

# The early Wittgenstein, Tolstoy's *Kurze Darlegung des Evangelium* and Nietzsche's *Der Antichrist*

JOAN B. LLINARES CHOVER

To understand the religious background to Wittgenstein's work and the man himself, it is helpful to bear in mind the Catholic education his mother gave him from infancy, and to take note of at least some of the authors who influenced him in this area from adolescence and youth, for example, Angelus Silesius, Kierkegaard, Schopenhauer, William James, and the two greatest Russian writers of the nineteenth century, Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky. It may also be appropriate to add Nietzsche to this list, as we shall try to explain.

The curious feature here is that the singular vision that Nietzsche, author of *Also sprach Zarathustra*, had of Christianity would have been impossible in his final lucid stage (we refer to the works of 1887-1889 that he published or left ready for printing, and which were largely brought together in one volume, published with deficiencies and manipulations in 1904) without his meticulous and annotated earlier reading of certain of Dostoyevsky's novels and a long essay by Tolstoy, *Ma Religion* that had been published in 1885. Nietzsche read Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky in French, rather than German translations, because he considered them as exceptional interlocutors in the environment of the best culture of his time, being that created in Parisian circles. Tolstoy's work (on the hundredth anniversary of the Russian novelist and thinker's death) will help us, therefore, to specify aspects of the philosophy of religion both in the mature Nietzsche and the young Wittgenstein, particularly in *Der Antichrist* and the so-called *Geheime Tagebücher*, respectively.

As is well-known, this 'secret' section of the *Tagebücher* is written in code, on the opposite pages of three books of notes that cover the period from August 1914 to August 1916. Known as the *Notebooks 1914-1916*, they were written at the front during the First World War and during the gestation of what were to become the *Tractatus*.

However, we should like to point out some important omissions. We shall not be looking at the traces, noticeable in the Wittgenstein of those years, of his passionate reading of what is surely the best of Tolstoy's legacy – his literature. There are documents from the time that show that he both knew and greatly valued not only Tolstoy's posthumous story *Hadji Murat* (1912) but also his *Volkserzählungen* (his Russian Folk Legends). Nor is it trivial that we shall ignore his readings of Dostoyevsky, especially *Verbrechen und Strafe* (as 'Crime and Punishment' has finally been translated – it was previously known as *Schuld und Sühne*) and *Die Brüder Karamasow* as we believe that they provide clues that make it much easier to understand what is meant by being 'born-again', as well as for defining and discussing what is meant in Wittgenstein by 'religion' or 'being religious' and even the 'mystical'. What we present here is, therefore, a minuscule part of a complex relationship.

The basis of our considerations is to be found in these two annotations of the *Geheime Tagebücher*, corresponding to the parts written on 2.9.1914 and 8.12.1914 respectively and which read: "*Gestern fing ich an, in Tolstois / Erläuterungen zu den Evangelien zu lesen. / Ein herrliches Werk.*" And: "*Nietzsche Band 8 gekauft / und darin gelesen.*"<sup>1</sup>

## 1. A Misleading Title

We will begin by clarifying a textual problem: Wittgenstein gives the name of Tolstoy's book as *Erläuterungen zu den Evangelien* (for example, on 2.9.1914 and 8.9.1914), though in the annotation of the 11.10.1914 he gives its title as *Darlegungen des Evangeliums*. To complicate matters further, it is known that, in a letter to L. von Ficker, Wittgenstein refers to this work as *Kurze Erläuterungen des Evangeliums*<sup>2</sup>. Three different ways, therefore, of giving the title of a specific book that he acquired at the time. Yet which specific work was he referring to?

In 1891, the Berlin publishers Hugo Steinitz published F. W. Ernst's translation of the Russian work *Krátkoye izlozhenie Yevánguelia* by L. Tolstoy under the title *Kurze Auslegung des Evangelium*. In 1892, however, the publisher Philipp Reclam of Leipzig published a new

<sup>1</sup> The original text quotes Wittgenstein, 1991. Hereafter referred to as GT.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Valdés Villanueva, 2006, 324, note 3.

translation, with a foreword by the new translator, Paul Lauterbach, a Tolstoy expert who was interested in the changes in the Russian text upon which the great novelist continued to work, but he published it under a slightly different title: *Kurze Darlegung des Evangelium*. Therefore, in 1914, there were at least two different editions of Tolstoy's book in German and they were certainly not based on exactly identical original manuscripts in Russian, as can be deduced by comparing several noticeably different passages in these translations – not simply because of choices of terminology that do not coincide, or the obvious stylistic differences in the personal way the two translators write – on occasions there are entire pages that do not appear in one, which demonstrates that the manuscript that served as a source was another, one less explicit and developed. At that time, Tolstoy was working unceasingly on what he considered to be the heart of his message, the authentic gospel. Indeed, the mature Tolstoy invested a great deal of energy and writing on explaining his religion from 1878 until his death, that is, more than thirty years of intense efforts spent on research, as well as teaching and popularization, as we shall now see.

Professor Valdés suggests that it is 'reasonable to suppose that the edition that Wittgenstein bought in Tarnów was the Reclam one', but does not give any reasons for his supposition<sup>3</sup>. W. Baum, the editor of the GT, is of the same opinion because in note 15 of his edition<sup>4</sup>, explaining what Wittgenstein wrote on 2.9.1914, he says: "The work by Tolstoy that Wittgenstein refers to is a translation into German of a text by Tolstoy, entitled *Kurze Darlegung des Evangeliums*. Wittgenstein had acquired the booklet (a double volume of Reclam's well-known 'Universal-Bibliothek') by chance some days earlier."<sup>5</sup>

Our confusion when reading these notes is double, because it is currently possible to consult that German translation of Tolstoy's KDE on the Internet thanks to a copy held by the University of California, and upon examination, it can be seen, on the one hand, that Baum does not quote the title exactly (at the end of 'Evangelium(s)' he has as extra s) and, on the

---

<sup>3</sup> See the note quoted op. cit. ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit. p. 49.

<sup>5</sup> This will be quoted as KDE. Page numbers in this German translation will be shown with the prior abbreviation s. and ss.

other, that the Spanish editors, who seem to be interested in the traces of the work in Wittgenstein, have chosen to translate a section of a German translation that, according to their own indications, is not the one used by the young Wittgenstein<sup>6</sup>, as if the specific version of a text that one reads were unimportant. Many Wittgenstein commentators are even more audacious, because they neither base their work on the German translations nor do they go back to the Russian original of KDE, they merely mention a recent English reissue, *The Gospel in Brief*, a way of proceeding that would alarm any philologist, and with good reason, but as is well-known, the care applied to religious and literary questions is not the same as that used with scientific and mathematical texts, as corresponds to our civilisation's prevailing values.

For this reason, we believe that the only rigorous way to approach the question requires both taking note of what Wittgenstein's wrote in his GT and the German translation of Tolstoy's work just as he read it. Although, in his note, Baum does not justify his decision in favour of the Reclam edition either, we suppose that it may be justified by the existence of copies Wittgenstein acquired and gave to his friends, as it is known that he did, and that are perhaps filed with other elements of his legacy, or by the study of the quotations that he wrote in his GT, comparing both texts and confirming their identity, as anyone can verify.

