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Near and Middle Eastern Studies at the Institute for Advanced Study: A Historical Sketch
“The function of the humanistic disciplines is the critical study of that organized tradition which we call civilization … We cannot, and in the long run, will not fight for what we do not understand. Our democratic way of life is not, in the last analysis, a material order; it is a spiritual point of view. It is a kind of sum total of the achievements of man’s intelligence and idealism in all the ages that have gone before us. It can in the end only be destroyed by being forgotten. It must be remembered and understood if men are to have the basis for still greater achievements in the future. Human nature does not change; in each generation men possess the same capacities for good or for evil as their forefathers. But different ages vary widely in the vividness of their understanding of the great achievements of the past. When humanistic studies flourish, life is richer and gracious. When they decay in the dark ages of history, man’s way of life becomes brutal, poor and mean. The natural and the social sciences teach us, among other things, the techniques of preserving our way of life in peace and in war. The humanistic disciplines show us what it is we are struggling to preserve. They supply the motive for effort and sacrifice and show us the meaning of success in that great struggle against chaos and the mark which the human race has made since the beginnings of civilization, that effort which we can never forego to make life on this planet not merely a blank animal existence but something free, gracious and spiritual, filled with ardour and meaning.”

(Frank Aydelotte, Director of the Institute for Advanced Study, 1939 through 1947, writing in 1941)

S A B I N E  S C H M I D T K E

T H E  S C H O O L  O F  H U M A N I S T I C  S T U D I E S

In 1929 Louis Bamberger (b. 1855, d. 1944) and his sister, Caroline Bamberger Fuld (b. 1864, d. 1944), approached Abraham Flexner (b. 1866, d. 1959), who had made a name for himself as an expert on higher education, to set up an “institution of higher learning … [where] those who are assembled in the faculty or staff of the institution may enjoy the most favorable opportunities for continuing research or investigations in their particular field or specialty, and that the utmost liberty of action shall be afforded the said faculty or staff to that end.” For this purpose, the Bambergers made an initial munificent gift of US$5,000,000. From the outset, Flexner, who in 1930 was named the founding director of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, had envisaged as a structural minimum “a series of ‘schools’ or ‘groups’—a school of mathematics, a school of economics, a school of history, a school of philosophy, etc.,” as he vaguely described his plans in October 1931. Mathematics being “the most fundamental of all the disciplines” in Flexner’s view, this field was tackled first, and the School of Mathematics began working on

---

1 Unless otherwise noted, the archival material cited in this study is from the Shelby White and Leon Levy Archives Center, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ.
3 See Bamberger and Fuld, “Letter addressed by Founders to their Trustees.” See also Stern, A History, pp. 55–56. Needless the say, the deliberations that led to the idea of establishing the Institute for Advanced Study have a history of their own. The most detailed account of the early history of the Institute up until 1950 is Stern’s unpublished A History. Mention should also be made of Smith Porter, “From Intellectual Sanctuary,” and Batterson, Pursuit of Genius, both of which are primarily concerned with the School of Mathematics. Ulrich Raulff has been working for some time on a history of the Institute from its beginnings to the mid-sixties. See https://www.iias.edu/scholars/ulrich-raulff.
5 See also Flexner, I Remember, pp. 359–360: “In the course of time I came to the conclusion that I would begin with one subject, and I hit upon mathematics for several reasons: (1) It was fundamental. (2) It required the least investment in plant or books. (3) It had become obvious to me that I could secure greater agreement upon personnel in the field of mathematics than in any other subject.” Cf. also ibid., p. 371: “Mathematics is the severest of all
October 1, 1933. Oswald Veblen (b. 1880, d. 1960), since 1905 professor of mathematics at Princeton University, was put in charge of building up the school, which developed rapidly and successfully, in close cooperation with the mathematics department at Princeton University. Flexner next turned his attention to setting up the School of Economics and Politics—economics being a field that was particularly important to him. For a variety of reasons it was the school that had been the hardest to establish. Though a first appointment had been made in April 1933 with David Mitrany (b. 1888, d. 1975), followed by three additional faculty appointments, Edward M. Earle (b. 1894, d. 1954), Winfield W. Riefler (b. 1897, d. 1974), and Robert B. Warren (b. 1891, d. 1950), the school was discontinued in 1949 and the remaining faculty, Mitrany, Warren, and Earle, were integrated into the School of Humanistic Studies, which was now renamed the School of Historical Studies.

Although he had envisaged from the outset including humanistic studies in the Institute, Flexner’s plans as to which disciplines should be prioritized and how they were to be structured were more vague than had been the case with the two other schools. Moreover, constrained by the modesty of the first endowment, Flexner initially planned to postpone starting a third school. During the board meeting of October 1931 he stated that “[b]eyond these two schools [of mathematics and economics], I do not now look, though it is obvious how readily history and other schools—literature, music, or science—can be added when money, men, and ideas are available.” The minutes have an interlinear addition by hand, in pencil, placed on top of “literature, music, or science,” which reads “art, archaeology, history or other schools.” Though it remains unclear who made this addition, it shows how disciplines, antecedent, on the one hand, to science, on the other, to philosophy and economics and thus to other social disciplines. With all its abstractness and indifference, both pure and applied scientific and philosophical progress of recent years has been closely bound up with new types and methods of sheer mathematical thinking.” Cf. a more practical approach expressed in Flexner, “Beyond the Graduate Schools,” p. 180: “I ultimately decided to recommend to the Board that we should begin with a single subject in order to test the validity of the idea, and I chose mathematics because in the first place it required so little in the way of equipment and in the second place because there was no subject in which it was easier to obtain agreement as to the personnel of the faculty.” See also Stern, A History, pp. 90–91.

9 Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Members of the Corporation Institute for Advanced Study, October 13, 1931 (Record of the Board of Trustees. First Volume of the Trustees Minutes. 1930–1934). The wording of his 1931 report is echoed in Flexner, I Remember, pp. 374–375: “Beyond these two schools, I did not at first look, though it is obvious how readily art, archeology, history, and other schools would be added when money, men, and ideas became available.” See also Stern, A History, pp. 93, 263.
vague the plans were at the time. Be that as it may, for a variety of reasons Flexner soon felt the need to move faster than initially planned, and he rushed to establish the nucleus of a School of Humanistic Studies, which began to operate in the academic year 1936–1937.

Satisfied with the positive evolution of the School of Mathematics, whose members were hosted by Princeton University in Fine Hall and worked in close companionship with their colleagues in the mathematics department, Flexner envisaged a similar set-up for the humanities, for which he received several proposals from Princeton University faculty. Under the chairmanship of Princeton University’s head librarian, James Thayer Gerould (b. 1872, d. 1951), Philip K. Hitti (b. 1886, d. 1978), who had joined Princeton University in 1926 as an assistant professor of Semitic philology and who was affiliated with the Department of Oriental Languages, and several other colleagues from the Departments of Art and Archaeology, Classics, and History, formed an interdepartmental Committee on Near Eastern Studies. In March 1933 they issued a report urging Princeton University to “develop … a more extensive series of studies” relating to the Near East, arguing that

among the studies related to the area which we know as the Near East, those which are concerned with the history, the literature and the art of the Islamic world have been in this country too largely neglected. Such studies are becoming of constantly increasing importance on account of their intrinsic value as a discipline, their place in the history of thought and culture, and the decisive part which the newly established nations are destined to play in world affairs.

Gerould had previously discussed the committee’s work with Flexner, and on March 2, 1933, he sent Flexner the committee’s report, in all likelihood with the intention to engage Flexner and the Institute in its realization. Flexner’s enthusiasm was lukewarm—he evidently did not consider the study of the Near East to be of fundamental importance.

---

10 There were nevertheless concerns voiced at Princeton University, as is evident from a report dated October 23, 1936, that the arrangement might absorb more space than was available at Fine Hall and that it might place an unduly high burden on the University’s faculty (Institute for Advanced Study. General. 1936. Historical Subject Files Collection. Box 335. Folder 4. Princeton University Archives. Department of Rare Books and Special Collections. Princeton University Library).


13 Letter from Flexner to Gerould, March 14, 1933 (Director’s Office. General Files. Box 25. Gerould, James T.): “Dear Mr. Gerould: I read with great interest your memorandum on the
Charles Rufus Morey (b. 1877, d. 1955), since 1925 chairman of the Department of Art and Archaeology at Princeton University, was more successful in gaining Flexner’s ear. He convinced the latter to form the School of Humanistic Studies according to the needs of his department, which had been founded in 1883 by Allan Marquand (b. 1853, d. 1924) and had developed into one of the preeminent centers of its kind in the United States. Erwin Panofsky has aptly described Morey as a person who “could not prevent the force of his personality from acting upon his surroundings much as the force of gravity operates in the physical world.” Morey’s ambitions for his department transcended the concerns of the university—he had initiated in 1917 an ambitious project to create the Index of Christian Art, directed the publication of the series Catalogo del Museo Sacro della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, and chaired since 1931 the Committee for the Excavation of Antioch-on-the-Orontes, a consortium of five institutions, viz. the Worcester Art Museum, the Baltimore Museum of Art, Dumbarton Oaks, the Musées Nationaux de France, and Princeton University. When approached by Flexner regarding how best to set up the humanities in the nascent Institute for Advanced Study, Morey saw this as a welcome opportunity to fill some of the pressing needs of his own department.

The discussions between Morey and Flexner date back to 1931. On December 17, Flexner had sent out a letter to a number of recipients at various US academic institutions of higher learning, asking for advice about the ideal facilities the future Institute for Advanced Study should provide for the convenience of scholars. Among the responses Flexner received, Morey’s letter of December 23 stands out—Morey’s outline of the envisaged collaborative work style among faculty and subject of the Near East. Of its importance I have no doubt, but I do not believe that for some time to come it is going to be possible to start anything new. In fact, the next few years may witness in higher education a thorough re-examination with a view of eliminating the things which are not of fundamental importance. With all good wishes, Sincerely yours.

14 On him, see the obituaries by Panofsky, “Charles Rufus Morey”; Lee, “Charles Rufus Morey”; Stohlman, “Morey, Charles Rufus.”
16 See Morey, “An Important Instrument of Research”; Hourihane, “They stand on his shoulders.”
18 Apart from Morey’s reply (Director’s Office. Aydelotte File. Bulletin-Finance. Box 2. D File), Flexner received responses from the American historian Charles A. Beard (b. 1874, d. 1948) (December 20, 1931); from the president of the Brookings Institution in Washington DC, Harold G. Moulton (b. 1883, d. 1965); from the cardiologist Alfred E. Cohn (b. 1879, d. 1957) (Board of Trustees Records. Board Minutes Books. Box 1. Volume I. 1930–1934); from G. J. Laing, dean of the Division of the Humanities, the University of Chicago (January 25, 1932); from Varts B. Greene, Department of History, Columbia University (March 11, 1932); and many others. See also “Extracts from Letters Concerning Bulletin # 1” (Director’s Office. Aydelotte File. Bulletin-Finance. Box 2. D File).
graduate students in the Department of Art and Archaeology at Princeton University and his vision for the needs for advanced studies in the humanities must have resonated positively with Flexner and his ideals. Morey was able to convince Flexner that it would serve the Institute best if the nascent School of Humanistic Studies collaborated closely with his department, and his letter to Flexner of April 9/10, 1934, is nothing less than a blueprint for the School of Humanistic Studies. Morey writes: “... I have tried to set down in this letter the potentialities of the present Princeton group working in the archaeology and history of art, and the lacunae which have developed therein, with suggestions as to the filling of these gaps in case of an extension of the staff of the Institute of Higher Study into this field.” Following an account of the history and current profile of his department, he suggests that “[t]he wiser plan is to realize and fill lacunae which have made themselves insistently felt within our local research—and to fill these with scholars of outstanding ability who would add powerfully to the sum of archaeological scholarship that can be concentrated usefully at Princeton.” Morey then describes in detail the positions he envisages:

We need … (1) a specialist in the later Middle Ages and the early Renaissance, a ‘Quattrocentist’ in short, whose preference for Italian or Northern Renaissance would be immaterial, provided he would bring to bear upon our work an outstanding competence in the period, and the critical acumen and ability to synthesize the diverse phenomena of the end of the Middle Ages. (2) For our work in the illustration and illumination of manuscripts, we need the constant help of a palaeographer of demonstrated authority. (3) … our classical archaeologists are field-workers and likely so to continue. The research personnel at home could be profitably enlarged by (a) a specialist in Greek architecture (with special reference to the excavation of the Athenian Agora), and (b) by another scholar of outstanding competence in Greek epigraphy…. (4) A Near Eastern archaeologist with a special competence in Islamic art. The recent development of Islamic literature and history within the Department of Oriental Languages and Literatures would provide such a scholar with the necessary assistance in the philological and historical aspects of his subject; his presence in the archaeological group would be immensely helpful, not only for the interpretation of the finds at Antioch, but for the constantly recurring problems of Islamic influence which often baffle the students of the mediaeval art of Europe.

Next, Morey provides a list of scholars to be appointed to those positions:

---

19 Morey had developed those ideas in some more detail in a pamphlet that he had printed in 1931 at his own cost, *A Laboratory-Library*.

20 Stern (*A History*, pp. 265ff) suggests that the reason was Flexner’s need for a powerful counterweight to Veblen, who might otherwise have vetoed any appointment to the School of Humanistic Studies.

21 Letter from Morey to Flexner, April 9/10, 1934 (Director’s Office. General Files. Box 44. Morey, Charles Rufus 1931–1938). See also figures 6.1 through 6.6.
“Names present themselves immediately for some of these lacunae, not so readily for others. The most brilliant scholar in the late Middle Ages and early Renaissance that we know is Erwin Panofsky … He meets in every way desideratum no. 1, and as he seems to be available, this particular problem can be solved in a highly satisfactory way…. For our palaeographer, one would like to find a scholar combining high proficiency in both Greek and Latin palaeography, but such a genius does not, to our knowledge, exist…. For Latin palaeography one thinks at once of E. A. Lowe … the best of our American scholars in the field … his name would immediately associate itself in Princeton minds with desideratum 2. In the case of desideratum 3a in Classical Archaeology, the obvious person is Dinsmoor of Columbia … For 3b, Meritt of Johns Hopkins … is an outstanding epigraphist … As to an Islamic specialist, we would have no recommendation to make at present, since the search would have to be made, in view of the age of the outstanding scholars in this field, in the ranks of the younger generation. This need is in fact not so pressing as the foregoing, and could await an extended sifting of personalities in this country and particularly in Europe.”

Morey continues to list areas for which he desires research associates and assistants to be appointed: “(1) [A] research assistant for the Index of Christian Art,” for which he suggested Glanville Downey, “a brilliant young classicist in Princeton”; “(2) a young Byzantinist to take over certain unallocated portions of the project for the Corpus of the Old Testament Illustration in Greek Manuscripts,” for which he wished to have “Kurt Weitzmann, a pupil of Adolph Goldschmidt in Berlin” appointed; and lastly “a research assistant to help in the cataloging of the Museo Christiano of the Vatican Library,” a position for which he suggested “Dimitris Tselos, a Greek who was until recently an instructor in New York University; two or three other names might suggest themselves as alternatives to Tselos for this post.”

Lastly, Morey suggests that both groups, the department and the Institute, should be working in close vicinity to each other—similar to the successful arrangement of the mathematicians, who were all based in Fine Hall—which would entail that the Institute should fund an appropriate building on Princeton University’s campus as the art history department’s McCormick Hall would not suffice.

The blueprint character of Morey’s letter is confirmed by Flexner’s first appointments to the School of Humanistic Studies: while there is no indication that

---

22 To which should be added a “Memorandum on Immediate and Future Needs for Research in Art and Archaeology in the School of the Humanities of the Institute for Advanced Study” by Morey and Panofsky (Beatrice Stern research files. Vertical Files. Box 3. H). The memorandum is undated but was submitted most likely at the beginning of 1935 to Flexner. See also letter from Morey to Aydelotte, April 10, 1941 (Director’s Office. Frank Aydelotte files. Box 6. School of Humanistic Studies. Correspondence), which contains a report on the contribution of the School of Humanistic Studies since 1937.

23 See also the Director’s Report (Board of Trustees. Minutes of Regular Meeting of The Institute for Advanced Study. January 24, 1938): “The experiment in the field of mathemat-
Flexner ever approached William Bell Dinsmoor (b. 1886, d. 1973), since 1934 the chairman of the Department of Fine Arts at Columbia University, the Byzantinist Kurt Weitzmann (b. 1904, d. 1993), who also mastered Syriac and Arabic materials, was the first one to be appointed in 1935 to the position of Field Medievalist. The precise nature of his appointment at the Institute was disputed during Frank Aydelotte’s directorship (1939–1947)—while Weitzmann, Panofsky, and apparently also Flexner and Morey had understood the appointment to be a permanent one, this had never been confirmed by the Trustees, as Aydelotte pointed out in 1942. The dispute was eventually solved, and in addition to this, Princeton University offered Weitzmann in 1945 a half-time professorship. Weitzmann held a joint app-
pointment until his retirement in 1972, with the Institute and Princeton University each paying half his salary, an arrangement that allowed Weitzmann to split his time between research and teaching. The appointments of Erwin Panofsky (b. 1892, d. 1968) and Benjamin D. Meritt (b. 1899, d. 1989) were approved by the Board of Trustees on April 22, 1935, followed by the appointment of Elias A. Lowe (b. 1879, d. 1969), which was approved on April 13, 1936.

