ABSTRACT

This article is a coda to Paul Oskar Kristeller’s criticism of the scholarly behavior of Raymond Klibansky (d. 2005) found in my 2015 article “Kristelleriana: Two Biographical Notes.” In a letter of 24 February 1995 to the independent scholar W. Cameron McEwan, Kristeller (d. 1999) accused Klibansky of refusing to acknowledge Kristeller’s discoveries concerning the Renaissance philosopher Nicholas of Cusa and explained how he had been warned against Klibansky by the distinguished contemporary scholars Ernst Cassirer, Erwin Panoksky, David Ross, and Richard Walser.
Some years ago I published a memorandum that Paul Oskar Kristeller (1905–1999) left behind in his papers at Columbia University detailing the moral failings as a scholar of Raymond Klibansky (1905–2005), a *tabula pecatorum*, as I described it in the abstract of the article.¹ Recently, however, I have come across a passage in the correspondence between W. Cameron McEwen and Kristeller that adds significant details and color to Kristeller’s complaints about Klibansky.² The two texts overlap only slightly even though they share the same basic theme, Klibansky’s bad behavior as a scholar. The letter to McEwen is distinguished by Kristeller’s much greater concern to record the agreement of other scholars concerning Klibansky’s bad character. In a letter 18 February 1995, McEwan had posed a series of questions to Kristeller concerning his relationship with Martin Heidegger, Klibansky, and other figures in the years before World War II. Kristeller responded on 24 February in part as follows (I have introduced a sequential number between square brackets before each item to be discussed so as to facilitate later reference):

---

¹ Monfasani 2015.
² This correspondence can be found in Columbia University’s Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Paul Oskar Kristeller Papers, Correspondence, Box 35, Folder 6. The earliest preserved letter in the collection is one of 19 April 1994 from McEwen; the last was written on 19 September 1996 and is also from McEwen. A partner in an online publishing firm, McEwen published on modern philosophy as an independent scholar.
My hostile relations with Klibansky go back to 1937. [1] In that year I found in the Biblioteca Civica in Bergamo ms. Gamma IV, 19 (Iter I, pg. 8b). This ms., written on paper in the XVth cent. of 10 fols., contains Proclus, *Platonis Theologica* translated by Petrus Balbus Pisanus, ep. Tropiensis, dated March 22, 1462. In his preface to Ferdinand I, King of Naples and Sicily (fols. 1-4v), inc. Nicolaus de Cusa Sancti Petri ad Vincula Presbiter cardinalis, prudentissime atque invictissime regum, in which he states that he undertook this translation on the request of Nicolaus Cusanus, but only completed it after his death in 1464. I communicated this important fact by word of mouth to Klibansky, and soon afterwards he repeated it in print without giving me any credit. [2] When I later found an important Cusanus Ms. in Brussels I published its description, including a preface of the respective text in my contribution to the anniversary conference on Cusanus in Bressanone in 1954. This Ms. had remained unknown before this to Klibansky. I remember that both [3] Cassirer and [4] Panofsky orally told me that they had reservations about him, and that [5] Sir David Ross from Oxford when he visited Columbia ca. 1939 told me that I should be very cautious in my dealings with Klibansky. I also remember that [6] Richard Walsh who contributed an important edition to the series *Plato Arabus* edited by Klibansky had considerable trouble with him. [7] Finally, when Klibansky edited in 1964 a volume in honor of Cassirer on the 100th anniversary of his birth, it didn’t contain a contribution by me, although I should have normally been among those included. This means that Klibansky either did not invite me to contribute a paper or [had decided] not to include it in case I had sent him one.

Kristeller’s recollection was not always accurate in recalling various moments of his life, but in my earlier article on his criticism of Klibansky I found no misstatements. Indeed, more than half of his criticisms could actually be documented as being true, while the others could not be verified nor falsified for one reason or another, such as reports of personal conversation (e.g., “Klibansky offered to pay [Ernst Moritz] Morasse for finding errors in my Supplementum Ficinianum. Manesse refused and told me about it”). [5] In the new *tabula peccatorum*...
published in this article, Kristeller was certainly confused about one item as we shall see, but in the case of the other charges in the list he was either demonstrably correct or plausibly so. We can start with the first [I], concerning Klibansky’s behavior when faced with Kristeller’s discovery of a translation of Proclus.