## **2. Tolstoy's Religious Works**

In the *Vorwort* (KDE s. 5) Tolstoy explains that the brief version of the gospel that he offers us is "*ein Auszug aus einem grösseren Werke, das im Manuskripte vorliegt, in Russland aber nicht erscheinen darf.*" The work could not appear in his own country because of censorship, obviously, since in czarist Russia questions that affected the Orthodox Church as the official church were under strict government control. There was a kind of a ministry dedicated to such tasks and police control was implacable. There was neither freedom of the press nor in publications of a religious nature, far less if they presented a version of biblical texts that departed from the canonical version. In his novel *Resurrection* Tolstoy himself, who was eventually excommunicated by the Orthodox hierarchy in 1901, portrayed

---

<sup>6</sup> Cf. the translator's introduction, op. cit. p. 22 and the 'Conclusion', ibid. p. 309.

the outrages and injustices in the treatment of evangelical 'sects' and their wailing presence in Russian jails<sup>7</sup>. So, what "*grosses Werk*" did KDE summarize?

At the beginning of 1880s, the magnum opus that Tolstoy was focusing his enormous capacity for work on was, as he indicated himself, divided "*aus 4 Teilen*", the *first*, of a personal nature and the one that, in our opinion, refers to materials that would go towards the book that we know today as *A Confession*; the *second*, a "*Darlegung der christlichen Lehre nach den Auslegungen der Kirche... nebst den Beweisen für die Falschheit dieser Auslegungen,*" in our opinion, referring to materials that would go towards the book known today as *Critique of Dogmatic Theology*; the *third*, an "*Untersuchung der christlichen Lehre... allein nach dem, was von Christi Lehre auf uns gekommen ist*" and a "*Übersetzung der vier Evangelien und einer Verschmelzung derselben in eines*"; the *fourth* forms a "*Darlegung des wirtlichen Sinnes der christlichen Lehre, der Gründe um derentwillen sie enstellt worden ist und der Folgen, die ihre Predigt haben muss*", an exposition that can largely be found in the book today known in Spanish as *Cuál es mi fe*, in English as *What I Believe*, and in French as *Ma religion*. Given this, it is obvious that "*diese "Kurze Darlegum des Evangelium" nun ist ein Auszug aus jenem dritten Teile*" (KDE s. 5), that is, the work that we know today as *The Four Gospels Harmonized and Translated*.

Thus, it is advisable to bear in mind that Tolstoy's obsessive dedication to religious problems led him to write numerous pages, in particular the following texts: (1) an autobiography, significantly entitled *A Confession*, written between 1879 and 1882, published in Russian in Geneva in 1884, with the relevant subtitle, 'Foreword to an unpublished work'. With Tolstoy's successive research from 1878 onwards, as the years passed, this 'unpublished work' continued to grow and took shape, as we have partially indicated, in the following books: (2) A critical essay, written between 1879 and 1881, entitled *Critique of Dogmatic Theology*,

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. our presentation to the XVIII Congrès de filosofia de la Societat de Filosofia del País Valencià, entitled "Antropologia Filosòfica i Literatura: La religió en la novel.la de L. Tostói *Resurrecció* (1899)",(Philosophical Anthropology and Literature: Religion in Tolstoy's novel *Resurrection* (1899)) awaiting on-line publication.

(3) a work with a critical edition in Greek, Russian translation and comments, entitled *The Four Gospels Harmonized and Translated*, published in its original version in Geneva in 1890, from whose manuscripts, almost all dating from 1881-1882, *The Gospel in Brief*, as it is known in English, was derived – a compendium previously prepared by one of Tolstoy’s disciples, V. I. Alekseyev. This was revised, enlarged and prefaced by the author and was the one that, in German translation, accompanied Wittgenstein during the First World War, the KDE. And (4) the essay *What I Believe* which had been finished in January 1884 and was published in Russian in Geneva that same year. Tolstoy completed his reflections on a crucial problem, non-violence, with (5) the essay *The Kingdom of God is Within You* (1890-1893). We have not enumerated the *articles* on religious themes from these decades that are, certainly, very pertinent for the nuances that they provide, such as *Religion and Morality* (1893), or *Church and State* (1882), for example, or the *Pensées de Tostoï*, published in Paris in 1898 (with its equivalent in German *Über Gott und Christentum (On God and Christianity)*<sup>8</sup>, and in English, *Thoughts and Aphorisms*), nor the *letters*, nor the writer’s *diaries* during those years, nor yet his various essays and other works of *literary creation* that are also directly related with that problem; we refer, for example, to *What is Art?* (1897) – read by Wittgenstein –, to *What is to Be Done?* of 1884-1886, and to *Resurrection* (1899), respectively, referring only to texts that synthesize what was explained in shorter works and in Tolstoy’s dedication to narratives and popular theatre, which were very productive at that time.

With respect to the five long works on religion that we have listed, it may be pertinent to add that these had a gestation period of several years, from 1877-1878, when Tolstoy anxiously finished writing *Anna Karenina*. At the time, he was nearly fifty years of age, and since they could not be published in Russia without severe cuts imposed by the censors, they first appeared unabridged in other countries. By then, he was a very famous author and the number of his disciples grew year on year, many having to go into exile for possessing forbidden copies of these works and thereby contributing to their diffusion. Tolstoy’s international prestige was already

---

<sup>8</sup> Texts translated by M. Syrkin and published in Berlin by Steinitz in 1901, successfully used for understanding the relationships between Tolstoy and Wittgenstein, for example, by Ilse Somavilla in her illuminating article “*Spuren Tolstoï in Wittgensteins Tagebüchern von 1914-1916*”.

immense. It was multiplied by the threatening political situation that turned him into a privileged focus of attention, and he was visited by journalists from all over the world. However, this facet has almost entirely disappeared for us now, his literary legacy, largely from the period prior to his 'conversion', being what has lasted. In fact nowadays, Tolstoy's religious essays are very scarce in European bookshops, although there are indications of a certain *revival*. Yet it is reasonable to suppose that the Wittgenstein of 1914, like the young Gandhi, or B. Schaw, R. Rolland, S. Zweig... and many of the Zionists of the time would also have a conception of Tolstoy where those sapiential characteristics would stand out strongly, recognizing him above all as a great independent religious thinker, which led to his being excommunicated by the Orthodox church as if he were a dangerous heretic and, consequently, his extraordinary civil burial. In 1910, as Vargas Llosa put it, "years previously (Tolstoy) had ceased to be merely one of the greatest novelists of all times, and had become a prophet, a mystic, an inventor of religions, a patriarch of morals, a theoretician of education and an imaginative ideologist who proposed pacifism, manual and agricultural labour, asceticism and a primitive, *sui generis* anarchist Christianity as a remedy for humanity's wrongs... The things he said reverberated the world over and on at least four of the five continents there arose, during his own lifetime, agrarian communities of young Tolstoyans... who abandoned the cities, renounced the pursuit of money and went to be morally regenerated, sharing everything and working the earth with their hands."<sup>9</sup>

