

**IVAN KARAMAZOV AND THE GRAND INQUISITOR AS NIHILISTIC REBELS
IN DOSTOEVSKY'S *BROTHERS KARAMAZOV***

Prakriti Renjen

Research Scholar

Department of English and Culture Studies

Panjab University, Chandigarh

prakritirenjen@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The paper examines the nature of rebellion as observed in the Legend of "The Grand Inquisitor" in Fyodor Dostoevsky's The Brothers Karamazov, while comparing and contrasting it with the meaning and nature of rebellion as explored by Friedrich Nietzsche and Albert Camus. The key argument of my paper is that the rebellion of Ivan Karamazov and The Grand Inquisitor in The Brothers Karamazov is a nihilistic one and very close in its objectives to the rebellion explored by Albert Camus in The Rebel. However, their version of nihilistic rebellion is opposed to Nietzsche's version of the same and my paper starts off by drawing a configuration of sorts between the two very different ramifications of nihilistic rebellion as lived through by Ivan Karamazov and his Inquisitor and as explored by Nietzsche, undisputedly the greatest nihilist in European history. The paper proceeds by mapping the nihilism prevalent in Ivan's and the Grand Inquisitor's rebellion with Albert Camus' nihilistic rebellion. The paper arrives at its objective by exploring the variegated nuances of rebellion. Nietzsche's idea of an absolute affirmation and the acceptance of the absurd as the ultimate key to surviving in a Godless universe also helps in strengthening my claim of the Grand Inquisitor being a projection of Ivan's metaphysical turmoil which starts off with a positive revolt, but ends up as a catastrophe not only on a personal level but also on a universal one. There are a lot of points at which Ivan's and The Grand Inquisitor's ideas pertaining to rebellion intersect with those of Camus' as expounded by him in The Rebel. However, there also exist simultaneously sharp differences over ideas of rebellion as understood by both the sides. My paper traces all those nodes of intersection as well as those of contradictions in the idea of rebellion.

"Is it possible to find a rule of conduct outside the realm of religion and of absolute values? That is the question raised by revolt" (Camus, Rebel 27), and that is precisely the endeavor taken on by the Grand Inquisitor of Dostoevsky's The Brother's Karamazov. The legend of the Grand Inquisitor as narrated by Ivan to his brother Alyosha can be read as a prophetic culmination of Ivan's own inchoate and contradictory metaphysical stirrings which unfortunately tear him apart and render him mentally incapable of reason in the end.

According to Nietzsche, “A nihilist is not someone who believes in nothing, but someone who does not believe in what he sees” (Camus 61). However, Nietzsche accepts the entire burden and consequences of the brand of nihilism propagated by him. (Camus 59) Christianity, socialism, and all other forms of morality and humanitarianism according to Nietzsche are nihilistic as they substitute ideal ends for real ends and “. . . condemn the universe of passion and emotion in the name of an entirely imaginary world of harmony” (Camus 59). Nietzsche is the proponent of an active nihilism and denounces all forms of passive nihilism as propagated by Christian decadence and socialistic tendencies which are strongly reflected in Ivan Karamazov’s character. Ivan’s metaphysical collapse ends in the victory of ethical and political nihilism overpowering his sanity and rationale. Nietzsche’s active nihilism is a mode of rebellion which takes its roots in discontentment: “. . . a man who judges of the world as it is that it ought not to be, and of the world as it ought to be that it does not exist” (Nietzsche, WP para 585 A). The active nihilism of Nietzsche can also be understood in terms of the free spirit, the Antichrist or the “superman” of Thus Spake Zarathustra. His “superman” is the strongest ideal of being and existence who is likened to the “frenzy” and “lightning” which will burn all pity, morality and eternal values. Man, according to Nietzsche is merely, “something that is to be surpassed” and “a rope stretched between the animal and the Superman—a rope over an abyss” (TSZ). The “man” in man must be overcome in order to arrive at this highly awakened and powerful state. This actively nihilistic state is one in which pity or compassion is strongly condemned by Nietzsche as a dangerously weakening and debilitating parasite: “What good is my pity! Is not pity the cross on which he is nailed who loveth man? But my pity is not a crucifixion” (TSZ). Thus, Nietzsche has compared pity to the metaphorical crucifixion of Christ. He denounces the values of pity and excessive love both of which lead to a decline in the strength of man. On the other hand, “Nihilism as decline and recession of the power of the spirit” is said to be passive nihilism according to Nietzsche. (WP para 22 B) This passive nihilism is specifically visible in Ivan and the Grand Inquisitor’s rebellion as their will is ruptured to the extent of them wanting no external interference in their action.