For the field of Near Eastern and Islamic archaeology, an opportunity for an appointment arose when Ernst Herzfeld (b. 1879, d. 1948), one of the leading Near Eastern archaeologists and Islamicists at the time, was dismissed in September 1935 from his position as full professor and director of the Seminar for Oriental Countries and Antiquities at the University of Berlin, Germany, which he had held since 1920—he was henceforth Morey’s preferred candidate for the position at the Institute, and Flexner seemed satisfied with this choice. Herzfeld, who had earned his
doctorate in 1907 in Berlin, followed by the venia legendi in 1909, covered an enormous range in his scholarly oeuvre:

A list of his main fields of interest reads like the disciplines of a school of Oriental studies with an extensive faculty: historical geography and topography of the Near East; the stone age, copper age, and bronze age of Iraq and Iran; Hittite, Babylonian, and Assyrian civilizations; Achaemenid art, and the glory of Persepolis; the prophet Zarathustra; the problems of Parthian and Sasanian archeology; the genesis of Muslim art; trends in the development of Islamic architecture; the epigraphic and numismatic documents of Achaemenid, Sasanian, and Muslim periods; the many intricacies of Near Eastern iconography—all these and many others were his fields of research and in all of them his keen and resourceful mind made new and vital contributions.28

Since 1903 Herzfeld had participated in some sixteen excavations and field expeditions. In April 1931 he was named field director for the Persepolis excavations, under the sponsorship of the Oriental Institute in Chicago. In December 1934 he was dismissed from this position and was forced to leave Iran, first to England (December 1934 through 1936), from where he continued to the United States.

Around the same time, another distinguished Near Eastern scholar was brought to Flexner’s attention by Cyrus Adler (b. 1863, d. 1940), the chancellor of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America and the president of Dropsie College,29 and by William F. Albright (b. 1891, d. 1971), the W. W. Spence Professor of Semitic Languages at Johns Hopkins and director of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem,30 namely, the Assyrologist Julius Lewy (b. 1895, d. 1963), who until his dismissal in the summer of 1935 had occupied the chair for Semitic languages in Gießen, Germany.31 While Flexner seemed positively impressed by Lewy’s profile and may have seriously considered appointing him to the position in Near Eastern studies, Morey made it clear that only Herzfeld met the requirements he had defined earlier on for the position.32 On January 28, 1936, Flexner signed

---


32 Letter from Morey to Flexner, May 9, 1935 (Director’s Office. School files. Schools of Economics and Politics/Humanistic Studies. Box 1. Humanistic Studies. General Adminis-
Herzfeld’s letter of appointment to a faculty position in the School of Humanistic Studies from July 1, 1936 onwards, which Herzfeld accepted with a letter dated February 9, 1936.  

The relations between Morey and Herzfeld were tense from the outset—Morey already states in his aforementioned letter to Flexner concerning Lewy when discussing Herzfeld that “I have every reason to believe that he is a difficult person to get on with.” Morey had also hoped that Herzfeld would install his extensive collection of books and artefacts in McCormick Hall, where the Department of Art and Archaeology had its base, but Herzfeld disagreed—he wanted access to his material day and night and made the Institute rent an apartment for his library at 10 Bayard Lane, in the same building in which Herzfeld and his sister lived. Morey and Flexner also exchanged letters during March 1937 about Herzfeld—Morey evidently found Herzfeld to be less cooperative than was the case with Panofsky, especially since Herzfeld was less inclined to train Princeton’s graduate students than Morey had initially planned.  

33 Flexner apparently pursued the possibility of appointing Lewy again a few months later (Herzfeld had already been named to the position at this stage), when Lewy was recommended to him by yet another Assyrologist, François Thureau-Dangin (b. 1872, d. 1944). This is suggested by a letter from Panofsky to Flexner, April 1, 1936 (Director’s Office. Aydelotte Files. Box 6. Panofsky, Erwin), in which the former gives his opinion on Lewy, at Flexner’s request: “I am returning Monsieur Thureau-Dangin’s letter which you were kind enough to send to me. Professor Lewy is, of course, known to me by reputation, but as his field is utterly outside of my own, I feel that only an Orientalist would be entitled to comment on Monsieur Thureau-Dangin’s suggestion. I should think that it should be referred to Mr. Hitti and particularly to Professor Herzfeld whose field of study is more closely related to that of Professor Lewy and who may also know him personally.”

34 See above, n. 32.

35 Stern, A History, pp. 286–287. The majority of Herzfeld’s scientific materials, objects and antiquities, sketches and papers were donated after his death to the Metropolitan Museum and the Smithsonian Institute. See “The Ernst Herzfeld Papers” and “Ernst Herzfeld Papers 1899–1962.” See also Ettinghausen, “Ernst Herzfeld,” pp. 609–614 for more details.

36 Letter from Flexner to Morey, March 22, 1937; letter from Morey to Flexner, March 24, 1937; letter from Flexner to Morey, March 31, 1937 (Director’s Office. General Files. Box 44. Morey, Charles Rufus. 1931–1938); see also the contrast between Herzfeld and Panofsky in the following letter from Morey to Aydelotte, April 10, 1941 (Director’s Office. Frank
Although the initial profile of the School of Humanistic Studies had largely been defined by Morey rather than Flexner, the latter did not consider its structure to be set in stone. During the meeting of the Board of Trustees that led to the appointments of Meritt and Panofsky (April 22, 1935), Flexner repeated his vision of flexibility for the future: “The subjects which may eventually be included in a school of humanistic studies are varied and extensive. They include language, literature, art, history, philosophy, and perhaps other subjects. I do not suppose that at any one time all subjects will be represented, but, in so far as the Institute possesses the means, if any scholar of preeminent importance emerges in any one of these fields, he could be fitly included in the membership of the School of Humanistic Studies. Upon his retirement his place need not be filled unless someone of equal eminence can be secured.” The first appointment in the school Flexner made independently of Morey was the classical archaeologist Hetty Goldman (b. 1881, d. 1972), who served on the faculty of the School of Humanistic Studies from 1936 until her retirement in 1947. Though trained as a classical archaeologist, Goldman was nonetheless concerned with Near Eastern studies as a result of her excavations at Tarsus in Anatolia, which also brought to light Islamic materials.

During its first decade, the Institute hosted a number of scholars in Near and Middle Eastern studies among its members. One of the first members in the School of Humanistic Studies was Richard Francis Strong Starr (b. 1900, d. 1994), who had been recommended to Erwin Panofsky by his colleagues Paul J. Sachs (b. 1878, d. 1960).
1965) and Edward W. Forbes (b. 1873, d. 1969) of the Fogg Art Museum at Harvard University, where Starr held a fellowship during the years 1929 through 1935. Panofsky, in turn, had discussed the matter first with Morey and Hitti at Princeton University before approaching Flexner in September 1935.38 Starr, who had been educated at Cornell University (BS, 1924), was granted a membership in the School of Humanistic Studies from 1935 through 1939 and again during the academic year 1940–1941. Prior to joining the Institute he had participated as archaeological assistant (1927–1929) and then director (1929–1931) in the Harvard-American School of Oriental Research expedition at the ancient Assyrian Mesopotamian city of Nuzi and in various capacities in several other excavations in 1935. While it is difficult to assess the relations between Herzfeld and Starr, the latter was valued by Morey and Hitti at Princeton University, where he completed his MA in 1937 and, in 1938, his PhD with a dissertation entitled “A Comparative Study of the Painted Designs on the Harappan Pottery of the Indus Valley.” Beyond his studies, Starr completed two publications that were based on his earlier excavations, *Excavations and Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions of Serabit El-Khadem* (1936) and *Nuzi, Reports of the Excavations at Yorgan Tepe near Kirkuk, Iraq* (1937–1939). The Institute also subsidized the publication of Starr’s doctoral dissertation, which was published in 1941 under the title *Indus Valley Painted Pottery: A Comparative Study of the Designs on the Painted Wares of the Harappa Culture* by Princeton University Press as volume 8 of the Princeton Oriental Texts series.39 World War II put an end to his scholarly career as an archaeologist.40

Donald Newton Wilber (b. 1907, d. 1997) was also among the first members in the School of Humanistic Studies. Wilber was a graduate of Princeton University, where he had studied archaeology and Arabic. At Morey’s suggestion, he held a membership at the Institute from 1935 through 1939. In a letter dated February 18, 1939, Flexner made it clear to Wilber that the Institute would not extend his membership for yet another year.41 After World War II, in 1949, Wilber earned a PhD


39 See also *The Institute for Advanced Study: Publications of Members, 1930–1954*, pp. 170–171. The study was severely criticized by Donald E. McCown; see his review in *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature* 58 (1941), pp. 421–426.

40 For a biographical sketch, see Owen, “R. F. S. Starr, 1900–1994.”

41 The relations between Wilber and the Institute must have reached a low point by then. See letter from Flexner to Wilber, February 18, 1939 (Director’s Office. Member Files. Box 148): “After talking with the men with whom you have been associated I am inclined to think that you should do one of two things: (1) accept a teaching post, or (2) if you wish to devote yourself to research, strengthen your acquaintance with languages, ancient and modern, and with architecture if that is the field in which you propose to be active.” Wilber responded on July 30, 1939 (Director’s Office. Member Files. Box 148), evidently in an effort to end his relation with the Institute on a somewhat positive note. It is remarkable, in this context, that in his 1949 dissertation, which he submitted to Princeton University, neither the Institute nor any of its representatives at the time are named (such as Herzfeld, for example). In his
with his doctoral dissertation “The Architecture of Islamic Iran: The Il Khānid Period” and eventually joined the CIA until his retirement in 1970. He was also a prolific writer and is particularly known for his book *Iran, Past and Present*, which was first published in 1948 and repeatedly revised and republished over the decades.

Edward Jabra Jurji (b. 1907, d. 1990), who hailed from Latakia, in Syria, and who was a graduate student at Princeton University, was introduced in March 1936 to Flexner by Hitti, his doctoral advisor. In his letter Hitti stated that “Mr. Jurji is anxious to become a member of your Institute and to take advantage of the presence of Professor Herzfeld next year…. He is ready to put his services at the disposal of Professor Herzfeld and any other member of your faculty who may need them.” Jurji completed his doctoral dissertation in 1936; it was published in 1938 as volume 4 in the Princeton Oriental Texts series under the title *Illumination in Islamic Mysticism*. Flexner offered him a grant for the academic year 1936–1937 and extended it for another year (1937–1938). In addition to Herzfeld, for whom Jurji proved useful as a research assistant, Mitrany of the School of Economics and Poli-

1939 letter to Flexner he writes: “These last days I have been thinking that some kind of a report of my most recent activities might be of some interest to you…. The years I was fortunate enough to be associated with The Institute for Advanced Study have proven of infinite value to me. I have worked not only upon certain specific problems which may in themselves be relatively unimportant, but I have been able to devote some time towards developing a literary style. As far as the type of work I have been doing there was no person in the entire world with whom association could have been so valuable as with Professor Herzfeld. I still feel very strongly that the best solution for me would be a continued association with him. I do hope, if no other solution is possible, to be able to live in Princeton, although I shall actually be giving courses in New York, and hence keep in close touch with him.”

42 Letter from Hitti to Flexner, March 31, 1936 (Director’s Office. Member files. Box 69. Jurji, Edward J.).

43 During the 1930s, Jurji also regularly contributed to the journal *The Syrian World*, and this in addition to his regular publications in several Arabic newspapers and journals. See, e.g., his “Intellectual Aggression,” which is preceded by the following editorial comment: “The *SYRIAN WORLD* is privileged to publish another article by the promising Syrian scholar, now on Prof. P. K. Hitti’s staff at the summer ‘Arabic and Islamic Seminar of Princeton University.’ In this article, which remarkably expresses one of the fundamental objectives of our publication, Mr. Jurji expounds the type of cultural expression our Syrian people can logically give as a contribution to the composite of the United States.” Further, Jurji coauthored with Hitti a history of the Arabs, *Tārīkh al-ʿarab* (Beirut 1949–1951), basically a translation of Hitti’s *History of the Arabs* that had been first published in 1943 (with repeated revised editions later on). See also *The Institute for Advanced Study: Publications of Members, 1930–1954*, p. 98.

44 Letter from Flexner to Hitti, April 30, 1936 (Director’s Office. Member files. Box 69. Jurji, Edward J.).

45 Letter from Bailey to Jurji, April 20, 1937 (Director’s Office. Member files. Box 69. Jurji, Edward J.)
tics was also interested in Jurji and explored at some point the possibility of extending his membership for yet another year to do some systematic work in the field of Islamic political theory. Jurji reapplied for a membership with the School of Economics and Politics in early 1939. Though the application was unsuccessful, Mitrany’s brief but positive comments on the significance of the proposed project are noteworthy, as is a detailed statement by Mitrany’s colleague Warren reflecting on how important it would be to study the Islamic world. Jurji eventually continued

---

46 Letter from Mitrany to Flexner, May 6, 1938; letter from Flexner to Mitrany, May 7, 1938 (Director’s Office. Faculty Files. Box 23. Mitrany, David 1936–1939). See also letter from Hitti to Flexner, May 6, 1938 (Director’s Office. Member files. Box 69. Jurji, Edward J.): “… especially in view of the fact that both Prof. Herzfeld and Prof. Mitrani [sic], to whose scholarly service he devoted practically all his time since graduating from our Department, …”, memorandum to Flexner from Mitrany, April 11, 1939 (Director’s Office. Member files. Box 69. Jurji, Edward J.).

47 Letter from Mitrany to Flexner, April 19, 1939 (Director’s Office. Member files. Box 69. Jurji, Edward J.).

48 Memorandum from Warren to Flexner re. Jurji, April 20/26, 1939 (Director’s Office. Member files. Box 69. Jurji, Edward J.): “… I would … like to concur with Dr. Mitrany’s general observation that virtually what we call the ‘whole’ subject of political theory is that theory traceable through the history of Western Europe—a single stream with few tributaries. I am persuaded that a study of Islamic political and social philosophy by a competent person would widen the field. It might even have actual utilitarian value. The Islamic state is in theory a theocracy. But the Islamic states inherited from pre-Islamic times non-assimilable minorities. In handling the minorities, it borrowed from the Roman theory, the pre-Roman Ptolemaic theories, and the pre-Alexandrian Persian theory, which doubtless was old stuff to Darius. On the whole, it was not a bad record. Compared with the record of Western Europe (and that goes for England-Ireland) it was a brilliant record. This is the only phase of Islamic social and political theory with which I am acquainted; but I would infer that if they could do so well in a field that has always been difficult for Western Europeans, it is quite imaginable that they had some other good ideas. I might add that the idea of religious tolerance was accepted as a matter of course in Islamic political theory at a time when it had almost no status in European thinking. In 1492, when Ferdinand was providing Hitler with his model, the Turkish Empire opened its ports without quotas to the Jewish refugees—and they fitted easily into the Islamic political and social structure. We laugh at the ancients because they pictured the world as a narrow belt of land about the Mediterranean, with the desert on the south and the forests on the north, and the Ocean Stream flowing all around. But that is still the cosmography of the Social Science. To them all history and society and science are the history and society and science of the Western European peninsula; and in spite of the fact that a majority of the civilized world has always lived outside of this little orbit, the record of those people is not history or society or science. It is just outer darkness. Three considerations suggest themselves: (1) there is no urgency about this field. But when one considers its magnitude and the prospective rapid evolution of the Islamic World in the next two decades, there is a time element to be considered in formulating a general attitude toward Islamic studies …”
to study theology at the Princeton Theological Seminary, 1939–1942, and he was ordained in May 1941. From 1942 he embarked upon an academic career at the Princeton Theological Seminary until his retirement in 1977.49

Harold Walter Glidden (b. 1910, d. 1990) was as student of Hitti (Arabic philology) and he completed in 1937 his PhD dissertation, entitled “A Comparative Study of the Kay Kawus, Nimrod and Alexander Ascensions in Oriental Literature and Art.” Glidden was granted a membership during the academic year 1937–1938, after which he moved to Jerusalem, where he was granted a one-year fellowship at the American School of Oriental Research.50 Glidden as well as Starr were the most promising students in Morey’s eyes at the time, and he had hoped that Herzfeld’s appointment would prove beneficial for their development as scholars.51

The historian of Islamic art Richard Ettinghausen (b. 1906, d. 1979), who in 1931 had obtained a PhD at Frankfurt University for a dissertation entitled “Antike Völker im Koran” (published 1934) and had then joined the staff of the Islamic section of the State Museum, Berlin, as a voluntary assistant, was forced in May 1933 to leave Germany.52 During the academic year 1937–1938 he held a membership at the Institute, and he was reappointed in 1938 for another year, but left in the summer of 1938 to take up an offer for a permanent position at the Uni-

49 His private papers are preserved as the Edward J. Jurji Manuscript Collection. Special Collections, Princeton Theological Seminary Library. See http://manuscripts.ptsem.edu/collection/143.


51 See Morey and Panofsky’s “Memorandum on Immediate and Future Needs for Research in Art and Archaeology in the School of the Humanities of the Institute for Advanced Study” (Beatrice Stern research files. Vertical Files. Box 3. H): “The appointment of Dr. Herzfeld has become more urgent by reason of the active interest in the appointment of an Islamic archaeologist which is being manifested by the very effective group of scholars constituting the Department of Oriental Languages and Literatures in Princeton. The graduate students in this department are not only growing significant in number but have this year developed a specific trend toward Islamic archaeology. As a matter of fact we have on the ground at the present two men, Glidden and Starr, who are orienting themselves in this direction without any Islamic archaeologist within our group to guide their future development. Of these men, Starr is already on the Institute’s rolls. Glidden is probably the most brilliant student in Arabic philology that Professor Hitti has had. We should like very much to see this youth trained for a period of years by a competent master, with a view to producing at the end of that time an Islamic archaeologist of the Herzfeld type, with the sound philological training which Glidden already possesses and with the training in method and command of the material of Islamic archaeology which can be imparted by Herzfeld. For this reason it seems to us highly desirable that some means be found to bring Herzfeld to Princeton on a basis that would insure a seminar in Islamic Archaeology for the benefit of our graduate students and to give him Glidden as his research assistant and pupil.”