In fact, there are striking elective affinities between Tolstoy and Wittgenstein or, if you prefer, there is a certain relationship or family likeness, and it is customary to mention evident parallels between the two men. Both were descendants of very wealthy families, yet preached austerity, detachment and asceticism with their own lives, giving away their considerable personal inheritances. Despite their 'aristocracy', they valued work, above all manual labour, as indispensable. Tolstoy, while physically strong, was not very nimble-fingered and Wittgenstein was an engineer with flair. They both loved music, solitude and nature. Both had experience of war and had demonstrated their spirit and courage. They were both affected by serious crises that led them to the brink of suicide,

---

<sup>9</sup> Vargas Llosa, 2010, 29.

and confronted with death, both experienced a kind of ‘religious conversion’ though distanced from churches or confessional sects, institutions and hierarchies. They were both deeply concerned with teaching and spent several years of their lives as teachers, even writing teaching manuals in the form of dictionaries or spelling primers. They both distrusted the academic environment and official teaching, and because of their inquisitive dispositions, their frank intelligence and their assorted interests, they did not experience the schism between the so-called ‘two cultures’. Both men often kept a personal diary, confessing deeply personal matters, setting down in writing their sensual and spiritual problems. Though having very different experiences and influences, both are characterized by a vision that counterpoints love and sexuality, perhaps to an unhealthy extent. They were both strongly influenced by the work of Schopenhauer; neither had much liking for Shakespeare; and so on. We believe that it is not outrageous to imagine that, had he lived a couple of decades earlier, Wittgenstein, who tried to live as a worker in the USSR, might have wished to live out his fantasy existence as a manual worker within a group of sincere Tolstoyans who, congruently, had chosen to live somewhere that was silent, isolated, and of a beautiful, rural nature.

### **3. From Existential Crises to the Writing of the Abbreviated Gospel**

Let us now recall the context in which KDE was written and its development. The principal years spent on writing *Anna Karenina*, from 1873 to 1875, were marked by painful bereavement in his own home. Tolstoy lost three children and two aunts whom he loved very much – one of them had been like a mother to this hypersensitive orphan. In this context, in a letter dated March 1876, he tells his cousin Alexandrina that he has met a certain count who is a strong believer: “He cannot be contradicted because he doesn’t try to prove anything. He simply says what he believes and, when listening to him, one feels that he is happier than those who do not believe, above all one feels that a faith such as his cannot be obtained by an effort of mind, but rather must be received as a miraculous gift. That is what I want!”<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Quoted by H. Troyat, 1965, 198-199.



One night in 1876, having finished *Anna Karenina*, he was seized by an access of terror: he thought that he was dead, locked in his coffin. He transferred this traumatic shock to his work: in the eighth and last part of the novel, Tolstoy narrates his crisis via his fictional *alter ego*, the character of Levin, the name being a diminutive of his own<sup>11</sup>. Life seemed to him even more terrible than death, weighed down by insoluble problems: where did life come from, what did it mean, why have we been given life? His minutely reviewed scientific convictions did not provide him with any solutions. He read Plato and Spinoza, Kant and Schelling, Hegel and Schopenhauer. “At one time, reading Schopenhauer, he put in place of his will the word *love*, and for a couple of days this new philosophy charmed him, till he removed a little away from it. But then, when he turned from life itself to glance at it again, it fell away too.”<sup>12</sup> He then began to read theological works, verified the opposing positions of Catholic and Orthodox theologians, and these constructions also crumbled. Life became a torment, a bitter, intolerable joke, caused by the cruel irony of a wicked genius... “And Levin, a happy father and husband, in perfect health, was several times so near suicide that he hid the cord that he might not be tempted to hang himself, and was afraid to go out with his gun for fear of shooting himself.”<sup>13</sup>

In *A Confession*, Tolstoy narrates those years of crisis succinctly and without intermediaries, until he finds a way out<sup>14</sup>. The backbone of his autobiography is the search for the meaning of life, that being the central question. We think that Wittgenstein's *Notebooks 1914-1916*, written at the front, invites a rereading of this dramatic confessional tale in its most genuinely philosophical and religious dimensions. The presence of death is a decisive experience in both authors' return to religion, which is why they

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. chapters VIII-XIX of the last part of *Anna Karenina*. I think it helpful to point out that during the trip they made to Iceland in 1912, D. Pinsent “compared his friend Wittgenstein with Beethoven and with Levin, the character from Tolstoy's novel, *Anna Karenina*”, as mentioned by Baum, 1988, 64.

<sup>12</sup> Quoting the work in Spanish translation, L. Tolstói, 1986, 962-963.

<sup>13</sup> Op. cit. p. 964. In chapter IV of *A Confession*, Tolstoy admits that he too had suffered exactly the same anguish and fear.

<sup>14</sup> Tolstoy, 2008.

both understand it so radically, as a true power of salvation, capable of transforming life, not as the result of a metaphysical argument.

The *Critique of Dogmatic Theology* is a frontal attack on ecclesiastical teachings. As a self-confessed follower of Rousseau, claiming to be a good son of the Enlightenment and thus necessarily employing understanding and reason, Tolstoy rejects whatever he believes goes beyond them. This includes, for example, the dogma of the Trinity, or that Jesus is the second person of a God who is three and one, born of the Virgin Mary conceived by the Holy Spirit, or that he rose again on the third day, as well as everything related to angels and demons, the creation of the world in six days, the myth of Paradise, Adam and Eve and the snake, or the doctrine of salvation and eternal damnation, and so on. For Tolstoy, all of these are vulgar legends, mere superstitions. He does not think that it is necessary to pray to have faith, as if human beings were unaware of the precarious and ephemeral situation in which we live, like those who are shipwrecked and in great peril, always at the mercy of death that visits us whenever it wants. In religion, the fundamental question for Tolstoy is to know what the human being should do, how he should live. The gospel is, finally, the proclamation of a rule of life that can be reduced to five commandments that refer to the five temptations that are to be defeated (not to get angry, not to commit adultery, not to swear, not to fight evil with evil, not to treat anyone as an enemy), those commandments come down to a central rule: “to love God and your neighbour as yourself”, which is the equivalent of this fundamental precept: “to treat others as you wish them to treat you”. For Tolstoy, this is the novelty of Jesus’ teaching, just as he explained it in the *Sermon on the Mount*, in clear contrast with traditional Jewish doctrines, that is, the law of Moses and later ecclesiastical doctrines, perverted in the interests of the State by the service of the three supposedly Christian churches.

In his essays, Tolstoy tries to be clear and intelligible for any reader, so he does not worry if he repeats himself and chooses to employ very flexible existential metaphors (the oriental fable of the dragon and the well; the immense forest that has neither paths nor exits; the boat in stormy waters; the ship with neither captain nor compass, bound for nowhere, and so on, like the prophetic dreams of some Kaspar Hauser), as well as very effective – though perhaps excessively Manichean – structural oppositions with clear and firm contrasts between black and white, as well as right and

wrong, life and death, light and darkness, the vital situation after recognizing the evangelical doctrine (“now”) and existence without that faith and without the morals that derive from it (“then”), that is to say, the antithesis between Jesus’ law and the law of the world, the genuine Gospel and the church, the true and rational life as opposed to the false and absurd life, the opposition between faith and scientific reason, the heart and the intellect, the individual and the mob, the boy and the adult, the voice of one’s own conscience and public opinion or ‘what they will say’, between sense and nonsense, the spirit and the flesh, eternity and time, and even between men and women, sickness and health, good sense and lunacy, town and country, agriculture and industry, war and peace, and so on.

