

*Harold F. Cherniss:
Letters to Mario Untersteiner, 1951-1977*

1. Harold F. Cherniss and Mario Untersteiner: a correspondence of thirty years

Scholarship is a small world, where long distance can be removed by a sort of intellectual *koiné*, and *amicitia* can arise even without personal acquaintance.

That is the case of the correspondence – lasting about three decades, and interrupted only by the death of the one of the parties – between two of the foremost classicists and historians of ancient philosophy of the 20th century: Harold F. Cherniss (1904-1987) and Mario Untersteiner (1899-1981).

The role played by Harold Cherniss on the scholarship of Plato, Aristotle, and the Academy is well known¹; but another important contribution to the field of ancient philosophy was provided in the same period by Mario Untersteiner. Professor of Greek literature and history of ancient philosophy at the universities of Genoa (1947-1958) and Milan (1959-1969), he published renowned editions with commentary of the Sophists and the Eleatics (but also of

¹ For a profile of Harold Cherniss, see Vander Waerdt 1994 and the obituary published in different versions by Leonardo Tarán (Tarán 1987; Tarán 1988a; Tarán 1988b; see Tarán 2001, pp. 667-672). For a critical balance of his influence, see Gerson 2014.

Aristotle's *Peri philosophías*)² and many studies, the most influential being doubtless the one on the Sophists, which was translated into English and French³.

After his death, the whole archive and the book collection of Untersteiner were gifted to the library of his birthplace, Rovereto⁴, and the letters and papers here conserved have been the object of a research project of the University of Trento⁵.

It was during this project that a corpus of 27 letters were found⁶, which were sent to Untersteiner by Cherniss, and which were not yet known to the scientific community⁷.

Although Cherniss often expressed the wish to know his Italian colleague personally – «it would be very pleasant to see you and conversation would be much more satisfactory than any amount of correspondence can be», he writes for instance in Letter 9 (March 24, 1957)⁸ – this did not happen, and they never met⁹.

² Untersteiner 1949-1962; 1955; 1958; 1963a; 1963b. Untersteiner also edited the tragedies of Aeschylus: Untersteiner 1946-1947.

³ Untersteiner 1949. Outstanding studies are also Untersteiner 1935; 1942; 1946; see also Untersteiner 1970; 1980.

⁴ The inventory of the Archive is edited by G. Calì in the series *Annali Roveretani. Serie Strumenti* (2008), and can be consulted on the website of the Civic Library 'G. Tartarotti' of Rovereto: <http://www.bibliotecacivica.rovereto.tn.it/Patrimonio-e-risorse/Pubblicazioni-della-Biblioteca>.

⁵ See Bonandini 2017a, Bonandini 2017b and Bonandini 2017c.

⁶ The corpus includes 27 letters (the last sent by Cherniss to Mario Untersteiner's wife, Linda, after his death), three greeting cards signed by Harold Cherniss and by his wife, Ruth, and the copy of a letter sent by Cherniss to Untersteiner's pupil Antonio Battezzare. The letters are generally written in Princeton, on headed paper of the Institute of Advanced Study - School of Historical Studies (9 letters; from 1975 onward also a private letterhead is present) or on air mail paper (12 letters). Most of them (18 letters) are typewritten. There are also copies of many letters, and the originals of six of them (Letters 13; 15; 19; 20; 22; 26) are lost.

⁷ Except a brief reference to the five latest letters (22-26) by Gigante 1999, pp. 19-20, who received them on loan directly from Untersteiner's wife.

⁸ See also Letter 3 (July 17, 1954).

⁹ See Letter 27 (February 10, 1983, to Untersteiner's wife): «I am more than ever regretful of what I have missed in not having known him personally».

Cherniss' letters, however, show a deep *sympatheia*, increasing through the years.

Moreover, they cast light on personal relationships inside the community of ancient philosophy scholarship in the central decades of the 20th century: decades deeply marked by the controversy between different interpretative approaches to the study of Plato, derived in particular from the different evaluation of Aristotle's testimony and, consequently, from the acceptance of the existence of unwritten doctrines, diverging from the dialogues.

Being well known, Cherniss is considered the most influent defender of the anti-esoteric approach¹⁰, opposed to the so-called 'Tübingen School' of Hans Joachim Krämer and Konrad Gaiser¹¹; but the position of Mario Untersteiner proves that even in Platonic scholarship conciliating approaches can exist.

Already in 1937, Untersteiner wrote a review of *Aristotle's Criticism of Presocratic Philosophy*¹², the book where, for the first time, Cherniss puts in doubt the doxographical validity of Aristotle's testimony. According to Untersteiner, the «fundamental» book of Cherniss, «accurate and acute» as it is, would lead to a reappraisal of this topic¹³; but Cherniss also, in his letters, continuously expresses a deep admiration of his Italian colleague¹⁴.

However, Untersteiner is by no means an apologist of Cherniss' position on Plato: among his correspondence, letters of the same Krämer and Gaiser are conserved, and in Milan he maintained a close relationship with Giovanni Reale, the younger scholar who disseminated the 'Tübingen School' approach in Italy¹⁵.

¹⁰ See Gerson 2014; see *ultra* Vlastos 1963.

¹¹ The reference works of the Tübingen School are Krämer 1959 and Gaiser 1963.

¹² Cherniss 1944.

¹³ Untersteiner 1937, pp. 148-151.

¹⁴ See e.g. Letter 5 (October 6, 1954): «it is with admiring wonder that I have long regarded the scope and variety of your contribution to classical scholarship, the wide range of your knowledge, and the incisiveness of your insight in so many different fields».

¹⁵ See Krämer, Reale 1982; Reale 1984; Reale 1994.

In the introduction of his article on *Charmides*¹⁶, Untersteiner presents the works of Cherniss 1945 and Krämer 1959, asserting that although they disagree, their theories are substantially complementary, and converging in giving a groundbreaking overall interpretation of Platonism.

Both Krämer and Gaiser wrote to Untersteiner congratulating him on this article, and thanking him for supporting their reconstruction. In a letter dated July 8, 1965, Krämer writes:

Ich persönlich muß Ihnen dankbar sein für das hohe Verständnis, mit dem Sie über meine Thesen berichten, und noch mehr dafür, daß Sie sie unterstützen und durch eine weitere Beobachtung fundieren. Ich bin mir bewußt, welchen Einfluß diese Ihre Tat der Vermittlung meiner Ergebnisse im ganzen italienischen und vielleicht im romanischen Sprachraum überhaupt haben wird. Aber auch im deutschen Sprachbereich wird man Ihren Aufsatz als die wichtigste Stimme vermerken, die nach den Arbeiten der Tübinger positiv zum esoterischen Platon Stellung nimmt¹⁷.

And yet, Cherniss' influence seems to be even more substantial, since it concerns the question of Plato's method; according to Cherniss – Untersteiner writes – the dialogues «esprimono una lezione di metodo»¹⁸; and method, in Untersteiner's opinion, is the very key to understanding Plato's thought. Therefore, he devoted his last years to an overall reconstruction of it, as he recalls in a letter sent to his assistant, Paola de Dominicis, and to Anna Testa (March 18, 1977):

Da ultimo stavo lavorando su Platone e avevo esplorato più di due terzi dell'opera trovando la chiave per scoprire il metodo del filosofo.

¹⁶ Untersteiner 1965a, pp. 347-354.

¹⁷ To this letter briefly refers Gigante 1999; a grateful acknowledgment to the role played by Untersteiner in disseminating the Tübingen paradigm is also contained in a second letter, dated September 24, 1965, and in a letter of June 1st, 1965 by Konrad Gaiser.

¹⁸ Untersteiner 1965a, p. 350.

Alice Bonandini

Il problema del metodo era stato posto, anche se non sviluppato, da Harold Cherniss, *The riddle of the early Academy*.

Io credo di aver trovato la chiave, o almeno una chiave, per risolvere il problema, ma poi doveti interrompere perché il 21 luglio 1974 improvvisamente mi si oscurò quell'occhio col quale riuscivo ancora a leggere¹⁹.

In the letter, Untersteiner claims that his investigation had been suggested by Cherniss' *The Riddle of the Early Academy*²⁰, and that he was close to find the key of the problem, when a sudden deterioration of his eyesight, leaving him half-blind²¹, forced him to interrupt his ambitious research²²: the article on *Charmides* of 1965 would remain the only contribution on Plato published by the Italian scholar²³.

As a testimony of such a meticulous study, a number of boxes remains in his archive, containing his countless files on Platonism; a material as rich as useless for any other scholar, as both Untersteiner²⁴ and Cherniss well knew, since the latter one writes²⁵:

My own eyes begin to fail me, though I make shift to use them still without knowing how long they will last; and I know that in my files too are quantities of notes and outlines that can be used by nobody and which I should wish nobody to use or misuse.

And two months later again²⁶:

¹⁹ The letter is published in Leoni 1992, pp. 11-14; the part quoted is on p. 13.

²⁰ Cherniss 1945.

²¹ References to Untersteiner's vision problems are constantly present in Cherniss' last letters: see Letters 22-26.

²² On the interpretation of Plato given by Untersteiner see Bonandini 2017b.

²³ See also the new edition of Untersteiner 1931, published as an *editio maior* with a new introduction (pp. 21-246) in 1966.

²⁴ A similar statement in the letter to Paola de Dominicis and Anna Testa quoted above: Leoni 1992, p. 13.

²⁵ Letter 23 (August 10, 1975).

²⁶ Letter 24 (October 26, 1975).

As you say, material collected for a purpose by one person is not likely to be useful to another; and I should not wish to impose upon anyone else the burden of reading through and interpreting the notes and material that I have collected. I know from experience how frustrating and useless such a task must prove to be.

Untersteiner's last book was doomed to remain unwritten and unpublished, as the second volume of Harold Cherniss' *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato and the Academy* was, although he devoted all his energies to its completion in his last years²⁷; and we can read this fact as proof of the affinity between the two scholars: their accuracy (exactly the quality Untersteiner praises in his review of Cherniss 1935²⁸, and that Cherniss often commends in his letters²⁹), reflected by a scrupulous organization of numberless cards (the boxes of Untersteiner and Cherniss' famous files, jokingly defined by Arnaldo Momigliano as one of the seven wonders³⁰), and the need of a careful verification of each testimony and of the whole bibliography.

Such a perfectionism led both of them to prefer, rather than publishing an incomplete, summary or defective work, not to publish it at all – a perfectionism fitting with the information, provided by Isnardi Parente 1990, 122, that Cherniss, like a second Vergil, asked for his manuscripts to be destroyed after his death.

²⁷ See e.g. Tarán 1998a, p. 666.

²⁸ Untersteiner 1937; see *supra*.

²⁹ See e.g. Letter 8 (February 24, 1957): «[I] am much impressed by the care and precision with which you have supported your illuminating interpretation».

³⁰ Of these files Margherita Isnardi Parente speaks in enthusiastic terms in the account given to her mentor Untersteiner after visiting Cherniss at the Institute of Advanced Studies: «Abbiamo ammirato il memorabile schedario di Cherniss, di cui Momigliano parla sempre ridendo come di una delle sette meraviglie; effettivamente sbalorditivo. Mi ha fatto anche vedere, a una mia richiesta, la massa di carte e di appunti preparatori per il secondo volume di *Arist. Crit. Pl. Acad.*» (Letter dated September 22, 1969, conserved in the Untersteiner Archive in Rovereto: Unt. I.1.2.120).