52 Hanisch and Schönig, Ausgrenzte Kompetenz, p. 19.
During his time at the Institute, Ettinghausen became a close friend of Herzfeld, and the two scholars continued their close relation and mutual support even after Ettinghausen left Princeton in 1938.

George C. Miles (b. 1904, d. 1975) had studied Oriental languages and literature and held three degrees from Princeton University, an AB from 1926, an MA from 1930, and a PhD from 1937. His doctoral dissertation was titled “The Numismatic History of Rayy.” Prior to completing his thesis he had worked as a teacher at Robert College, Istanbul (1926–1929 and 1931–1933), as an advisor to the Turkish government in language teaching (1933), as the epigraphist of the Rayy expedition of the University Museum, Philadelphia, and Boston Museum of Fine Arts (1934), as assistant field director of the Rayy expedition (1935–1937), and as a research assistant at the American Numismatic Society, New York (1937–1938). He was granted a membership in the School of Humanistic Studies for the academic year 1938–1939, during which he collaborated closely with Herzfeld. The two also remained close friends after Miles’s departure from Princeton. Miles published a list of Herzfeld’s publications in 1940 (with an addendum in 1952), and he curated a volume in memory of Herzfeld, which was published, with financial support from the Institute, in 1952.

Florence E. Day (b. 1908) was recommended to Flexner by both Goldman and Ettinghausen as a highly qualified Arabist and specialist for Islamic archaeology, inscriptions, textiles, and ceramics. Day had already collaborated with Goldman in Tarsus in 1936 when she made a preliminary study of the Islamic material from the excavation. Goldman was eager to have her at the Institute to continue her work on a catalogue of the Islamic pottery of Tarsus. As was the case with most members during the early days of the School of Humanistic Studies, she was still a PhD candidate when she was appointed to a one-year membership during the academic year 1938–1939. She was reappointed again in 1940 for a few months, and in the same year she successfully defended her PhD dissertation, entitled “Mesopotamian Pottery: Parthian, Sasanian, and Early Islamic,” at the University of Michigan. Having

53 For the publications resulting from his stay at the Institute, see The Institute for Advanced Study: Publications of Members, 1930–1954, p. 65.
55 Director’s Office. Member Files. Box 96. Miles, George C. For the publications resulting from his stay at the Institute, see The Institute for Advanced Study: Publications of Members, 1930–1954, pp. 123–124.
57 Her first publication was Day, “Islamic Finds at Tarsus.” See also The Institute for Advanced Study: Publications of Members, 1930–1954, p. 47.
58 See also The Princeton Alumni Weekly 39, no. 2 (October 7, 1938), p. 38.
59 Her doctoral advisor was Mehmet Ağa-Oğlu (b. 1896, d. 1949). On him, see Simavi, “Mehmet Ağa-Oğlu.” See also University of Michigan Official Publication, vol. 42 no. 56 (January
worked for some years as assistant curator of Islamic arts at the Metropolitan Museum in New York, Day returned to the Institute in 1956 to work again for two years as a research assistant to Hetty Goldman. In 1958 Day was awarded a Guggenheim fellowship.

In April 1938, Franklin Edgerton (b. 1885, d. 1963), since 1926 Salisbury Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology at Yale University, approached Flexner, suggesting that the Institute provide support for the Iranologist Wilhelm Geiger (b. 1856, d. 1943) and for the Austrian Paul Maximilian Tedesco (b. 1898, d. 1980), a specialist in Indic, Iranian, and Indo-European linguistics who as a Jew had been denied an academic position in Vienna. Flexner rejected Geiger, possibly in view of his advanced age, but reacted favorably to Tedesco, of whom Herzfeld had also approved. Thanks to a grant from the Emergency Committee in Aid of

11, 1941): The President’s Report for 1939-1940, p. 288: “In connection with the work of the Research Seminary, it may be of interest to note that the first doctorate conferred for work in Islamic art was granted to Miss Florence E. Day at the Commencement in June.” I thank Margaret Graves for the 1941 reference.

60 “Directory of Staff, Faculty, and Members of the Institute for Advanced Study for the Academic Year 1956–1957”; “Directory of Staff, Faculty, and Members … 1957–1958.” See also letter from Day to Oppenheimer, November 25, 1956 (Director’s Office: Faculty Files. Box 16. Goldman, Hetty-Tarsus), in which she mentions George Sarton (b. 1884, d. 1956) as having been her principal mentor until his death some months before. See also her “Plans for Research,” dated October 1957 (Director’s Office. Member Files. Box 27. Day, Florence E.), with which she applied for a reappointment for the academic year 1958–1959, which was apparently not granted.

61 See https://www.gf.org/fellows/all-fellows/florence-ely-day/. Day’s papers and objects (ceramics, glass, and metal) were bequeathed to Brown University. See Marilyn Jenkins-Madina’s posting to H-ISLAMART (August 28, 2006) at http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trxy=vx&list=h-islamart&month=0608&week=e&msg=RWuZsXf9g7U4n08 CHFk7HQ&user=&pw=. Some of these objects are nowadays held by the RISD Museum, Providence; see, e.g., https://risdmuseum.org/art_design/objects/9423_towel_fragment?context=18&type=collections.

62 On him, see Schlerath, “Geiger, Wilhelm.”

63 Letter from Edgerton to Flexner, April 26, 1938 (Director’s Office. Member Files. Box 137. Tedesco, Paul M.).

64 Letter from Flexner to Edgerton, May 2, 1938. See also letter from Herzfeld to Flexner, May 6, 1938, containing a very positive assessment of Tedesco’s scholarship (Director’s Office. Member Files. Box 137. Tedesco, Paul M.). Tedesco in fact supported Herzfeld when the latter wrote his Zoroaster and His World, which was published in 1947. See letter from Herzfeld to Aydelotte, April 18, 1941 (Director’s Office. Frank Aydelotte files. Box 6. School of Humanistic studies. Correspondence): “I have further prepared for publication the following volumes: I. Zoroastrian Studies. This is a large book devoted to an analysis and discussion of all the historical and geographical material contained in the religious books and inscriptions of the Zoroastrians. The preliminary work is philological, and in this I have had the most valuable help of Dr. Paul Tedesco. The new interpretation of many words and pas-
Displaced German Scholars, a formal offer for a one-year membership was sent to Tedesco on July 8, 1938. In view of the deteriorating situation in Europe, Flexner approached various donors to secure funding for Tedesco during the war years, and his membership was annually renewed. In 1941–1942, Tedesco moved to the Department of Linguistics at Yale, but the Institute continued to pay his stipend over the next few years. For the academic year 1944–1945, a compromise was reached, with Yale University and the Institute each carrying half of the costs. From 1946 onwards, Tedesco was fully employed by Yale University, where he remained until his retirement in 1966.\textsuperscript{65}

Cyrus Herzl Gordon (b. 1908, d. 2001), a specialist of Hebrew and other Semitic languages, had earned his PhD with a dissertation submitted in 1930 to the University of Pennsylvania and entitled “Rabbinic Exegesis in the Vulgate of Proverbs.” Gordon held a membership in the School of Humanistic Studies during the academic years 1939–1940 and 1941–1942, working primarily on Ugaritic grammar and literature.\textsuperscript{66} He reapplied later twice, both times unsuccessfully, for the academic year 1951–1952 with a project entitled “Comparative Grammar of the Syro-Aramaic Dialects,” and for the academic year 1962–1963.\textsuperscript{67}

James Henry Breasted, Jr., who, like his (more famous) father, James Henry Breasted (b. 1865, d. 1935), was a Near Eastern archaeologist and Egyptologist and who had completed 1937 an MA at the University of Chicago with a dissertation entitled “The Development of the Human Figure in the Statuary of the Eighteenth Dynasty in Egypt,” contacted the Institute’s director Frank Aydelotte in March 1939 about the possibility of a membership in the School of Humanistic Studies. Although Morey’s assessment of him was lukewarm,\textsuperscript{68} Breasted was granted a stipendiary membership (1939–1940), which was extended for another year (1940–1941) on
a nonstipendiary basis. During his time at the Institute, Breasted worked on his
study “Egyptian Servant Statues,” which he eventually submitted to the University
of Chicago as his PhD dissertation and which was later published (Pantheon Books,
1948).69 Towards the end of World War II, Breasted again contacted Aydelotte, of-
fering himself for a position at the Institute, a request that was declined.

There were other scholars in Near Eastern and Islamic studies, some promi-
nent and some less prominent, who turned to the Institute during the years of Herz-
feld’s term as permanent faculty in the School of Humanistic Studies, either directly
or through colleagues at either Princeton University or other US universities, inquir-
ing about the possibility of being appointed, on a temporary basis or a permanent
one.

Having refused the oath of allegiance to fascism on January 1, 1932, the Italian
Semitist Giorgio Levi Della Vida (b. 1886, d. 1967) was dismissed from his position
as professor of Semitics at the University of Rome and henceforth lived as a private
scholar. After 1932 he was named an associate at the Vatican Library in order to
prepare a catalogue of the library’s collection of Arabic manuscripts, which was pub-
lished in 1935. On July 4, 1936, Levi Della Vida approached in writing “The Secret-
ary” of the Institute for Advanced Study, inquiring whether the Institute “would
take some interest into the plan I have formed of delivering, in the winter session
1936–1937, some lectures on Arabic and Semitic subjects in different Universities
and Scientific Institutes in the U.S.A.”. Levi Della Vida participated in Princeton in
one of Hitti’s conferences and apparently also met Flexner during that visit. Levi
Della Vida approached Flexner again in writing on May 24, 1938, to inquire about
the possibility of spending some more time at the Institute to teach and on Septem-
ber 1 with the question, “I venture to ask you again if you do not see any way by
which I might settle in America.” Flexner responded on January 21, 1939, asserting
to him that he was actively trying to get him into the United States, and indeed, on
January 1 of the same year, Flexner had written to Stephen P. Duggan (b. 1850, d.
1950), executive director of the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German
Scholars, asking for support for Levi Della Vida. By the end of the month, however,
on January 30, Flexner informed the committee that it should do nothing about Levi
Della Vida for the time being. On June 10, 1939, Levi Della Vida informed Flexner
that he had been appointed visiting professor in Semitics at the University of Penn-
sylvania, beginning with the fall term.70 Two years later, on September 9, 1941, Levi
Della Vida approached Panofsky to inquire about the possibility of getting a perm a-
nent appointment to the Institute. Panofsky must have known Levi Della Vida well
since the summer of 1935, when he sojourned in Rome working in the Vatican Li-
brary.71 Panofsky appreciated Levi Della Vida’s scholarship, as is evident from the

69 See also The Institute for Advanced Study: Publications of Members, 1930–1954, p. 30.
70 See Director’s Office. General Files. Box 39. Levi Della Vida, G.
71 Board of Trustees. Minutes of Regular Meeting of the Institute for Advanced Study. Oc-
tober 14, 1935.
appreciative assessment he submitted to Aydelotte.72 Aydelotte in turn consulted Herzfeld as the faculty closest to Levi Della Vida’s field, adding the caveat, “I see no possibility of our making a place for Levi Della Vida at the present moment …”.73 Herzfeld’s response is not documented, but on October 28, 1941, Aydelotte informed Levi Della Vida that there were no funds to consider his appointment.74

NEAR EASTERN ARCHAEOLOGY AT THE THE SCHOOL OF HISTORICAL STUDIES, 1949 THROUGH 1972

Following Herzfeld’s retirement in 1944, the faculty of the School of Humanistic Studies nominated the aforementioned biblical archaeologist William F. Albright, the W. W. Spence Professor of Semitic Languages at Johns Hopkins University,75 as Herzfeld’s successor. The nomination was eventually tabled;76 the field of Near

72 Letter from Panofsky to Aydelotte, September 18, 1941 (Director’s Office. Aydelotte File. Box 6. Oppen–Z. Dr. Aydelotte Correspondence School of Humanities Studies): “Yesterday I received the enclosed letter from Professor Giorgio Levi Della Vida, together with a pamphlet, likewise enclosed, which he asked me to present to you. To be the recipient of this letter is both an honor and somewhat embarrassing for me. Levi Della Vida, whom I met years ago while working in the Vatican Library and have seen again two or three times in this country, is, in my opinion, one of the great humanistic scholars of the age. I cannot, of course, pass judgment on his work from the point of view of the specialist, but the fact that he was Professor of Semitics at the University of Rome and Director of the oriental school in that city seems to bear witness to the fact that his work has been recognized by his fellow orientalists. I personally can only say that I have never met a man so widely read in all literatures, so proficient in all dead and living languages, and so impeccable as a person as Levi Della Vida. He speaks French, German, Spanish and English like a native, and his general humanistic erudition is something unique. The fact that he resigned his post in Rome as early as 1931 when antisemitism was absolutely unknown in Italy merely because he profoundly disagreed with the principle of Fascism, and that he was later hospitably received and personally befriended by Pope Pius XI may also be adduced as proof of his importance and integrity. As he has, in addition, great personal charm and natural dignity, I do believe that there could not be a more splendid addition to our permanent faculty than Mr. Della Vida. On the other hand, I feel that the person who should be consulted in this matter is Dr. Herzfeld—respectfully referred to in Della Vida’s letter—rather than myself, and I hesitate to approach you without having spoken to him …”


75 On him, see Running and Freedman, William Foxwell Albright.

76 Letter from the humanistic faculty to Aydelotte, May 3, 1945, together with a letter from Nelson Glueck to Goldman, April 15, 1945, containing a positive assessment of Albright’s scholarship (Director’s Office. Aydelotte File. Box 6. Oppen–Z. Dr. Aydelotte Correspondence School of Humanities Studies). Initially, the faculty of all schools were asked in April
Eastern archaeology was discontinued in the School of Humanistic Studies for the time being, and the overall profile of the school, which in 1949 was renamed the School of Historical Studies, gradually shifted towards a more eurocentric orientation. The first appointment after World War II (1947) was the (Greek) archaeologist Homer A. Thompson (b. 1906, d. 2000), followed in 1948 by Harold F. Cherniss (b. 1904, d. 1987), a specialist in Greek philosophy. Additional appointments were made in 1951 in two entirely new fields, modern history and medieval European history, with Ernest Llewellyn Woodward (b. 1890, d. 1971) and Ernst Kantorowicz (b. 1895, d. 1963). It is noteworthy that Kantorowicz had acquired some basic knowledge of Arabic, which he had studied over two terms (summer 1920 and winter 1920–1921) in Heidelberg, and that he had written his doctoral dissertation on a topic of Islamic economic history before turning his attention to European medieval history, and it was precisely his transcending the borders of a conventional medieval historian that was highlighted by the faculty of the School of Historical Studies when they recommended him for an appointment:

His work and interests … transcend the field of mediaeval history as commonly defined in time and space and in subject-matter and method. In time they range from the later phases of classical antiquity to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; in space they embrace both western Europe and the Byzantine and Islamic East; in subject-matter and method they treat complicated problems of many facets by viewing them from all the various angles from which his familiarity with widely

1945 to nominate two candidates to be appointed. Thereupon the School of Humanistic Studies proposed three names: William F. Albright, the American art historian Alfred H. Barr (b. 1902, d. 1981), and the classical archaeologist Oscar Broneer (b. 1894, d. 1992). Aydelotte reduced the list of nominations from each school to one, with Albright being the single candidate for humanistic studies, a nomination that was approved by the entire faculty of the Institute on May 22, 1945, but tabled by the Committee of Appointments that convened immediately following the faculty meeting. See Stern, *A History*, pp. 573–577.—Albright had already in 1931 been suggested as a suitable candidate for a faculty position to Flexner by Edward C. Armstrong (b. 1871, d. 1944), chairman of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) from 1929 to 1935. See letter from Armstrong to Flexner, March 3, 1931 (Director’s Office. General files. Box 32. Institute Organization. Flexner, correspondence regarding): “Oriental Languages. – William F. Albright, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, professor at the Johns Hopkins. Age 40. Center of interest, Semitics. You are already acquainted with him and his work. We have had opportunity to observe him closely in connection with his participation in activities of the Council, and have formed a highly favorable impression. From the standpoint of your preference not to break into the larger folds, he has the disadvantage of being in one of our larger institutions.”


different specialties and techniques enables him to illumine all of them. It is significant that even in his doctoral dissertation, “On the Nature of Moslem Artisans’ Corporations” (Heidelberg, 1921), Kantorowicz had already focused his attention upon the intersection of the two cultural spheres, the interaction of which was an important factor in determining the course of mediaeval history.\(^79\)

In 1955 Andrew Alföldi (b. 1895, d. 1981) was appointed to yet another position in classics, specializing in Roman history, and a year later George Kennan (b. 1904, d. 2005) was elected for the field of diplomatic history.

The overall profile of the school was now focused on classics and European history, and the faculty of the school preferred as a rule applicants working within the faculty’s purview.\(^80\) As a result, only few members were selected during the 1950s and 1960s with interest in Near Eastern studies—mention should be made of Walter B. Henning (b. 1908, d. 1967) in Iranian studies (1956),\(^81\) Richard Walzer (b. 1900, d. 1975) in the field of Greek and Islamic philosophy (1953–1954),\(^82\) Aziz Suryal Atiya (b. 1898, d. 1988) in Coptic and Islamic studies (1958–1959),\(^83\) Shlomo

---


\(^80\) See, for example, the decision of the faculty of the School of Humanistic Studies of December 13, 1945, not to invite Albert Schweitzer (b. 1875, d. 1965) as a member to the Institute, which was justified as follows: “… The question of inviting Dr. Albert Schweitzer, the distinguished authority on Bach and writer on philosophical subjects, to membership in the Institute, as suggested by Dr. Walter Lowrie, was brought up. The Faculty, while recognizing the great eminence of Dr. Schweitzer, felt that his work was in no way connected with that of the members of the School of Humanistic Studies and decided against inviting him….” (Records of the Office of the Director. Files by Schools: Economics and Politics/Humanistic Studies. Box 1 of 1. Humanistic Studies: Minutes of meetings. Minutes of the Meeting of the Faculty of School of Humanistic Studies, December 13, 1945).

