

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

MINUTES

Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees
January 22, 1964
Pinnacle Club, New York City

Present Messrs. Galpin, Henry, Leidesdorf, Lewis, Mitchell, Rosenwald, and Shanks; Dr. Oppenheimer; and Mr. Morgan.

Absent Messrs. Garrison, Greenbaum, Hochschild, Linder, and Strauss.

Presiding Officer The Chairman, Mr. Leidesdorf, opened the meeting at 12:20 p.m.

Minutes The minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board held in New York on October 8, 1963 were approved as circulated.

Dr. Oppenheimer moved the following amendment to the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board held in Princeton on April 19 and 20, 1963:

"The Director requested the Board's approval of a leave-of-absence without salary for Professor Borel for the second term of the academic year 1963-1964. The leave was approved."

The amendment was approved.

Director's Report The Director reported the following gifts to the Institute since the last meeting of the Board:

A. Gifts

1. An anonymous gift of securities in the approximate amount of \$10,000, which will be added to the endowment of the Herodotus Fund.
2. From Mr. Harold Linder, a gift of securities in the approximate amount of \$5,000, with the request that it be used as a memorial for the late Senator Lehman, perhaps in some portion of the new library.
3. From Mr. Brunson S. McCutchen, a gift of \$1,000, which will be used for the support of visiting lecturers.
4. From the I.B.M. Corporation, approval of the appointment of Dr. Lars Hörmander as the first incumbent of the John von Neumann Chair in Mathematics.

B. Faculty Procedures

The Director described in detail the recent adoption of a change in faculty procedures involving nominations for faculty appointment. (Draft minutes of Faculty Meeting of December 19, 1963 and "Faculty Procedures Adopted by the Faculty" attached.) In general, nominations in the future will be made by the faculty of the school in which the

appointment is being considered. The members of the faculty of the school will vote upon the nomination, and the nomination will then be presented to the faculty as a whole for discussion, but not for vote. In the case of an appointment in a field outside of the existing disciplines of History, Mathematics, and Physics, an ad hoc committee will be appointed by the faculty to consider the nomination and report its findings to the full faculty.

C. Appointment
of Professor
Clagett

The Director recommended the appointment of Professor Marshall Clagett (vita attached) to a professorship in the School of Historical Studies. The appointment was unanimously approved.

D. Faculty
Salaries

The Director described the current widespread practice of supplementing faculty salaries in the sciences, particularly in mathematics, with government contract funds. The standard amount is two-ninths of the base salary, and it is usually paid in the two summer months. This was brought into sharp focus at the Institute with the appointment of Professor Harish-Chandra, who was receiving a salary of \$21,000 at Columbia University, plus a \$7,000 summer grant from the National Science Foundation. In order to meet this combined salary it was necessary for the Institute to pay one-half of Professor Harish-Chandra's supplementary salary (\$3,500) for the past summer, but the Director did not wish to inaugurate the practice of using government funds in this manner at the Institute; so the \$3,500 was charged to the Contingent Fund.

The Director met with the mathematics faculty to discuss the problem. Despite a divergence of opinion, with some members strongly opposed to the practice, it was agreed to set \$5,000 as a proper supplementary summer salary.

The Director stated that there were two overriding considerations for the Board:

1. The present faculty salary figure of \$25,000 was not competitive, particularly in the sciences.
2. There should be equity as to salary among the three schools.

With these two factors in mind, he recommended to the Board a general increase in faculty salaries to \$30,000.

There was a general discussion of the problem among the members of the Board, and it was the sense of the meeting that a decision should not be delayed. It was therefore moved, seconded, and unanimously passed, that, effective July 1, 1964, faculty salaries be set at \$30,000. It was understood that this action in no way changed the existing pension commitments.

Library

Mr. Morgan was asked to give a brief progress report on the construction of the new library.

Annual Meeting

The weekend of April 17 and 18 was selected for the Annual Meeting of the Board.

Committee
on Library
Acquisitions

The Director stated that acquisitions to the library had been greatly reduced during recent years for lack of space, and that he and the librarian would need guidance in this area once the new library was complete.