2. Reconstructing a life, reconstructing a personality, reconstructing a research activity

Reading a *corpus* of letters in its entirety allows to cast light on a biography; more precisely, it can provide valuable clues on personality features otherwise destined to sink into oblivion. In the case of scholars, correspondence may also give useful information on research and methodology.

What immediately stands out from Cherniss' letters is his courtesy: he writes his thank you letters promptly and makes abundant use of polite expressions and compliments, whereas, speaking of himself, he prefers a tone of understatement: «It was not my intention ... to speak of myself in this note», he writes for instance in Letter 8 (February 24, 1957); or, in Letter 10 (October 20, 1957): «Pardon me for having talked so much about myself».

This seems to be due to an authentic affability, more than to affectation or formalism, since the same courtesy is reserved for one of Untersteiner's pupils, Antonio Battezzore³¹, who had sent Cherniss a book.

The letters seem therefore to confirm what his pupil Leonardo Tarán writes concluding his obituary, where he recalls Cherniss' «generosity in helping other scholars, especially younger ones», but also «the still more numerous number of those who corresponded with him», together with «his meticulous care, his respect and consideration for other people's views»³². A portrait supported by the testimony of another scholar (and former Untersteiner's pupil), Margherita Isnardi Parente, who describes him as an «extraordinary epistolist»³³.

As far as Cherniss' interests are concerned, the letters contain two English poetry quotations (one of Tennyson: Letter 16 - August 16, 1959; and one of Milton: Letter 22 - June 12, 1975), but above all a profound civic engagement.

³¹ A copy of this letter, dated October 20, 1979, is conserved in Untersteiner Archive.

³² Tarán 1988a, pp. 666-667.

³³ Isnardi Parente 1990, p. 120.

Cherniss appears to be deeply concerned by the question of personal liberty: in Letter 5 (October 6, 1954) he writes, about news concerning the withdrawal of passports:

I have often wondered with regard to this last subject how many officials in the agencies of modern governments, including our own Department of State, remember or know that before 1919 it was the normal thing for citizens of all Western countries to travel wherever they pleased without passports or 'papers' of any kind. It is a strange sort of 'progress' that we have made in the last thirty years; and it is more than disturbing to recognize that, once the kind of bureaucratic meddling represented by this business of passports is introduced, it is almost impossible to be rid of it. What is done under the plausible pressure of an emergency is rarely undone when the emergency has passed, and those who have memory and intelligence enough to learn from such experience the obvious lesson learn it too late to be of any use.

More generally, during the '50s, Cherniss often expresses his worry about the international political situation:

The course of world affairs during the last six months has depressed me greatly – and the American 'policy' has enraged me, for it seems to me to have done nothing but contribute to confusion and chaos! I have no hope that it will be better in the coming year, but I hope that my pessimism will not be justified as was that of Cassandra³⁴.

For the Italian colleague, Cherniss acts as interpreter of U.S. internal politics, commenting Eisenhower's presidency (Letters 8 and 9 - February 24 and March 24, 1957) and 1960 elections (Letters 17 and 18 - August 3 and October 18, 1960).

As far as Kennedy's election as well as the Halton affair³⁵ are concerned (Letter 12 - April 19, 1958), Cherniss takes up a stand against Catholics. Such a hostility, however, is due not to religious prejudice (Cherniss had Jewish origins), but to a deep concern for

³⁴ Letter 7 (December 24, 1956); see also Letters 6 (January 2, 1955); 9 (March 24, 1957); 17 (August 3, 1960).

³⁵ On Halton see below.

Alice Bonandini

any form of obscurantism, and for the influence of religious hierarchies on personal liberty, as emerges from Letter 11 (March 30, 1958):

I have followed with interest and concern the accounts in our newspapers of the struggle in Italy against the clerical influence, especially recently when the Italian courts appear at last to have gone some distance in asserting the authority of the constitution and the laws over the clericals as well as over people in general. In the United States, where from the beginning there has been a strict separation of church and state, the growing power of the Roman Catholic Church has been expressing itself in a fashion that is most ominous; and such a struggle as that in Italy no longer seems to be so far distant from our own domestic problems.

Like that of Untersteiner, Cherniss' thought is marked by a deep laicism, the immediate effect of his rationalism³⁶.

Such a civic engagement reached its acme in 1954, when Cherniss was instrumental in preventing Robert Oppenheimer's dismissal from the directorship of the Institute for Advanced Study. When the famous physicist lost his security clearance by reason of his suspected communist sympathies and espionage activity, Cherniss promoted an open letter in his defense, which was signed by, among others, Albert Einstein, the Nobel prize winner Chen Ning Yang, Kurt Gödel, and Erwin Panofsky³⁷.

Short after the publication of this letter, Cherniss wrote to Untersteiner (Letter 3 - July 17, 1954):

During the last two months I have been deeply troubled and very busy with matters that have little or nothing to do with scholarship or my own work [...]. The vicious attack upon Dr. Oppenheimer, the Director of our Institute, has naturally been my primary concern and worry. It has already wrought incalculable harm to the United States and cannot help, I fear, continuing to have baleful consequences for the country. We hope, however,

³⁶ See Isnardi Parente 1990, p. 130.

³⁷ *Colleagues Back Dr. Oppenheimer*, «The New York Times» July 1, 1954, p. 14 = «Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists» September 1954, p. 283.

and trust that these consequences will not extend to the narrower sphere of the activities of the Institute itself.

Subsequently, when Oppenheimer's position had been reaffirmed, he expressed his relief by writing (Letter 5 - October 6, 1954): «In this respect, at any rate, the tension here has been relaxed; and we all breathe more freely and can now address ourselves to our work with a feeling of happy security».

Similar remarks on the fact that external events prevent him from focusing on work, and on the consequent worry about fulfilling his obligations and carrying out his projects, are a constant factor of these letters³⁸. Cherniss was concerned with the delay in editing Plutarch's Stoic and Platonic essays, a task that lasted almost twenty years³⁹; but, above all, he was troubled with his slowness in the redaction of the second volume of *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato and the Academy*.

Already the first sentence of the foreword to the first volume, published in 1944 but written before the war, clearly shows that Cherniss conceived of his work as a diptych: «In the two volumes which will constitute this work I propose to give a complete account and analysis of all that Aristotle says about Plato and about Plato's pupils and associates in the Academy»⁴⁰. The second volume would have concerned Plato's supposed mathematical ontology, and its content was later summarized by *The Riddle of the Early Academy*⁴¹. Cherniss was awarded a Guggenheim fellowship to complete his work already in 1942⁴²; but the project was never brought to completion, even though it absorbed him deeply

³⁸ See Letters 5 (October 6, 1954); 8 (February 24, 1957); 9 (March 24, 1957); 14 (May 29, 1959); with specific regard to health, Letters 21 (January 4, 1966); 14 (May 29, 1959, on his sister's illness); 24 and 25 (October 26, 1975 and February 8, 1976, both on his wife's illness).

³⁹ See Letters 16 (August 16, 1959); 19 (March 16, 1963); 24 (October 26, 1975); see below.

⁴⁰ Cherniss 1944, p. IX; see also pp. XXIV-XXV.

⁴¹ See also Cherniss 1951.

⁴² See <http://www.gf.org/fellows/all-fellows/harold-f-cherniss/>.

during all his life, as the letters to Untersteiner clearly show⁴³: «I hope ... to proceed with the second volume of *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato and the Academy*, though I cannot be sure that I shall ever finish it», he said in 1975 (Letter 24 - October 26). But already in 1956 (Letter 7 - December 24), he wrote:

I feel very guilty about the length of time I have taken over the second volume of *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato*; but my absence during the war and the great amount of scholarly publication on the subject since that time have both prevented me from finishing the work sooner, and I can only say in apology that I have continued to work steadily at the problems involved and hope to finish the work some day not too far in the future.

The same justifications – interruption caused by the war, and the quantity of scholarly publication – are presented again some months later (Letter 9 - March 24, 1957), in a letter giving some additional statements about the reception of his controversial conclusions:

When I published the first volume of that work, I felt sure that it would arouse violent antagonism, and consequently I was not discouraged by some of the sharp criticism that it did call forth. In fact I was rather surprised that there was so much favorable comment and so little said by those who objected on principle seemed to me to be based upon any real evidence. What has prevented me thus far from finishing the work is first the long interruption caused by the war and my absence in the army with the consequent falling behind in my study of all the publications that touch upon the subject, publications which have multiplied at an enormous rate during the last decade and to all of which I feel I must give careful consideration.

Some months later, stimulated by a remark made by Untersteiner on the review of de Strycker, he wrote (Letter 10 - October 20, 1957):

⁴³ See Letter 16 (August 16, 1959) and the reference to the «heap of preparatory notes» Margherita Isnardi Parente refers to in her letter quoted above.

De Strycker wrote to me quite apologetically about that review (which, in fact, was one of the most favorable given to the book, for the American and English reviews were mostly hysterically violent in their opposition), and ever since that time we have corresponded with each other most amicably. The Jesuits of Louvain are bitter opponents of the book, of course; but the Aristotelians of Oxford abhor it even more than does the school of Mansion, and the Oxonians are led by Sir David Ross in their disdain of it. Since I expected this reaction, it rather amuses me; and I am genuinely surprised when anyone takes the trouble to read the book and to find anything good in it.

Anxiety about the possibility of a prompt fulfilling of his projects and a sense, so to speak, of being overwhelmed by the increasing bibliography are strictly interlaced again when Cherniss embarks on a survey of a Platonic literature (Letter 14 - May 29, 1959):

I am desperately in arrears of the schedule of work to which I am committed, and I do not dare to take any long period of time away from work at least before I have got out of the way a few of the things which I promised to have finished long ago. At present I am still involved in the wretched 'survey' of Platonic literature, which grows every day without apparently coming any nearer to the conclusion; I am very eager to finish it in order that I may turn to some of the unfinished things which I flatter myself are more important and which certainly are more interesting to me.

Due to Cherniss's already mentioned perfectionism, the «wretched survey» grew «burdensome»⁴⁴ until it reached the monumental size of more than 600 pages, published in two parts in «Lustrum» between 1959 and 1960⁴⁵.

But, even after the publication, Cherniss was not satisfied at all, having felt the necessity of a further revision, as he affirms in strong terms in Letter 17 (August 3, 1960):

I hear to my amazement and disgust that the editors of LUSTRUM have already published the first part of my Survey of Platonic Literature

⁴⁴ So Cherniss expresses himself in Letter 16 (August 16, 1959).

⁴⁵ Cherniss 1959a; Cherniss 1960.

Alice Bonandini

without having let me see the proofs. This is particularly shocking, since I know that there will be innumerable misprints and that misprints render such a publication practically useless.

He was so upset that he refused even to see his article printed (Letter 18 - October 18, 1960: «I have not myself looked over the printed section, for it is too late to do anything about it»).

