

#1

“Art” must be conceived in terms of the dialectic between the Apollonian and the Dionysian. These are metaphysical categories. They can be understood as the “art-worlds” of ‘dreams’ and ‘drunkenness’.

The way the philosophical man knows that the world around him conceals a different reality, the aesthetical man knows that the reality of his dreams is but an appearance. This notion of a perfect and higher truth underlying the unintelligibility of the dream is embodied by Apollo.

What is concealed underneath the Apollonian will turn out to be the Dionysian. The intoxication of the Dionysian vanishes the subjective in self-forgetfulness. Man is reconciled with man; man is reconciled with Nature. He becomes a work of art.

#5

Homer and Archilocus were said to be the Greeks exemplifying the objective and the subjective aspects of art. But there is a problem with this analysis: subjective art is not said to be art at all. Notable, Schopenhauer offers this incorrect analysis.

We need our new metaphysic to describe the lyrist: First, Dionysian identification with the Primal Unity; then, Apollonian revelation of the music in which the Unity is recast. The “I” of the artist refers back not to him as a subject but to the world-genius expressing himself in the artist.

#9

Greek tragedy appears “simple, transparent and beautiful” because it is an attempt at remedy by way of the Apollonian light from the searing darkness of the Dionysian night. This is made evident in the characters of Oedipus and Prometheus. Such is the true nature of the Greek cheerfulness: On the surface of an unfathomably black sea.

#11

Euripides was the murderer of tragedy, who made it ‘kill itself’ by introducing the spectator and making it a thing of the rabble. A slave revolt of sorts, with a fickle cheerfulness replacing the previous profound and black one.

But this is not to say that original tragedy did not hold a positive relationship with an audience: It did. And in fact, Euripides was less favored by the public than Sophocles and his like. So: “What strange consideration for the spectator led him to oppose the spectator?”

The answer to the question lies in the fact that Euripides was only interested in two specific kinds of spectators: Himself (as ‘thinker’), and Socrates.

#12

Euripides wanted to purify art of the Dionysian, but even its most intelligent adversary was enchanted by it (his character ‘Pentheus’). And so, Euripides tried to recant (“casts himself from a tower”), but it was too late: Underneath Euripides, the *Socratic* tendency had already formed a new antithesis with the Dionysian.

In the Euripidean design, paradoxical thoughts and fiery passions replace the Apollonian intuitions and the Dionysian ecstasies respectively, and the maxim followed is: “To be beautiful everything

must be known ('esthetic Socratism')". They are naturalistic and inartistic; "everything was directed towards pathos, not action".

#15

Alongside the artist, a new type (of man) is posited: The theoretical man. Because its ultimate goal is so chimeric, the honest scientist knows that he cares more about the search for truth than for truth itself. Alongside this honesty, the Socratic creates the illusion that thinking can reach to the nethermost depths of being. This theoretical optimism opposes a practical pessimism.

But science changes into art when taken to the limit of this ultimate goal. When the "noble and gifted man" reaches the periphery of science, he is dismayed by the unfathomable and his optimism is wrecked; his "tragic perception" requires, to be endured, art as protection and remedy.

Will this ultimate need, then, give us the *music-practicing Socrates* in the future? Or will we descend into barbarism?

#16

This aphorism gives us the reason Nietzsche wrote this book. He thinks music is where tragedy will find its rebirth in the modern world, and was inspired into analysis after hearing Wagner's *Beethoven* and comments on it. He cites a long passage from Schopenhauer, who justifies this claim by saying that music is not a copy of the phenomenon but of the will itself. The universality of concepts forms an opposition with the universality of melodies. The former is an *abstracta* antecedent to the thing; the latter is an inmost kernel which precedes it.

Similar to the description of the lyrist in #5, Nietzsche says, following up Schopenhauer's long paragraph, that music reaches out from the intuition of the Dionysian universality and expresses it in Apollonian images (and the latter expresses the eternity of the phenomenon, while the former of the will). Thus, art (and the tragic) can only be understood through the spirit of music.

#24

The moral domain and the tragic are mutually exclusive.

Why do we enjoy representations of "painful victories, agonizing contrasts of motives" so much? Not because art is an imitation of reality, but because it is a metaphysical supplement to reality.

Perhaps some day the German spirit will reawaken music and (the tragic) myth.

#25

The Dionysian calls into existence the world of phenomenon; and "in order to keep alive the animated world of individuation", this Dionysian dissonance needs a dynamic illusion which in general makes life worth living. In this way, the world is said to be eternally justified only as an aesthetic phenomenon.

These two impulses—primordial suffering and illusory beauty—develop their powers in strictly mutual proportion.