Raymond Klibansky first made his reputation in 1929 with the announcement that he had discovered a medieval Latin translation of Proclus’ commentary on Plato’s *Parmenides* that preserves a segment of text no longer extent in the Greek. He would then go on to publish in 1939 a landmark guide to the history of medieval Platonism, *The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition during the Middle Ages*, which served as a programmatic statement for the grand editorial project *Corpus Platonicum Medii Aevi*, for which he served as the general editor. And finally, in 1953, in conjunction with Lotte Labowsky, he published the lost part of Proclus’ *Parmenides* commentary preserved in the medieval Latin translation of William of Moerbeke. Having thus from the earliest stages of his career been intimately connected with Proclus and the scholarship of the medieval Platonic tradition, Klibansky knew well the great significance of Kristeller’s discovery in Bergamo in 1937 of a manuscript of a known but previously anonymous translation of Proclus’ *Platonic Theology* that bore a dedication of the translator, Pietro Balbi.  

Kristeller records the years he visited. The first is precisely 1937. In the letter to McEwen, Kristeller was guilty of another error. Having obviously given a quick glance at the *Iter*, where Balbi’s preface is correctly described as running to f. 10, he inadvertently described the manuscript to McEwen as having 10 folios when in fact it contains 179 folios.

Kristeller referred in a less precise manner to Klibansky’s failure to acknowledge his discovery of the Bergamo manuscript in two of the list of twenty-six charges he laid against Klibansky in the memorandum published by me in Monfasani 2015, p. 406, item 2: “My work in Italy. I found a few Cusanus mss. and sent them to [Ernst] Hoffmann. Used by [Paul] Wilpert and Gerda von Bredow”; and Monfasani 2015, p. 407, item 4: “I may have given Klibansky the Bergamo manuscript of Proclus tr. Petrus Balbus of which he made so much fuss. His offer to give his extensive material on [Ludwig] Bertalot (my talk with [Gertrud] “Bing”.”

In a report on *Plato Latinus*, Klibansky 1949, p. 11, he announced the discovery of the manuscript in Bergamo.

7 Kristeller referred in a less precise manner to Klibansky’s failure to acknowledge his discovery of the Bergamo manuscript in two of the list of twenty-six charges he laid against Klibansky in the memorandum published by me in Monfasani 2015, p. 406, item 2: “My work in Italy. I found a few Cusanus mss. and sent them to [Ernst] Hoffmann. Used by [Paul] Wilpert and Gerda von Bredow”; and Monfasani 2015, p. 407, item 4: “I may have given Klibansky the Bergamo manuscript of Proclus tr. Petrus Balbus of which he made so much fuss. His offer to give his extensive material on [Ludwig] Bertalot (my talk with [Gertrud] “Bing”.”

8 In a report on *Plato Latinus*, Klibansky 1949, p. 11, he announced the discovery of the manuscript in Bergamo.

Item [2] also involves a manuscript discovery by Kristeller, in this case, Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, ms. 10817, containing a Latin translation of the treatise De Fato of the Byzantine Platonist George Gemistus Pletho made by the Greek émigré John Sophianos and dedicated to Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa. That Klibansky did not know this manuscript before Kristeller discovered it would seem not to be an especially damning criticism save for the fact that Klibansky held himself up as an expert on Nicholas Cusanus as well as a master of the medieval and Renaissance Platonic tradition.

Item [3] is a very interesting case. Almost immediately after his entrance into the circle of scholars affiliated with the Warburg Library in Hamburg in 1926, Klibansky sought to associate himself publicly with the prominent Neo-Kantian philosopher Ernst Cassirer. Already in 1927, with the publication of Cassirer’s Individuum und Kosmos, we find Klibansky supplying an edition of Carolus Bovillus’ De Sapiente as an appendix to the volume. He and Cassirer were together in England in the first half of the 1930s. In 1936 Klibansky co-edited a volume of essays by distinguished contemporary thinkers and scholars in honor of Cassirer, at the end of which he included an essay by himself. Later on in life he gave two interviews specifically about his relations with Ernst Cassirer in addition to discussing the same in the course of the retrospective of his life published in 1998, seven years before his death. Cassirer’s wife, Toni, also talks of Klibansky in a memoir on her life with her famous husband. In contrast, Kristeller could not boast of a close relationship with Cassirer before World War II, though the two met in the early 1930s after Kristeller had published his doctoral dissertation on Plotinus and though Cassirer demonstrably thought well of him.