More broadly, already in 1957 he expressed his concern over the editorial accuracy of his publications: «I have often thought that soon it may be necessary for scholars to return to the methods of the Renaissance scholars and learn to set type and to print their own works»⁴⁶.

As far as bibliographic knowledge is concerned, Cherniss feels a deep affinity with Untersteiner (Letter 13 - October 6, 1958), whose *Parmenides* is praised in these terms:

You have absorbed an enormous amount of scholarly literature on the subject, and your control of this vast amount of bibliography and your critical use of it in every detail are most admirable and will be indispensable to everyone who henceforward desires to study Parmenides seriously.

Even more appreciative is the comment devoted to Untersteiner 1962 and Untersteiner 1963a (Letter 19 - March 16, 1963):

Your masterly command of all the complicated literature on these subjects and the care with which you have analysed the multifarious modern interpretations and have put your finger on their crucial points arouse my wonder and are almost unique in modern scholarly treatments of any subject, and I should think that everyone would feel your example in this to be an ideal for the profession of interpretation. I hold it before myself as something to strive for, even though I despair of approximating it.

Such a praise must not be read as mere flattery, since elsewhere Cherniss discusses Untersteiner's theses frankly, if not harshly: the statements of the Italian colleague about Aristotle's *De philosophia*, in particular, give him the opportunity to reaffirm his

⁴⁶ Letter 10 (October 20, 1957).

positions on the usefulness of indirect testimony and on the chronological and philosophical relationship between Platonic and Aristotelic works.

That is the case of Letter 15 (June 14, 1959), regarding the dependence (affirmed by Untersteiner 1959) of Aristoteles, *Physica*, I, 8-9 on *De philosophia*:

I should say even now that in my opinion there is a good chance of your being right in thinking that the theme at least of a good deal of the two chapters concerned was in the *Peri Philosophias* and that Aristotle reused what he had written there. I am at the same time uneasy about your use of Plutarch's *De Iside* 370C-F. I see no reason at all to suppose that this has anything to do with the *Peri Philosophias*, I think that Jaeger's argument about the passage is invalid, and I think that Walzer and Ross had no justification for printing as a fragment of Aristotle's even so much of the passage as they did; but in any case I do not see that your argument concerning *Physica* I, 8-9 requires the use of that passage as support. About the dating of the various works I am highly sceptical. It is certain that the *Peri Philosophias* was earlier than *Physica* A-B and that these two books are earlier than *Metaphysics* A; but that says nothing at all about the absolute dating, and I think it perfectly possible (though I know no real evidence either way) that *Peri Philosophias* was written while Plato was still alive. In any case, I think it certain that Aristotle was not in a 'Platonic period' when he wrote any of these works including *Peri Philosophias* (indeed, I doubt that he ever had a 'Platonic period' in the sense in which this is ascribed to him by Jaeger, Bignone, and others) – and surely the remarks of Wilpert in favor of this which you cite in note 2 on p. 19 are simply and demonstrab[ly] wrong. However it may be with such matters, the general thesis of your paper, i.e. the relation of these chapters of the *Physica* to the *Peri Philosophias*, is not affected by them; and the thesis itself must be judged by itself on other grounds. Whether it is in a strict sense demonstrable is, of course, questionable. Perhaps demonstration is a procedure that does not apply to much of the work in this field. It is at any rate a fruitful suggestion, which at the moment seems to me to have a certain *prima facie* probability and as such is highly important in its implications.

In the same vein is Letter 20 (January 13, 1964), concerning Untersteiner's edition of *De philosophia* (Untersteiner 1963b):

I must confess that I have been taken aback by the fact that you insist upon taking the notorious passage in Aristotle's *De Anima* 404 B 16-27 to be an account of Plato's doctrine and seem to think that Ross and Krämer have refuted my proof that it is not so (Ross, of course, had refuted himself in his Commentary on the *Metaphysics*, though he seems not to have been aware of it); but I am still more amazed and completely disheartened by the fact that you still treat the whole of Philoponus, *In Nicomachi Isagog.* I, 1, 1 (p. 1,8-p. 2, 42 [Hoche]) as a fragment of Aristotle's *De Philosophia* despite the fact that, as I thought I had made clear beyond all shadow of doubt, this supposition on the part of Bywater and all others depends upon the fact that they had not read on in the work to the point at which Philoponus himself identifies the only reference in Aristotle there and says that he took it from the *Metaphysics*. If one is to disregard evidence like this and in spite of it still find 'lost' works where there is no evidence for them, I'm afraid that I am quite incapable of understanding the 'rules of evidence' that are to apply in scholarship.

Cherniss had treated both the passage of *De anima* and the problem of Philoponus' testimony in his review of H.D. Saffrey, *Le Περὶ Φιλοσοφίας d'Aristote et la théorie platonicienne des idées et des nombres* (Cherniss 1959b)⁴⁷ – probably connected to the «brief article on some supposed fragments of the *De Philosophia*» he refers to in the Letter 16 (August 16, 1959), but which he never completed. Cherniss did not publish his criticism on Untersteiner's edition, but it is meaningful that most of the remarks contained in both his letters are also present in the severe review published by his favorite pupil, Leonardo Tarán (Tarán 1966).

Private life and character features, as well as historical events and relationships with colleagues are factors that influence the research of a scholar much more deeply than it is generally assumed, since they condition its timing, its themes, and its evolution. That is the reason why a wide, complete, and chronologically extended collection of letters such as that of Cherniss to Untersteiner is valuable evidence to increase the knowledge of such an outstanding and influential, but also divisive, scholar as Harold F. Cherniss was.

⁴⁷ See also Cherniss 1944, in particular *Appendix IX*, pp. 565-580 and *Appendix X*, pp. 593-602.

Appendix
*Letters of Harold F. Cherniss to Mario Untersteiner, 1951-1977*⁴⁸

1. April 30, 1951

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

Thank you very much for your letter of April 24th and for your kind offer of a copy of your book, *I Sofisti* (Torino, Einaudi, 1949). I already possess a copy of this interesting work, and consequently I shall not need to presume upon your generosity with respect to it. I also possess fascicles I and II of your publication, *Sofisti, Testimonianze e Frammenti*; but I wonder whether you intend to publish a third fascicle of this work⁴⁹. I should be very much pleased and very grateful to receive off-prints of your articles on the Sophists and on ancient philosophy generally, however.

Just before your letter arrived I sent you a copy of a recent critical review that I have published. Since I did not have your address, I sent this in care of A. Barrera, Bottega d'Erasmus, Torino, through whom you had so kindly sent me a copy of your essay, *Un Nuovo Frammento dell'Anonymus Iamblichi*⁵⁰. I trust that Mr. Barrera will have forwarded to you the off-print that I sent in his care.

With thanks and all good wishes I am

Sincerely yours,

Harold Cherniss

2. September 13, 1951

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

Thank you very much for your kind note and also for your postal card sent from S. Nicolo.

I shall be glad to inform scholars whom I know that you are engaged in doing the volume on Socrates and the Socratics for the *Zeller-Mondolfo*⁵¹ and that you would like offprints of their writings on the subject.

⁴⁸ In transcribing the letters, the original use of capital letters, italics, punctuation etc. has been maintained.

⁴⁹ The third fascicle was published in 1954: see Untersteiner 1949-1962.

⁵⁰ Untersteiner 1943-1944.

⁵¹ See below. The revision of the volume on Socrates of the work of Zeller never came to an end.

Alice Bonandini

There have appeared in the last volume (LXXXI, 1950) of the Transactions of the American Philological Association two articles which would be of interest to you: 1) The Oxyrhynchus Fragments of Aeschines of Sphettus by Edmund G. Berry and 2) Antisthenes was no Logician by G.M.A. Grube. Professor Berry's address is University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada; and Professor Grube's is Trinity College, University of Toronto, Toronto 5, Canada. The address of Professor Kurt von Fritz, for which you ask, is 702 Philosophy Hall, Columbia University, New York 27, N.Y.

With best wishes I am
Yours sincerely,
Harold Cherniss

3. *July 17, 1954*

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

I want to thank you most sincerely for your kind letter of June 23rd as well as for your earlier letter of May 12th and at the same time to apologize for my tardiness in sending you my thanks. During the last two months I have been deeply troubled and very busy with matters that have little or nothing to do with scholarship or my own work, and I fear that I have in consequence neglected even my correspondence. The vicious attack upon Dr. Oppenheimer, the Director of our Institute, has naturally been my primary concern and worry. It has already wrought incalculable harm to the United States and cannot help, I fear, continuing to have baleful consequences for the country. We hope, however, and trust that these consequences will not extend to the narrower sphere of the activities of the Institute itself.

Probably Professor Mondolfo⁵² has talked with you about these matters. He is expected to arrive in New York on Thursday. His son will

⁵² The philosopher and philosophy historian Rodolfo Mondolfo (1877-1976). After the enactment of racial laws in 1938, he left Italy and started working as a professor in Argentina (National University of Córdoba; National University of Tucumán). Untersteiner maintained a close relationship with him, taking part in the endeavor, undertaken by Mondolfo, of updating and revising the monumental history of Greek philosophy of Eduard Zeller (Zeller, Mondolfo 1932-1979; see Letter 2 - September 13, 1951) and editing the *Festschrift* for his 70th birthday: Alfieri-Untersteiner 1950. The letters show a close correspondence also between Mondolfo and Harold Cherniss.

meet him there and take him on to Chicago the next day; but I shall go to New York Thursday afternoon in order to have a brief visit with him during the short time that he will be in the city. Although I have corresponded with him for many years, I have never met him; and I look forward eagerly to making his personal acquaintance at last.

I am sorry that you will not be able to attend the Congress in Copenhagen⁵³, for I had hoped to meet you there. It will unfortunately not be possible for me to visit Italy while I am in Europe this time; but I trust that some time not too far distant we may meet either on this side of the Atlantic or on the other.

With best wishes and cordial regards, I am
Yours sincerely,
Harold Cherniss

4. (*Date missing*)⁵⁴

[...] since it does not present itself openly and one cannot speak out against it without laying oneself open to the charge of religious prejudice.

I want to thank you too for telling me about the good attitude of Einaudi and Laterza and for offering to send me a catalogue of the publications of the former, which I shall be glad to have for my use.

I am very sorry that we shall not be able to come to Switzerland and take advantage of your generous offer to meet me there. Our itinerary is so crowded and my time so short that I shall have to abide by my plan to return to Princeton after a short stay in France; but I do hope to meet you some time in the not too far distant future. I am shocked by what you say concerning the fact that your renewed passport does not permit you to visit Austria; but perhaps that is due to the military occupation⁵⁵, and I hope that this does not mean that you would have any difficulty in getting a visa for the United States.

⁵³ The Second International Congress of Classical Studies, held in Copenhagen in 1954.

⁵⁴ Last sheet of a letter written on paper headed 'Hotel d'Angleterre - Copenhagen'. First part is missing. Since the imminent attendance of a congress in Copenhagen is announced in Letter 3, and since the question of passport restrictions, mentioned here, is further developed in Letter 5, it seems likely that this letter stands between them.

⁵⁵ Until 1955, Austria was divided into occupation zones and jointly occupied by the United States, Soviet Union, United Kingdom and France.

