

Pension Tramer, Villa Belfield, Menton,
France. 22 Jan. 1882.

My dear Sir,

I have to thank you for your
"Literarische Bekden" which you so kindly
sent me last Christmas. I read it before
leaving Florence, and should have re-
cognized it before but for the quantity
of work I have on my hands just now.
I am filled with admiration for the dig-
ging ingenuity of your conjectures, the
skillfulness and scholarship of the arguments
by which they are supported, the lucidity
and artistic arrangement of the exposition.
When reprinting my essays on Greek
Philosophy, which I hope will appear in a
collected form next summer, I shall
draw attention in footnotes to whatever passages
in your work tend to throw light on the
various topics discussed in mine, rather

by supplying criticisms, or by pointing for
 & could have been content
 to accept the old. In this manner I hope
 that those English scholars who are not yet
 acquainted with your theories may be led
 to examine and express their opinion on them
 For myself I should like to see some
 criticism on the work written by one who is
 both a philosopher and a philologist, and
 who is better acquainted than I am with
 the minutiae of the Platonic and Aristotelian
 texts. The point which, as I think, will
 awaken most opposition is the date you
 assign to the composition of Ar's Ethics;
 and I must confess to feeling great dif-
 ficulties on the subject. I find it almost
 incredible that a young man of 34 should
 be able to compose a work which, with all
 its faults, seems so filled with the matured
 observation and thought of a whole life-time;
 more especially when we consider that the
 Greeks were the very reverse of precocious

except in statesmanship and war - two
 arts which those who master them at all
 seem to master them in a very short time.
 And that the first two books of the Rhetoric
 should have been composed at a still
 earlier age is, if possible, still more extra-
 ordinary. Then again, even if Ar. himself wrote
 the Categories, which I do not believe he
 did, he could hardly have published
 them for the first time in such a meagre
 commentary; he must have been using them
 for some time in his larger works, before
 the advantage of bringing them together and
 illustrating them in a special treat became
 apparent to him or to one of his pupils.
 So that we have the Topics, if not the
Analytics, or another work published
 before the Ethics. I should say, indeed,
 judging from the passage quoted by you
 p. 188 that the Ethics was the last but one
 of Ar's whole series of works relating to
 human philosophy ($\eta\ \tau\epsilon\ \rho\epsilon\ \tau\alpha\ \epsilon\upsilon\beta\alpha\iota\tau\iota\kappa\alpha\ \phi\iota\lambda\omicron\sigma\phi\iota\alpha$.)

And, of course, according to my own view of
its construction it involves a continual re-
ference to his whole cosmic philosophy.

But why should not Plato have been re-
sponding to spoken criticisms of his disciples?
And why should not the Laws have re-
mained unpublished or unknown to us
for several years after Plato's death? I
doubt that you do not think it necessary to
say anything about the traditional opposition
of the States with Pisistrachus, which also
seems to indicate a late date for the com-
position.

I have also read
Chippelli's book. It seems to me a very
frank and scholarly production; but
I had not the advantage of being acquainted
at first hand with your side of the
argument, and so I may have attributed
more weight to his criticisms than they
really possess. Thanking you once
more for the "Fehden", I am Dear Sir

Yours very truly
Alfred Bern