Ivan’s and the Grand Inquisitor’s non-belief in the depravity of man and his meekness is directly at odds with the actual meaning of nihilism. “Nihilism is not the result of liberalism, but of a strain of modern thought that is largely at odds with liberalism, which sees man not as a limited and imperfect being, who “muddles through,” but as a superhuman being who can create the world anew through the application of his infinite will” (Michael Allen Gillespie, NBN Intro). Ivan’s is a case of the man who having destroyed God and law must re-build a parallel law or defying the very foundations of human reason, end up in insanity. If all values and virtue are destroyed and if the world is without an order then no action is forbidden because all benchmarks against which virtue or evil can be measured have been obliterated— this is Ivan’s universe. It is a nihilistic universe in which all referents and yardsticks have been annihilated. Thus, at the point where it is no longer possible to distinguish between good and evil, “freedom becomes a voluntary prison” (Camus 63).

However, Ivan’s nihilistic reasoning, “If nothing is true, everything is permitted”, (Dostoevsky 69) is understood by Nietzsche to be a dark, chaotic world in which chance is

king. The Nietzschean line of reasoning is more about a complete submission to this situation of impasse. The Nietzschean dictum, "Everything is false! Everything is permitted!" (WP para 602) is tantamount to a renunciation of everything that is permitted. Thus, after the death of God, man is faced with the two alternatives of denial or creation and Nietzsche's choice is one of creation - to say yes to the world. Nietzsche goes by a complete allegiance to the world, to which he feels man must be faithful and abolish all ends, as Zarathustra tells his disciples to remain connected with the Earth and everything earthly: "Remain true to the earth, my brethren, with the power of your virtue! Let your bestowing love and your knowledge be devoted to be the meaning of the earth! . . . Let it not fly away from the earthly and beat against eternal walls with its wings!" (TSZ). His "superman is the meaning of the Earth" and he warns his comrades to be wary of those who mete out promises of "superearthly hopes" ("Zarathustra's Prologue", TSZ). Thus according to him, man must live in a ceaseless flux of things and accept totally: "Total acceptance of total necessity" is Nietzsche's definition of freedom. (Camus 64)

The logic behind Nietzsche's nihilism is that a rebel can only become God by renouncing rebellion altogether and accepting and bowing down before historical forces. "Resistance – that is the distinction of the slave. Let your distinction be obedience. Let your commanding be itself obeying!" (Nietzsche TSZ) Ivan's logic differs from the Nietzschean one as in that the rebel wishes to replace God and rebels against the forces of history. In Nietzsche's opinion, one of the most dangerous blunders which man has been committing and continues to do so is ascertaining the value of the world and rendering,

. . . the world estimable for ourselves and which then proved inapplicable and therefore devaluated the world – all these values are, psychologically considered, the results of certain perspectives of utility, designed to maintain and increase human constructs of domination -- and they have been falsely projected into the essence of things. (WP 12 B)

Nietzsche calls it the "hyperbolic naiveté of man", in that man dangerously posits himself as the ultimate constructor of all criteria to measure the value of things. If according to Nietzsche, "the Universe seems to have lost value, seems "meaningless", it is "only a transitional stage." The feeling of valuelessness which overcomes man as a result of scrutinizing and valuing all absolute values is the nihilism which overtakes him. The faith in the categories of reason like aim, unity and being, is the cause of nihilism. Nietzsche explains the will to power as just a limbo or a bridge enroute the ultimate stage of discovering the will to power. In fact, even pessimism is considered by him to be a "preliminary form of nihilism." Nihilism according to Nietzsche can interestingly become the symptom for increasing strength or of increasing weakness.