Alice Bonandini

Thank you again for your kind letter and believe me most sincerely and cordially

Yours,
Harold Cherniss

5. *October 6, 1954*

My dear Professor Untersteiner,

Here in Princeton one more I write to thank you for your very kind letter of September 7th, which I found awaiting me upon my return, and for all the publications which you so generously sent me and which arrived a few days ago. I have read with profit and with admiration your essay on Timon and Pyrrho⁵⁶ and your contribution to the volume for Beltrami on the number of Aeschylus' dramas⁵⁷; it is with admiring wonder that I have long regarded the scope and variety of your contribution to classical scholarship, the wide range of your knowledge, and the incisiveness of your insight in so many different fields, and these essays confirm the reason for my admiration. The catalogue of the publications of *La Nuova Italia* I have already found most helpful, and I have read with vivid interest several of the articles in *Occidente*, particularly those of Salvemini and Treves and of Calogero and Cottino. With a different kind of interest, that of fascinated horror, I have read much in the issue of *Il Ponte*⁵⁸, 'Trent'Anni Dopo', and with indignation the pages in the other issue that you indicated, the letter concerning the withdrawal of passports. I have often wondered with regard to this last subject how many officials in the agencies of modern governments, including our own Department of State, remember or know that before 1919 it was the normal thing for citizens of all Western countries to travel wherever they pleased without passports or 'papers' of any kind. It is a strange sort of 'progress' that we have made in the last thirty years; and it is more than disturbing to recognize that, once the kind of bureaucratic meddling represented by this business of passports is introduced, it is almost impossible to be rid of it. What is done under the plausible pressure of an emergency is rarely undone when the emergency has passed, and those who have memory and intelligence enough to learn from such experience the obvious lesson learn it too late to be of any use.

⁵⁶ Untersteiner 1954.

⁵⁷ Untersteiner 1953.

⁵⁸ Cultural-political monthly founded in 1945 by Pietro Calamandrei.

There is at least one bit of good news here, however. You may have seen that last Friday the trustees of our Institute unanimously affirmed their confidence in Oppenheimer and reaffirmed his position as Director of our Institute. In this respect, at any rate, the tension here has been relaxed; and we all breathe more freely and can now address ourselves to our work with a feeling of happy security. I shall try now to return with whatever vigor I can muster to the matters upon which I should all along have been working. I know that I cannot work as fast or as effectively as you do, but I hope that I may finish some of the studies to which I have been so long committed.

I thank you most sincerely for your generosity in sending me all the publications that you have sent, and to my sincere thanks I add my best wishes for the continued success of your own studies and for your health and happiness.

With cordial regards, I am

Yours,

Harold Cherniss

6. *January 2, 1955*⁵⁹

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

I want to thank you most sincerely for the lovely booklet, *Il Giardino*, and for your good wishes that accompanied it and to send you in turn my best wishes for your health and happiness during the new year. May 1955 bring you the realization of all your own wishes and restore the world to a state of calmness in which all of us may think and work without apprehension of calamity.

With cordial regards I am

Yours,

Harold Cherniss

7. *December 24, 1956*

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

Your kind letter of December 13th has been forwarded to me here in Katonah, New York, where my wife and I had gone to spend the Christmas holidays with my wife's mother. We shall be back in Princeton within a few days; but I do not want to postpone even so long

⁵⁹ The message is written on a card illustrated with the woodcut *Daphnis and Chloe picking flowers* of A. Maillol.

Alice Bonandini

the expression of my thanks for your letter, and so I am writing at once, though I must write by hand and can only hope that you will not find this illegible.

I am delighted to learn that you have finished your *Parmenide*⁶⁰ and have sent it to the printer. I look forward eagerly to its publication and to the opportunity of using it. Naturally I am pleased to learn that you have found yourself not entirely in disagreement with my *Riddle*. I feel very guilty about the length of time I have taken over the second volume of *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato*; but my absence during the war and the great amount of scholarly publication on the subject since that time have both prevented me from finishing the work sooner, and I can only say in apology that I have continued to work steadily at the problems involved and hope to finish the work some day not to[o] far in the future.

The course of world affairs during the last six months has depressed me greatly – and the American ‘policy’ has enraged me, for it seems to me to have done nothing but contribute to confusion and chaos! I have no hope that it will be better in the coming year, but I hope that my pessimism will not be justified as was that of Cassandra. In any case, I trust that for you and yours the new year may be one of perfect health and happiness and of great satisfaction, and my wife joins me in sending you our best wishes and cordial regards.

Yours,
Harold Cherniss

8. February 24, 1957

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

I want to assure you of my most profound gratitude for the copy of your article, ‘L’ΟΔΟΣ di Parmenide come via all’EON’⁶¹, which you so kindly sent to me and which arrived here the day before yesterday. It seems to be impossible to get access to the *Studi urbinati* here in Princeton; and so, but for your thoughtful generosity, I might have found it impossible to have access to this article at all; but, apart from this, you know how eager I am to have in my own files and at my constant disposal for study and reference all of your writings, and so I am the more grateful to you for your kindness in this respect. I have read this particular study of yours now with the most lively interest and

⁶⁰ Untersteiner 1958.

⁶¹ Untersteiner 1956.

the greatest admiration and am much impressed by the care and precision with which you have supported your illuminating interpretation. I shall have to study it more in detail, of course, as I should already have done, were it not that at the moment I am deeply engaged in work that is rather far afield from Parmenides and for the completion of which I am far in arrears. I am, in fact, quite frustrated by the complications into which I have got myself and am very much depressed by the slowness and the inefficiency with which I have been working; and I feel that I owe a deep apology to my friends and my colleagues for having been so long in finishing the work that I have so long promised to finish and for having been able to contribute little or nothing to the advancement of those studies for which I have in some measure made myself responsible.

It was not my intention, however, to speak of myself in this note. I meant chiefly to tell you of my gratitude to you and of my admiration for your work and to send you my best wishes for its successful continuation and for your health and well-being in the pursuit of your studies.

The international situation has, of course, engaged a good deal of my attention and my concern in recent months. I have been deeply disturbed by the so-called 'policy' of Mr. Dulles⁶² and the Eisenhower administration, which seems to me to be based upon deep ignorance and a kind of irresponsibility, if not duplicity. Apparently a good many people here, even a good many in Congress, are becoming increasingly restive and dissatisfied about it; and this fact holds promise, though what the promise may come to no one can say, and, in any case, so much harm has already been done that change and reform, even if realized, would have little effect upon the situation.

I hope that you have received or will soon receive the small offprint that I recently sent to you and that I may soon be able to send you something more by way of a token of my thanks for your munificent generosity.

With cordial regards,
Harold Cherniss

⁶² John Foster Dulles, U.S. Secretary of State under the President Eisenhower from 1953 to 1959.

Alice Bonandini

9. March 24, 1957

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

I want to thank you very much for your kind letter and for the very encouraging remarks that you so graciously made in it about the continuance of my work on Aristotle's Criticism of Plato and the Academy. When I published the first volume of that work, I felt sure that it would arouse violent antagonism, and consequently I was not discouraged by some of the sharp criticism that it did call forth. In fact I was rather surprised that there was so much favorable comment and so little said by those who objected on principle seemed to me to be based upon any real evidence. What has prevented me thus far from finishing the work is first the long interruption caused by the war and my absence in the army with the consequent falling behind in my study of all the publications that touch upon the subject, publications which have multiplied at an enormous rate during the last decade and to all of which I feel I must give careful consideration. This has also turned me aside into work on a number of related papers, all of which are in a way necessary preludes to the writing of the second volume of the book. Among these are the few things that I have published on the *Timaeus*⁶³ and one or two longer papers on that dialogue which I have yet to finish and copies of which I shall send to you as soon as they are published.

All this I have been moved to say both by your flattering urging to finish the second volume of the book on Plato and Aristotle and by your very kind invitation to contribute an article to the volume in memory of Professor Bignone which you and Professor Della Corte are preparing⁶⁴. I should very much like to accept your invitation both because of my regard for Professor Bignone's scholarship⁶⁵ and because of my regard for you and your kindness; but I have already undertaken much more than I can do during the coming year, and I fear to promise more than I feel confident of being able to perform. To turn aside from the tasks that I have already assumed would be to break promises already given, and

⁶³ Cherniss published four articles on Plato's *Timaeus* (Cherniss 1954; 1956; 1957a; 1957b). Cherniss 1957a, in particular, contains his reply to the proposal, advanced by Owen 1953, to consider the *Timaeus* as preceding the *Parmenides*, and initiated a widespread and long-lasting debate (see Prior 1985, pp. 3-4).

⁶⁴ The volume was published with the title *Epicurea in memoriam Hectoris Bignone. Miscellanea philologica* (Genova 1959).

⁶⁵ Ettore Bignone's *L'Aristotele perduto e la formazione filosofica di Epicuro* (Florence 1936) is a work frequently cited in Cherniss 1944.

I should not want to do anything hastily which could only lower the standard of the work that you should publish in the volume that you are preparing. I hope therefore that you will understand why I feel that I ought not to accept the flattering invitation which you have extended to me and that you will explain it to Professor Della Corte. I should like, of course, to subscribe to a copy of the volume in memory of Professor Bignone, and I hope that you will let me know how I may do so.

I trust that your *Parmenide* will soon be published. The necessary or inevitable delays of publishers I know well; but after all, annoying as these are, they are one of the lesser evils in the world of today, and we can endure them with less harm and danger than we can the dangers and complications of international politics and internal political stupidities. I grow in wonder at the manner in which our Secretary of State continues successfully to delude the country, the world at large, and – in the end – himself and his close associates⁶⁶. It is a psychological case worthy of investigation by those who are interested and amused by such phenomena; for myself, it simply enrages and astounds me.

If all goes well and if the Congress of Classical Philology is really held in London in 1959, I hope that I may be able to attend it and that there I may at last meet you and talk with you. It would be very pleasant to see you and conversation would be much more satisfactory than any amount of correspondence can be. In default of such personal acquaintance, however, it is consoling that we may still write to one another; and I should like to assure you of my pleasure in your letters as well as my gratitude for the copies of your scholarly publications that you so graciously send me.

With best wishes and cordial regards, I am
Yours most sincerely,
Harold Cherniss

P.S. I was very glad to learn that you had subscribed to *Phronesis* and that you feel it to be a publication worthy of support and encouragement. I hope that it may grow in its purpose to be a truly international journal for the study of ancient philosophy and that this purpose may gain for

⁶⁶ Cherniss probably refers to the so-called 'Eisenhower Doctrine', a resolution, passed by the United States Congress on March 7, 1957, authorizing to pledge increased economic and military aid and even direct protection to foreign nations acknowledging the threat posed by communism, with particular regard to Soviet encroachment during the Middle Eastern crisis.

Alice Bonandini

it support in all the countries of Europe as well as in all of the English-speaking countries.

H.C.

