab at it, and then draws back.

This style works well for some subjects, and poorly for others. In *The Genealogy of Morality*, Nietzsche is tackling a genuinely academic problem (which is probably why academics tend to think this book is his masterpiece): the origins of morality. This brings Nietzsche dangerously close to dreaded methodical argument—an awkwardness he tries to counteract by maintaining his gnomic and forceful style. But if Nietzsche is not trying to get at the “truth” of the origins of Western morality, if he does not think that knowing the historical origins of good and evil is better than being ignorant of them, what is he doing?

For me, these are serious contradictions, and Nietzsche was probably aware of them. As a result, this book is suggestive, not conclusive. The fun comes more from reading Nietzsche’s prose than from any revelations about the nature of morality. But there are some solid insights, nonetheless. Nietzsche connects Christian meekness with the low status of the people who originated it. And isn’t that exactly the kind of idea you would expect from a powerless people—to turn the other cheek? Nietzsche points out that Christian morality effectively turns weakness into strength—the perfect moral system for a religion of the lower-classes.

But is this the true root of Christian morality? I have no idea. Such a question seems impossible to answer with any degree of certainty. For this, and all of the other arguments in this book, you'll just have to take Nietzsche at his word.

---

## **Kyle van Oosterum says**

This treatise stands as the most sustained criticism of Judaeo-Christian values, or rather, the origin of said values. Nietzsche redefines them as the products of the brutal conditioning of our animal instincts over the centuries. The failure to retaliate became "goodness", fear into "humility", submission to those who one hates "obedience" and cowardice into "patience".

Discarding the methods of his contemporaries, Nietzsche comes up with a theory, which delineates how morals come to evolve within cultures; the transvaluation of values. Nietzsche tells us to imagine two sets of creatures; birds of prey and lambs. Birds of prey are necessarily noble, strong and proud creatures and lambs in contrast are weak, timid and cowardly. Lambs possess what we call a "slave morality" and birds of prey a "master morality". Thus, it is natural for the lambs to get pissed at being carried off by the birds of prey, they succumb to resentment of these superior beings. So in order to make themselves feel better, they manufacture "morals" based off of the weaker parts of their character. These morals then spread through society and culture like an infection when weaker natures reevaluate their character and transform it into something it is not.

Later on, Nietzsche inquires as to why these behaviors went unchecked centuries ago. Pain is the answer. Free will can be a burden to "slave moralities" and so guilt and bad conscience may have arisen as a way to repay debts to our animal vitalities. Nietzsche thinks that Christians and other slave moralities crave cruelty and breed martyrs, the most famous example of which would be Jesus Christ, of course. There are innumerable reasons to punish: to render harmless, to prevent bad behavior, to repay a debt, to isolate, to instill fear, for festivity etc. Punishment more than anything does not deter us from wrong-doing, it makes us become more prudent. Beyond that, we internalize our instincts and bottle them up and thus this bad conscience is a subtle sickness in our society. This leads to Nietzsche to conclude: 'how much horror there is at the bottom of all "good things"!'.

The last chapter is a real departure. The other two chapters were a rather lengthy indictment (hehe, Confederacy of Dunces reference) against the Christian faith and how they suppress our instinct of freedom. This last chapter rather prophetically endorses human ambition and claims that all life has a "will to power." We affirm our own existence through our will and we become the authors of our morals and our fates. Then in a similar way that atheists attack religion, Nietzsche scathingly bludgeons science's credibility. Science looks for absolute truth as if it were a picture on a wall, but truth to Nietzsche is a sculpture; you walk around it, observing many faces and many perspectives. This represents Nietzsche's doctrine of perspectivism, which goes as far as to say that we can approach truth by looking at various perspective, but we may never actually obtain it. This leads to one of the many bold declarations that Nietzsche is known for making: "There are no facts, only interpretations."

Nietzsche rarely stays on topic and that is not necessarily a bad thing. In a book which was meant to sketch the evolution of morals over the centuries, we also looked at how science and religion have no claim to truth and also how we can make the most of our lives. The versatility of topics makes the Genealogy the most forcible, ambitious and amazingly accessible work of Nietzsche's.

[illegible]

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।  
 श्रीकृष्णार्चनं सर्वभूतहितं जगद्विदुः ।  
 कृष्णाय नमः ॥

????? ????. «??? ? ??»? «??? ? ??»?

[illegible]

????? ???. «????»? «????????» ? ?? ????????? ??????

האם יש צורך להגדיר את המושג "החלטה" בצורה מדויקת יותר? האם יש צורך להוסיף דוגמאות נוספות? האם יש צורך להבהיר את ההבדל בין החלטה לבין תוצאה? האם יש צורך להוסיף הערה על כך שהחלטה היא תוצאה של תהליך?

????? ??? ???? ???? ???? ???? ???? ?

[illegible]

[illegible][illegible]

????? ?????? ??????? ?????? ?? ??????????? ??????

[illegible][illegible]

~~~~~

[illegible]

1. aphoristic
2. slave morality
3. master morality
4. resentment
5. guilt
6. bad conscience
7. punishment
8. Ascetic Ideal

???? ?????