Tolstoy bluntly generalizes and universalizes, with the result that everything that we know about the author of Ecclesiastes, Socrates, Buddha, Confucius or Mohammed comes down to one and the same vital wisdom, because deep down all the sages agree and say the same thing – that is, what Jesus expressed with the greatest clarity and well-defined practical consequences. This wisdom, which to Tolstoy’s mind had become forgotten and perverted and therefore needed to be proclaimed again, is that which he expresses in his indefatigable writing, translating, commenting and compiling the gospels in his own personal way.

#### **4. Tolstoy’s *Kurze Darlegung des Evangelium* in Wittgenstein’s *Geheime Tagebücher***

Let us now return to the previous thread and those *Secret Diaries*: Wittgenstein bought Tolstoy’s *Kurze Darlegung des Evangelium* at the end of August of 1914 and, as he notes on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of September, *had begun reading it from the first of the month*.

On the second, he acknowledges some disappointment, because although he considers it “*ein herrliches Werk*”, he adds shortly afterwards that “*es ist mir aber / noch nicht das, was ich davon er- / wartete*”. Nonetheless, one day after that, on the 3<sup>rd</sup>, he notes that “*in Tolstoi gelesen / mit grossem Gewinn*”. It is striking that he does not say that he has read the ‘Gospel’, or the ‘abbreviated Gospel’, but rather that he has read ‘Tolstoy’, as if the writer’s voice and his personal message should matter greatly to him, rather than an Evangelist’s version of the person and teachings of

Jesus, or the persistent question of who the historical Jesus was, the problem of the sources, primitive Christianity, and so forth.

Five days later, on 8.9.1914, he writes: “*Jeden Tag viel / gearbeitet und viel ins Tolstois Erläuterungen / zu den Evangelien gelesen!*”. And again we wish to stress that he does not simply note that he is reading the Gospels, but ‘Tolstoy’s comments on the Gospels’. It is the clear emphasis on *Tolstoy’s authorship* that is again surprising: that mediating presence stands out, with his personal points of view and existential commitment, and not simply his work of translating the words of Jesus of Nazareth and aligning the four Evangelists. It seems, therefore, that what interests Wittgenstein most is Tolstoy’s perspective of the New Testament, the hermeneutic work that he subjects it to, his particular religious message as a path to personal health. In fact, one month later, on 11.10.1914, he writes: “*Trage die “Darlegungen des Evangeliums” von Tolstoi immer mit mir / herum, wie einen Talisman*”. It is not necessary to underline the magical-religious character that he attributes to this book here, as if it were an amulet connected with astrology and everything in the cosmos, an object charged with forces that protected him against being hunted from outside, such as the bullets of enemy rifles, or from within himself, such as the temptations that besiege the soul and the body and desire its strength. Wittgenstein *always* carries it with him, as a basic necessity, a proven remedy, until it became one of his distinguishing characteristics and he would give it to his best friends.

Let us start another section and specify what Tolstoy, according to what he says himself in the *Vorwort*, does in this book. He synthesizes the four Gospels according to Jesus’ original doctrine, and endorses the truthfulness of his interpretation with a double argument: on the one hand, the unity, clarity, simplicity and entirety of the teaching thus presented, that is, its economy and coherence, and, on the other, its alignment with the internal feelings of everyone seeking the truth (EA p. 34). In this way, it lapses into a type of arrogant ‘begging the question’ that serves to legitimize his work by the presumed superior purity of his intentions and, at the same time, dismiss the ecclesiastics as well as the historians and freethinkers of the nineteenth century, such as D. F. Strauss or E. Renan, who tackled the scientific-positivist study of the Gospels and who continue to fail to understand them because their interests are awry and they seek their own advantage. Jesus’ teaching is summarized in twelve points that

are the equivalent of the content of the Lord's Prayer, just as Tolstoy translates and interprets it.

The deep mark the book made on the young Wittgenstein's diaries can be observed particularly in certain themes that are repeated in both texts, as it were *leit-motivs* that connect them and give them structure. Here is a possible list: the antithesis of the *spirit* and the *flesh*, the soul and the body; the consideration of the temptations of *sensuality*, depression, fear and sin; *freedom* as an experience of the spirit; the meditations on the question of *time*, the present and eternity; the vindication of work, both manual and spiritual, as a path to salvation: "*Die Gnade der Arbeit!!*", as Wittgenstein will say (2.11.1914); the conception of the *true life*, a life that is happy and reasonable, rational and blessed; the experience of *death* as a moment of truth and a radical affirmation of life and its meaning; the discovery of 'the only thing that is necessary'; the acceptance of *divine will* as a liberation from crises and doubts; isolation and solitude as existential conditions and as preludes to religious experience; religion as *light* and *clarity*, as *peace*, as *happiness* and fullness of meaning; genuine faith as *praxis and a way of life* that is pleasing to God; the need to fulfill the difficult commandment of *never resisting evil and not confronting people's wickedness*; and so on. Following the Tolstoyan gospel and the most personal part of Wittgenstein's diaries along each of these central themes provides valuable nuances for outlining their respective visions of religion, and which should then be complemented by what each states in other, later texts.

Here and now, we will only note one question, of celebrated Augustinian derivation, that of *time*, an experience that also marked them both. Wittgenstein's reading of KDE resonates in this note which he made on 12.10.1914: "*Über die nächste / Zukunft völlig im ungewissen! / Kurz, es giebt Zeiten, wo ich nicht / bloss in der Gegenwart und nur dem / Geiste leben kann. Die guten / Stunden des Lebens soll man als Gnade / dankbar genissen und sonst gegen das / Leben gleichgültig sein.*" We can see the Tolstoyan roots of this conception (which, as is known, could also be argued from Schopenhauerian texts). We can already find these six theses in the *Vorwort* of KDE, the last of the twelve that summarize the central meaning of the teaching of the Gospels according to Tolstoy's hermeneutics:

7. Das zeitliche, fleischliche Leben ist die Speise des wahren Lebens, der Baustoff für das vernünftige Leben.
8. Und darum liegt das wahre Leben ausserhalb der Zeit allein im Gegenwärtigen.
9. Der Trug des Lebens ist der Zeit, in Vergangenheit und Zukunft verbirgt den Menschen das wahre Leben, das in der Gegenwart.
10. Und darum muss der Mensch dahin streben, den Trug des zeitlichen, des Vergangenheits- und Zukunfts-lebens zu zerstören.
11. Das wahre Leben liegt nicht allein ausserhalb der Zeit, als ein Leben im Gegenwärtigen, sondern ist auch ein Leben ausserhalb der Persönlichkeit, als ein allen Menschen gemeinsames Leben.
12. Und darum vereint sich, wer im gegenwärtigen, allen Menschen gemeinsamen Leben lebt, mit dem Vater, dem Ursprunge und Grunde des Lebens (ss. 6-7, pp. 29-30).