11 Cassirer 1927.

12 Klibansky & Paton 1936. Klibansky’s article, “The Philosophic Character of History,” is on pp. 323–37. In the Harper Torchbooks reprint of New York, 1963, Klibansky had a prefatory note in which he repudiated at least in part what he asserted in the article (“Among those who survive [since the original publication of the volume] some may have modified their views during the long interval—this is so in the case of the joint-editor who was also a contributor”). On the background to the volume see Whitaker 2018, pp. 86–90 (“The Cassirer Festschrift”).


14 Cassirer 1981.

15 In his Reminiscences, Kristeller 1983, pp. 157–58: “I might say it was through this Bruno Cassirer family that I also had a kind of social contact with Ernst Cassirer, who was a professor in Hamburg, and when he came to Berlin stayed with his cousin Bruno. He was a close friend of my teacher Hoffmann, and when my dissertation was published, Hoffmarin urged me to send a complimentary copy to Cassirer, which I did, and Cassirer reacted in a very friendly way, and asked me to visit him when I was in Berlin. We had a very pleasant conversation, and I have been in touch with him ever since. He helped me to emigrate.” Since Kristeller attended the University of Berlin 1928–31, Cassirer’s invitation to meet in Berlin only makes sense after Kristeller moved to Freiburg to work with Martin Heidegger. Further on in Reminiscences, Kristeller
to England in 1933, Cassirer supported Kristeller’s application for support of the Academic Assistance Council,16 even writing a testimonial for him; and later, in 1937, when at the University of Gothenburg in Sweden, he prepared the way for Kristeller’s request for support for the project that would become the *Iter Italicum*, by writing Fritz Saxl, the head of the Warburg Institute, recommending consideration.17 But only after Cassirer left Sweden to come to Yale University in New Haven in 1941 and then transferred to Columbia University in 1944, did he and Kristeller come into frequent contact.18 Before Cassirer died of a heart attack on 13 April 1945, Kristeller had worked with him on a translation of some of his essays,19 and had brought him into the project that would eventually result in the very successful volume, *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man*.20 Indeed, to commemorate Cassirer’s participation in the project, his name was maintained as one of the authors.21 So the only plausible time when Cassirer and Kristeller would have had a certain level of intimacy and the opportunity to talk about Klibansky would have been during Cassirer’s American period, 1941–1945.

This is the place also to take up item [7], i.e., Kristeller’s charge that Klibansky snubbed him when planning an anniversary volume on the occasion of the hundredth year of Cassirer’s birth. Unless there was a movement afoot for such a volume in the 1970s that had reached his ears but has thus far escaped my knowledge, Kristeller was wrong here. The hundredth anniversary of Cassirer’s birth was 1974, not, as Kristeller said, 1964. A volume in honor of Cassirer did appear near 1964, but it was a reprint in 1963 of the volume that Klibansky had co-edited in England in 1936. In fact, a copy of this reprint in Columbia’s Butler Library is actually

16 See Whitaker 2017, p. 346.
18 See Whitaker 2017, pp. 461–62; *Reminiscences*, Kristeller 1983, pp. 461–62: “he then had an invitation from Yale, and arrived during the war at Yale, and was a visiting professor there for several years. I went to see him in New Haven, and he gave me a very friendly reception. Then when he reached the age limit at Yale he was invited to Columbia as a visiting professor, and spent an academic year — I think 1944–1945 in New York. They had an apartment I think on West End Avenue, and he often invited me, and it was on that occasion that I met his wife, Toni Cassirer, a very interesting person in her own right. My dealings with him were extremely congenial, and he did review my Ficino book when it came out in 1943 in a very friendly way, and when I received [Helmut] Kuhn’s invitation to prepare a Renaissance volume I asked him and [John Herman] Randall to join with me to edit this volume, and he (Cassirer) had still time to give his opinion on the selection of the material, although he was dead when the actual work was done and finished, but his name is still associated with that.”
19 See Cassirer 1945. Cassirer’s preface is dated October 1944.
20 Cassirer, Kristeller, & Randall 1948.
21 See Kristeller’s comments at the end of n. 18 above.
Kristeller’s own, part of the legacy of books he left the University. But this complaint may be more than simply false memory of a snub at the hands of the man whom Kristeller called “his best enemy.” Among Cassirer’s correspondence preserved at the Warburg Institute is a three page typed letter from Cassirer dated 29 July 1934, the day after his sixtieth birthday, thanking his “younger friends and students” for the collection of philosophical essays (Aufsätze) they have presented him. The problem is that no such Festgabe, as Cassirer called it, exists. Perhaps what Cassirer was talking about was the table of contents of a proposed volume. In any case, what is especially interesting for our purposes is that two copies of the letter survive in the correspondence of Cassirer with Leo Strauss and Paul Oskar Kristeller (one in the correspondence with Strauss and the other in the correspondence with Kristeller), neither of whom were invited to participate in the 1936 volume edited by Klibansky. So it would seem that