10. *October 20, 1957*

Dear Professor Untesteiner,

I am very much obliged by your kind letter of October 14th, which arrived here yesterday; and I want to assure you of my gratitude for it and for your friendly regard. I was sorry, however, to learn from your letter that the publication of your 'Parmenide' has been delayed by the publisher. I hope that 'La Nuova Italia' will make amends by publishing the work promptly now and will take special care to make the composition and the press-work on it such as to gratify you entirely. Apparently the story of delay in publication is much the same in all countries now; here the situation goes from bad to worse, and even in England books scarcely ever appear anywhere near the dates for which their publication is announced. In the same post as your letter came one from Professor Mondolfo in which he complained bitterly about the long delay of 'La Nuova Italia' in publishing several of his books that have long been in their hands, and I constantly hear similar complaints about all publishers from scholar in almost all countries. I have often thought that soon it may be necessary for scholars to return to the methods of the Renaissance scholars and learn to set type and to print their own works.

I am gratified, of course, to learn that during recent months you have had occasion to work with some of my writings about Aristotle and the Academy and that you have found something in them worthy of your consideration. Your remarks about De Strycker's review of the *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato and the Academy*⁶⁷ brought vividly back to mind that old story. De Strycker wrote to me quite apologetically about that review (which, in fact, was one of the most favorable given to the book, for the American and English reviews were mostly hysterically violent in their opposition), and ever since that time we have corresponded with each other most amicably. The Jesuits of Louvain are bitter opponents of the book, of course; but the Aristotelians of Oxford abhor it even more than does the school of Mansion, and the Oxonians are led by Sir David Ross in their disdain of it. Since I expected this

⁶⁷ De Strycker 1949.

reaction, it rather amuses me; and I am genuinely surprised when anyone takes the trouble to read the book and to find anything good in it.

Pardon me for having talked so much about myself. I meant merely to thank you for your good letter and to assure you again of my gratitude and my friendly regard.

Yours cordially,
Harold Cherniss

11. March 30, 1958

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

I want to thank you for your letter, which arrived yesterday, and for your thoughtfulness in letting me know so promptly the sad news of the death of Professor Mondolfo's brother. I have written at once to Professor Mondolfo to give him my condolences, and I am grateful to you for having made it possible for me to let him know at once that I am thinking of him in this sorrow of his. He has often written to me about his brother, and I know that he was planning to go to Italy in May to see him again. I hope that despite his brother's death he will carry out his plans for this trip, for I think that it will do him a great deal of good to see his many friends and collaborators in Italy, even though the visit will now be a much sadder thing than he had hoped or expected.

I am very grateful to you for having sent to me the copy of 'Il Mondo'⁶⁸ of which you speak in your letter. Of course, it has not yet arrived here; but I shall be very much interested to read the article to which you refer, and I shall write to you about it when I have received it and read it. I have followed with interest and concern the accounts in our newspapers of the struggle in Italy against the clerical influence, especially recently when the Italian courts appear at last to have gone some distance in asserting the authority of the constitution and the laws over the clericals as well as over people in general. In the United States, where from the beginning there has been a strict separation of church and state, the growing power of the Roman Catholic Church has been expressing itself in a fashion that is most ominous; and such a struggle as that in Italy no longer seems to be so far distant from our own domestic problems.

⁶⁸ *Il Mondo* was a political, cultural, and economic magazine founded in 1949, characterized by laicism and independence.

Alice Bonandini

Thank you again for your letter and for your promptness in giving me the news, unpleasant though that news may be. Please accept with my thanks my cordial greetings and all my best wishes.

Yours,
Harold Cherniss

12. April 19, 1958

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

The copy of *Il Mondo* which you so generously sent to me arrived here yesterday, and I want to write now to thank you for it and to tell you that I have read with interest and with much pleasure many of the articles in the issue besides the one which was your reason for thinking to send me the issue.

As to that particular article⁶⁹, I can say that the story of Halton which it gives is quite correct⁷⁰. In fact the conduct of Halton was even more outrageous than the author of the article could in the space at his disposal make clear, and many of us cannot yet understand why the University refrained so long from denying him further hospitality. He is still in town and still preaching at his Aquinas Foundation against the University, the Institute, and anything intellectual or decent that comes to his attention; and he still enjoys the support of the Bishop of Trenton. People generally pay little attention to him now; but he still represents, I fear, a strong and growing force of darkness and of anti-intellectualism in this country, where the Catholic hierarchy grows in power daily and is blindly and foolishly supported by many Protestant and Jewish bigots.

What I meant to say, however, is that *Il Mondo* is to be congratulated upon this article and upon the correspondent, Mino Vianello, who wrote it, for it is a fair, concise, and true account of what happened and gives quite accurately the 'feeling' of the affair. The Catholic intellectuals like Maritain, Taylor, and my own colleague Morse were mortified by Halton's conduct; but they were powerless and entirely frustrated.

Thank you very much for your kindness. With all good wishes

Yours cordially,
Harold Cherniss

⁶⁹ M. Vianello, *Publici peccatori a Princeton*, «Il Mondo» March 25, 1958, p. 5.

⁷⁰ Cherniss refers to the controversy surrounding the Princeton Roman Catholic chaplain Hugh Halton, who harshly criticized the University's «abusive liberalism» and was then dismissed by Princeton president R.F. Goheen.

13. October 6, 1958

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

There arrived here today from 'La Nuova Italia' the copy of your *Parmenide* which you so generously had sent to me, and I want to let you know at once that it has safely arrived and to thank you for it and to congratulate you upon the publication of this impressive work. Naturally I have not yet been able to give it any of the serious study that it deserves and which I shall certainly devote to it; but I could not help putting aside my work to sample your book as soon as I had opened it, and I found myself reading in it extensively most of the day and the evening. You have absorbed an enormous amount of scholarly literature on the subject, and your control of this vast amount of bibliography and your critical use of it in every detail are most admirable and will be indispensable to everyone who henceforward desires to study Parmenides seriously. Your text and commentary with the translation provide a means of study far more adequate and useful than anything hitherto available for Parmenides and should help scholars to avoid many of the errors that they have committed from relying upon the text of Diels that suffers from its lacunae.

I hope that you feel great satisfaction with the publication of this work upon which you must have lavished so much time, energy, and careful thought. It should be a source of satisfaction to you, and I for one am grateful to you for having done the work as well as for your kindness in sending me a copy of it.

With congratulations and best wishes I am

Yours cordially,
Harold Cherniss

14. May 29, 1959

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

Your kind letter of May 10th must have been here a fortnight or more; but I have only just read it, for on May 13th I had to make a hurried departure for California to see my sister, who is desperately ill there, and I have only just returned to Princeton. I want to write you at once to thank you for all your generous remarks and also to congratulate you upon the appointment to the Chair at the University of Milan, where you will certainly be more comfortable and will be saved the inconvenience and the loss of time and energy involved in traveling every week to Genoa and spending several days away from

Alice Bonandini

home⁷¹. I am very happy for you, and I hope that you will find the new arrangement in every way satisfactory to you.

I was distressed to learn from your letter that you had been ill of a bronchial pneumonia, but it is good to be assured that when you wrote you had already recovered your health; and I trust that you have experienced no post-recuperative difficulties but have been perfectly healthy ever since the writing of your letter. I hope that you will soon have the opportunity to get away to some quiet place for a good vacation during the summer and may there find healthful relaxation and refreshment after your strenuous activities and your period of illness.

So far as I now know, I shall be here during most of the summer unless some new emergency should call me away for a short time. I am desperately in arrears of the schedule of work to which I am committed, and I do not dare to take any long period of time away from work at least before I have got out of the way a few of the things which I promised to have finished long ago. At present I am still involved in the wretched 'survey' of Platonic literature, which grows every day without apparently coming any nearer to the conclusion; I am very eager to finish it in order that I may turn to some of the unfinished things which I flatter myself are more important and which certainly are more interesting to me.

Once more, allow me to offer you my congratulations. With them I send my very cordial good wishes and my thanks for your letter and for all the copies of your interesting scholarly productions which you have always so generously sent to me.

Yours,
Harold Cherniss

15. *June 14, 1959*

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

You can imagine that I read through as soon as it arrived the copy of your article, 'Aristotele *Phys.* I 8-9: Frammenti del *Peri Philosophias*'⁷². I want now at once to thank you for your goodness in sending me a copy of it; I need not tell you how important it is for me to have the article handy for my constant reference in my own work on Aristotle,

⁷¹ On November 1, 1959, Mario Untersteiner left the University of Genoa and was appointed as a Faculty member at the University of Milan, the city where he lived. Here he taught History of Ancient Philosophy until his retirement, in 1969.

⁷² Untersteiner 1959.

and how glad I am that by your generosity I am enabled to study it carefully and to refer to it with ease.

Naturally the one rapid reading for which I have so far had time is not sufficient to permit me to pass the judgment upon all the details of the work that I shall want to form after careful study of it; but I should say even now that in my opinion there is a good chance of your being right in thinking that the theme at least of a good deal of the two chapters concerned was in the *Peri Philosophias* and that Aristotle reused what he had written there. I am at the same time uneasy about your use of Plutarch's *De Iside* 370 C-F. I see no reason at all to suppose that this has anything to do with the *Peri Philosophias*, I think that Jaeger's argument about the passage is invalid, and I think that Walzer and Ross had no justification for printing as a fragment of Aristotle's even so much of the passage as they did; but in any case I do not see that your argument concerning *Physics* I, 8-9 requires the use of that passage as support. About the dating of the various works I am highly sceptical. It is certain that the *Peri Philosophias* was earlier than *Physics* A-B and that these two books are earlier than *Metaphysics* A; but that says nothing at all about the absolute dating, and I think it perfectly possible (though I know no real evidence either way) that *Peri Philosophias* was written while Plato was still alive. In any case, I think it certain that Aristotle was not in a 'Platonic period' when he wrote any of these works including *Peri Philosophias* (indeed, I doubt that he ever had a 'Platonic period' in the sense in which this is ascribed to him by Jaeger, Bignone, and others) – and surely the remarks of Wilpert in favor of this which you cite in note 2 on p. 19 are simply and demonstrably wrong. However it may be with such matters, the general thesis of your paper, i.e. the relation of these chapters of the *Physics* to the *Peri Philosophias*, is not affected by them; and the thesis itself must be judged by itself on other grounds. Whether it is in a strict sense demonstrable is, of course, questionable. Perhaps demonstration is a procedure that does not apply to much of the work in this field. It is at any rate a fruitful suggestion, which at the moment seems to me to have a certain *prima facie* probability and as such is highly important in its implications.

Once more, let me thank you for the paper and congratulate you upon it. With my thanks and congratulations I send you as always my best wishes and greetings.

Yours sincerely,
Harold Cherniss

Alice Bonandini

16. August 16, 1959

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

I want to thank you for the very kind letter that you sent to me from Sirmione. Do you know the lines written by the English poet, Tennyson, upon his visit to Catullus's Sirmio⁷³? You will probably now be in the Oberland bernese, but I take it that within a few days you will have returned to Milan, and I hope that you will there have some time of pleasant repose before you take up your new post at the university there. I wish you all happiness and much interesting accomplishment in your chair of the history of ancient philosophy, and I trust that the coming decade will be one of delight to you free from the hurry and the annoyances of constant travel to and fro that you have hitherto had to endure.