The primary difference between Ivan's and Nietzsche's rebellion lies in the treatment accorded to the ideal or the ends. Ivan and the Grand Inquisitor simply negate or deny the ideal while Nietzsche secularizes the ideal. However, according to Camus, a true rebel is one who "must simultaneously reject the frenzy of annihilation and the acceptance of totality" (238) and reside in the tentative state where the individual and history balance each other in a condition of a perpetual and acute tension which is the ultimate source of rebellion. Camus in *The Rebel* has traced the specific stages of metaphysical rebellion in the man of existential

angst. He believes that metaphysical rebellion in its primary stages is positive because it derives its strength from the tension between complete negation and total submission. But when finally God is killed and the entire onus of creating a new rule of order, justice and unity falls upon man, he begins to tire of the tension caused by the positive and negative nature of rebellion and gives in to one side completely. Camus states that it is at this point when rebellion forgets its original purpose and values that it ceases to be rebellion. So, he traces that very tenuous line on which the rebel is situated and derives all his energy from the tension between the two opposing poles. The moment he abandons himself to any one side, rebellion turns into a revolution. Camus has thus blended his notion of rebellion with the absurd. According to him, the absurd is a reservoir - the source of creative resistance. We can observe the strains of this argument in his works like "The Myth of Sisyphus," where Sisyphus derives his creative resistance from the intense awareness of the absurd, but neither without submitting to the situation nor overpowering it – thriving on the creative balance or the creative tension which Camus refers to in his *The Rebel*.

The Inquisitor's rebellion against heavenly justice is antithetical even to what Camus' idea of rebellion is, wherein dignity and creativity is bestowed on every individual. In fact, the world of rebellion is a world of creation which by its very existence denies the world of mastery and servitude. Furthermore, rebellion according to Camus is cut off from its true origins, oscillates "between sacrifice and murder" (Rebel 244). Ivan's and the Grand Inquisitor's nihilistic passion ends in legitimizing murder, corroborating it with the conviction that this world is dedicated to death, while the consequence of rebellion according to Camus is to refuse to sanction murder because rebellion ultimately is a protest against death.

The Grand Inquisitor is only an extension of Ivan Karamazov's own angst-ridden personality and exhibits Ivan's torturous contradiction of the soul which swings between two extremes of metaphysical rebellion. On the one hand, it seeks to revolt against all the prevailing injustice of the world and denounces God for all the evil and suffering on the Earth, while on the other hand, it justifies murder on the pretext of establishing a reign of justice and peace on this Earth. Ivan himself cannot quite understand or come to terms with this blasphemous contradiction wherein peace on Earth established by the Man-God is built on the reign of terror. Ironically however, it is Ivan himself who allows his father to be murdered. Therefore, Ivan in the end turns out to be a classic model of the metaphysical rebel who "preferring generalized injustice to mutilated justice" loses his powers of rationale and gets thrown into the abyss of irrationality. (Camus 73)

Camus' metaphysical rebel just like Dostoevsky's Ivan, demands a logical explanation for all the misery and suffering of the world. The protest against omnipresent evil is the quintessence of the metaphysical rebel. He suffers the agony and disenchantment of a failed God and a pseudo-religious experience and obstinately confronts a world condemned to death with his demand for life and an absolute explanation for all the misery of the world. According to Camus, there are rebels who want to die and those who want to cause death, but they are identical in their craving for true life, which is essentially the breaking point of Ivan's life. Ivan wishes to achieve the unity of the world and desires to establish a reign of peace and justice on the edifice of human values which has unfortunately not been achieved