The Chairman appointed Messrs. Lewis, Rosenwald, and Henry to serve as a committee on library acquisitions.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Minot C. Morgan, Jr.
Assistant Secretary

AMENDED

DRAFT

MINUTES

Faculty Meeting, December 19, 1963

Present: The Director, Professors Alföldi, Beurling, Borel, Cherniss, Dyson, Gilbert, Gödel, Harish-Chandra, Kennan, Meiss, Maritt, Montgomery, Selberg, Strömbergren, Thompson, Weil, Whitney, and Yang.

1. The Director welcomed Professor Harish-Chandra, and expressed the sense of loss of the Faculty at the death of Professor Kantorowicz.
2. The draft Minutes (circulated within the last two days) of the meeting of April 26, 1963 were approved.
3. The Director stated that the purpose of this meeting is to discuss the Faculty Committee's Proposals for Faculty Procedures, which have been circulated, together with a foreword by Professors Selberg and Strömbergren. The Faculty Committee consisted of Professors Borel, Meiss, Selberg, Strömbergren and Thompson.
4. After considerable discussion, an amendment to the Faculty Committee's Proposals was passed that Section 4 of the Proposals be changed to read:

"After the Faculty meeting, the nomination may be presented
by the Director to the Board of Trustees for their consideration."
5. Professor Gödel discussed the second paragraph of Section 1 of the Proposals. He raised the point that, "...shall communicate this decision to the Director..." may imply that the Director is excluded in the discussion leading to the decision. Professors Selberg and Strömbergren said that the Faculty Committee does not read into that paragraph such implications at all. In fact, the Proposals are not meant to, and do not legislate the procedure with which the Nominating Group arrives at its decision.

After considerable discussion, an amendment was passed that the second paragraph of Section 1 of the Proposals be changed to read, "This group (referred to hereafter as the Nominating Group), after having reached its decision to make the nomination, shall report this decision in writing to the Director, and also notify all Faculty members."
6. An amendment was passed that the last sentence of Section 5 of the Proposals be changed to read: "In other respects the above rules shall then apply."
7. There was considerable discussion of the last sentence of Section 3 of the Proposals. In the discussion the question also was raised as to the purpose of the Faculty Meeting in the proposed procedure. Professor Selberg said that it was the Committee's opinion that verbal presentation is oftentimes in some respects more complete and informative than a written one. In fact, some statements which can be made in a discussion may perhaps be best left out in a written document.

The Director and Professor Alföldi made the point that with a Faculty Meeting there will be a record for the Faculty and for the Trustees of the discussions that may take place concerning the nomination.

An amendment was passed that the last sentence of Section 3 of the Proposals be deleted.

8. There were general discussions on what is meant by the term "formal debate" in the second paragraph of Section 2. The discussion established the general opinion that it is not desirable, as a rule, to have verbatim records of Faculty Meetings, but that any Faculty Member could have, if he so desires, his opinion recorded in detail in the Minutes.

9. An amendment was passed that the word "presently" in the introductory sentence of the Proposals be changed to read "at present".

10. The Faculty wanted to record its appreciation of the work of the Faculty Committee.

11. The meeting was adjourned.

C. N. Yang
Secretary

FOREWORD

This proposal for new procedures in the processing of nominations for Faculty appointment by the Faculty of the Institute is based on a discussion held at a meeting by a Faculty committee chosen to consider these questions. At the end of this meeting the committee left the preparation of a draft of such a proposal in the hands of the undersigned.

The proposal is meant to provide more independence for each of the three Faculty groups representing the three areas of study now established in the Institute, thereby eliminating some sources of friction and conflict. At the same time it is intended to help to preserve contact between these groups and thus maintain the concept of the Faculty as an entity.

Specifically: It places the Faculty responsibility for new appointments fully on the group of Faculty members representing the area of study in which the appointment is being made.

While relieving the other parts of the Faculty from the obligation to pass judgment on the nomination, it preserves their right to be fully informed.

Atle Selberg

Bengt Strömberg

December 9, 1963

Faculty Procedures Adopted by the Faculty

It is recognized that three areas of study are at present established in the Institute: History, Mathematics and Physics; each of these terms to be understood in a wide rather than narrow sense.