I have been here in Princeton all summer, trying to get on with the wretched survey of Platonic literature that I should not have undertaken and which, the longer I work at it, grows ever more burdensome. I had hoped to finish it before the summer should end, but I see now that I shall be fortunate if I can bring it to an end before the winter sets in. As it is, I am desperately tired; and, although I hate to go away and leave the manuscript unfinished, I have consented to take a few days of vacation with my wife before the new academic term commences. We shall leave here a week from tomorrow and drive northwards in search of cooler weather (it has been frightfully hot and humid here for days now), but we have no definite objective or itinerary. In any case, we shall be back in Princeton by the middle of September; and then I shall settle down once more to the endless books and articles on Plato. As soon as I finish this, if I ever do finish it, I want to write up the brief article on some supposed fragments of the *De Philosophia* which I set aside half finished a year ago. I have also another volume of Plutarch's *Moralia* half finished (the Platonic and the Stoic essays), which I

⁷³ A. Tennyson, *Frater Ave Atque Vale* (1883; in *Tyresias, and other poems*, 1885): «Row us out from Desenzano, to your Sirmione row! / So they row'd, and there we landed—'O venusta Sirmio!' / There to me thro' all the groves of olive in the summer glow, / There beneath the Roman ruin where the purple flowers grow, / Came that 'Ave atque Vale' of the Poet's hopeless woe, / Tenderest of Roman poets nineteen-hundred years ago, / 'Frater Ave atque Vale'— as we wander'd to and fro / Gazing at the Lydian laughter of the Garda Lake below / Sweet Catullus's all-but-island, olive-silvery Sirmio!».

promised to have in the hands of the publisher long ago and which I must finish as soon as possible⁷⁴. I hope to be working at the second volume of *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato* concurrently with this, however, and thereafter to work on this book only until I shall have finished it.

With all my best wishes and with many thanks again for your kind letter, I am

Yours cordially,
Harold Cherniss

17. August 3, 1960

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

It was very kind of you to write to me, and I want to thank you most sincerely for your letter of July 25th as well for the news that you send of Professor Mondolfo as for your kind offer concerning articles printed in ACME⁷⁵: concerning the latter our library has found it impossible to acquire the issues regularly because the Institute has no publications of its own and so cannot establish an 'exchange' with the University of Milan.

Princeton University does receive ACME on exchange; but it seems to get the issues late, and in any case it is inconvenient for me to have to go across town to the library of the university when I want to consult a volume of the review. It happens, however, that just after Professor Mondolfo was here in New York our librarian at the Institute succeeded in purchasing from some bookseller in Europe the first seven volumes of ACME, and I have managed myself to pick up several others. So at the present time there is no reason for me to take advantage of your kind offer to try to get for me offprints of the articles in which I am interested. It may be that in the future, however, I shall have occasion to let you know of some such article; and meanwhile I want to assure you of my deep gratitude for your kindness in suggesting that I might

⁷⁴ After having edited the *De Facie in Orbe Lunae* in 1957, in 1976 Cherniss published the edition in two volumes as part of the Loeb Classical Library, including new texts based on exhaustive review of the manuscripts and philosophical commentaries of Plutarch's Stoic and Platonic essays (*Moralia*, 13, parts 1-2), for which he received the Goodwin Award (see Vander Waerdt 1994).

⁷⁵ «Acme» is the periodical of the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Milan.

Alice Bonandini

through you approach some author of an article in which I might be interested and whose acquaintance you have.

I have not heard from Professor Mondolfo since he left New York, and so I am all the more grateful for your news that he is safe and well. If you should see him, please give him my kindest regards and best wishes.

I congratulate you upon the completion of your article on the *Περὶ Φιλοσοφίας*⁷⁶, though I am sorry to learn that there will be so much delay in its publication. I shall look forward to reading it when it does appear. I hear to my amazement and disgust that the editors of *LUSTRUM* have already published the first part of my *Survey of Platonic Literature* without having let me see the proofs. This is particularly shocking, since I know that there will be innumerable misprints and that misprints render such a publication practically useless. Meanwhile I continue to work at the rest of the *Survey*, trying my best to finish it before the autumn comes.

Kennedy's loyalty to his Catholic Church does in my opinion render him unfit to be president of the country – even if he were fit on any other grounds, which I think he is not. I shall not vote for him, but I cannot vote for Nixon either, for I consider the latter a rogue and utterly unreliable. So I consider myself to be disfranchised so far as the coming election is concerned. The restriction of the voters' choice to these two impossible candidates is a catastrophe for the country and a great misfortune for the world in these dangerous times.

Permit me to congratulate you upon the coming marriage of your daughter, who I hope will be very happy in her new life; and again let me thank you most heartily for your very kind letter.

Yours cordially,
Harold Cherniss

18. *October 18, 1960*

Dear Professor Untersteiner:

I want to thank you for your kind letter about the arrival of the copy of the *Platonic Survey*; but I must at the same time apologize for it. This part, a 'torso', was printed by the editors without their having told me that they intended to print it at this time and without their having given me an opportunity to read proof of it. I was shocked and outraged by this behavior, for I am sure that the printed section must be full of

⁷⁶ Untersteiner 1960-1961.

misprints and false references which I could have eliminated if I had been given the normal opportunity to go over the proofs. As it is, I have not myself looked over the printed section, for it is too late to do anything about it and besides I am now eager to finish the manuscript as quickly as I possibly can.

Your remarks on the forthcoming American election are of interest to me, especially since I gather that you feel much as I do about the influence of the Catholic Church, which has grown enormously in this country during the last 25 years. I shall myself not vote for Kennedy, who to my mind has shown no reason at all why he should be considered a candidate for the presidency except for the two facts that he is a Catholic and will therefore get all the Catholic vote, which now amounts to a great deal, and that he is enormously rich and has been eager to spend a great deal of money on his candidacy. On the other hand, I cannot bring myself to vote for Nixon either, for whom I have the utmost scorn as an unprincipled and malign politician. Many Americans, I think, feel themselves to be in the same dilemma as mine and are disgusted with the campaign in which they are offered a choice between 'the pot and the kettle'.

I am pleased to learn that you find your work in the new academic year interesting, and I hope that your health and good spirits will be such as to enable you to carry it on and to do your own research and writing as well.

With thanks and best wishes I am
Yours cordially,
Harold Cherniss

19. March 16, 1963

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

Yesterday I received from the publisher, sent to me at your request, a parcel containing both your new volume on Zeno, *Testimonianze e Frammenti*⁷⁷, and the fourth fascicle of your *Sofisti, Testimonianze e Frammenti*⁷⁸. I am overwhelmed by your generosity and your kindness, and I find it difficult to express adequately in words my gratitude to you for this double gift and for all the other similar gifts of your books and articles. I am, moreover, ashamed that I have no prospect soon of giving some evidence of my gratitude by sending you something of mine in

⁷⁷ Untersteiner 1963a.

⁷⁸ Untersteiner 1949-1962.

Alice Bonandini

return, for I am still far from finishing the volume of Plutarch's Platonic and Stoic essays, at which I have been working so long. When it is finally published, it will be slight recompense for your handsome and many gifts. I can only hope, therefore, that you will take for granted my deep obligation to you for your generosity and accept my sincere expression of thanks.

Besides being personally grateful to you for these books, I am deeply grateful to you for having finished them. It must be a great satisfaction to you to have completed the four volumes of the Sophistic fragments; and surely all scholars must feel indebted to you for the richness of the collection and the commentary that you have now put at their disposal. It is admirable in the highest degree and enviable that you should at the same time have been able to finish the volume on Zeno. Your masterly command of all the complicated literature on these subjects and the care with which you have analysed the multifarious modern interpretations and have put your finger on their crucial points arouse my wonder and are almost unique in modern scholarly treatments of any subject, and I should think that everyone would feel your example in this to be an ideal for the profession of interpretation. I hold it before myself as something to strive for, even though I despair of approximating it.

I am glad that you were able to enlist the aid of such a competent disciple as Dr. Battezzore, who in the treatment of Critias has shown himself to be a worthy follower of your method; and I hope that you will convey to him my congratulations upon his work in this fourth fascicle.

To you with my profound thanks and my sincere congratulations I send my best regards and wishes for your personal welfare and happiness.

Yours cordially,
Harold Cherniss

20. January 13, 1964

Dear Professor Untersteiner:

I received this morning both your beautiful card with the good wishes of your wife and yourself for 1964 and your impressive volume, *Aristotele, Della Filosofia*⁷⁹; and I wish to thank you most heartily for both. You are especially generous in sending me this volume, on the completion and the publication of which I want to congratulate you

⁷⁹ Untersteiner 1963b.

Harold F. Cherniss: Letters to Mario Untersteiner, 1951-1977

most sincerely. I have not yet really read much of the volume, of course; and I shall have to study it with great care and attention, which at the slow pace of work which unfortunately is mine will take me some time to do. I have, however, not been able to refrain from looking at passages here and there, putting aside the work on which I am engaged in order to do so; and I must confess that I have been taken aback by the fact that you insist upon taking the notorious passage in Aristotle's *De Anima* 404 B 16-27 to be an account of Plato's doctrine and seem to think that Ross and Krämer have refuted my proof that it is not so (Ross, of course, had refuted himself in his Commentary on the *Metaphysics*, though he seems not to have been aware of it); but I am still more amazed and completely disheartened by the fact that you still treat the whole of Philoponus, *In Nicomachi Isagog.* I, 1, 1 (p. 1,8-p. 2, 42 [Hoche]) as a fragment of Aristotle's *De Philosophia* despite the fact that, as I thought I had made clear beyond all shadow of doubt, this supposition on the part of Bywater and all others depends upon the fact that they had not read on in the work to the point at which Philoponus himself identifies the only reference in Aristotle there and says that he took it from the *Metaphysics*. If one is to disregard evidence like this and in spite of it still find 'lost' works where there is no evidence for them, I'm afraid that I am quite incapable of understanding the 'rules of evidence' that are to apply in scholarship.

Despite all this I know that I must patiently try to learn what I can from the reconstructions of capable scholars, and I am deeply grateful to you for having so generously put at my disposal this important work of yours. I hope that you will be well aware of my gratitude for this and for your continual friendliness and will accept with my thanks and my congratulations my very best wishes.

Yours cordially,
Harold Cherniss

21. January 4, 1966

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

I want to send you a note at least to thank you for the copy of your article, 'Ancora su Parmenide' (Frag. B 8, 5-6)⁸⁰, which came to me in the mail today. You know how much I appreciate having copies of your

⁸⁰ Untersteiner 1965b.

Alice Bonandini

publications, I hope; and for this I thank you also because it brings me a kind of message of your own well-being as well as your response to Professor Mondolfo in the debate about the reading of the famous line⁸¹. You must forgive me, however, for not writing at length. I am still unable to write normally and can only tap out a few lines at a time on a machine in this fashion, for I am still wearing the steel collar to hold my neck in place after the operation on my spine. I had hoped to be rid of this encumbrance and back at my regular work by this time; but the recent examination in Baltimore caused the surgeon to decide that I must continue this wretched regiment at least until early in February, when I shall return to Baltimore to have him examine me again. He may wish to do another operation, but I hope to escape that.

I do not want to trouble you with more boring details of my disability but hope that I may be able within a few months to write a more satisfactory letter, and meanwhile I assure you of my gratitude and of my best wishes to you for a healthy, happy, and profitable year.