22 The copy has the Library of Congress shelf mark, D 16.8. K52 1963, with the name Kristeller written by hand at the bottom of the verso of the title page, i.e., the page with the publication data of the Harper Torchbook edition.

23 See Reminiscences, Kristeller 1983, p. 128: “I might mention that from Heidelberg I also know the man whom I might call my best enemy, named Raymond Klibansky, a quite prominent scholar in my field in which we were rivals already as students.”

24 Whitaker 2017, p. 361, n. 27.

25 Whitaker 2017, p. 361, n. 27. I have consulted the copies to Strauss and Kristeller in PDF available online at the Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg website http://agora.sub.uni-hamburg.de/sub-


27 See Klibansky, Panofsky, & Saxl 1964.
Klibansky; indeed, no mention at all of Klibansky appears in the post-1955 correspondence. When Panofsky and Kristeller spoke of Klibansky is impossible to say. Kristeller was in contact with Panofsky for thirty years. When he arrived in America in 1939, he found Panofsky already a member of the Institute of Advanced Study in Princeton.

As for item [5], Kristeller gives us a date as to when he talked with Sir David Ross, the famous philosopher, classical scholar, and Provost of Oriel College, Oxford, namely, on the occasion of Ross receiving an honorary degree from Columbia University in 1939. The degree was awarded in camera on 13 February 1939. But on that date Kristeller was still aboard ship sailing to America from Italy. He did not arrive in New York until 23 February 1939. He was whisked off that very day to New Haven by his host, Professor Hermann Weigand, in order to begin teaching the seminar on Plotinus at Yale which has been the justification for his receiving a non-quota visa to escape Italy and come to America on the eve of World War II. Did Kristeller misremember? The answer is definitively no. Not only is it conceivable that Ross went up to New Haven on his America visit, but we also have proof that this is exactly what he did and that he spoke to Kristeller. In a letter on Columbia University stationary of 6 March 1939, Ross wrote Kristeller to set up a meeting made possible by his having to give a lecture at Yale on the night of 7 March. Later that month, after returning to New York from New Haven, Ross wrote a testimonial about Kristeller that he hoped would “be of service” to the young German in securing a permanent position in America. He and Kristeller

33  The letter in Columbia’s Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Paul Oskar Kristeller Papers, Box 49, folder 4, and is part of a correspondence between Kristeller and Ross that begins with a letter dated 2 May 1934, concerning Ross’s discussion with the British Academic Assistance Council concerning Kristeller, and ends with a letter of 15 April 1954, in which Ross expresses the hope of meeting up with Kristeller “when you come to Europe next year.” All the preserved letters in the collection are from Ross.