in God's reign. However, the dominion of Earthly justice which succeeds God's death is only a farcical and perverted version of the heavenly kingdom. So the fragile threshold on which Ivan stands and attempts to take the side of mankind in a Godless Universe is distorted by a mutilated reign of tyranny which masquerades as Earthly justice, but is only a kingdom built on a morbid lineage of slavery and misery. As Camus states, "To kill God and to build a Church is the constant and contradictory purpose of rebellion" (74-75). Camus considers the rebel as one who starts off with an awakening of conscience and with a desire to conquer his own self and to maintain it in the face of God (assuming that his core fundamental values are aligned with the rest of humanity), but somewhere along the line sets out to conquer the world and shape man and history along the lines of some universal dictates of peace and justice. This is where the irrational claim for absolute freedom and nihilism comes into play, ". . . which smothers the creative force in the very core of rebellion. . ." (Camus 75). So the rebels, Ivan and the Grand Inquisitor as his extension, start indulging in irrational crimes so as to justify the tenet of: "I rebel, therefore we exist," which ironically defeats the very purpose of rebellion and demolishes its own existence. (Camus 75). Therefore, rebellion only remains true until it manages to remain suspended in the tension between the two opposing polarities of absolute submission and absolute nihilism beyond which it only assumes the form of a mindless terror as pursued by the Grand Inquisitor. It is only the dialectical synthesis of the two, absolute servility and absolute domination which furnishes Camus' ideal of rebellion with its innate creativity and force.

The Grand Inquisitor, a rival of the creator, affirms Camus' idea of a rebel, though his rebellious leanings are not those of a metaphysical one but more of a "rebel as a creator and a ruler" in the Nietzschean sense. This can be proved if we consider his magnificent undertaking, one which involves the liberation of man from the prison of God and thereafter re-constructing his own prison of history, security and justice for mankind - "The Tower of Babel" is reconstructed. However, ultimately it is not complete affirmation which makes the Grand Inquisitor move ahead, but complete defiance of all that is related with freedom. The Grand Inquisitor affirms the idea of rebellion as one in which, ". . . the mystery of man's being is not only in living, but in what one lives for. Without a firm idea of what he lives for, man will not consent to live, and will destroy himself even if there is bread all around him" (Dostoevsky 254). This thought resonates with Camus' idea that, "The rebel does not ask for life, but for reasons for living" (The Rebel 73).

The Grand Inquisitor supposes the absolute malleability of human nature and its possible reduction to the conditions of a historic force. He uses the oxymoronic term, "the feeble rebels" for his people with the knowledge that they are in a sense rebels because they have surrendered the freedom of choice and the power of knowledge between good and evil over earthly temptations, like, "miracle, mystery and authority" (Dostoevsky 255). They are "rebels" because they possess the power to deny and negate the freedom of choice offered to them in the first place while they are "feeble" because their rebellion ends at relinquishing "heavenly freedom" in place of earthly security. So in a sense, the "feeble rebel" does in fact make a choice (though a weak one), albeit that of succumbing to his earthly passions over

heavenly justice and surrendering his power of choice and knowledge of good and evil into the hands of the Grand Inquisitors.

Men like the Grand Inquisitor have only one fear, and that is rebellion. The rebellion of man if at all it comes about will be the refusal of man to be treated as an object and to be reduced to mere historical terms. Though this threat of rebellion is almost negligible, as the men in whom it is present have already joined the rank and file of Christ - the ones who “endured his cross, endured scores of years of hungry and naked wilderness, eating locusts and roots” - and these few chosen “children of freedom” were, as the Grand Inquisitor says, Gods. (Dostoevsky 256)

Ivan’s poem “the Grand Inquisitor” is built on a stark irony which can be read in Camus’ comparison of Russian Communism with Fascism. “Russian Communism”, as Camus says, “. . . in its most profound principle, aims at liberating all men by provisionally enslaving them all” (212). This is precisely the scenario with our Grand Inquisitor. There is another interesting commonality between the two worth noting down, which is that Fascism and Russian Communism both derive their energy from moral nihilism. So the stark picture of the apparently benign and benevolent Communism is caricaturized if we see it through Camus’ lens. Ivan rebels against God, kills him and creates the Man-God, The Grand Inquisitor, destined to rule over the feeble rebels and feed them. The Son of God suffered for the sins of humanity but left them with the eternal damnation of having to choose between good and evil, while the likes of the Grand Inquisitor “suffered freedom”, and liberated the feeble mankind from the deathly throes of freedom.