These theses are detailed in chapter VIII of KAE entitled *Das Leben ist keines in der Zeit* (s. 126 and ss.), and we would refer the reader to check them in the text. We think that they decisively marked Wittgenstein's way of experiencing *religion* at the front. We must now tackle the second part of our objective in this article.

## **5. Nietzsche's 'Der Antichrist', Tolstoy's Christianity, and the Young Wittgenstein**

The entry made on 8.12.1914 of the GT may be found surprising: in the recognized context of war where Wittgenstein found himself, meditating on the logical-philosophical problems of what would become the *Tractatus* and suffering from a foot wound, one suddenly reads: "*Nietzsche Band 8 gekauft / und darin gelesen. Bin stark / berührt von seiner Feindschaft // gegen das Christentum.*" As the editor W. Baum explains in the corresponding note<sup>15</sup>, the eighth volume of the *Works* of Nietzsche was published in Leipzig in 1904 and contained the following texts: 1. *Der Fall Wagner*. 2. *Götzen-Dämmerung*. 3. *Nietzsche contra Wagner*. 4. *Umwertung aller Werte: Ertes Buch: Der Antichrist*. 5. *Gedichte* (the *Dionysos-Dithyramben*). And he specifically adds: "What most interested Wittgenstein in this volume was undoubtedly *Der Antichrist*". It may be

---

<sup>15</sup> Baum, 1983, 109.

opportune to add that this edition – where in a non-disinterested way it is incorrectly supposed that the Nietzschean legacy included more books of *The Revaluation of All Values*, thereby preparing the fraud of *The Will to Power* – is very dissimilar from the one that can be read today in G. Colli and M. Montinari's critical edition. The adjective 'idiotic' applied to Jesus (with obvious roots in Dostoyevsky) does not appear in it, nor, for example, does the text end with that terrible page entitled *Gesetz wider das Christentum*, which had he seen it, would have shocked young Wittgenstein even more.

His reading of this text, which must have interested him enormously, has a strong relationship with Tolstoy's work because, as specialists well know, he was one of the authors who most strongly influenced the preparation and writing of *Der Antichrist*<sup>16</sup>, specifically by his essay *Ma Religion*, which Nietzsche read in 1887-1888 in the French translation published in Paris in 1885 by Librairie Fischbacher, as noted above. He made numerous notes while reading it, sometimes copying out passages in full. Such notes, more than forty in number, can be consulted in the Colli-Montinari edition of the complete works of Nietzsche.<sup>17</sup> Both Tolstoy and Nietzsche carried out their interpretations of the Old and New Testaments consulting the studies of philologists and historians who were extremely famous at the time, such as D. F. Strauss and E. Renan, whom both comment on and criticize, though they do so based on quite different suppositions and considerations. Nietzsche remained an expert professor of classic philology *par excellence*, committed to a peculiar version of *psychology* that had an intimate relationship with his philosophical project based on the complex ontology sketched out in the concept of *Wille zur Macht*.

Perhaps it would not be inappropriate to point out some aspects of AC where, to our reading at least, the influence of Tolstoy is particularly clear in Nietzsche and in his concept of 'Christianity'. By this term both

---

<sup>16</sup> Hereafter referred to as AC.

<sup>17</sup> In the footnotes that, with the valuable assistance of A. Morillas, we have prepared for our Spanish translation of the posthumous fragments of the philosopher's mature years, we have indicated the numbers of the page or pages from the mentioned French translation to which each refer. Cf. Nietzsche, 2008,. Cf. particularly fragments 11 [236-282] of a notebook of November 1887 – March 1888, pp. 427-437.

authors understand two things: what Jesus of Nazareth lived and preached; this personal experience, according to both Tolstoy and Nietzsche, deserves special attention and should be distinguished – with the greatest care – from something that is very different but, unfortunately, is usually also called ‘Christianity’, what Paul and others preached as the purported message of Jesus and which the various Christian Churches have continued to modify, particularly since Constantine and the new circumstances of Christianity, which were the product of its relationships with the established powers and its return to Jewish conceptions, partly to adapt to the mood of the public to whom they addressed themselves.

Both Tolstoy’s powerful criticisms of dogmatic theology and the mature Nietzsche’s ferocious attack on this ecclesiastical and priestly Christianity focus on the second meaning of this term, not the first. This distinction is unfortunately absent from various commentators on Wittgenstein’s work who only distinguish the negative part of AC. In this, they are it faithful to the letter of what he noted in his diary, but they miss the opportunity to highlight the remarkable parallelisms between the text and the Tolstoyan vision of evangelical Christianity.<sup>18</sup>

Here are some features of the image that Nietzsche offers of Jesus in the aphorisms of AC, an image, as we have mentioned, marked strongly by what he read in Tolstoy, but also, let us not forget, Dostoyevsky. Nietzsche had not only read some of Dostoyevsky’s books, for example, *The House of the Dead* (*Souvenirs de la maison des morts*) and *The Possessed* (*Les possédés*), but among other things he also knew, through various articles and an excellent book by E. M. M. de la Vogüé, *Le roman russe*, what Dostoeivski had written both in *Crime and Punishment* and in a strange novel with suggestions about the figure of Jesus, entitled *The Idiot*. We think it worthwhile to highlight Dostoyevsky’s Christological hermeneutics and summarize the Tolstoyan interpretation of Christianity, as well as the great influence both authors had on Nietzsche’s AC, because it may help to clarify Wittgenstein’s reading of both KDE and AC.

In aphorism 27 of this text, the *political* dimension of the Jesus of Nazareth type is presented as if he were a kind of young Dostoyevsky, or convinced Tolstoyan, who would be condemned to hard labour in Siberia in the nineteenth century for having subversive ideas:

---

<sup>18</sup> Cf. for example, Monk, *Ludwig Wittgenstein*, 1994, 126.



Dieser heilige Anarchist, der das niedere Volk, die Ausgestossnen und "Sünder", die *Tschandala* innerhalb des Judentums zum Widerspruch gegen die herrschende Ordnung aufrief – mit einer Sprache, falls den Evangelien zu trauen wäre, die auch heute noch nach Sibirien führen würde, war ein politischer Verbrecher, soweit eben politische Verbrecher in einer *absurd-unpolitischen* Gemeinschaft möglich waren.<sup>19</sup>

However, as aphorism 29 explains, Nietzsche is particularly interested in Jesus' *psychological type*, because he considers Renan's interpretation (Jesus as *hero* and as *genius*) to be superficial and mistaken; the Dostoyevskian version (the *idiot*, that is, Prince Myshkin as the Christological figure) and the Tolstoyan (the *non-resistance to evil* as the central commandment of the Sermon on the Mount; the true evangelical message announcing that *the kingdom of God is within you*) seem to him far more correct and, without mentioning these authors, explicitly assumes their teachings with unmistakable details, literally transcribed from his knowledge of *The Idiot* and *Ma Religion*:

Herr Renan, dieser Hanswurst in psychologicis, hat die zwei *ungehörigsten* Begriffe zu seiner Erklärung des Typus Jesus hinzugebracht, die es hierfür geben kann: den Begriff *Genie* und den Begriff *Held* ("héros"). Aber wenn irgend etwas unevangelisch ist, so ist es der Begriff *Held*. Gerade der Gegensatz zu allem Ringen, zu allem Sich-In-Kampf-fühlen ist hier Instinkt geworden: die Unfähigkeit zum Widerstand wird hier Moral ("widerstehe nicht dem Bösen!" das tiefste Wort der Evangelien, ihr Schlüssel in gewissem Sinne), die Seligkeit im Frieden, in der Sanftmut, in Nicht-feind-sein-können. Was heisst "frohe Botschaft"? Das wahre Leben, das ewige Leben ist gefunden, – es wird nicht verheißen, es ist da, es ist *in euch*: als Leben in der Liebe, in der Liebe ohne Abzug und Ausschluß, ohne Distanz. Jeder ist das Kind Gottes – Jesus nimmt durchaus nichts für sich allein in Anspruch –, als Kind Gottes ist jeder mit jedem gleich... Aus Jesus einen *Helden* machen! – Und was für ein Missverständnis ist gar das Wort "Genie"! Unser ganzer Begriff, unser Cultur-Begriff "Geist" hat in der Welt, in der Jesus lebt, gar keinen Sinn. Mit der Strenge des Physiologen gesprochen, wäre hier ein ganz andres Wort eher noch am Platz: das Wort *Idiot*.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Nietzsche, 1980, s.198.

<sup>20</sup> Op. cit. ss. 199-200.

The good news announced by Jesus corresponds to a physiological habit that Nietzsche diagnoses by means of characteristics that he seems to have taken, one by one, from the Tolstoyan interpretation of the Gospel:

Man übersetze sich einen solchen physiologischen habitus in seine letzte Logik – als Instinkt-Hass gegen *jede* Realität, als Flucht in's "Unfassliche", ins "Unbegreifliche", als Widerwille gegen jede Formel, jeden Zeit- und Raumbegriff, gegen Alles, was fest, Sitte, Institution, Kirche ist, als Zu-Hause-sein in einer Welt, an die keine Art Realität mehr rührt, einer bloss noch "inneren" Welt, einer "wahren" Welt, einer "ewigen" Welt... "Das Reich Gottes ist *in euch*"...<sup>21</sup>

This aversion to every formula and all conditioning within the coordinates of space and time, this internal, true and eternal world, refer to the concept of 'spirit' that Tolstoy presents in its KDE and which reappears so often in Wittgenstein's *Tagebücher*.

In aphorism 31, Nietzsche finally admits the enormous debt that he owes to the two great Russian writers, to Dostoyevsky, obviously, but also, though implicitly, to Tolstoy's particular version of the Final Judgement, which is in no sense at all either post-historic or celestial:

Jene seltsame und kranke Welt, in die uns die Evangelien einführen – eine Welt, wie aus einem russischen Romane, in der sich Auswurf der Gesellschaft, Nervenleiden und "kindliches" Idiotentum ein Stelldichein zu geben scheinen – muss unter allen Umständen den Typus *vergrößert* haben... Man hätte zu bedauern, daß nicht ein Dostoiowsky in der Nähe dieses interessantesten *décadent* gelebt hat, ich meine, jemand, der gerade den ergreifenden Reiz einer solchen Mischung von Sublimem, Krankem und Kindlichem zu empfinden wußte... Einstweilen klafft ein Widerspruch zwischen dem Berg-, See- und Wiesen-Prediger, dessen Erscheinung wie ein Buddha auf einem sehr wenig indischen Boden anmutet, und jenem Fanatiker des Angriffs, dem Theologen- und Priester-Todfeind, den Renans Bosheit als "le grand maître en ironie" verherrlicht hat... Als die erste Gemeinde einen richtenden, hadernden, zürnenden, böseartig spitzfindigen Theologen nötig hatte, *gegen* Theologen, *schuf* sie sich ihren "Gott" nach ihrem Bedürfnisse: wie sie ihm auch jene völlig unevangelischen Begriffe, die sie jetzt nicht entbehren konnte, "Wiederkunft", "jüngstes Gericht", jede

---

<sup>21</sup> Op. cit. s. 200.

Art zeitlicher Erwartung und Verheißung, ohne Zögern in den Mund gab.<sup>22</sup>

Tolstoy's presence in the text of AC is rarely more obvious than in aphorisms 32 and 33. Traditional theology's conceptions of 'sin', 'reward' and 'punishment' fall apart here, and innovative theses that will also mark Wittgenstein's philosophy of religion are defended. These are: the fundamental importance of the way of life (*Wandel*), of *praxis* as the only truthful and congruent manifestation of genuine religious belief, and *silence* as the pertinent road for such experience, and they are radically different from those enunciated and described by our civilization's scientific-technical language, replete with legal formulas, orders and verbal credos. In any event, language serves to present signs, analogies, metaphors, complementary ways of seeing and suggesting aspects of what may be perceived, as if from the standpoints of eternity and blessedness. Genuine Christian faith is not the result of a rational proof, the exercise of dialectics, of syllogisms and argument, nor is it affected by alternative reasoning. It has taken root at another level, in the deep feelings of the heart, that of the living life:

Die "gute Botschaft" ist eben, dass es keine Gegensätze mehr gibt; das Himmelreich gehört den *Kindern*; der Glaube, der hier laut wird, ist kein erkämpfter Glaube... Dieser Glaube formuliert sich auch nicht, – er *lebt*, er wehrt sich gegen Formeln... Man könnte, mit einiger Toleranz im Ausdruck, Jesus einen "freien Geist" nennen – er macht sich aus allem Festen nichts: das Wort *tödtet*, alles, was fest ist, *tödtet*. Der Begriff, die *Erfahrung* "Leben", wie er sie allein kennt, widerstrebt bei ihm jeder Art Wort, Formel, Gesetz, Glaube, Dogma. Er redet bloss vom Innersten: "Leben" oder "Wahrheit" oder "Licht" ist sein Wort für das Innerste, – alles übrige, die ganze Realität, die ganze Natur, die Sprache selbst, hat für ihn bloss den Wert eines Zeichens, eines Gleichnisses... Das *Verneinen* ist eben das ihm ganz Unmögliche –. Ingleichen fehlt die Dialektik, es fehlt die Vorstellung davon, dass ein Glaube, eine "Wahrheit" durch Gründe bewiesen werden könnte (– *seine* Beweise sind innere "Lichter", innere Lustgefühle und Selbstbejahungen, lauter "Beweise der Kraft" –). Eine solche Lehre *kann* auch nicht widersprechen...

---

<sup>22</sup> Op. cit. 202-203.

In der ganzen Psychologie des “Evangeliums” fehlt der Begriff Schuld und Strafe; insgleichen der Begriff Lohn. Die “Sünde”, jedwedens Distanz-Verhältnis zwischen Gott und Mensch ist abgeschafft, – *eben das ist die “frohe Botschaft”*. Die Seligkeit wird nicht verheissen, sie wird nicht an Bedingungen geknüpft: sie ist die *einzig* Realität – der Rest ist Zeichen, um von ihr zu reden...