Yours as ever,
Harold Cherniss

22. June 12, 1975

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

I have been reading tonight the very moving book, *Incontri*⁸², which was awaiting me when I came home this evening; and I cannot sleep without first having thanked you for it, both for the gift of it, which is a precious honour to me, and for the contents of the book itself, enlightening to me for so many men whom I have hitherto known only from their publications and all the more moving because it is a victory over the pain and discomfort that would have discouraged most men and prevented them from even undertaking the task that you have completed. I was sad indeed when I read your words about your lost vision but filled with the greater admiration and gratitude for the work accomplished; and there came to my mind Milton's lines⁸³,

So much the rather thou, Celestial light,

⁸¹ This article is the response to Mondolfo 1964, who rejected the reading of Parmenides, fragm. 8, 5-6 given by Untersteiner 1956.

⁸² Untersteiner 1975, a biographic booklet containing the portraits given by Untersteiner of some Italian philologists and philosophers, and of himself (*Incontro con me stesso*).

⁸³ J. Milton, *Paradise Lost*, III, 51-53.

Shine inward, and the mind through all her powers
Irradiate...

As I thank you for all the *Incontri* that you have enabled me and others to share with you, so most of all do I thank you for your 'Incontro con me stesso', which has made me feel that we have now in fact met each other and that I know and appreciate more than ever the source of that friendship which you have so generously granted me unmet these many years.

With my deepest thanks I send you my best wishes for health and tranquility, and I beg you to share these wishes of mine with your good wife.

Yours ever,
Harold Cherniss

23. August 10, 1975

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

I cannot refrain from sending you my thanks for your kind and moving letter of July 25th written in Bormio. My own eyes begin to fail me, though I make shift to use them still without knowing how long they will last; and I know that in my files too are quantities of notes and outlines that can be used by nobody and which I should wish nobody to use or misuse. So my sympathy for what you say is genuine, founded as it is on my own experience; but I am keenly aware that the world loses far more as a result of your trouble than it could ever lose as a result of mine, and as part of that world I grieve for the cruel interruption of your work. You have done so much, however, that you can rest on your laurels with satisfaction and without regret; and I hope that you will enjoy in tranquility for many years the rest that you have earned and the gratitude of your contempor[ar]ies like me and of the new generation of younger scholars now taking our places.

With affectionate and respectful regards to you and Signora Untersteiner I am as always

Yours,
Harold Cherniss

24. October 26, 1975

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

I was very profoundly touched by your kind letter of September 10th, for which I should have thanked you much sooner than this if my time and concern for the last six weeks had not been concentrated upon the

Alice Bonandini

illness of my wife, whose depression had become so severe that a month ago she had to be hospitalized again and this time subjected to a long series of 'electric shock' treatments. She is still in the hospital, but the treatments now appear to be having a good effect; and I have been encouraged to believe that she may be permitted to come home in a week or two.

I was very much interested in your reference to the machine called 'Optakon'⁸⁴; and I hope with all my heart that it may prove to be useful to you and enable you to read and so to make use of the material that you have gathered for your further studies. At present I manage to get along with a powerful magnifying glass that enables me to see a page at a time; and with this I am trying to correct the proofs of the Plutarchean essays, the publication of which has been so long delayed. I hope than to proceed with the second volume of 'Aristotle's Criticism of Plato and the Academy', though I cannot be sure that I shall ever finish it.

As you say, material collected for a purpose by one person is not likely to be useful to another; and I should not wish to impose upon anyone else the burden of reading through and interpreting the notes and material that I have collected. I know from experience how frustrating and useless such a task must prove to be.

With thanks and all my best wishes to you I am as ever yours most cordially,
Harold Cherniss

25. *February 8, 1976*

Dear Professor Untersteiner,

I would have written sooner than this to thank you for your letter of January 16th and for your good wishes, had my wife not had a severe relapse, a recurrence of her depression which now seems to be worse than ever and which has left me little time for correspondence, study, or anything but frustrated worry.

I was very sorry indeed to learn from your letter that you had had to abandon the attempt to use the 'Optacon' because its complication made it too difficult and tiring and impractical to use. I scarcely dare to hope that you have found some other and more practical machine; but I do hope that you may have such things as are the 'recordings' of books

⁸⁴ The Optacon (Acronym for 'Optical to Tactile Converter') is an electromechanical device, patented in 1966 by John Linvill, that enables blind people to read printed material.

made for blind students in this country, and above all I hope that you have not become discouraged or dispirited but find in yourself that philosophic courage that your many writings have manifested for so long and which has won you the admiration of so many scholars. I trust that you are aware of my own admiration and of my gratitude to you and that you will share with Signora Untersteiner the fervent good wishes that I send you.

Yours cordially,
Harold Cherniss

26. March 25, 1977

My dear Professor Untersteiner,

The mail this morning brought me a parcel sent by the publisher, Paideia editrice; and, when I opened it, I found that it contained a copy of your book, *Da Omero ad Aristotele*⁸⁵, with your card enclosed in it. I am overwhelmed by your generosity and do not know how to find words adequate to the expression of my feeling but must ask you to understand that in saying 'thank you' for this latest of your many gifts I mean to convey all the most sincere degrees of gratitude.

I am most happy to have these writings of yours for the sake of their content too and am glad, as I am sure all others scholars will be, that you have collected and reprinted them. It made me profoundly sad to read the first sentence of your preface, however, and to know from it that you[r] sight has not been improved. I had been thinking of you in your affliction very frequently of late; and – almost as if it were by telepathy – I had intended to write to you today to ask about your health, so that the arrival of your gift was almost like an answer to the question that I had meant to ask of you. It is good to know, however, and must be an incalculably great consolation as well as help to you that your wife is able to correct proofs for you and to bring your citations up to date. I should like to thank her too for what she has done; and I hope that both of you will understand how deeply concerned I am about your welfare and you[r] spirits as well as how grateful I am for all the kindness you have shown me and continue to show, this last sumptuous gift of yours being but one more manifestation of your generosity.

With best wishes and affectionate regards
Yours cordially,
Harold Cherniss

⁸⁵ Untersteiner 1976.

Alice Bonandini

27. *February 10, 1983* (sent to Mario Untersteiner's wife, Linda Candia Untersteiner)

Dear Dottoressa Untersteiner,

I want to thank you most warmly and sincerely for your kindness in having sent me copies of the memorial articles by Livio Sichirolo⁸⁶ and by Margherita Isnardi Parente⁸⁷ in honour of your lamented husband, our colleague and friend. These offprints arrived here yesterday, and I have been deeply moved by reading what they both say and by the profound feeling of admiration and devotion that is obvious in the words of both authors.

You know that my friendship for your husband grew out of knowledge of his scholarly work and our long correspondence, and I am more than ever regretful of what I have missed in not having known him personally, for, though I have long been aware of his courage and his steadfastness and have admired him for his loyalty in action to his high ideals, what these two friends and colleagues have written in the articles that I now have read has made me appreciate more keenly and fully the personality that I knew only from afar. Some sentences in the article by Dott. Isnardi Parente and more that she has written to me in her letters to the same effect have made me aware of your own great part in all that your husband did and was and of the loving and stalwart support you provided through all trials and sorrows, and I would have you know that even we who have not had the advantage of your personal acquaintance are aware of the debt of gratitude that we owe you.

With sincere thanks to you for your generosity and with my very best wishes to you I am as ever

Yours cordially,
Harold Cherniss

⁸⁶ Sichirolo 1982.

⁸⁷ Isnardi Parente 1981.

Abstract.

This article presents 27 hitherto unpublished letters (1951-1977) sent by one of the foremost classicists of the 20th century, Harold F. Cherniss (1904-1987), to Mario Untersteiner (1899-1981). Such a wide, complete, and chronologically extended collection of letters casts light on personal relationships inside the community of classical scholarship in the central decades of the 20th century, but also provides valuable clues on personality features, research and methodology. Moreover, Cherniss' statements on U.S. internal politics gives a testimony on American history in these decades.

Keywords.

Harold F. Cherniss, Mario Untersteiner, Correspondence, Classical Scholarship, Ancient Philosophy, Plato, American history.

Alice Bonandini

Università degli Studi di Trento
alice.bonandini@unitn.it

BIBLIOGRAPHY⁸⁸

Alfieri-Untersteiner 1950: V.E. Alfieri-M. Untersteiner (eds.), *Studi di filosofia greca. Pubblicazione in onore di R. Mondolfo per il 70° compleanno*, G. Laterza & Figli, Bari.

Bonandini 2017a: A. Bonandini, *Vivitur ingenio, cetera mortis erunt. Mezzo secolo di dibattito filologico e riflessione filosofica nella corrispondenza di Mario Untersteiner*, «Quaderni di storia» 85, 2017, pp. 223-265.

Bonandini 2017b: A. Bonandini, *Platone filosofo del logos in un inedito di Mario Untersteiner*, «Acme» 67, 2017, pp. 45-59.

Bonandini 2017c: A. Bonandini, *Quarant'anni in Italia, tra storia e filologia. Testimonianze dall'epistolario di Mario Untersteiner*, «Eikasmós» 28, 2017, to be published.

⁸⁸ In the author-date citations, the date refers to the first edition, in order to allow a better understanding of the chronological evolution of Cherniss' and Untersteiner's research, and to maintain a clear parallelism between bibliography and correspondence.

Alice Bonandini

Cherniss 1935: H.F. Cherniss, *Aristotle's Criticism of Presocratic Philosophy*, Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore (Octagon Books, New York 1964²).

Cherniss 1944: H.F. Cherniss, *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato and the Academy*, vol. I, Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore.

Cherniss 1945: H.F. Cherniss, *The Riddle of the Early Academy*, University of California Press, Berkeley (Garland, New York-London 1980²).

Cherniss 1951: H.F. Cherniss, *Plato as Mathematician*, «The review of metaphysics» 4, 1951, pp. 395-425 (= Cherniss 1977, pp. 222-252).

Cherniss 1954: H.F. Cherniss, *A much misread passage of the Timaeus (49C7-50B5)*, «American Journal of Philology» 75, 1954, pp. 113-130 (= Cherniss 1977, pp. 346-363).

Cherniss 1956: H.F. Cherniss, *Timaeus 52C2-5*, in *Mélanges de philosophie grecque offerts à Mgr. Auguste Diès*, Vrin, Paris, pp. 49-60 (= Cherniss 1977, pp. 364-375).

Cherniss 1957a: H.F. Cherniss, *The Relation of the Timaeus to Plato's Later Dialogues*, «American Journal of Philology» 78, 1957, pp. 225-266 (= Cherniss 1977, pp. 298-339).

Cherniss 1957b: H.F. Cherniss, *Timaeus 38A8-B5*, «Journal of Hellenic Studies» 77, 1957, pp. 18-23 (= Cherniss 1977, pp. 340-345).

Cherniss 1959a: H.F. Cherniss, *Plato (1950-1957)*, «Lustrum» 4, 1959, pp. 5-308.

Cherniss 1959b: H.F. Cherniss, review of *H.D. Saffrey, Le Περὶ Φιλοσοφίας d'Aristote et la théorie platonicienne des idées et des nombres*, «Gnomon» 31, 1959, pp. 36-51 (= Cherniss 1977, pp. 423-438).