Camus defines metaphysical nihilism as one in which, “hatred of the creator can turn to hatred of the creation or to exclusive and defiant love of what exists. But in both cases it ends in murder and loses the right to be called rebellion” (The Rebel 73), which provides a just explanation of Ivan’s metaphysical dilemma. The man who trembled at the suffering of a child, from the moment that he demolishes the kingdom of God and defies God, ironically accepts the logic behind murder. Once Ivan loses touch with the positivity and innocence empowering his rebellion, he ceases to be a rebel and becomes a nihilistic murderer for whom everything is justified. This is precisely the pretext given by the Grand Inquisitor too who justifies the weak and rebellious nature of man as the root cause of all suffering and wishes to lead man into a reign of justice and security by blindfolding him, thereby thwarting all instincts of self-awareness (the seeds of rebellion) if any in him and leading him to a make-believe universe of artificially induced peace and a fallacious justice. The entire metamorphosis occurs at the suicidal point where Ivan’s metaphysical rebellion extends itself from ethics to politics and launches itself on the murderous spree of erecting the kingdom of man on the ruins of God.

In the legend of the Grand Inquisitor, we are witness to a metaphysical rebellion, the aim of which is striving for man’s dignity and sovereignty, transmogrifying into a violent, metaphysical revolution, the aim of which is the dominion of mankind, which can be metaphorically paralleled with an altruism degenerating into a nihilistic solipsism. The Grand Inquisitor communicates man’s choice to the Son of God, “And mankind rejoiced that they were once more led like sheep. . .” He confesses to having taught the people to “blindly

obey” mystery, “even setting aside their own conscience” (Dostoevsky 257). The Grand Inquisitor’s venture, though it initiates as a metaphysical rebellion is at heart a purely egocentric one which wears the mantle of a politico-religious undertaking. Even though the Inquisitors proclaim and crown themselves as the guardians of the weak, helpless and indecisive man, they are terribly disoriented in their venture and have completely lost track of the essence of a metaphysical rebellion. The creativity and positivity of their rebellion has given way to a ruthless desire to overtake man and make him bow at their feet and worship them. “The universal union of mankind”, which the Grand Inquisitor states as one of the eternal torments of men is grossly misunderstood as “universal dominion” and “possessing mankind.” It is a silencing of the rebellion inherent in man in order that he may be led choicelessly. The Grand Inquisitor in his lofty speech to the imprisoned Son of God exemplifies condescension. He deigns to man and wishes to “give them quiet, humble happiness.” He wishes to silence all that is unruly and mutinous in man’s nature and wants man to come crawling to his feet in a plea to save his soul from freedom, reason and science, ironically all that bears the potential to liberate him.

So, under a smokescreen of gathering the scattered flock and making it submit to the precepts of universal justice and peace, the likes of Grand Inquisitor pursue relentlessly a venture in the name of God which is at heart only driven to give an expression to their own tendencies of power and total domination. The cataclysmic moment however, where Ivan’s and the Grand Inquisitor’s nihilistic and proud denial of God and everything heavenly gives way to a violent Earthly peace, is quite contrary to Nietzschean nihilism. The Nietzschean nihilism amounts to dismantling the edifice of human faith and belief and living amidst the absurdity of a Godless universe. Nietzsche’s rebellion is an absolute affirmation and acceptance of the destruction of morality and the deification of fate and chance in an illogical universe: “Nietzsche's rebellion was a way of saying that no great metaphysical forces governed human life and created a framework for meaning, every individual faced the possibly absurdity of existence alone” (Chamberlain).