Die *Folge* eines solchen Zustandes projiziert sich in eine neue *Praktik*, die eigentlich evangelische Praktik. Nicht ein “Glaube” unterscheidet den Christen: der Christ handelt, er unterscheidet sich durch ein *andres* Handeln... Das Leben des Erlösers war nichts andres als *diese* Praktik, – sein Tod war auch nichts andres... Er hatte keine Formeln, keinen Ritus für den Verkehr mit Gott mehr nötig, – nicht einmal das Gebet... er weiss, wie es allein die *Praktik* des Lebens ist, mit der man sich “göttlich”, “selig”, “evangelisch”, jederzeit ein “Kind Gottes” fühlt. *Nicht* “Busse”, *nicht* “Gebet um Vergebung” sind Wege zu Gott: die *evangelische Praktik allein* führt zu Gott, sie *eben ist* “Gott”!... Der tiefe Instinkt dafür, wie man leben *müsse*, um sich “im Himmel” zu fühlen, um sich “ewig” zu fühlen, während man sich bei jedem andern Verhalten durchaus *nicht* “im Himmel” fühlt: dies allein ist die psychologische Realität der “Erlösung”. – Ein neuer Wandel, *nicht* ein neuer Glaube...<sup>23</sup>

The religion of the ‘Good News’ is to be found in a state of the heart that is outside time and space, and hence is not affected by so-called *natural death*. It is an experience of completeness that overcomes terrors and fears, hopes and disappointments, and maintains a *praxis* that by itself guarantees its peace and bliss:

Der Begriff “des Menschen Sohn” ist nicht eine konkrete Person, die in die Geschichte gehört, irgend etwas Einzelnes, Einmaliges, sondern eine “ewige” Tatsächlichkeit, ein von dem Zeitbegriff erlöstes psychologisches Symbol... Das “Himmelreich” ist ein Zustand des Herzens, – nicht etwas, das “über die Erde” oder “nach dem Tode” kommt. Der ganze Begriff des natürlichen Todes *fehlt* im Evangelium: der Tod ist keine Brücke, kein Übergang, er fehlt, weil einer ganz andern, bloss scheinbaren, bloss zu Zeichen nützlichen Welt zugehörig. Die “Todesstunde” ist *kein* christlicher Begriff, – die “Stunde”, die Zeit, das physische Leben und seine Krisen sind gar nicht vorhanden für den Lehrer der “frohen

---

<sup>23</sup> Op. cit. 203-206.

Botschaft" ... Das "Reich Gottes" ist nichts, das man erwartet; es hat kein Gestern und kein Übermorgen, es kommt nicht in "tausend Jahren", – es ist eine Erfahrung an einem Herzen; es ist überall da, es ist nirgends da...

(...)

Dieser "frohe Botschafter" starb wie er lebte... Die *Praktik* ist es, welche er der Menschheit hinterließ: sein Verhalten vor den Richtern, vor den Häschern, vor den Anklägern und aller Art Verleumdung und Hohn, – sein Verhalten am *Kreuz*. Er widersteht nicht, er verteidigt nicht sein Recht...<sup>24</sup>

Evangelical *praxis*, precisely as Tolstoy and Nietzsche present it, that of the genuine Christian, implies another way of acting: not offering resistance, not differentiating between native and foreign, not getting angry with anybody, not despising anybody, not going to court nor swearing, not moving away from the person with whom an intimate coexistence has begun, in brief, loving thy neighbour, living in the light, being already in paradise, as Jesus told the good thief. As a result it immediately becomes obvious that ecclesiastical doctrine and its conception of Christianity are an absolute misrepresentation of this 'Good News', a miserable degradation of its singularity:

man hat aus dem Gegensatz zum Evangelium die *Kirche* aufgebaut... Dass die Menschheit vor dem Gegensatz dessen auf den Knien liegt, was der Ursprung, der Sinn, das *Recht* des Evangeliums war, dass sie im Begriff "Kirche" gerade das heilig gesprochen hat, was der "frohe Botschafter" als *unter* sich, als *hinter* sich empfand – man sucht vergebens nach einer größeren Form *welthistorischer Ironie*.<sup>25</sup>

For this reason, Nietzsche personalizes and, if possible, underlines the false transvaluation carried out by Pauline and ecclesiastical Christianity to an even greater degree than Tolstoy, though, as will be shown below, this does not mean that he scorns Jesus' message and the way of life from which it arises. However, based on these texts, the vertiginous, implacable, bloodcurdling degree of accusation and the harshness of his criticism in AC also turns out to be understandable:

---

<sup>24</sup> Aphorisms 34 y 35, op. cit. ss. 206-207.

<sup>25</sup> Aphorism 36, op. cit. p. 208.

ich erzähle die *echte* Geschichte des Christentums. – Das Wort schon “Christentum” ist ein Mißverständnis –, im Grunde gab es nur Einen Christen, und der starb am Kreuz. Das “Evangelium” *starb* am Kreuz. Was von diesem Augenblick an “Evangelium” heisst, war bereits der Gegensatz dessen, was er gelebt: eine “*schlimme* Botschaft”, ein *Dysangelium*. Es ist falsch bis zum Unsinn, wenn man in einem “Glauben”, etwa im Glauben an die Erlösung durch Christus das Abzeichen des Christen sieht: bloss die christliche *Praktik*, ein Leben so wie der, der am Kreuze starb, es *lebte*, ist christlich... Heute noch ist ein *solches* Leben möglich, für *gewisse* Menschen sogar notwendig: das echte, das ursprüngliche Christentum wird zu allen Zeiten möglich sein... *Nicht* ein Glauben, sondern ein Tun, ein Vieles-*nicht*-tun vor allem, ein andres *Sein*...<sup>26</sup>

Given this, one can understand that Wittgenstein should be shocked by Nietzsche’s fiery and drastic ‘anti-Christian’ transvaluation in AC. In a way, he already knew the positive and affirmative part of this book through his readings of Tolstoy’s KDE, which strongly emphasized the *Fluch auf das Christentum*, the overwhelming series of aphorisms that like an incendiary pamphlet, attack Pauline theology, the priestly reading, the insertion of ecclesiastical power into the history of the West, its decadentism, its nihilism, its deplorable degradation of humanity. These are the words with which, on 8.12.1914, Wittgenstein, as a young soldier summarized his startled reading of the texts in the eighth volume of Nietzsche’s works:

Bin stark / berührt von seiner Feindschaft // gegen das Christentum. /  
Denn auch in seinen Schriften ist etwas / Wahrheit enthalten. Gewiss, /  
das Christentum ist / der einzige *sichere* / Weg zum Glück. Aber wie, /  
wenn einer dies Glück / verschmähte?! Könnte / es nicht besser sein  
unglück- / lich, im hoffnungslosen / Kampf gegen die äussere / Welt zu  
Grunde zu gehen? / Aber ein solches Leben / ist sinnlos. Aber warum /  
nicht ein sinnloses Leben / führen? Ist es unwürdig? / Wie verträgt es sich  
mit dem / streng solipsistischen / Standpunkt? Was muss ich / aber tun,  
das[s] mein Leben // mir nicht verloren geht? / Ich muss mir seiner immer  
/ -des Geistes immer- bewusst sein.