\(^81\) It is noteworthy that Henning had published in 1951 a harsh critique of Herzfeld’s aforementioned 1947 monograph, *Zoroaster and His World*, entitled *Zoroaster, Politician or Witch-Doctor*, which was based on his Ratanbai Katrak lectures of 1949. On Henning, see Sundermann, “Henning, Walter Bruno”; Hanisch and Schönig, *Ausgegrenzte Kompetenz*, p. 37. Henning applied again unsuccessfully in October 1963 for membership during the first term of the academic year 1964–1965 to complete his dictionary of the Khwārazmian language.


Pines (b. 1908, d. 1990) in the area of Islamic and Greek philosophy (1958–1959 and again 1966–1967), and the Princeton scholar who had published on Arabic literature, James Kritzeck (1966, 1968). Kritzeck’s interest in a membership was different from those of his colleagues. He had been asked to become the founding director of Notre Dame University’s Institute for Advanced Religious Studies and he was eager to learn more about the functioning of the Institute in Princeton. He approached Robert Oppenheimer, the Institute’s director at the time, directly for this purpose, which seems to have facilitated the subsequent formal application process.

The continuity in Near Eastern studies in the School of Historical Studies during the 1950s and 1960s was further ensured through a number of long-term appointments. A quasi-long-term appointment was granted in 1954 to the Iranist and historian of religion Jean Pierre de Menasce (b. 1902, d. 1973) at the initiative of Oppenheimer (the costs for his membership were covered by the Director's Fund). De Menasce had already stayed at the Institute twice as a member in the School of Historical Studies, during the fall of 1951 and the fall of 1953, after which the offer was made. It was apparently for reasons of failing health that de Menasce never returned to the Institute. Moreover, in 1958, the possibility of appointing a

---

84 On him, see Hanisch und Schönig, *Ausgegrenzte Kompetenz*, p. 71; Ben-Shammai [et al.] (eds.), *Exchange and Transmission*; van Ess, *60 Years After*.
85 His PhD dissertation, submitted to Princeton University in 1954, was entitled “Peter the Venerable and Islam.”
86 Letter from Kritzeck to Oppenheimer, September 27, 1964 (Director’s Office. Member Files. Box 79. Kritzeck, James).
87 On him, see Gignoux, “Menasce, Jean Pierre de.”
88 Letter from Oppenheimer to de Menasce, March 18, 1954 (Director’s Office. Member files. Box 29. de Menasce, Jean Pierre): “Dear Jean, It is with pleasure that I can report to you that your colleagues here feel as I do about your return. We would like to have you know how welcome you will be whenever you can spend a term with us during the next years. We hope that that will be often and that you will regard yourself as close enough to the Institute to let us hear from you whenever an opportunity arises for your coming. There are not many people to whom we write without qualification and so informally; I am sure that you understand the many reasons which persuade us to write to you in these terms.” For the funding of de Menasce’s membership, see “Director’s Fund” (Board of Trustees records: Board-General. Box 1. Director’s Report Transcripts, Drafts). The Director’s Fund was created in 1947 to finance memberships for fields not represented among the Institute’s faculty, such as literature, philosophy, psychology, law, contemporary history, history of science, and biology. See Board of Trustees Records. Board-General. Box 1. Director’s Fund.
permanent professor in the field of Iranian studies was discussed in the school, but the faculty eventually decided not to pursue it further.\(^89\)

Another long-term appointment was granted to the Near Eastern archaeologist Henri Seyrig (b. 1895, d. 1973), who in 1929 was named director of antiquities under the French mandate in Syria and Lebanon,\(^90\) and from 1938 through 1941 served as director of the Institut français de Damas.\(^91\) From 1943 until the end of the war he served as cultural attaché with the Free French delegation in the United States.\(^92\) In 1945 he was appointed the founding director of the French institute of archaeology in Beirut, a position he retained until his retirement in 1967.\(^93\) It was probably around 1960 that a faculty position in the School of Historical Studies was offered to Seyrig. The offer coincided with his appointment as director of the museums of France, which prompted him to decline the Institute’s offer.\(^94\) A few years later, Sey-

---

\(^89\) See the minutes of the meeting of the School of Historical Studies, March 11, 1958 (Records of the School of Historical Studies. Meetings: Minutes and Related Documents. Box 6 of 15. 1949–1958): “6. The question of appointing a permanent professor in the field of Iranian Studies was discussed in connection with a letter written by Dr. S. H. Tagizadeh to the Director, in which he recommended that such a position be considered for Mr. W. B. Henning of London. The Faculty of the School recommended that no action be taken.”

\(^90\) It was in this capacity that Seyrig “had gotten Rufus Morey the concession to excavate in Antioch.” Weitzmann, *Sailing with Byzantium*, pp. 102, 314–315.


\(^92\) See *The New York Times* (January 25, 1973), https://timesmachine.nytimes.com/timesmachine/1973/01/25/90914164.pdf. During this time, Seyrig was in contact with many notable scholars and authors. The Paris archive of letters at the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (Fonds Louis Robert) holds 157 letters from Henri Seyrig to Louis Robert (b. 1904, d. 1985) of exceptional interest. For the Fonds Louis Robert, see http://www.aibl.fr/travaux/antiquite/article/le-fonds-louis-robert?lang=fr. I thank Glen W. Bowersock, who is in charge of the Fonds Louis Robert at Mme Robert’s request, for this information. For other correspondence from this period between Seyrig and Aimé Césaire (b. 1913, d. 2008), see Véron, “Césaire at the Crossroads in Haiti.”

\(^93\) For his life and his scholarship, see Duyrat [et al.] (eds.), *Henri Seyrig (1895–1973)*. For the larger context, see Chevalier, *La recherche archéologique*.

\(^94\) The nature of the proposed appointment is not entirely clear in the minutes of the meeting of the School of Historical Studies, October 27, 1960 (Records of the School of Historical Studies. Meetings: Minutes and Related Documents. Box 6 of 15. 1959–1966): “The Director reported that he had received a letter from M. Henri Seyrig regretfully withdrawing from membership because of his having assumed the office of Director of Museums of France. The Director was authorized, in writing to M. Seyrig, to express the hope that he might come to the Institute at some later time.” See also the minutes of the meeting of the School of Historical Studies, February 7, 1961 (Records of the School of Historical Studies. Meetings: Minutes and Related Documents. Box 6 of 15. 1959–1966): “Professor Alföldi proposed that Dr. Henri Seyrig be considered for a professorship. It was agreed, however, that his age (65) might make an arrangement along the lines of Dr. Koyré’s appointment more
Seyrig was open to a regular, long-term affiliation with the Institute, and as had been the case with de Menasce, the costs were not covered by the regular school budget. Oppenheimer invited Seyrig on December 11, 1962, to spend the spring term of 1963–1964 at the Institute, and on April 7, 1964, he was offered a membership in the School of Historical Studies for the second term of two academic years, 1964–1965 and 1965–1966, and the offer was periodically renewed. Seyrig declined the last offer dated January 20, 1970, for the first term of the academic year 1970–1971 due to his wife’s illness.

During his time at the Institute, it seems that Seyrig was instrumental in attracting other representatives of Near Eastern archaeology to the School of Historical Studies. Mention should be made of George C. Miles (member in 1961), at the time chief curator of the American Numismatic Society and working on Arab-Byzantine material, who had already been a member in the School of Humanistic Studies in 1937–1938, and of the two Turkish archaeologists Tahsin Özgüç (member in 1962–1963) and Nimet Özgüç (member in 1966–1967). The continuity of Near

suitable for Dr. Seyrig. Dr. Oppenheimer suggested that Professor Alföldi explore the question with Dr. Seyrig, leaving the form of appointment open.”

95 See “Memorandum Andrew Alföldi, April 7, 1964” (Director’s Office. Member Files. Box 127. Seyrig, Henri): “Some years ago we tried to win over Henri Seyrig as a permanent professor for our School. He declined our proposal with regrets, because he was then tied down in Paris as the director general of all the French museums. Since then he has given up his tiresome job and continues to direct the French Archaeological Institute in Beirut. He would be, however, now inclined to have some sort of permanent appointment at the Institute enabling him to return for the second semester of each year. He is now 68 years old but in full possession of his mental abilities and working power.”

96 The complete correspondence is found in Director’s Office. Members. Box 127. Seyrig, Henri. See also the minutes of the meeting of the School of Historical Studies, April 7, 1964 (Records of the School of Historical Studies. Meetings: Minutes and Related Documents): “Professor Alföldi read a statement in which he proposed that a special membership be given to Dr. Henri Seyrig. Dr. Oppenheimer and the members of the faculty were unanimous in supporting this suggestion. After discussion of arrangements and the period of the membership, it was agreed to invite Dr. Seyrig, who is now 68 years of age, to become a member of the School for the spring term of each of the next two academic years. Dr. Oppenheimer said that he would ask the Trustees to fund this membership separately so that the budget of the School would not be involved.”

97 As a result of his sojourn at the Institute he published The Islamic Coins and “Byzantium and the Arabs.”

98 Director’s Office. Member files. Box 105. Özgüç, Tahsin. On him, see Emre [et al.] (eds.), Anatolia and the Ancient Near East. In his case it was thanks to Hetty Goldman that he was granted a membership. See the minutes of the meeting of the School of Historical Studies, April 4, 1962 (Records of the School of Historical Studies. Meetings: Minutes and Related Documents. Box 6 of 15. 1959–1966): “3. The Executive Officer asked if the faculty wished to consider again the membership application from Dr. Tahsin Özgüç, saying that Miss
Eastern archaeology in the selection of members during the 1950s through the 1970s was further promoted by the archaeologist Homer A. Thompson, who served on the permanent faculty of the School of Historical Studies from 1947 through 1977. Thompson compiled in 1975 a report on archaeology at the Institute for Advanced Study, which contains a paragraph on the Near East:

Mindful of the field of interest of two of its earlier members [i.e., Ernst Herzfeld and Hetty Goldman, SCS], the Institute has continued to be hospitable towards scholars from the Near East or those working on Near Eastern archaeology. Among such have been Tahsin Özgüc (1962/63) and Nimet Özgüc (1966/67) (leading students of Anatolian prehistory), Jale Inan (an active Turkish excavator and student of classical sculpture) (1967/68, 1973/74), Kenan Erim (excavator of Aphrodisias) (1964), Kurt Bittel (excavator of Boğazköy and for long President of the German Archaeological Institute) (1963, 1973), Paul Bernard (Director of the French Archaeological Mission in Afghanistan) (1971, 72) and Ann B. Tilia (Archaeological Consultant, Persepolis) (1974/75). Between 1964 and 1969 the Institute was honored by repeated one-term visits of the late Henri Seyrig, dean of Near Eastern scholars, whose presence enriched the community both inside and outside the Institute.100

In 1972, the untimely death of another representative of Near Eastern archaeology while a member during the academic year 1972–1973, Daniel Schlumberger (b. 1904, d. 1972),101 who had also been a close friend of Henri Seyrig,102 provided Thompson with yet another occasion to reflect on the status of Near Eastern studies at the School of Historical Studies, past and present, during the memorial service

Goldman was eager to have Dr. Özgüc here. After discussion, it was agreed to extend membership for the academic year 1962/63 …”

99 School of Historical Studies records. Members, Faculty, Visitors: 1936–1992. Box 8. Özgüc, Nimet; and Director’s Office. Member files. Box 105. Özgüc, Nimet. As a result of her stay in Princeton, she published some of the results of her earlier excavations in Anatolia, namely, Kültepe mühr baskılarında Anadolu grubu and Kanis Karumu İb kati mührleri ve mühr baskılıları. On Nimet Özgüc and her scholarship, see also Mellink [et al.] (eds.), Aspects of Art and Iconography.


101 Director’s Office. Member files. Box 124. Schlumberger, Daniel. On Schlumberger and his scholarship, see his autobiographical work L’Ocident à la rencontre de l’Orient.

102 Seyrig had approached Thompson in July 1971 with the question “if there could be any chance of an invitation for a semester being extended to Daniel Schlumberger, the director of the French Arch. Inst. in Beirut? This is a quite informal question, but I understand that he would appreciate a few months exclusively devoted to his publications, about his excavations in Afghanistan.” (School of Historical Studies records. Members, Faculty, Visitors. 1936–1992. Box 9. Schlumberger, Daniel).
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for Schlumberger held on October 26, 1972, in the Institute’s lecture room in the West Building.103

OTTO NEUGEBAUER AND NEAR EASTERN MATHEMATICS AND ASTRONOMY

While the field of Near Eastern studies was, after 1944, temporarily relegated to the margins in the School of Humanistic (or, since 1949, Historical) Studies, it had a robust presence from 1945 onwards, though with an entirely different focus, in the School of Mathematics through Otto Neugebauer (b. 1899, d. 1990), who at an early stage of his career became intrigued by the history of mathematics. In 1922 he enrolled at the University of Göttingen, where he pursued mathematics and theoretical physics with Arnold Sommerfeld (b. 1868, d. 1951), Karl F. Herzfeld (b. 1892, d. 1978), Arthur Rosenthal (b. 1887, d. 1959), Max Born (b. 1882, d. 1970), David Hilbert (b. 1862, d. 1943), Gustav Herglotz (b. 1881, d. 1953), Richard Courant (b. 1888, d. 1972), Edmund Landau (b. 1877, d. 1938), and Emmy Noether (b. 1882, d. 1935).104 At the same time, he studied Egyptian with Kurt Heinrich Sethe (b. 1869, d. 1934) and with Sethe’s successor (in 1924), Hermann Kees (b. 1886, d. 1964), and he devoted his doctoral dissertation (1926) to Egyptian unit fractions (Die Grundlagen der ägyptischen Bruchrechnung). The ancient Near East took center stage in Neugebauer’s scholarly work, as he pursued the study of non-Greek mathematics and mathematical astronomy through a technical cross-cultural approach—in addition to Egyptian mathematics he embarked on learning Akkadian in order to study, from 1927 onwards, Babylonian mathematics, which he considered to be the foundation of all later mathematical systems in the various civilizations. Over the course of his career Neugebauer explored many of those later traditions, with primary sources in Greek and Latin, Arabic and Hebrew, Sanskrit and Ethiopic. Neugebauer’s scholarship resulted in pathbreaking studies and text editions on the history of the exact sciences and especially mathematical astronomy from the ancient Near East to the European Renaissance.105

Having received his venia legendi in 1927, Neugebauer taught between 1928 and 1933 the history of mathematics at the Mathematical Institute at Göttingen. In April 1933 he was ousted from the university, and in May a correspondence between Courant, Flexner, and Veblen began with the aim of bringing Neugebauer to the Institute. As Neugebauer was also looking for a new home for his journal, Zentralblatt für Mathematik und ihre Grenzgebiete, founded in 1932, a transfer to Princeton

---

103 Director’s Office. Member Files. Box 124. Schlumberger, Daniel. The file also contains addresses in memory of Schlumberger by Harald Ingolt, George Miles, and J. F. Gilliam.

104 Noether later also joined the Institute as a visitor, from 1933 through 1935. See “Emmy Noether’s Paradise.”

105 For Neugebauer’s biography, see Swerdlow, “Otto E. Neugebauer.” For an assessment of his scholarship, see the contributions to Jones [et al.] (eds.), A Mathematician’s Journeys. For Neugebauer’s early years, see Rashed and Pyenson, “Otto Neugebauer.”
seemed unsuitable at that stage, and a three-year appointment in Copenhagen (beginning in January 1934) proved to be a better solution. At the end of 1938 Neugebauer, together with all other non-German editors, resigned from the editorial board in view of increasing pressure and censorship on the journal. Veblen and other supporters renewed their efforts to bring Neugebauer to the United States—Brown University extended a formal offer to him on December 1938 for a professorship in the mathematics department. Neugebauer accepted and began to teach there in February 1939, eventually turning Brown “into the leading institution in the world for the study of the history of the exact sciences.”

From 1945 Neugebauer was also affiliated with the Institute. He spent the academic year 1945–1946 as a member in the School of Mathematics, and in November 1948 Oppenheimer approached Neugebauer, voicing “our interest in providing for a more continued association for you with the Institute for Advanced Study” and inviting him for the first term of 1949–1950 as a member of the two schools, Mathematics and Historical Studies. In February 1950, Oppenheimer extended yet another offer to Neugebauer for a five-year membership, starting from July 1, 1950. In view of the support he had experienced at Brown, Neugebauer hesitated to leave Providence for an extended period of time and asked for the offer to be modified; he would rather spend one term every second year at the Institute. The arrangement was renewed in October 1954 until June 1960, and again in April 1960 “until the June 30th following” Neugebauer’s 70 birthday (1969). His reappointment as a long-term member in the Schools of Historical Studies and Natural Sciences was approved for another five years, beginning July 1, 1969, followed by periodic reappointments on July 1 of 1974, 1980, 1983, and 1986. After he retired from Brown in 1969, Neugebauer moved to Princeton, where he held a permanent appointment at the Institute from 1980 until his death in 1990. Occasionally, the Institute also sponsored Neugebauer’s publications, as is the case with his Astronomical Cuneiform Texts: Babylonian Ephemerides of the Seleucid Period for the Motion of the Sun, the Moon, and the Planets, a set of three volumes that include a number of high-quality photographs of cuneiform tables, which was published for the Institute for Advanced Study by Lund Humphries in London.