Ivan’s grand endeavor, his rebellion, fails miserably not only on an individual level (he loses all powers of reason while trying to find a reasoning for murder), but also on a universal level wherein the new tower of Babel is soaked with the blood of thousands of people. The philosophy for which he rebels against a murderous God: “I absolutely renounce all higher harmony. It is not worth one little tear of even one tormented child”, is ultimately betrayed in favor of a frenzied passion to extend this rebellion to the entire universe. Ivan Karamazov and his alter ego, the Grand Inquisitor are betrayers of their own rebellion.

Ivan’s and the Inquisitor’s rebellion not only differs with Nietzschean rebellion in terms of its structure but is also erected upon different motives altogether. Nietzsche consciously recognizes nihilism and accepts it in the face of all absurdity while Ivan and the Grand Inquisitor are only unconsciously aware of their nihilism. They are nihilistic rebels but it is an irony that they lack an awareness of their own nihilism. They justify their nihilistic venture as a divine undertaking with an aim to unite man and give him a timid, sweet happiness and a security of miracle, mystery and authority, but it is actually a despairing, nihilistic enterprise wrought with the madness of mass murder. The Grand Inquisitor justifies the burning of the

heretics (the enemies of the Roman faith) as the only way of taming the wayward spirit of man and bringing him down to complete obedience wherein he will “come crawling to us and lick our feet” (Dostoevsky 258).

Ivan’s over-riding skepticism in the nature of man and his inherent belief that “. . . they will never be strong enough to manage their freedom. . .” makes him view people as sufferers “who are tormented by great sadness and love mankind” (Dostoevsky 261). Ivan’s inverted views lead him to scorn the “pitiful rebels” and “geese” with a condescending contempt and recognize the people like the Grand Inquisitor as “the intelligent people.” He and the Grand Inquisitor are of the opinion that man represents “an unfinished, trial creature” created by God “in mockery, and for mockery.” The new rulers will lead this pitiful, blind creature towards death and destruction but all cloaked with a blanket of stability and security in such a way that man does not realize where he is being led and will consider himself happy because he will be getting his share of bread, miracle and authority. In the Inquisitor’s world man’s free will is taken and sacrificed in favor of social security and contentment. The Grand Inquisitor’s opinions on the revolting and vile nature of man almost border on a hideous mockery of God’s creatures, as a stratagem constructed to take revenge from a merciless God. As Nietzsche says: “No longer to pray, but to give one’s blessing, and the earth will abound in men-gods” (Camus, *Rebel* 65). The Grand Inquisitor is a creator to the extent that he liberates man from the prison of God and thereafter constructs his own prison of history, but ultimately it is nihilism masquerading as a prison of security and justice, the realm of values which the Grand Inquisitor proposes to offer to mankind. “The contemporary revolution which claims to deny every value is already, in itself, a standard for judging values” (Camus 213). While on the one hand, the Grand Inquisitor calls man “depraved” and absolutely incapable of bearing the onus of freedom, which suggests that there has been a complete erosion of values in man, on the other hand he paradoxically believes in the unquestioning obedience of this depraved creature. What is this if it is not the ruthless display of coercion and a devilish delight taken in amending Christ’s endeavors? The deeds of the Son of God which had been repressed midway will hereby be completed by the Inquisitors who with “sinister fires” will tame the sheep with the sway of their terrible powers.

One must note another very interesting facet of the Grand Inquisitor’s nihilistic rebellion. “But I awoke and did not want to serve madness” and “I left the proud and returned to the humble” - these are not mere heretic utterances from the old man, nor are they a phantasmagoria as Alyosha finds it to be. (Dostoevsky 260) These utterances, appearing towards the end of the Inquisitor’s speech resound with an acerbic jolt of rebellion which stands stark naked in front of God. It is reminiscent of the rebel who unnerves even the most true believer, though shaking his head in disbelief, but silently feels his heart sink. Pride is one very important accusation leveled against God by the Grand Inquisitor on behalf of the millions of faith-holders who had waited for him “with the same faith and the same tender emotion” for fifteen centuries. (Dostoevsky 247) God’s arrogance is what has made man a rebel and that too a depraved one. Man now refuses to wait anymore for Him and surrenders instead to the new rulers who have risen from the ranks of men itself which explain their humble origins. Their promises reek of earthly bread and earthly justice, while God’s

promises have been long discarded as heavenly mirages or tantalizers which would only lead man towards a destructive delusion, the limbo of freedom.