34  In a short note of 13 March on Columbia stationary, Ross wrote “I shall write a testimonial which I hope will be of service to you. [Signed]. W. D. Ross” The testimonial itself, again on the stationary of Columbia’s Philosophy Department, is undated and written in Ross’s nearly indecipherable hand, of which he sensibly arranged to have a typed copy made for general distribution. Ross’s evaluation at this stage in Kristeller’s career is worth publishing: “(Copy) / Columbia University in the City of New York / Department of Philosophy / Dr. P.O. Kristeller is known to me as one of the most promising of the younger German scholars in the field of history of philosophy. He had an excellent classical training, and has published very good contributions to the study of Plotinus. More recently he has for several years devoted himself to the intellectual side of the Italian Renaissance, and especially to the study of Marsilio Ficino. Any university interested in Renaissance
certainly would have reason to want to talk to each other. The correspondence between the two starting in 1934 shows Ross trying to help Kristeller in the dire circumstances at the moment. He had read Kristeller’s 1929 dissertation on Plotinus, and in 1937 he received from Kristeller in Italy the two volumes of his *Supplementum Ficinianum*. Moreover, Ross certainly was quite familiar with Klibansky. Klibansky must have made contact with Ross not long after arriving in England in 1933. Already in October of that year he visited Oxford as the guest of Clement Webb and so impressed the medieval historian Maurice Powicke that the latter proposed him for honorary membership in the Oriel Senior Common Room. Then in 1936, at the invitation of Ross, Klibansky moved to Oriel College as a lecturer. Nonetheless, in 1938 Klibansky left Oriel College to take up a lectureship at Liverpool University, suggesting that Ross as Provost of Oriel had cooled in his attitude towards Klibansky. What is undoubtedly clear, however, is that the conversation between Ross and Kristeller concerning Klibansky in 1939 remained so vivid in Kristeller’s memory that he could recall it with precision in ordinary correspondence forty-five years later.

The remaining item, [6], concerns a long time friend of Kristeller’s, the illustrious expert on Greek and Arabic philosophy, Richard Walzer, whom Kristeller first met when working under Werner Jaeger in Berlin in 1928–1931, and with whom he continued to be in contact until Walzer’s death in 1975. Once Walzer

---

35 Whitaker 2018, pp. 84–85. Ross was supportive of various scholars connected with the *Corpus Platonicum* project. He “accommodated at Oriel” Richard Walzer and Lornzo Minio-Paluello; see Teicher 2017, p. 329.


37 Multiple factors might have been involved. In 1937 the medievalist Richard Hunt, then at the University of Liverpool, had sought to raise funds in Liverpool for Klibansky’s *Corpus Platonicum* and eventually was successful; see Whitaker 2018, pp. 94–95.

38 Kristeller himself recognized that in old age he suffered from the well known phenomenon of remembering better, as Roland Bainton once said, “yesteryear than yesterday.” In a letter of 23 September 1996 to his nephew Edgar Ross, M.D., in the same folder as the correspondence with Sir David Ross, Kristeller remarked: “my memory [is] still pretty good ... Yet my memory of the last few days and weeks is unreliable.”

39 On Walzer see Deitz 2004, pp. 231–32; on Kristeller’s relationship with Walzer over time see Monfasani 2018, pp. 25–26. In his *Reminiscences*, Kristeller 1983, p. 156, Kristeller has this to say just before the passage quoted in n. 15 above: “The other one [Privatdozent in Berlin] was Richard Walzer. Richard Walzer was also a student of Jaeger and had written a good dissertation on Aristotle. He was Jewish, and I think even came from an Orthodox family. He developed an interest in Arabic philosophy, and already at the time when I knew him he had learned Arabic, and had made it a specialty to..."
arrived in England in 1938 and was esconced at Oriel College, Oxford with the support of Sir David Ross, he became involved in the Corpus Platonicum project, editing with Franz Rosenthal in 1943 Alfarabi’s De Platonis Philosophia, with Paul Kraus in 1951 Galeni Compendium Timaei Platonis. Aliorumque Dialogorum Synopsis Quae Extant Fragmenta, and with Francesco Gabrieli in 1952 Alfarabi’s Compendium Legum Platonis. Given his position at Oriel College from 1938 onward and his involvement in the Corpus Platonicum into the 1950s, Walzer could not but having gotten to know Klibansky fairly well. And given Sir David Ross’s reservations concerning Klibansky by 1939, we may reasonably suppose that Walzer too shared his patron’s opinion by that date, though he could not have shared it with Kristeller until Kristeller started to visit England after the war.

The letter of 1995 to McEwen is, in short, a significant addendum to the memorandum that Kristeller had written a decade earlier concerning Klibansky, important not simply for understanding Kristeller’s intellectual and personal biography, but also as something of a corrective to accounts of Klibansky in more recent times written—quite reasonably so given their context—from a sympathetic, if not to say, panegyrical perspective.
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