Having founded in 1947 a special department for the history of mathematics for Neugebauer, Brown University enabled him to attract younger scholars with similar interests to collaborate with him. The Institute provided him with a similar arrangement, which resulted in a remarkable continuity of ancient and medieval

---

110 Physics and mathematics were later separated and a School of Natural Sciences was founded in 1965. See https://library.ias.edu/sites/library.ias.edu/files/page/SNS.html.
Near Eastern history of science over several decades, both in the School of Mathematics and in the School of Historical Studies. Neugebauer was joined during 1945–1946 by the Assyrologist Abraham J. Sachs (b. 1915, d. 1983), and the two collaborated on Babylonian horoscopes and meteorology. Edward S. Kennedy (b. 1912, d. 2009), an expert in medieval Islamic mathematics and astronomy who, between 1946 and his retirement in 1976, held a professorship in the mathematics department at the American University of Beirut, was another close friend and collaborator of Neugebauer. Kennedy joined him as a member in the Schools of Mathematics and Historical Studies for the spring terms of 1950, 1954, and 1958 and for the entire academic year 1961–1962, followed by a four-month visitorship over the summer of 1962 and another visit during the summer of 1966. After his retirement, Kennedy and his wife Mary Helen purchased an apartment in Princeton to be close to Neugebauer. The Danish mathematician Olaf H. Schmidt (b. 1913, d. 1996) was Neugebauer’s first student, first in Copenhagen and later at Brown, where he completed his doctoral dissertation “On the Relation between Ancient Mathematics and Spherical Astronomy.” Schmidt went back to Denmark after the war but regularly returned to the United States to visit Neugebauer and to work with him. During the spring term of 1952 Schmidt held a membership in the School of Mathematics, working with Neugebauer on Sanskrit materials. David E. Pingree (b. 1933, d. 2005), Neugebauer’s former student and (from 1971) his successor at Brown University, regularly came to Princeton during the 1960s and 1970s as a summer visitor, and he spent two academic years as a member in the School of Historical Studies at the Institute, 1968–1969 and 1978–1979. One of the results of their collaborative work was the publication of Sanskrit astronomical texts, The Pañcasid-
dbhantika of Varahamihira (1970–1972), which was jointly funded by the Danish Academy of Sciences and by the Institute (each side contributed $10,000). Moreover, in 1969, Neugebauer suggested Pingree for a professorial appointment at the Institute, though without success. With Noel M. Swerdlow (b. 1941), who was twice a member in the School of Historical Studies during the academic year 1973–1974 and the first term of 1985–1986 and a visitor during the summers of 1986, 1989, 1990, and 1991, Neugebauer published in 1984 Mathematical Astronomy in Copernicus’s De Revolutionibus. Swerdlow had devoted his doctoral dissertation of 1968, written under the supervision of Bernard R. Goldstein, to Ptolemy’s theory of distances and sizes and its tradition during the Middle Ages, including the Hebrew and Arabic traditions, and like Neugebauer, he also published on Babylonian astronomy. Bernard R. Goldstein (b. 1938), in turn, was a former student of Neugebauer at Brown who worked on mathematics and astronomy in Hebrew and Arabic. Goldstein was also elected twice to membership in the School of Historical Studies, during the academic year 1978–1979 and again after Neugebauer’s demise during the spring term of 1993. George Saliba (b. 1939), an expert on Islamic astronomy, also belonged to the wider circle of scholars mentored by Neugebauer and his immediate students and collaborators, and he held a membership in the School of Historical Studies during the academic year 1982–1983. The Assyriologist Erica Reiner (b. 1924, d. 2005), who taught since 1956 at the University of Chicago

118 Memorandum for the Record: Conversation with Dr. Neugebauer in the Director’s Office on Wednesday, March 26, 1969 at 2:00 pm [signed Carl Kaysen, dated March 26, 1969] (Director’s Office. Member Files. Box 109. Pingree, David Edwin).

119 May 27, 1969 Memorandum for the Record [signed Carl Kaysen]: “In Neugebauer’s judgment Pingree was simply and obviously the best man in the field of Arab and Oriental science and, further, the field was peculiarly suitable to the Institute. Neugebauer has discussed this possibility with Professor Cherniss but no other of the Faculty. I indicated my receptivity to the idea, suggested that he talk to Professor Clagett about it, and I would then talk to Clagett and Cherniss.” See also letter from Neugebauer to Oppenheimer, September 9, 1963, in which Neugebauer had already warmly recommended Pingree to Oppenheimer. Whether this was done in the context of the ongoing search for a medievalist that eventually brought about the appointment of Marshall Clagett and in which Neugebauer was involved as a reviewer (see below) remains uncertain. There is only a brief reference to Pingree in the minutes of the meeting of the School of Historical Studies, March 16, 1971 (Records of the School of Historical Studies. Meetings: Minutes and Related Documents. Box 6 of 15. 1967–1971), when the faculty discussed possible fields and candidates to be appointed in the future: “Professor Cherniss said he thought that Dr. David Pingree, historian of science and a former member, should be kept in mind.”

120 See Records of the School of Historical Studies, Member and Visitors Files: 1954–2011 [bulk 1970–1990], Sedley-Whitehead, Swerdlow, Noel M.

121 The Babylonian Theory of the Planets.

122 His 1963 dissertation was entitled “The Commentary of Ibn al-Muthannā to the Astronomical Tables of al-Khwārizmī.”
where she was for decades in charge of the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, worked closely with David Pingree, and she held a membership in the School of Historical Studies during the spring term of 1990. During those months she completed her book *Astral Magic in Babylonia*, which, she states in the introduction, owes much to Otto Neugebauer, to whose memory the book is dedicated. Reiner was, in turn, the teacher of Francesca Rochberg at the University of Chicago, another expert on Babylonian science who was a member in the School of Historical Studies during the spring term of 2007 and a visitor during the summer of 2011 and as such forms part of the intellectual genealogy that began with Neugebauer. The Austrian Assyriologist Hermann Hunger (b. 1942), who published extensively on Babylonian astronomy, also collaborated over decades with Neugebauer and Sachs and later on also with Pingree—Hunger held a membership in the School of Historical Studies during the fall term of 1993. During Neugebauer’s time at the Institute, there were other prominent historians of science with long-term membership appointments, turning Princeton into a veritable hub of the history of science during those decades: Alexandre Koyré (b. 1892, d. 1964) spent extended periods of time at the School of Historical Studies between 1955 and 1964, while Henry E. Guerlac (b. 1910, d. 1985) held a two-year appointment as a member in the School of Historical Studies from September 1953 through June 1955. Both were also instrumental, it seems, in attracting historians of science to the Institute.

**MARSHALL CLAGETT AND ANCIENT EGYPT**

With the appointment of the medievalist Marshall Clagett (b. 1916, d. 2005) in 1964 as a permanent member of the faculty in the School of Historical Studies, Arabic gained again some relevance among the permanent faculty, albeit in a limited manner. Clagett was a historian of science, focusing on physics, mechanics and mathe-

---

123 See Renger, “Erica Reiner.”
124 Reiner, *Astral Magic*, p. ix: “The Near Eastern material for this book was collected over many years of association with the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary; for the stimulation provided by discussions at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton (in the second term of 1990–91 and the summer of 1992), and for the opportunity to explore a variety of avenues there I am indebted especially to the faculty of the Institute’s School of Historical Studies. The original impetus to study astral influences in Babylonia, as well as many suggestions, came from Otto Neugebauer; I could no longer seek his advice for the final manuscript in Princeton, but to his memory I would like to dedicate this work.”
125 See Rochberg-Halton (ed.), *Language, Literature, and History*.
126 They jointly published *MUL.APIN* and *Astral Sciences in Mesopotamia*.
127 See, e.g., the minutes of the meeting of the School of Historical Studies, October 30, 1957 (Records of the School of Historical Studies. Meetings: Minutes and Related Documents. Box 6 of 15. 1949–1958): “15. Professor Meritt read a letter from Dr. Koyré in which he requested that the School extend membership to Dr. Marshall Clagett of Wisconsin. It was agreed that, upon receipt of Dr. Clagett’s application, Dr. Oppenheimer should invite him to membership for the academic year 1958/59 with, if necessary, a normal stipend.”
matics, which he approached through large-scale projects aimed primarily at medieval Latin sources, which he made available through editions and annotated translations. Whenever relevant, he also considered Greek and occasionally Arabic materials, as in his multivolume *Archimedes in the Middle Ages*, which he published between 1964 and 1984. During his time as a permanent faculty at the Institute, the School hosted a number of historians of science who were concerned with Islamic (Arabic and Persian) materials—apart from George Saliba, David Pingree, and Bernard Goldstein (see above), mention should be made of Wilbur R. Knorr (b. 1945, d. 1997), who was elected to membership during the academic year 1978–1979; Charles Burnett, who held a membership during the academic year 1984–1985; and Roshdi Rashed, who was elected to membership twice, during the academic year 1986–1987 and again during the fall term of 1993. While Knorr, with his interest in the ancient (Greek, Arabic, and Latin) sources of the medieval tradition of mechanics, and Burnett, as an expert in medieval Latin translations of Arabic philosophical, mathematical and scientific texts, were closer to Clagett and his scholarship, Rashed might perhaps rather be counted among the wider circle of Neugebauer, to whom he devoted a study.

Sometime during the last decade of his appointment, Clagett began to learn hieroglyphics, and after the completion of the last *Archimedes* volume he focused exclusively on Ancient Egypt, working on a series of volumes, *Ancient Egyptian Science: A Source Book*, which he published between 1989 and 1999 in three volumes. As

---

128 For appraisals of his oeuvre, see Grant, “Marshall Clagett”. See also *A Community of Scholars*, pp. 12–13.

129 *Archimedes in the Middle Ages*, vol. 1: *The Arabo-Latin Tradition*.

130 During Clagett’s time there was apparently no established practice that would have allocated an even share of members to each faculty member. This is at least suggested by Clagett’s comment in the Oral History Project interview he gave in 1996, in which he stated: “I’ll tell you what happens about members. And nobody should be bitter about this because it’s just the way life is. For the first two or three years your colleagues say, ‘Well Marshall needs a candidate or two,’ and then the pressures of their own studies increase, so that practice drops off, with an occasional exception, like Roshdi Rashed” (Oral History Project. Box 7. Clagett, Marshall. Interviews, March 14, 1996, transcript p. 17). In his “Report of the Activity of Marshall Clagett at the IAS (1964–1975),” Clagett provided a list of twenty-one members and visitors in his fields of interest. See Marshall Clagett Papers. Box 1. Institute-General Faculty (including information on prospective faculty).

131 On Knorr, see Mendell, “Eloge.” For Charles Burnett, who was appointed to a lectureship at the Warburg Institute, London, upon his return from Princeton, see https://warburg.sas.ac.uk/charles-burnett. (See also Director’s Office. Member Files. Box 16. Burnett, Charles S. F.)


133 Clagett’s plan to publish a fourth volume on medicine, biology, and representations of nature was never realized. Clagett describes the change of direction in his scholarly interests in his 1996 interview: “… [O]ne gets tired of doing somewhat the same things, especially
the title indicates, the books are essentially a collection of Egyptian scientific source documents in translation, and their reception among Egyptologists was not entirely positive.\textsuperscript{134}

Neugebauer’s and Clagett’s presence at the Institute overlapped during more than twenty-five years and despite their different personalities, scholarly backgrounds, and interests their fields of research were closely related. Neugebauer was by far the more original and versatile scholar of the two, and there are indications that he was critical of Clagett’s scholarship. When asked for his assessment of Clagett as a scholar when the latter was considered for appointment to a faculty position at the Institute, Neugebauer closes his otherwise positive letter as follows:

Since you mention in your letter my “sympathetic interest in the Institute” I hope not to transgress my mandate by saying what my viewpoint would be with respect to the Institute. If the Institute were a University with a teaching staff and the field of Mediaeval Science to be represented I would not hesitate to consider Clagett the obvious candidate. For the Institute no such necessity exists. Clagett has an excellent position which gives him all possibilities for research and instruction as he wants it. Neither for Clagett personally nor for the field as such would

with the Archimedes, where I’d done essentially ten volumes and you know I suppose I was getting tired of doing that, and I was fascinated with Egypt from the time I was in graduate school. Earlier I had to put it aside; … When I reached retirement I began again to work through Gardner’s great grammar, which is one of the best works for learning hieroglyphics. And somewhere along the time I took my first trip to Egypt, in 1976…. And so I began to fiddle with the hieroglyphics then and try to revive what knowledge I had of that work. After I got back I saw that little had been done on science that tries to bring all the documents together, the most important ones, and so I began in the morning to read hieroglyphics…. Not connected with the history of science necessarily, just texts, so I would get some facility with the grammar and the language in every way. And I literally did that for almost ten years.”—Clagett’s work on Ancient Egypt also led him to what one would nowadays call digital scholarship. In order to integrate hieroglyphs into his publications (he provided the publisher with camera-ready copies for all three volumes) he had a graphic system developed that allowed him to do so through the Lettrix program. See his “Computer-Generated Hieroglyphs.”

On the other hand, Neugebauer had supported Clagett’s endeavor when the latter embarked on *Ancient Egyptian Science* by handing him “his entire collection of Egyptian reprints” and by sharing with him “his learning at all stages of this work.”

**NEW VISTAS IN NEAR AND MIDDLE EASTERN STUDIES: BERNARD LEWIS, CLIFFORD GEERTZ, AND THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE**

Towards the end of the 1960s, several developments brought new impulses into the study of the Near East at the Institute, in an entirely new guise and again in several schools. Shortly after taking up office as director of the Institute in September 1966, Carl Kaysen (b. 1920, d. 2010), eager to broaden the Institute’s profile with respect to fields relevant to the contemporary world, approached Bernard Lewis (b. 1916), since 1949 professor of the history of the Near and Middle East at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, to discuss with him his plans “in the area of comparative historical studies”—Kaysen clearly had in mind his plans to establish a school for the social sciences. Kaysen and Lewis held a first meeting in London in May 1967, and three months later, in August, Lewis visited Princeton, to support Kaysen in his wish to appoint the anthropologist Clifford Geertz (b. 1926, d. 2006) as the first faculty appointment to the School of Social Science. The two also discussed on this occasion the possibility of Lewis spending

---

135 Letter from Neugebauer to Cherniss, November 2, 1963 (Director’s Office. Faculty Files. Box 48. Clagett, Marshall).
138 See Lewis, *Notes on a Century*, p. 180: “I first visited the Institute for Advanced Study sometime before I even thought of moving to the United States. On one occasion, while I was still in London, the director of the Institute called and asked if I would be willing to make a short, special, trip to Princeton to help him in a certain matter. He was proposing to elect a scholar in a field previously unrepresented. There was some resistance to this proposal, and he asked if I would come to Princeton to attend a meeting, make a case in favor of this scholar, and then return. I agreed and therefore made a hurried transatlantic roundtrip for just two days, to plead the case for this appointment. The gentleman was duly appointed. He did not, of course, know of the circumstances.” See also interview with Carl Kaysen (Oral History Project. Box 9), pp. 92–93, on Geertz’s appointment and Lewis’s role as a member of the ad-hoc committee: “… Bernard [Lewis] said that he was not a classical Arabic scholar but there’s no question he commanded it well enough to read what he had to read, and he did know Dutch and he did know Javanese. There was nobody to say yea or nay if he knew Javanese or not. And in the faculty discussion I remember somebody, possibly Harold [Cherniss], but possibly not, saying in a hostile way, that he didn’t think his language capacities were first class in every language. And Marshall Rosenbluth, who was newly a fac-
a term at the Institute, which resulted in Lewis’s membership during the spring term of 1969. Though he was formally affiliated with the School of Historical Studies, Lewis came to the Institute within the framework of Carl Kaysen’s Program in Social Science, along with four other visitors during that year. During his stay in Princeton, Lewis also gave two seminars for the Program, entitled “Religion and Revolution in Medieval Islam” and “Islamic Attitudes on Race and Color.”

A few years later, in February 1972, two members of the school’s permanent faculty, Kenneth M. Setton (b. 1914, d. 1995) and Clagett, initiated the process of appointing Lewis to a permanent faculty position in the school. Whether the initiative was theirs or whether they acted on behalf of Kaysen remains uncertain—be that as it may, Kaysen was clearly eager to have Lewis appointed and tried hard, yet unsuccessfully, to find a donor to fund a position for him. A first discussion was held during the school meeting of October 9, 1972, and despite reservations voiced by a faculty member said, ‘it seems to me he’s learned everything he needs to know to do his work and it’s clear to me if he has to learn more, he’ll learn more.’ And it was said in such a flat way that nobody took it up, you know, it was interesting.”—The evolution and working of the School of Social Science is described by Geertz, “School Building.” For an account of its early, controversial history from the point of view of a representative of the School of Historical Studies, see White, A Philosopher’s Story, pp. 286ff.

139 Memorandum for File (School of Social Science): Conversation with Bernard Lewis, University of London, August 22, at Olden Farm (Director’s Office. Faculty files. Box 20. Lewis, Bernard. 1967–1974).

140 Lewis had apparently encouraged Richard N. Frye (b. 1920, d. 2014), the founding director of the Center for Middle Eastern Studies and its program in Iranian studies at Harvard University, to apply for membership at the Institute so that they would be there together during the spring term of 1969. Frye clearly liked the idea and wrote to this effect to Kaysen (letter from Frye to Kaysen, September 14, 1967), who replied positively (letter from Kaysen to Frye, September 29, 1967): “Why not? I would be delighted to have you and Bernard Lewis as a package deal. I have written to him, and you can see from the attached carbon, and I hope we can get the issue settled for both of you with reasonable dispatch.” Kaysen’s mentioned letter to Lewis (“I have heard from Dick Frye that he and you would appreciate a joint invitation to come to the Institute for the second term of 1968–1969. If this is indeed your desire, I would be glad to extend this invitation to both of you. I have written to Dick in the same sense, and I hope you can bring this matter to an early decision.”) is dated September 29, 1967. Lewis reply to Kaysen, dated October 6, 1967, was not enthusiastic, and Frye never did hold a membership or visitorship at the Institute. The relevant correspondence is found in Director’s Office. Faculty files. Box 10. Lewis, Bernard. 1967–1974.