Though Ivan is slightly higher placed than man considering the sparks of metaphysical rebellion in him, yet his tragedy is that his rebellion slips off into a frenzied nihilistic passion giving way to an absolute denial (rather than affirmation) of all morals and values, good and evil, making him eventually lose a grip on the tenuous thread which nourishes the balance of rebellion. Even the holiest figure in Dostoevsky's book, Father Zosima, urges Alyosha to leave the monastery and enter the world and has himself been purged by confronting actual history in the face. Father Zosima's teaching: "all are responsible for all", is directly antithetical to Ivan's dictum: "If nothing is true, everything is permitted", and is closely linked to Nietzsche's absolute affirmation of the world and everything worldly, which Ivan unfortunately fails to comprehend.

Dostoevsky also attempts to assert that the word of God can never be the last word in history and the Devil seeks absolute obedience (reminiscent of the Grand Inquisitor) which faith relinquishes. Christ can be known and understood precisely through his absence just as Camus' rebellion can only be nurtured and kept alive through a "thought at the meridian", or the suspension of the rebel between the opposing extremes of servitude and dominion, affirmation and nihilism. This tragic irony is overlooked by Ivan Karamazov which ultimately leads to his destruction.

The Elder, Father Zosima's view that all terrestrial law is equivalent to a manifestation of "Christ's law" which makes itself overt in "the acknowledgement of one's own conscience", typifies the precarious balance between total surrender and total mastery which the Caesars of the earth have failed to fathom and maintain. (Dostoevsky 64)

Notes:

- i. The quote is taken from the paragraph which occurs in Book III of *The Will to Power* – "Principles of a New Evaluation".
- ii. The quotes are taken from "Zarathustra's Prologue" in *Thus Spake Zarathustra*.
- iii. The quote is taken from "Zarathustra's Prologue" in *Thus Spake Zarathustra*.
- iv. The quote is taken from the paragraph which occurs in Book I of *The Will to Power* – "European Nihilism".
- v. The quote is taken from the paragraph which occurs in Book III of *The Will to Power* – "Principles of a New Evaluation".
- vi. The quote is taken from Chapter 22 – "The Bestowing Virtue" of the First Part of *Thus Spake Zarathustra*.

- vii. The quote has been taken from Chapter X, Part I, of *Thus Spake Zarathustra* – “War and Warriors”.
- viii. The quote is taken from the paragraph which occurs in Book I of *The Will to Power* – “European Nihilism”.
- ix. The quote has been taken from Lesley Chamberlain’s article, “The Political Message of Nietzsche’s ‘God is Dead’” published in *The Guardian*.

Works Cited:

- Camus, Albert. *The Rebel*. Trans. Anthony Bower. 2000 ed. London: Penguin, 1951. Print.
- Chamberlain, Lesley. “The Political Message of Nietzsche’s ‘God is Dead.’” *The Guardian*. Web. 3 Jan 2014.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *The Brothers Karamazov*. Trans. Richard Pevear, Larissa Volokhonsky. London: Vintage Books, 2004. Print.
- Gillespie, Michael Allen. *Nihilism Before Nietzsche*. Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1996. Print.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spake Zarathustra: A Book for All and None*. Trans. Thomas Common. U of Adelaide, The University of Adelaide Library, Australia. 28 Apr. 2001. Web. 15 Apr. 2011.
- . *The Will to Power*. Trans. Walter Arnold Kaufmann. *Archive.org*. Web. 23 Oct. 2012.