Cherniss 1960: H.F. Cherniss, *Plato (1950-1957), II*, «Lustrum» 5, 1960, pp. 323-648.

Cherniss 1977: H.F. Cherniss, *Selected papers*, ed. L. Tarán, Brill, Leiden.

de Strycker 1949: E. de Strycker, *Aristote, critique de Platon*, «L'Antiquité Classique» 18, 1949, pp. 95-107.

Gaiser 1963: K. Gaiser, *Platons ungeschriebene Lehre*, Klett, Stuttgart.

Harold F. Cherniss: Letters to Mario Untersteiner, 1951-1977

Gerson 2014: L.P. Gerson, *Harold Cherniss and the Study of Plato Today. Books that have shaped the historiography of philosophy*, «Journal for the History of Philosophy» 52, 2014, pp. 397-409.

Gigante 1999: M. Gigante, *Untersteiner nel centenario della nascita*, in L. Belloni et al. (eds.), *Dalla lirica al teatro. Nel ricordo di Mario Untersteiner (1899-1999)*, *Atti del Convegno internazionale di studio (Trento-Rovereto, febbraio 1999)*, Dipartimento di scienze filologiche e storiche, Trento, pp. 15-28.

Isnardi Parente 1981: M. Isnardi Parente, *Mario Untersteiner*, «Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica» 109, 1981, pp. 477-483, reviewed reprint in A.M. Battagazzore-F. Decleva Caizzi (eds.), *L'etica della ragione. Ricordo di Mario Untersteiner*, Cisalpino-Goliardica, Milano 1989, pp. 31-38 (= Isnardi Parente 2003, pp. 59-66).

Isnardi Parente 1990: M. Isnardi Parente, *Ricordo di Harold Cherniss*, «La cultura» 28, 1990, pp. 406-414 (= Isnardi Parente 2003, pp. 119-132).

Isnardi Parente 2003: M. Isnardi Parente, *I miei maestri*, Il Mulino, Bologna.

Krämer 1959: H.J. Krämer, *Arete bei Platon und Aristoteles. Zum Wesen und zur Geschichte der platonischen Ontologie*, Winter, Heidelberg.

Krämer 1982: H.J. Krämer, *Platone e i fondamenti della metafisica. Saggio sulla teoria dei principi e sulle dottrine di Platone con una raccolta dei documenti fondamentali in edizione bilingue e bibliografia*, introduction and translation by G. Reale, Vita e pensiero, Milano.

Leoni 1992: D. Leoni (ed.), *Mythos. Ricordo di Mario Untersteiner*, La grafica, Mori, Rovereto.

Mondolfo 1964: R. Mondolfo, *Discussioni su un testo parmenideo (Die Fragm. d. Vorsokr. 28BS, versi 5-6)* «Rivista di storia della filosofia» 19, 1964, pp. 310-315.

Owen 1953: G.E.L. Owen, *The Place of the Timaeus in Plato's Dialogues*, «Classical Quarterly» 47, 1953, pp. 79-95 (= Id., *Science, Logic, and Dialectic*, Duckworth, London 1986, pp. 65-84).

Prior 1985: W.J. Prior, *Unity and development in Plato's metaphysics*, Croom Helm, London-Sydney.

Reale 1984: G. Reale, *Per una rilettura e una nuova interpretazione di Platone*, CUSL, Milano (10th ed. *Per una nuova interpretazione di Platone. Rilettura della*

Alice Bonandini

metafisica dei grandi dialoghi alla luce delle 'dottrine non scritte', Vita e pensiero, Milano 1991).

Reale 1994: G. Reale (ed.), *Verso una nuova immagine di Platone*, Vita e pensiero, Milano.

Sichirolo 1982: L. Sichirolo, *Mario Untersteiner*, «Gnomon» 54, 1982, pp. 613-615.

Tarán 1966: L. Tarán, review of *Aristotele, Della filosofia. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento esegetico a cura di M. Untersteiner*, «American Journal of Philology» 87, 1966, pp. 464-472.

Tarán 1987: L. Tarán, *Harold F. Cherniss*, «Biographical Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society» 1987, pp. 133-140.

Tarán 1988a: L. Tarán, *Harold F. Cherniss*, «Gnomon» 60, 1988, pp. 665-667.

Tarán 1988b: L. Tarán, *Harold F. Cherniss y la historia de la filosofía antigua*, «Méthexis» 1, 1988, pp. 85-88.

Tarán 2001: L. Tarán, *Collected Papers*, Brill, Leiden.

Tordesillas 1989: A. Tordesillas, *Bibliografia di Mario Untersteiner*, in A.M. Battezzato-F. Decleva Caizzi (eds.), *L'etica della ragione. Ricordo di Mario Untersteiner*, Cisalpino-Goliardica, Milano 1989, pp. 153-181.

Untersteiner 1931: M. Untersteiner, *Platone. Repubblica, libro X*, Cristofori, Milano; 3rd rev. and enl. ed., Loffredo, Napoli 1966.

Untersteiner 1935: M. Untersteiner, *Sofocle. Studio critico*, 2 vols., La Nuova Italia, Firenze; revised and enlarged ed., Lampugnani Nigri, Milano 1974.

Untersteiner 1937: M. Untersteiner, review of *H. Cherniss, Aristotle's Criticism of Presocratic Philosophy*; A. Covotti, *I Presocratici*, «Mondo Classico» 7, 1937, pp. 148-54.

Untersteiner 1942: M. Untersteiner, *Le origini della tragedia*, Fratelli Bocca, Milano; 2nd ed. *Le origini della tragedia e del tragico: dalla preistoria a Eschilo*, Einaudi, Torino 1955 (Cisalpino-Goliardica, Milano 1984³).

Untersteiner 1943-1944: M. Untersteiner, *Un nuovo frammento dell'Anonymus Jamblichus: identificazione dell'Anonimo con Ippia*, «Rendiconti dell'Istituto

Harold F. Cherniss: Letters to Mario Untersteiner, 1951-1977

Lombardo, Accademia di Scienze e Lettere, Classe di Lettere, Scienze morali e storiche» 72, 1943-1944, pp. 442-458 (= Untersteiner 1971, pp. 422-39).

Untersteiner 1946: M. Untersteiner, *La fisiologia del mito*, Fratelli Bocca, Milano; rev. and enl. ed., La Nuova Italia, Firenze 1972.

Untersteiner 1946-1947: M. Untersteiner, *Aeschyli fabulae quae exstant*, 3 vols., Istituto editoriale italiano, Milano.

Untersteiner 1949: *I sofisti*, Einaudi, Torino; rev. and enl. ed. Lampugnani Nigri, Milano 1967, 2 vols. (Mondadori, Milano 1996³; English translation by K. Freeman, Blackwell, Oxford 1954; French translation by A. Tordesillas, with a preface by G. Romeyer-Dherbey, Vrin, Paris 1993).

Untersteiner 1949-1962: M. Untersteiner, *Sofisti. Testimonianze e frammenti*, 4 vols. (vol. 4 with A.M. Battezzatore), La Nuova Italia, Firenze 1949-1962; 2nd ed. 1961-1967 (Bompiani, Milano 2009³).

Untersteiner 1953: M. Untersteiner, *Quanti drammi scrisse Eschilo?*, in *In memoriam Achillis Beltrami*, Istituto di filologia classica, Genova, pp. 239-245 (= Untersteiner 1971, pp. 219-225).

Untersteiner 1954: M. Untersteiner, *Contributi filologici per la storia della filosofia 1: L'incontro fra Timone e Pirrone*, «Rivista di storia della filosofia» 9, 1954, pp. 285-287 (= Untersteiner 1971, pp. 641-644).

Untersteiner 1955: M. Untersteiner, *Senofane. Testimonianze e frammenti*, La Nuova Italia, Firenze (1967²; Bompiani, Milano 2008³).

Untersteiner 1956: M. Untersteiner, *La ὁδὸς di Parmenide come via all'ἔόν*, «Studi urbinati di storia, filosofia e letteratura» 29, 1956, pp. 22-69 (= Untersteiner 1958, pp. LI-CI).

Untersteiner 1958: M. Untersteiner, *Parmenide. Testimonianze e frammenti*, Firenze (1967²; 1979³).

Untersteiner 1959: M. Untersteiner, *Aristotele Phys. I 8-9. Frammenti del Περὶ Φιλοσοφίας*, «Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica» 37, 1959, pp. 1-23 (= Untersteiner 1971, pp. 529-550).

Untersteiner 1960-1961: M. Untersteiner, *Il Περὶ Φιλοσοφίας di Aristotele*, «Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica» 38, 1960, pp. 337-362, and 39, 1961, pp. 121-159 (= Untersteiner 1971, pp. 551-613).

Alice Bonandini

Untersteiner 1963a: M. Untersteiner, *Zenone. Testimonianze e frammenti*, La Nuova Italia, Firenze (1970²).

Untersteiner 1963b: M. Untersteiner, *Aristotele. Della filosofia*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Roma.

Untersteiner 1965a: M. Untersteiner, *Studi platonici. Il Carmide*, «Acme» 18, 1965, pp. 19-67 (= Untersteiner 1976, pp. 345-416).

Untersteiner 1965b: M. Untersteiner, *Ancora su Parmenide (Die Fragm. d. Vorsokr. 28 B 8, vv. 5-6)*, «Rivista di storia della filosofia» 20, 1965, pp. 51-53 (= Untersteiner 1971, pp. 180-183).

Untersteiner 1970: M. Untersteiner, *Posidonio nei placita di Platone secondo Diogene Laerzio III*, Paideia, Brescia.

Untersteiner 1971: M. Untersteiner, *Scritti minori. Studi di letteratura e di filosofia greca*, Paideia, Brescia.

Untersteiner 1975: M. Untersteiner, *Incontri*, ed. R. Maroni-L. Untersteiner Candia, VDTT, Trento (Guerini, Milano 1990²).

Untersteiner 1976: M. Untersteiner, *Da Omero ad Aristotele. Scritti minori - seconda serie*, Paideia, Brescia.

Untersteiner 1980: M. Untersteiner, *Problemi di filologia filosofica*, ed. L. Sichirollo-M. Venturi Ferriolo, Cisalpino-Goliardica, Milano.

Vander Waerdt 1994: P.A. Vander Waerdt, *Harold F. Cherniss*, in W.W. Briggs (ed.), *Biographical Dictionary of North American Classicists*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT, p. 94 [= <http://lichen.csd.sc.edu/dbcs/index.php?page=person&id=464>].

Vlastos 1963: G. Vlastos, review of *H.J. Krämer, Arete bei Platon und Aristoteles. Zum Wesen und zur Geschichte der platonischen Ontologie*, «Gnomon» 35, 1963, pp. 641-655.

Zeller 1932-1979: E. Zeller, *La filosofia dei Greci nel suo sviluppo storico*, updated transl. R. Mondolfo *et al.*, La Nuova Italia, Firenze 1932-1979 (orig. ed. *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung dargestellt*, Fues, Tübingen 1844-1852; 6th ed. by Wilhelm Nestle, Reisland, Leipzig 1919).