141 Director’s report to the Board of Trustees, April 25–26, 1969 (Board of Trustees Records: Board-General. Box 1. Notes, Drafts, Minutes—April 25 & 26,1969).

142 Letter from Setton to the faculty of the School of Historical Studies, February 14, 1972 (Director’s Office. Faculty files. Box 10. Lewis, Bernard. 1967–1974): “Herewith I send you a curriculum vitae of Bernard Lewis, whom Professor Clagett and I would recommend for an appointment (in view of his age, an early appointment) in the School of Historical Studies.”
by some faculty a decision was taken “that the nomination of Sir Bernard Lewis be considered, and that Professor Setton and Professor Clagett be empowered to prepare a letter to go out over the Director’s signature soliciting the opinions of several people.” In November, the school’s faculty voted against offering Lewis a permanent position.143

Kaysen continued to pursue his plan to bring Bernard Lewis to the Institute, and over the course of 1973 the possibility of a joint appointment with Princeton University (where Abraham Udovitch was pushing the matter forward) was explored and presented to the faculty, which would imply “a long-term membership of one term each year for Bernard Lewis” at the school.144 This was approved by the Historical Studies faculty on November 1, with the understanding that “the funds for this appointment and the appropriate facilities [are] to be derived from resources outside the Institute,”145 and Lewis was formally offered in December 1973 a dual appointment “as Cleveland Dodge Professor of Near Eastern Studies at the University and as a Long-Term Member at the Institute for Advanced Study,” which he accepted on October 1, 1974. The terms of the dual appointment between the Institute and Princeton University were that “[t]he total costs of salary, benefits, and research expenses … will be shared equally by the Institute for Advanced Study and Princeton University…. The arrangement will continue during Professor Lewis’ tenure as a Professor at Princeton University. Professor Lewis would spend one semester at the University and one at the Institute for Advanced Study each year.”146

During his time at the Institute, Lewis was affiliated both with the School of Historical Studies and with the School of Social Science, an arrangement that provoked tensions.147 Another bone of contention, in Lewis’s view, was that he was not

---

143 The arguments are summarized in the director’s memorandum to the faculty, November 7, 1973.
144 See letter from Kennan to Kaysen, July 17, 1973 (Marshall Clagett Papers. Box 1. Institute-General Faculty (including information on prospective faculty).
146 Letter from Aaron Lemonick (Dean of the Faculty, Princeton University) to Kaysen, December 21, 1973 (Director’s Office. Faculty files. Box 10. Lewis, Bernard. 1967–1974).
147 The initial arrangement is laid down in the director’s memorandum to the faculty, November 7, 1973 (Director’s Office. Faculty files. Box 10. Lewis, Bernard. 1967–1974): “The School of Historical Studies proposes to appoint Bernard Lewis … to a long-term Membership for one term a year, beginning 1974–75, for the period of his tenure of a Professorship at Princeton University. The proposal was voted in the School meeting of November 1, 8 affirmative, none opposed, 4 abstaining. Professor Geertz has indicated that he welcomes the appointment from the point of view of the School of Social Science, and would be prepared to make the Membership joint in both Schools. I share his view.” On March 3, 1975 Lewis wrote to Kaysen complaining that “on the Institute list I appear among the permanent members in the School of Social Science but among the visitors in the School of Historical Studies.” Kaysen replied on March 6, 1975, that “[t]he official pamphlet of the Institute …
formally granted the privilege of participating in the selection of members in either
of the two schools and/or of nominating one or two members in his field on an
annual basis. Lewis nevertheless encouraged applicants in his field and occasional-
ly approached the Institute’s director to invite those whose applications had been
rejected by the school in the director’s program. This was the case, for example,
with Itamar Rabinovich, who taught at the time contemporary history of the Middle
East at Tel Aviv University and whose application for a membership at the School
for Historical Studies in 1977 had been rejected—Lewis successfully approached
the director to invite Rabinovich as a visitor in the director’s program during the sum-
mer of 1978. Lewis made a similar request for Elie Kedourie (b. 1926, d. 1992), an-
other prominent historian of the Middle East during the twentieth century, which

lists you properly as a member with long term appointment in both Schools of Historical
Studies and Social Science. The listing of members in the School of Historical Studies that
appears on the SHS page of the Staff and Member List is the product of that School’s secre-
tarial office, so I cannot explain it. Needless to say, your status is as you understand it, that
of permanent member, whatever the typographical vagaries would seem to suggest.” Lewis
replied to Kaysen on March 12, 1975: “Thanks for your reply to my note, and clarification. It
seems that I am not entitled to box files in the History School, nor, I am told, to any other
‘permanent equipment.’ However, it seems that I am entitled to all these as a Social Scientist,
so I shall accept my new disciplinary designation with appropriate gratitude.” The issue was
taken up by the School of Historical Studies’s executive officer at the time, Christian Ha-
bicht, to correct the way Lewis was listed. See Director’s Office. Faculty files. Box 10. Lewis,

148 “Statement concerning the status and perquisites of B. Lewis” (April 1, 1975): “[T]here
was agreement within the School of Historical Studies, that there was no commitment to
invite 1–2 members each year at the suggestion of B. Lewis (Minutes of the meeting of the
School of October 3, 1973, as amended at the meeting November 1, 1973. – Letter of Pro-
fessor White to the Executive Officer, Professor Kennan, of November 1, 1973).” Addi-
tional background information on the ongoing discussions about imminent appointments in
the School of Historical Studies is included in a letter from Felix Gilbert to the faculty of the
School of Historical Studies, November 1, 1972. Kaysen’s original idea had indeed been dif-
ferent. See letter from Kaysen to Gilbert and Kennan, June 29, 1973: “Further, the School of
Social Sciences would be prepared to invite one or two members each year on his sugge-
sion, and I think that, if the invitation to Lewis is made, the School of Historical Studies
should be prepared to do likewise. This is to give Lewis what in the past we have given
Neugebauer, with results which I think have been widely felt to be admirable.” That Lewis
was not involved in the selection of members in the School of Social Sciences has been
pointed out by Clifford Geertz in an interview he gave within the framework of the Oral
History Project (Oral History Project. Box 8. Geertz, Clifford): “Bernard was not involved in
the workings of the School at all at any point. He never was involved in choosing members.
He sometimes suggested them and I sometimes wouldn’t have them, that made him a little
irritated.”
did not yield any result. Amnon Cohen, a specialist in Ottoman studies, had first applied for a membership in the School of Historical Studies in 1977, for the academic year 1978–1979. He may well have been encouraged to do so by a suggestion from Lewis. The latter closes his letter supporting the application as follows: “One final point. In making this recommendation I should declare an interest. Dr. Cohen and I collaborated on a book entitled: Population and Revenues in the Towns of Palestine in the Sixteenth Century. This is now with the Princeton University Press and it is to be published by them next year.” While this application was unsuccessful, Cohen applied again in 1981 for the academic year 1982–1983. Lewis was again asked to assess the application, which he did, favorably, and this time Cohen was granted a membership. During the same year, another historian of the modern Middle East, Emmanuel Sivan, professor of history at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, was also granted a membership at the School of Historical Studies. To what extent this was also motivated by Lewis’s presence in Princeton cannot be assessed.

Clifford Geertz served for thirty years on the faculty of the School of Social Science, and his scholarly focus on the Muslim world, particularly Indonesia and Morocco, led to a steady stream of members working on various aspects of the Islamic world in the school, which has continued up until the present day. The

---

155 See “IAS Scholars in the field of Near and Middle Eastern Studies, Past and Present: A Directory” in this volume.
academic year 1976–1977 had “Islamic Societies” as its annual theme, and its members included the anthropologist Dale F. Eickelman (b. 1942), the historian of North Africa during the modern period Lucette Valensi (b. 1936), and Abraham L. Udovitch (b. 1933) of Princeton University, who was active in organizing an “Islamic [‘Muslim’] Seminar” over the course of the year. Among the seminar’s regular participants were faculty and members from both schools, Social Science and Historical Studies, including the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (b. 1930, d. 2002), who held a membership during that year in the School of Social Science, and David Ayalon (b. 1914, d. 1998), a specialist on the Mamluks, who was a member in the School of Historical Studies, as well as the long-term member S. D. Goitein (on whom see below) and faculty and students of the Department of Near Eastern Studies at Princeton University, namely, the economist and historian of the Middle East Charles Issawi (b. 1916, d. 2000), the historian of the modern Near East and North Africa Leon Carl Brown (b. 1928), the specialist on premodern Arabic poetry and prose Andras Hamori, the historian of the premodern Middle East and Iran Roy Mottahedeh (b. 1940), and the historical anthropologist and specialist on Yemen Brinkley Messick.

Bernard Lewis’s appointment to the Institute ended in 1986, when he reached the age of seventy—unlike permanent members of the faculty at the Institute, long-term members, once retired, do not enjoy any emeritus privileges. The Institute offered him a visiting membership (without stipend) for an additional year (1986–1987), which allowed Lewis to retain his spacious office in the West Building (W 318), which housed his personal library of more than 10,000 volumes. Much to his chagrin, Lewis was asked to vacate his office towards the end of the academic year 1986–1987, as he bitterly complains in his autobiographical Notes on a Century (p. 181). Yet Lewis’s relation with the Institute, and especially the School of Social Science and Clifford Geertz, seems to have been an uneasy one throughout his appointment. While he seemed happy at the university’s Near Eastern studies department, where he appears to have spent most of his time, his comments about the Institute are less favorable:

---

156 Geertz, “School Building,” p. 7, where 1972–1973 is mentioned; this is not corroborated by the archival documents.
157 School of Social Science Records. Files related to Maskin, Geertz, School events theme years, seminars, and miscellaneous other topics. Box 3. Islamic Seminar. 1976–77.
I’m told that my appointment, half-time university and half-time Institute, was the first and last of its kind. Thanks to the dual appointment I had the time and the setting in which to be quite productive. For my part, I found it an excellent arrangement—the Institute gave me leisure, space and privacy, all three of them, especially the latter, in ample measure. The obverse of the value of privacy was that there was not the cross-fertilization among disciplines that was envisaged when the Institute was created. But this I managed to find at the university.¹⁶⁰


On May 15, 1969, Joseph R. Strayer (b. 1904, d. 1987), who between 1941 and 1961 had served as head of the history department at Princeton University, approached Setton with the proposal that the Institute make a membership offer to S. D. Goitein (b. 1900, d. 1985), which would allow the latter to continue his work on the documentary Geniza once he retired from the University of Pennsylvania. Goitein had studied in Berlin and Frankfurt am Main with Josef Horovitz (b. 1874, d. 1931) as his main mentor under whose guidance he had also prepared a doctoral dissertation titled “Prayer in the Qur’ān” (1923).¹⁶¹ He had left Germany in the same year and in April 1928 joined the staff of the School of Oriental Studies at the newly founded Hebrew University in Jerusalem as “Instructor, later Professor, in Islamics,”¹⁶² and he served as director of the School of Oriental Studies from 1949 through 1956.¹⁶³ Goitein had left Jerusalem in 1957, when offered a chair of Arabic studies at the University of Pennsylvania. It was some years prior to his departure for the United States that he began to work on the documentary Geniza, a field that occupied him for the rest of his life.¹⁶⁴ His first accounts of the nature of the material and his method of making use of it to write up a social history of Mediterranean

¹⁶⁰ Lewis, Notes on a Century, pp. 180–181. That the antipathy between Lewis and Geertz was mutual is also confirmed by the latter’s remarks in his 1995 interview (Oral History Project. Box 8. Geertz, Clifford).
¹⁶¹ For Josef Horovitz, see Hanisch, Nachfolger der Exegeten, pp. 191 and passim.
¹⁶² Thus his own description in the curriculum vitae he submitted at the time (Director’s Office. Member Files. Box 48. Goitein, Shelomo Dov).
¹⁶³ For his time at the Hebrew University, see Selzer, The History of the Hebrew University, pp. 112–116.
¹⁶⁴ See Cohen, “Shelomo Dov Goitein”: “Goitein ‘discovered’ the Geniza on a trip to Budapest in 1948. While there he had the opportunity to examine Geniza papers that had once belonged to the collection of the late nineteenth-century scholar, David Kaufmann. Thus began a preoccupation that would last for the rest of his life with these fascinating letters, legal records, marriage contracts, business accounts, and other documents that reveal daily life in the medieval Mediterranean Islamic world.” See also Rosenthal, “Shlomo Dov Goitein.” For the Dávid Kaufmann (b. 1852, d. 1899) collection, see http://kaufmann.mtak.hu/index-en.html. See also Thulin, Kaufmanns Nachrichtendienst.
society, as he called it, were published in 1954, 1955, and 1960; in addition, publications focusing on a select number of Geniza documents began to appear around the same time. When Goitein retired from the University of Pennsylvania in July 1970, only some of his aims for the Geniza project had been achieved. To bring the project to completion, he needed financial and logistical support. He was confronted with another difficulty—while he had accumulated only a small pension during his time in Philadelphia, he would be ineligible for his Israeli pension unless he returned to Israel.

The overall reaction of the faculty of the School of Historical Studies to Strayer's proposal was positive, and (complying with Goitein's wish to deal with his request only a year later, in 1970), the faculty approved on October 30, 1970 a three-year appointment for Goitein. On December 10, Kaysen made a formal offer to Goitein for a membership during the years 1971–1972, 1972–1973, and 1973–1974. From 1975 onwards up until his death on February 6, 1985, Goitein continued to be affiliated with the Institute as a long-term visitor to the School of Historical Studies. The change of status, from member to visitor, did not affect the financial arrangements. Throughout his time at the Institute, securing the funds to pay Goitein's stipend and to finance his research posed a continuous challenge—in most years the funds came from the Littauer Foundation, occasionally also from the National Endowment for the Humanities—until 1983, when Goitein was awarded a MacArthur lifetime fellowship. The scholarly results of the investment in Goitein's research over the course of those years can hardly be overestimated. Shortly before
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165 Goitein, “From the Mediterranean to India”; idem, “What Would Jewish and General History Benefit by a Systematic Publication of the Documentary Genizah Papers?”
166 Goitein, “The Cairo Geniza as a Source for the History of Muslim Civilization.”
167 Goitein, “The Documents of the Cairo Geniza as a Source for Mediterranean Social History.”
168 See Attal, Bibliography.
170 Memo regarding Dr. Goitein’s grants, February 26, 1980 (Director’s Office. Member Files. Box 48. Goitein, Shelomo Dov).
171 On the Princeton University side, Abraham Udovitch was instrumental in supporting the continuous search for funding. See his remarks on the occasion of a memorial for Goitein, Shelomo Dov Goitein, 1900–1985, p. 8: “The fund-raising each year necessary to maintain this association with the Institute was often quite an adventure, but it was an adventure which we managed to survive every year due to the devoted efforts of Carl Kaysen, Harry Woolf and other friends. This annual ordeal continued until 1983 when Goitein’s achievement was recognized through the award of a MacArthur lifetime fellowship.”
172 Abraham Udovitch summarizes Goitein’s Princeton years in a foreword to volume 5 of Goitein’s A Mediterranean Society as follows (p. xi): “Upon his retirement from Pennsylvania in 1971, Goitein came to Princeton as a long-term member of the School of Historical Studies
his death, Goitein sent off the fifth and final volume of his magnum opus, *A Mediterranean Society: The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza*, to the publisher; the index volume was published posthumously. His *India Book* was also published posthumously, in three volumes. Goitein had bequeathed his personal archive of index cards, microfilms, photocopies, and photographs, as well as his transcriptions and translations of Geniza documents, to the Jewish National and University Library (now the National Library of Israel), but copies of everything remained in Princeton. These formed the basis of the Princeton Geniza Lab at Princeton University.

Though the focus of Near Eastern studies had shifted since the early 1970s to the newly founded School of Social Science, the increased visibility of the field also had an effect on the selection of members in the School of Historical Studies. While the fields of archaeology and history of science continued to attract members specializing in the Near and Middle East (see above), and Bernard Lewis managed time and again to bring scholars concerned with the modern history of the Near East to the Institute, the number of scholars working on Islamic history during the premodern period rose slightly during the 1970s and 1980s. These included members working in the fields of Arab-Byzantine relations, Ottoman studies, Islamic art, and early Islamic history: Robert I. Burns (b. 1921, d. 2008) held a membership during the spring term of 1972, during which he worked on Muslim-Christian relations and social changes in thirteenth-century Spain. Irfan Shahid (b. 1926, d. 2016) was at the Institute for Advanced Study. Goitein thrived in Princeton. In the calm and supportive atmosphere of the Institute, Goitein completed the last three volumes of *A Mediterranean Society* and produced three other books and numerous articles most of which were based on his Geniza work. He continued to have contact with his former students and to serve as an informal advisor to younger scholars embarking on Geniza research.” For Goitein’s biography and his scholarship, see the contributions to *Shelomo Dov Goitein, 1900–1955*. Cohen curiously enough omits to mention the Institute in his otherwise detailed obituary, “Shelomo Dov Goitein.”

173 “On the day of his death, the outline of his next major project, a three-volume edition and translation of the Geniza texts relating to the Indian Ocean trade, was neatly arranged on his desk.” Udovitch, foreword to Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, vol. 5, p. xi.