Nevertheless, R. Monk has lucidly written that, based on these words, “we can see how close Wittgenstein was, in spite of his faith, to

<sup>26</sup> Aphorism 39, op. cit. p. 211.

accepting Nietzsche's point of view."<sup>27</sup> Hence, he does not discuss the question of whether Christian doctrine is *true*, but rather, and in syntony with Nietzsche's *psychological* position, whether it offers help to confront existence, to find *meaning* in a world that otherwise could be found absurd and unbearable – in brief, if it offers a way to live, a *praxis* that *cures* the pains of a 'sick soul', as William James said and as Vicente Sanf elix has explained. In AC, there are indeed passages 'that convinced Wittgenstein that there was a certain truth in the work of Nietzsche'<sup>28</sup>. This, for example:

Bewusstseins-Zust nde, irgend ein Glauben, ein F r-wahr-halten zum Beispiel – jeder Psycholog weiss das – sind ja vollkommen gleichg ltig und f nften Ranges gegen den Werth der Instinkte: strenger geredet, der ganze Begriff gesittiger Urs chlichkeit ist falsch.<sup>29</sup>

As Monk indicated, the idea that the essence of religion resides in the *feelings* (or, as Nietzsche says, in the *instincts*) and in *praxes* rather than in beliefs would become a recurrent topic in Wittgenstein. During the First World War, Christianity was for him "*der einzige sichere Weg zum Gl ck*", though not because it promised him a blessed life in heaven, but because the figure of Jesus, just as Tolstoy and Nietzsche had taught him to interpret Him, provided an example, an attitude to follow that made life's suffering, anguish in the face of the death, bearable.

## References

- Baum, W. (1988): *Ludwig Wittgenstein Vida y obra*, translated by J. Ib  nez, Alianza, Madrid.
- Monk, R. (2008): *Ludwig Wittgenstein*, translated by D. Alou, Anagrama, Barcelona.
- Nietzsche, F. (1980): *S mtliche Werke. Kritische Studienausgabe, Band 6*. Herausg. von G. Colli und M. Montinari, DTV/Walter de Gruyter, M nchen/Berlin-New York.

---

<sup>27</sup> Op. cit. p. 127.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.p. 127.

<sup>29</sup> AC, aphorism 39, ed. cit. ss. 211-212.

- Nietzsche, F. (2008): *Fragmentos póstumos, Volumen IV (1885-1889)*, edited by D. Sánchez Meca, introduction, translation and notes by J. L. Vermal and J. B. Llinares, Tecnos, Madrid.
- Sanfélix, V. (2007): “Un alma enferma. La experiencia religiosa de Wittgenstein a la luz de Las variedades de la experiencia religiosa de William James”. *Dianoia*. Vol. LII. Nº 59
- Tolstoy, L. (1986): *Anna Karénina*, J. Pérez Sacristán, Cátedra, Madrid.
- Tolstoy, L. (2008): *A Confession*, translated by M. Rebón, Acantilado, Barcelona.
- Troyat, H. (1965): *Tolstoi*. Librairie Artheme Fayard. Paris.
- Valdés Villanueva, L. M. (2006): “Wittgenstein y “El Evangelio abreviado””, epilogue to L. Tolstoy, *El evangelio abreviado*, ed. Iván García Sala, KRK, Oviedo.
- Vargas Llosa, M. (2010): “La querencia del maestro” (The Teacher’s Affection), from the “Opinion” page in *El País*, 11-julio-2010.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1991): *Diarios secretos*, ed. Wilhelm Baum, Alianza, Madrid.

*University of Valencia. Spain*

*Translation from Spanish: Philip Daniels*



# **APORIA**

Απορία

## **HRSG. VON / EDITED BY**

Jesús Padilla Gálvez

(University of Castilla-La Mancha)

Alejandro Tomasini Bassols

(National Autonomous University of Mexico)

## **ADVISORY BOARD**

Pavo Barišić (University of Split)

Michel Le Du (Université de Strasbourg)

Guillermo Hurtado (National Autonomous University of Mexico)

Lorenzo Peña (Spanish National Research Council)

Nuno Venturinha (New University of Lisbon)

Nicanor Ursua Lezaun (University of the Basque Country)

Pablo Quintanilla (Pontifical Catholic University of Peru)

Aporia is a new series devoted to studies in the field of philosophy. Aporia (Απορία) means philosophical puzzle and the aim of the series is to present contributions by authors who systematically investigate current problems. Aporia (Απορία) puts special emphasis on the publication of concise arguments on the topics studied. The publication has to contribute to the explanation of current philosophical problem, using a systematic or a historic approach. Contributions should concern relevant philosophical topics and should reflect the ongoing progress of scientific development.

**Volume 4**

Luigi Perissinotto, Vicente Sanf elix (Eds.)

**Doubt, Ethics and Religion**  
Wittgenstein and the Counter-Enlightenment



**ontos**  

---

**verlag**

Frankfurt | Paris | Lancaster | New Brunswick

**Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.



North and South America by  
Transaction Books  
Rutgers University  
Piscataway, NJ 08854-8042  
[trans@transactionpub.com](mailto:trans@transactionpub.com)



United Kingdom, Ireland, Iceland, Turkey, Malta, Portugal by  
Gazelle Books Services Limited  
White Cross Mills  
Hightown  
LANCASTER, LA1 4XS  
[sales@gazellebooks.co.uk](mailto:sales@gazellebooks.co.uk)



Livraison pour la France et la Belgique:  
Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin  
6, place de la Sorbonne; F-75005 PARIS  
Tel. +33 (0)1 43 54 03 47; Fax +33 (0)1 43 54 48 18  
[www.vrin.fr](http://www.vrin.fr)

©2011 ontos verlag  
P.O. Box 15 41, D-63133 Heusenstamm  
[www.ontosverlag.com](http://www.ontosverlag.com)

ISBN 978-3-86838-102-3

2011

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in retrieval systems or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use of the purchaser of the work

Printed on acid-free paper  
FSC-certified (Forest Stewardship Council)  
This hardcover binding meets the International Library standard

Printed in Germany  
by [buch.buecher.de](http://buch.buecher.de)

## CONTENTS

LUIGI PERISSINOTTO AND VICENTE SANFÉLIX Doubt, Ethics and Religion: An Introduction	7
JEAN PIERRE COMETTI Is Wittgenstein a Religious Thinker?	9
VICENTE SANFÉLIX To Get Rid of the Torments of the Mind. Hume and Wittgenstein on Religion	25
JOAQUÍN JAREÑO The Existence of God (According to Wittgenstein)	43
JULIÁN MARRADES Subject, World and Value	63
CHON TEJEDOR The Ethical Dimension of the <i>Tractatus</i>	85
JOAN B. LLINARES The Early Wittgenstein, Tolstoy's <i>Kurze Darlegung des Evangelium</i> and Nietzsche's <i>Antichrist</i>	105
ISABEL CABRERA Wittgenstein's Religious Character	129
LUIGI PERISSINOTTO "...to begin at the beginning". The Grammar of Doubt in Wittgenstein's <i>On Certainty</i>	151