174 See https://www.princeton.edu/~geniza/about.html. For the development of Geniza studies over the past three decades, see Schmidtke, “Intellectual History of the Islamicate World,” as well as other contributions to a special issue of *Jewish History* 32 ii-iv (2018), edited by Jessica Goldberg and Eve Krakowski, entitled *Documentary Geniza Research in the 21th Century*.

granted a membership during the spring term of 1976.\textsuperscript{176} A specialist on the intersection between the Greco-Roman, Arabic, and Islamic worlds in the fourth through seventh centuries CE, Shahid had earned his PhD in 1954 from Princeton University and in 1963 was named the Oman Professor of Arabic and Islamic Literature at Georgetown University. His work at the Institute resulted in his seminal \textit{Byzantium and the Arabs in the Fourth Century}. Andrew C. Hess, who had earned his PhD in 1966 from Harvard University with a dissertation entitled “The Closure of the Ottoman Frontier in North Africa and the Origin of Modern Algeria: 1574–1595,” was granted a membership in the School of Historical Studies during the academic year 1973–1974 for a project devoted to the Christian-Muslim frontier in North Africa, which resulted in a monograph, \textit{The Forgotten Frontier: A History of the Sixteenth-Century Ibero-African Frontier}.\textsuperscript{177} Pierre A. MacKay (b. 1933, d. 2015) held a membership during the same year (1973–1974), preparing a publication on the manuscripts of the \textit{Seyahatname} of Evliya Çelebi.\textsuperscript{178} Richard Ettinghausen, who had held a membership in the School of Humanistic Studies in its early days (1937–1938) and was from 1967 a professor of fine arts at New York University as well as (since 1969) consultative chairman of the Department of Islamic Art at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, held a one-term membership in the same year (1973–1974).\textsuperscript{179} Jacob Lassner, who had earned his PhD in 1963 from Yale University with a dissertation entitled “The Topography of Baghdad according to al-Khatib al-Baghdadi,” was elected to membership for the academic year 1979–1980, during which he worked on his monograph \textit{Islamic Revolution and Historical Memory: An Inquiry into the Art of ʿAbbāsid Apologetics}.\textsuperscript{180} Etan Kohlberg held a membership during 1986–1987, working on aspects of medieval Shiʿism, and Mercedes García-Arenal stayed at the Institute during 1988–1989, working on Morocco during the sixteenth century from a social and cultural point of view.\textsuperscript{181}

\textsuperscript{176} See also https://www.doaks.org/research/library-archives/dumbarton-oaks-archives/historical-records/75th-anniversary/blog/irfan-shahid. According to this account Shahid spent some time at the Institute already in or after 1954, following the completion of his PhD dissertation. The Shelby White and Leon Levy Archives Center has no record about any formal affiliation of Shahid’s with the Institute during the 1950s.

\textsuperscript{177} School of Historical Studies records. Member and Visitor files. 1954–2011. Box 3. Hess, Andrew C.; and Director’s Office. Member Files. Box 60. Hess, Andrew C.


\textsuperscript{179} Director’s Office. Member Files. Box 37. Ettinghausen, Richard.

\textsuperscript{180} Director’s Office. Member Files. Box 82. Lassner, Jacob.

GLEN BOWERSOCK AND THE STUDY OF ANCIENT ARABIA

In 1980, Glen W. Bowersock, since 1962 a professor of classics at Harvard University, was appointed to the faculty of the School of Historical Studies.182 Aldo Schiavone aptly described Bowersock as “the quintessential historian of connection, interweaving and displacement[, whose] attention is drawn to sites of crossing and intersection, both physical, geographically defined places and cultural and mental ones.”183 This is the background to Bowersock’s scholarly trajectory from a classicist focusing on imperial Rome and its legacy into one of the leading scholars of late antiquity and the ancient Near East up until the rise of Islam. While his first monograph (Augustus and the Greek World, 1965) was devoted to the Greco-Roman world during the reign of the first emperor, his work on Galen (Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire, 1969) led him to delve into the study of Arabic. In 1971, Bowersock published his pathbreaking article “A Report on Arabia Provincia,” which he described as “a gathering together of new material on the history of Roman Arabia” and “a preliminary stage in the preparation of a history of the province of Arabia.”184 This programmatic paper not only heralded Bowersock’s immersion over the next fourteen years into the study of languages such as Nabatean, Syriac,185 and Aethiopic, it also prompted a number of younger scholars to embark on the study of Arabia during antiquity. In 1983, Bowersock published his monograph Roman Arabia, followed by numerous additional studies on the Nabatean kingdom before and after 1983.186 His most recent work, a trilogy of three monographs published between 2012 and 2017, concerns the Arabian background of the Prophet Muhammad, the origins of Islam in Mecca and Medina, and the first conquests—these masterpieces constitute a solid and innovative addition to the scholarship of historians who have been trained in the tradition of Near Eastern (Islamic and Arabic) studies.187 Over the decades, Bowersock attracted numerous scholars to the Institute who are engaged in the study of the ancient Near East. These include David L. Kennedy (1986–1987, 182 The faculty of the School of Historical Studies was eager to appoint Bowersock already in 1975, but Kaysen opposed the appointment of another classicist. It was only after 1976, when Harry Woolf succeeded Kaysen as the Institute’s director, that the appointment was possible. See interview with Glen Bowersock, April 22, 2009, p. 2 (Oral History Project. Box 11. Linda Arntzenius files. Bowersock, Glen transcript final version).
186 Bowersock’s publications in this field are listed in the bibliography of the Association for the Understanding of Ancient Cultures (AUAC) at https://www.auac.ch/info/auac_bibliography.php. For a full bibliography of Bowersock’s writings, see “Glen W. Bowersock: Bibliography.”
187 See Brown, “At the Center of a Roiling World.”

NEAR EASTERN STUDIES AT THE INSTITUTE, 1990 THROUGH 2014: OLEG GRABAR AND PATRICIA CRONE

Glen Bowersock valued textual sources as well as material sources, and as such he combined the methodological approaches of philology with those of history of art and architecture as well as archaeology. In doing so he continued the lineage of Herzfeld, Goldman, and Seyrig in the School of Historical Studies. At the same time, his scholarship closely connects to that of two members of the permanent faculty who represent different aspects of Near Eastern and Islamic studies in the school and who joined the faculty at a later stage, namely, Oleg Grabar (b. 1929, d. 2011), who was appointed in 1990, and Patricia Crone (b. 1945, d. 2015), who joined the Institute in 1997.

Grabar continued the early Institute’s tradition in Near Eastern studies inaugurated by Ernst Herzfeld—Herzfeld’s erstwhile assistant and later friend and advisor, Richard Ettinghausen, was Grabar’s principal mentor and predecessor at Ann Arbor. Moreover, Grabar did his graduate studies at Princeton University, where Hitti and Weitzmann figured among his most important teachers. 189 In 1955 he earned his PhD from Princeton with a dissertation entitled “Ceremonial and Art at the Umayyad Court” (which was never published). Moreover, like Herzfeld, Grabar opened entirely new horizons for the field. Both covered an unusually wide range of fields and shared a wider perspective on their respective objects of study than was the case with most of their respective predecessors and colleagues—the title of one of Herzfeld’s most original and influential publications, “Die Genesis der islamischen Kunst und das Mshatta-Problem” (1910), resonated in the title of Grabar’s most renowned book, The Formation of Islamic Art (1973). On the other hand, the two scholars represent two opposite angles in the development of their respective fields: Herzfeld was one of the last scholars to represent the German tradition of Near Eastern archaeology and art that had come to an end with World War I, whereas Grabar, by contrast, laid the foundation for a methodologically more refined and far


189 Grabar, “Philip Khûrí Hitti: Department of Near Eastern Studies.” For Weitzmann’s memories of Grabar as his student in Princeton, see his Sailing with Byzantium, pp. 174–175.
more sophisticated discipline of Islamic art history whose center of gravity was the United States and which continued to thrive after his demise.\footnote{See Hillenbrand, “Oleg Grabar: The Scholarly Legacy.” See also Grabar, “The Practice of Islamic Art History,” as well as his reflections on Ernst Herzfeld in From the Past to the Future through the Present. For the status of the history of Islamic art today, see Kerner, “From Margin to Mainstream”; Flood and Necipoğlu, “Frameworks of Islamic Art and Architectural History”; Carey and Graves, “Historiography of Islamic Art and Architecture.” I thank Margaret Graves for having provided me with the last two references.}

Besides his contributions to scholarship, Grabar is to be credited for two additional achievements. It is thanks to him that Near Eastern and Islamic studies was formally established as a field of its own in the School of Historical Studies—this being the precondition for guaranteeing it an equal annual share of members, which led to a significant and stable increase in the number of scholars in this field.\footnote{See “IAS Scholars in the Field of Near and Middle Eastern Studies, Past and Present: A Directory” in this volume.}

Moreover, Grabar was instrumental in having Patricia Crone appointed as a permanent member of the faculty, which further consolidated the field in the School of Historical Studies.\footnote{Although the relevant files are still closed to consultation, the following letter from Crone to Grabar, dated October 31, 1996, is included among the Grabar correspondence (Oleg Grabar Papers. 1947–2010. Fac.Grabar. Box 5 of 12. Crone): “Dear Oleg, despite your phone call and the provisional arrangement for a visit in December, I still can’t believe it. I have in fact quite deliberately refused to believe it ever since it first came up, first because I was not sure whether I would want to go and next because I was sure I would not get it, having decided that I want to go. Still I still have not received the formal letter I persist in my scepticism, but this is to say that if you are right, you are a genius and many thanks for that and even more thanks for having thought of me in the first place. I don’t know who it was who wrote the report that made the physicists wary, all I know is that it could have been anyone out of three quarters of all Islamicists in the world! This is why you are a genius. I would have thought that finding enough people to say the right thing about me would have been impossible, yet you claim to have managed it. And as for why you thought of me in the first place … well, that of course is the truly flattering bit of the story….”}

Patricia Crone, member of the permanent faculty from 1997 through 2014, was a scholar of early Islamic political, social, and intellectual history. As such, she represented a different discipline within Near Eastern studies than had been the case with Herzfeld, Seyrig, and Grabar, on the one hand, and Neugebauer and his circle, on the other, though she was at the same time closely connected to her predecessors (Herzfeld) and colleagues (Bowersock, Grabar) through her interest in pre-Islamic Arabia, Late Antiquity, and Iranian notions and culture. Crone had earned her PhD at the University of London in 1974, with a doctoral dissertation entitled “The Mawālī in the Umayyad Period,” with Bernard Lewis formally being her advisor (he...}
had left for the US before she defended her thesis in 1974), though her most influ-

With her scholarship, Crone significantly influenced—and in many ways pro-
nessionalized and modernized—the study of Islamic history, as Chase Robinson has shown in detail in his “Crone and the End of Orientalism” (2015).\footnote{See also Crone’s own reflections on her scholarship in Crone, *Collected Studies*, vol. 1, pp. xi–xvi.} Crone’s last major oeuvre that she was able to complete before her untimely demise was her prize-winning monograph *The Nativist Prophets of Early Islamic Iran: Rural Revolt and Local Zoroastrianism* (2012), a study of the Iranian response to the Muslim penetration and of Iranian religious beliefs and notions that persisted and influenced Islam far beyond Iran during the early Islamic period—a book she had envisaged writing already during her early days as a scholar in Oxford.\footnote{Of major relevance is also her *Collected Studies in Three Volumes*, which was published post-
humously. See also ibid., vol. 1, pp. 477–484 for a list of Patricia Crone’s publications.} Crone’s important contributions to Iranian studies in this monograph as well as in her many other studies are analyzed by Hassan Ansari in a contribution to this volume. Though entirely outside her scholarly field, mention should also be made here of the breathtaking 2014 doc-
umentary about Crone’s fight against cancer, produced by her sister, Diana Crone Frank, “For the Life of Me: Between Science and the Law.”\footnote{See https://www.forthelifeofmefilm.com/}

Beyond her achievements as a scholar, Crone was an exceptional team player, mentor, and promoter of Near Eastern and Islamic studies. Unlike most historians of her generation, Crone enjoyed working with colleagues. Over the course of her scholarly career, she worked and published with a number of close colleagues and friends—with Michael Cook (1977, *Hagarism*), with Martin Hinds (1986, *God’s Caliph*), with Shmuel Moreh (1999, *The Book of Strangers*), with Fritz Zimmermann (2001, *The Epistle of Salīm ibn Dhakwān*), with Luke Treadwell (2003, “A New Source on Ismailism at the Samanid Court”), and with Masoud Jafari Jazi (2010, “The Muqanna Narrative in the *Tārīkhnāma*”). Moreover, Crone was a blessing for countless graduate students and members at the Institute as well as for many colleagues around the world who had the privilege of meeting her, discussing with her, and of being exposed to her at times inquisitive questioning, which was founded in an honest and deeply rooted interest in what’s going on in the field and, more importantly, in others as human beings. But she also cared for complete strangers—her email account (which was taken care of during the last months of her life by her sister Diana as well as by two colleagues of hers at the Institute) is replete with correspond-
ence with scholars in Iran, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, and many other places who had consulted her and/or sent their papers to her, and she took the trouble to read them


194 See also Crone’s own reflections on her scholarship in Crone, *Collected Studies*, vol. 1, pp. xi–xvi.

195 Of major relevance is also her *Collected Studies in Three Volumes*, which was published post-
humously. See also ibid., vol. 1, pp. 477–484 for a list of Patricia Crone’s publications.

196 See https://www.forthelifeofmefilm.com/.
closely and to respond to them in detail. Moreover, Crone’s scholarship had a greater impact on readers in the Islamic world than had been the case with any other Near Eastern scholar among the Institute’s permanent faculty up to that point—through translations of her work into Arabic, Persian, and Turkish, as well as original publications, especially in Iran.197

Crone also significantly promoted the field of Near Eastern and Islamic studies in other ways. She bequeathed a considerable fortune to endow a membership in Near Eastern and Islamic studies at the School of Historical Studies,198 and she gave another substantial gift to Gonville and Caius College in Cambridge.199 In addition, she donated her personal scholarly library to the Institute. Mention should also be made of her mediation that helped engage the government of Oman to finance a new building for the al-Biruni Institute in Tashkent, with its important collection of manuscripts—the building has been inaugurated in 2017 and is also equipped with the technical machinery that will allow for the digitization of the entire manuscript collection.

NEAR EASTERN AND ISLAMIC STUDIES AT THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY TODAY: PERSPECTIVES FOR THE FUTURE

In 2014 the present author was named Crone’s successor, and the field of Near Eastern and Islamic studies continues, albeit with a different focus on Islamic intellectual history. Though the development of the field at the Institute over the past eighty years may seem arbitrary at first sight, it very much reflects the overall evolution of Near Eastern studies over the past century. Though the beginnings of Near Eastern and Islamic archaeology and art history date back only to the nineteenth century, it soon developed into the leading discipline among the various directions of Near Eastern studies, not least as a result of the state-sponsored patronage it en-

197 See Crone, Collected Studies in Three Volumes, vol. 3, pp. 247–254. As for Grabar, Hillenbrand has suggested that “regrettably there still does not exist a significant arabophone readership for his work—and, by extension, that of the wider community of Islamic art historians” (Hillenbrand, “Oleg Grabar,” p. 5, n. 21). This still seems to be true—although according to Abdalrazzaq Moaz, Grabar’s Mostly Miniatures was translated into Arabic and published by the Syrian ministry for culture. He also mentions Penser de l’art islamique having been translated into Arabic in Morocco. Interestingly, Moaz says that Syrian attempts to translate Grabar’s Formation of Islamic Art, which is, of course, the most obvious work for Syrian scholars (and indeed the Syrian state) to want to have in translation, have thus far all run aground. There are some more translations available both in Persian and in Turkish, but compared with translations of Crone’s scholarship into Persian, Arabic, and Turkish, Grabar’s reception among readers in the Islamic world seems more limited. I thank Margaret Graves for having provided me with detailed information on translations of Grabar’s work into Near Eastern languages.


joyed especially in Germany prior to World War I and in France during the mandate period. Herzfeld was one of the leading scholars German academia produced at the turn of the twentieth century, and the continuation of the field at the Institute through a long-term appointment for the French Near Eastern archaeologist Henri Seyrig seemed perfectly logical at the time. Their respective prominence notwithstanding, both Seyrig and, perhaps even more, Herzfeld marked the end of an epoch. Near Eastern archaeology never regained the prominence it had before World War II and, for Germany specifically, before World War I. Both Neugebauer and Goitein picked up earlier trends in scholarship but in both cases those trends were marginal prior to them, and they successfully turned them into something truly magnificent, defining entirely new areas of scholarship. The history of science of the ancient and medieval Near East was established as a field of its own through Neugebauer, as was the study of social history during the Middle Ages through the lens of the Geniza through Goitein. Moreover, both Neugebauer and Goitein successfully collaborated with younger scholars and by doing so took care of the continuation of their respective fields of scholarship—this being something Herzfeld had (with few exceptions) never done and apparently never tried to do. Embarking on and outlining entirely new fields of research was likewise characteristic of Bowersock, Grabar, and Crone. All three were instrumental in propelling their respective areas of scholarship into a new age. Grabar’s success in establishing the field of history of Islamic art goes hand in hand with his endeavor to have the Institute nominate a successor working in an area that represents some of the core fields of Islamic studies—this role is no longer played by historians of Islamic art. In Islamic studies during the second half of the twentieth century, it is the study of Islamic history, writ large, that has taken center stage. The Institute continues nonetheless to regularly host scholars of Islamic art history among its members, and these are now affiliated with the art history group.  

The Institute, through its School of Historical Studies, also regularly supports areas within the humanities that are immensely significant but often lack structural underpinnings in the academic institutions of North America and Europe. This began in 1947 during Oppenheimer’s directorship when the Director’s Fund was established to support such areas in all (then) three schools. Recent examples in the area of Near Eastern studies include efforts to foster scholarship on Eastern Christianity and Syriac studies. The Institute co-hosted in 2003 the North American Syriac Symposium and held in 2017 a workshop entitled “Why Syriac Matters,” in addition to providing about one membership per year for a scholar working in this field. A further example is the Shii Studies Research Program (2016–2019), made possible by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, which is an initiative comprising publications, memberships, and a visitors program, as well as a series of conferences, to foster this largely marginalized field and to encourage other academic institutions to

---

200 See also the contributions of Islamic art historians Margaret Graves, Valerie Gonzalez, and Emine Fetvaci to this volume.
grant Shi‘i studies its due place in their curricula. A more recent initiative is a special program in Iranian studies, which is still in its preparatory phase. Most importantly, however, the School of Historical Studies’s membership program ensures an annual cohort of some five to seven scholars working in entirely different fields of Near Eastern studies, from Ottoman studies to modern Middle Eastern studies, ancient Iranian studies, Qur’anic studies, social and intellectual history, and so on; in addition, the School of Social Science also continues to host several scholars working on Near and Middle Eastern contexts annually.

* * *

The present volume covers a wide spectrum of disciplines within the purview of Near and Middle Eastern studies. Its main part, “Fruits of Scholarship,” consists of essays and short studies by IAS scholars, past and present, faculty, members, and visitors, mathematicians, social scientists as well as historians, who are engaged in one way or another with the Near and Middle East in their scholarship, covering fields such as the ancient Near East and early Islamic history, the Bible and the Qur’ān, Islamic intellectual history within and beyond denominational history, Arabic and other Semitic languages and literature, Islamic religious and legal practices, law and society, the Islamic West, the Ottoman world, Iranian studies, the modern Middle East, and Islam in the West. The majority of the contributions are published here for the first time; others were originally published in the Institute’s newsletter, the Institute’s IDEAS website, or other online or print publications and have been revised or adapted for the present volume. When I reached out to the IAS community of scholars on the Near East during the summer of 2017 with the idea of bringing together a volume devoted to Near Eastern studies at the Institute, I was captivated by the positive reactions from all sides. My sincerest thanks goes to all those who have contributed to the volume.

I also thank the staff of the Shelby White and Leon Levy Archives Center at the Institute for Advanced Study, Casey Westermann and Erica Mosner, for their tremendous help during the preparation of this introductory chapter on the history of Near Eastern studies at the Institute. Thanks are also due to the staff of the Historical Studies/Social Science Library, Karen Downing, Cecilia Kornish, Krista Van Ness, Kirstie Venanzi, BreAnna Woods, Dana Van Meter, and Marcia Tucker, for their support in getting hold of at times obscure publications for the purposes of this publication, and to Marian Zelazny, administrative officer of the School of Historical Studies, for providing me with a list of names of earlier research assistants in Near Eastern Studies and with copies of the informal photo directory during the 1980s and 1990s. I am also grateful to the staff of the Institute’s IT department, Edna Wigderson and María Mercedes Tuya, for searching some of the internal databases for former members in Near Eastern studies and for technical support with some of the images included in this publication. Some of the archival material relevant to the study of Near Eastern studies at the Institute was not accessible to me due to restrictions placed by offices and donors and the policy of closing the Institute’s administrative records for thirty years from the date of creation. For the most recent past I was therefore unable to consult the relevant archival materials. Some of the gaps could be filled thanks to interviews with two emeriti among the faculty of
the School of Historical Studies, Glen W. Bowersock (October 6, 2017) and Heinrich von Staden (October 11, 2017), who patiently answered my numerous queries. For this, I thank them both. Moreover, Glen Bowersock and Stefan Schorch were kind enough to read the introductory chapter and to provide valuable comments and corrections. A special word of thanks is due to Hanna Siurua for her careful copyediting of the entire volume. I am grateful to George Kiraz and Melonie Schmierer-Lee for having agreed to publish this volume in the Gorgias Handbooks series and for having seen it through the press.
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In pursuance of the conversation we had the other day, I have tried to set down in this letter the poten-tialities of the present Princeton group working in the archaeology and history of art, and the issues which have developed therein, with suggestions as to the filling of these gaps in case of an extension of the staff of the Institute for Higher Study into this field. In the way of documentation, I have enclosed (1) the statement "The Future of the Department of Art and Archaeology," issued by the Department in 1932, on the margin of which I have made comments and corrections regarding those points in the statement which bear upon the expansion of facilities and personnel for research; (2) the statements of the research projects at present under way in the Department which we presented in 1932 and 1933 to the Princeton Council on the Humanities in application for subventions, and (3) three drawings showing the projected remodelling of McDonald Hall to provide further research facilities.

These data will help to make clear the following statement of desiderata (and especially desideratum) for Princeton research in our field, to which I have prefixed a brief summary of the character and trend of what is in process in that respect at present.

PRESEN'T STATUS OF SEARCH IN ART & ARCHAEOLOGY IN PRINCETON.

The tradition of the Princeton group was determined to a great degree by Allen Marquand, whose interest in the archaeological and historical aspect of art was quite as effective in turning scholarship at Princeton in this direction as was Charles Eliot Norton’s bias toward “appreciation” in orienting the Division of Fine Arts at Harvard to connoisseurship. Marquand’s own two specialties of Classical Archaeology and the art of the Italian Renaissance have, however, been only half continued in the research category: his early recruits, Butler, Wither, and Morey, were mainly interested in antiquity and the Middle Ages, rather than the Renaissance so far as their research was concerned, and this and the later expansion of the group have resulted in a principal emphasis on classical antiquity and medieval art as the main objectives of the Department’s advanced work. A reading of the list of projects at present under way will confirm this.

Further concentration in both these major interests has occurred; in classical archaeology the interest of the Department has focused very largely on the field work in the Athenian Agora, directed by T. Leslie Shear, with
Richard Stillwell (at present on leave from Princeton as Director of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens) has been at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. In the field of Medieval Archaeology, much work has centered lately on the study of illuminated manuscripts, with the object of obtaining material which is continuous and pervasively for all ages and epochs (such as illuminated manuscripts for antiquity) on which to reconstruct the evolution of artistic style throughout the Middle Ages. The work in both of the above fields has found a common ground in the tendency of some of our "Artists" to explore the later periods of antiquity (e.g., Elderkin and Morey), and of our medievalists to mostly work in the early Middle Ages (e.g., Baldwin Smith, Friend, DeWald, Morey) so that the group has acquired the reputation of specializing in the transformation of the ancient into the medieval. The outward manifestation of this has been the project for the excavation of Antioch, centering on excellence of such metamorphoses.

Only part of the Department's research, of course, has been located in the above-indicated 'twilight zone.' Rather's work has been in Italian Painting of the fourteenth century, and his critical writing over the field of painting as a whole. Shear and Stillwell are at present mainly interested in the monuments and problems uncovered by the small at Athens and Corintha. W. F. Stoholm, instructed with the catalogue of the manuscripts of the Museum Cristianis, has broadened this task into a project for a general corpus of manuscripts of Limoges type. B. D. Roberts is doing, for the Public Library in New York, a publication of the Michel Potier of the fourteenth century, and enlarging this enterprise by investigation in collateral examples and schools of fourteenth-century illumination. George Forster's excavation of Saint Martin at Angers has developed into a general reconstruction of the history of Carolingian and early Romanesque architecture in the center and west of France. George Rowley's catalogue of the Horris collection of Chinese painting has created a focus of research in Far Eastern art which seems to us to be an extremely promising and important departure. Lastly, the Index of Christian Art, now in the second decade of its existence, and beginning to bring to some realization its purpose of cataloguing and bibliographing all examples of Christian art to 1600, is a fertile breeding-ground for research essays in medieval art and iconography, some of which have been carried to publication by our graduate students, and the most important of which have been the publications of the Director of the Index, Helen Woodruff ("The Illustrated Manuscripts of Prudentius"; "The Physiologus of Beirne"; "The Iconography and Icones of the Icones of La Bassigna." ) Miss Woodruff, A. M. Friend, E. T. DeWald, and myself are combining in a project sponsored by the Index, of a complete publication of the illustrations of the Old Testament in Greek manuscripts, to parallel a similar corpus for New Testament illustration which has been undertaken by Willoughby, of the Department of New Testament Literature at Chicago. Elderkin and Shear are advocating the extension of the Index backward to cover classical antiquity; Baldwin Smith, Forster, and Roberts are planning to add to it a section on Medieval Architecture. Both these additions are urged on the plausible ground that the Index as conducted at present has solved the problem of cataloguing.

Figure 6.2: Letter from Charles Rufus Morey to Abraham Flexner, April 9/10, 1934 (Director's Office. General Files. Box 44. Morey, Charles Rufus 1931-1938. Shelby White and Leon Levy Archives Center, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton NJ), p. 2
any sort of artistic monuments and subject-matter, so that such extensions could proceed in orderly and exact fashion from the start, on the basis of an indexing system which has been worked out to quasi-perfection through many years of trial and error.

**POSSIBLE EXPANSION OF THE RESEARCH GROUP**

The above presents a picture of research in the archaeology and history of art as it present in process at Princeton. In what way can this be usefully enlarged? Should one aim at a fully-rounded group, to include scholars in fields not represented by the present personnel, but specialists, for example, in Egyptology, Mesopotamian antiquities, American Archaeology, etc., or should expansion be sought in talent that would supplement specifically the work in classical and medieval archaeology which has acquired at Princeton a considerable momentum?

It seems to me far more desirable, for economy and efficiency, to choose the latter alternative. To take the examples cited, a Princeton center of research in either Egyptology, Assyriology, or American Archaeology would inadequately duplicate long-established institutions such as the Oriental Institute at Chicago, or the Peabody Museum at Harvard. Even in our own field of the Middle Ages, it would hardly be wise to compete with Offner's exhaustive research in early Florentine painting, and Cook's work in Medieval Spanish painting, at New York University. The wiser plan is to realize and fill lacunae which have made themselves insistently felt within our local research - and to fill these with scholars of outstanding ability who would add powerfully to the sum of archaeological scholarship that can be concentrated usefully at Princeton.

Considering such lacunae, we have first the gap left by Father's retirement. We need, to replace him, (1) a specialist in the later Middle Ages and the early Renaissance, a "Quattrocentist" in short, whose preference for Italian or Northern Renaissance would be immaterial, provided he would bring to bear upon our work an outstanding competence in the period, and the critical acumen and ability to synthesize the diverse phenomena of the end of the Middle Ages. (2) For our work in the illustration and illumination of manuscripts, we need the constant help of a paleographer of demonstrated authority. (3) With the exception of Rilkekin, our classical archaeologists are field-workers and likely to continue. The research personnel at home could be profitably enlarged by (a) a specialist in Greek architecture (with special reference to the excavation of the Athenian Agora), and (b) by another scholar of outstanding competence in Greek epigraphy. It is hardly necessary to consider numismatics, since Princeton has already a competent numismatist in Weber, and a ready consultant in New York in the person of Newall, who is probably the best scholar in this field. (4) A Near Eastern archaeologist with a special competence in Islamic art. The recent development of Islamic literature and history within the Department of Oriental Languages and Literatures would provide such a scholar with the necessary assistance in the philological and historical aspects of his subject;
Figure 6.4: Letter from Charles Rufus Morey to Abraham Flexner, April 9/10, 1934 (Director’s Office. General Files. Box 44. Morey, Charles Rufus 1931-1938. Shelby White and Leon Levy Archives Center, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton NJ), p. 4
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his presence in the archaeological group would be immensely helpful, not only for the interpretation of the finds at Antioch, but for the constantly recurring problems of Islamic influence which often baffles the students of the medieval art of Europe.

Desiderati. Names present themselves immediately for some of these lacunae, not so readily for others. The most brilliant scholar in the late Middle Ages and early Renaissance that we know is Erwin Panofsky, until recently Dean of the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Hamburg, and at present Visiting Professor of Fine Arts in New York University, who will be making his home in Princeton during the next year and a half at least. He meets in every way desideratum no. 1, and as he seems to be available, this particular problem can be solved in a highly satisfactory way.

For our palaeographer, one would like to find a scholar combining high proficiency in both Greek and Latin palaeography, but such a genius does not, to our knowledge, exist. The most outstanding scholar in Greek manuscripts that we know is Arch. Giovanni Beresti, prefect of the Vatican Library, who is obviously not available. In this country we have Mirog Lake at Harvard, an excellent scholar, but not in the same class with Beresti; as to his availability I would not be able to speak. For Latin palaeography one thinks at once of R. A. Lowe, now at Oxford, the best of our American scholars in the field, and second to none in Europe; his name would immediately associate itself in Princeton minds with desideratum 2.

In the case of desideratum 3a in Classical Archaeology, the obvious person is Dinamor of Columbia, a scholar possessed of intuition amounting to genius in his preferred field of Greek architecture, and peculiarly fitted to fill out our group in this subject. If he came to the Institute, it would greatly facilitate the completion of his monumental work on the Propylees of the Acropolis, and he would have in Stillwell of our staff a younger coadjutor who promises to measure up to Dinamor’s competence as he grows and expands. For 3b, Harrett of Johns Hopkins, known for his brilliant work on the Agora inscriptions, is an outstanding epigraphist, and hardly to be bettered by any candidate from Europe.

As to an Islamic specialist, we would have no recommendation to make at present, since the search would have to be made, in view of the age of the outstanding scholars in this field, in the ranks of the younger generation. This need is in fact not so pressing as the foregoing, and could await an extended sifting of personalities in this country and particularly in Europe.

Research Associates and Assistants

Not less in importance for the future of a research group in consideration of its younger generation, - men who are to replace the arrived mentioned above, and to build on the foundations they have laid. Here one may choose with
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Parliament and not necessarily with assurance of permanent appointment. Nevertheless, three such posts for younger scholars have already been in the minds of our group as desiderata: (1) a research assistant for the Index of Christian Art, to act as inspector of entries, whose task it would be to remove discrepancies, correct references, and verify locations, with the further and more important function of searching Byzantine and Latin literature for descriptions of lost works of art; (2) a young Byzantinist to take over certain unlocated portions of the project for the Corpus of Old Testament Illustration in Greek Manuscripts; (3) a research assistant to help in the cataloguing of the Museum Christiani of the Vatican Library. We have the young men in mind to fill these places; for (1) R. B. S. Evett, a brilliant young classicist in Princeton; for (2) Kurt Weitzmann, a pupil of Adolph Goldschmidt in Berlin; for (3) Dimitris Tsolos, a Greek who was until lately an instructor in New York University; two or three other names might suggest themselves as alternatives to Tsolos for this post.

RESEARCH FACILITIES

In a conversation we had some time ago, you had some fun with me because I admired the "installation" of the Mathematics group in Fine Hall. I think what has been stated above shows that we are in agreement as to the highly superior importance of desiderata as compared with desiderata, particularly if the latter term be made to mean mere housing and material equipment. But the archaeologist and art-historian cannot say with Dr. Einstein that all they need is a pencil and a pad of paper. We work with plates, architectural drawings, plans and maps, photographs, movable objects from excavations, indices such as the Index of Christian Art; we cannot do without drafting-rooms, large spaces in which to lay out comparative material, rooms for the classified shelving of photographs, facilities for photographing and photostating, and store-rooms for excavation records. And we must have an adequate library, complete in the extensive publications by which archaeological scholarship is recorded.

When the proposed plan for the remodelling of McCormick Hall is completed (we hope by next fall), the Princeton group will have all these facilities, adequately installed, to meet present and minimum requirements. Any statement of the facilities of the department would not be accurate without emphasis on the underlined words. The money for the remodelling must come from the Speers bequest, and means just that much diminution of the endowment for expenses of research. We were not able to provide for future expansion by making a substantial addition to the building, because to do this would have meant spending more of this capital than we could afford.

The bearing of this upon the present prospectus is obvious. For instance, when the remodelling is done, we shall have provided offices in number sufficient only for our present staff, and these they must keep because of the use that is made of them in undergraduate teaching and conferences. The seating capacity of the Harquand and Burr Jepson Libraries will be, even after remodelling,
sufficient only for our graduate students and undergraduate senior departmental, allowing for no Juniors. I think that no great inconvenience will arise at the outset of any expansion in the personnel of the research group, since adjustments of one sort or another can always be made for a time. But as the number of scholars in the group, and especially as the number of advanced students increases, provision will have to be made in proximity to the library for additional offices and study-space.

The only area in which such offices and study-space can be conveniently located is the top floor of the Museum, which opens from the Marquand Library. This would entail the providing of equivalent space for the Museum, by an addition which could take the form of a wing extending north from the east end of the old Museum building. I mention this in order to give you an idea of the full extent of the commitments which the Institute might be assuming in undertaking an extension into the field of the archaeology and history of art in cooperation with the University's department of Art and Archaeology.

In conclusion, and in lieu of expressing very positive (but possibly prejudiced) convictions of my own in favor of our subject as an initial field for the expansion of the Institute's activity into the Humanities, I take the liberty of quoting Panofsky from a recent letter: "Art and Archaeology would really be the best thing to begin with, for as things have developed, art-history has become a kind of clearing-house (both literally and figuratively speaking) for all the other historical disciplines which, when left alone, tend to a certain self-isolation. This key-position of Art-History in modern Geistesgeschichte accounts also for the success of the Warburg Library in Hamburg, and it would be a magnificent idea to build up a similar thing (yet not a duplicate, thanks to the well-established tradition of your Department) at Princeton."

Very sincerely yours,

C. Morey

Figure 6.6: Letter from Charles Rufus Morey to Abraham Flexner, April 9/10, 1934 (Director's Office. General Files. Box 44. Morey, Charles Rufus 1931-1938. Shelby White and Leon Levy Archives Center, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton NJ), p. 6