1. A nomination for Faculty appointment in one of the established areas of study in the Institute shall be put before the Faculty after it has received the approval of the Faculty group concerned with this area of study.

This group (referred to hereafter as the Nominating Group), after having reached its decision to make the nomination, shall report this decision in writing to the Director, and also notify all Faculty members.

The Nominating Group shall prepare a document (or documents) containing relevant biographical data of the nominee, a bibliography and an evaluation of his scholarly or scientific work. Copies of this document shall be sent to all members of the Faculty, as shall copies of statements by outside experts, if such have been solicited.

2. The Director shall call a Faculty meeting to be held not less than two weeks after the dossier about the nominee has been distributed.

The purpose of this meeting is to acquaint the Faculty with the nominee and his work as well as with any circumstances that may further motivate the nomination, beyond what can be done conveniently in the distributed dossier. Questions may be asked and answered, and comments made, but there shall be no formal debate and no vote shall be taken.

3. A Faculty member who believes that he possesses some information that may possibly lead to a reconsideration of the nomination, may present this information to the Nominating Group before the Faculty meeting. It is the responsibility of the Nominating Group to assess this information and to decide whether to reconsider or not.

4. After the Faculty meeting, the nomination may be presented by the Director to the Board of Trustees for their consideration.

5. Two Faculty groups may agree to act as one Nominating Group for a nominee whose work has substantial bearing on both areas of study that the groups represent. In other respects the above rules shall then apply.

6. A proposal of a Faculty appointment in an area of study outside of those already established in the Institute, may be made by the Director or by one or more Faculty members. Such a proposal shall be discussed by the Faculty, and the membership of any ad hoc committee to be appointed should be discussed and approved by the Faculty. After the documents concerning the proposal have been distributed, the matter shall be considered and discussed at a Faculty meeting, and should the Faculty wish, further discussed and voted on at a meeting not less than two weeks later.

December 20, 1963

Dr. Robert Oppenheimer
Director,
The Institute for Advanced Study

Dear Dr. Oppenheimer:

At a meeting held on December 9, 1963 the active professors in the School of Historical Studies voted unanimously to nominate Marshall Clagett to a professorship in the Institute for Advanced Study and to submit this nomination to the Director. At an earlier meeting of the School on October 31st a preliminary discussion of this nomination had been held; and, all members being in agreement, it had been decided to ask Professors Koyré, Neugebauer, Gillispie, and Edelstein to give us their confidential opinions concerning Clagett's work and our consideration of him for a professorship in the Institute. Professor Edelstein declined to give an opinion, saying that he "cannot claim any real familiarity with his [Clagett's] work". The answers sent by the other three gentlemen and Clagett's Vita and Bibliography are given as annexes to this letter.

At the meeting held on December 9th the members of the School discussed the opinions expressed in these three letters. They considered with special care the qualifying reservations in the letter from Professor Neugebauer, and all agreed that these reservations do not outweigh either the favorable estimate given by Neugebauer himself or the advantages which would accrue to the School and the Institute as a result of Clagett's appointment. All expressed agreement with the estimate given by Professor Gillispie in his letter and felt that his recommendation effectively presents the argument in favor of the appointment.

The faculty of the School is personally acquainted with Clagett, who has held a membership here several times, and on the basis of its personal experience is convinced that all its members and all members of the academic community in Princeton would profit greatly by his permanent association with the Institute. All have some knowledge of his attitude to his work and his scholarly methods and all find them congenial and admirable. His appointment would give the School a representative of the history of science, which itself has for some time been felt to be a desideratum, and one whose direct access to the sources "places him", as Neugebauer says, "far above the majority of his colleagues in the History of Science"; and his special concern with mediaeval science would at the same time partially recompense the School for the grievous loss that it has suffered by the death of Professor Kantorowicz. Moreover, in Neugebauer's words again, the kind of work that Clagett has done and is doing "is the most urgently needed type of contribution in the study of mediaeval sciences and very rare indeed"; and the faculty of the School feels that by his appointment the Institute may encourage more students of the history of science to turn to this kind of sound, critical, and profitable scholarship.

The faculty of the School of Historical Studies therefore submits to you the name of Marshall Clagett in nomination for a professorship in the Institute and requests that you bring this nomination before the full faculty of the Institute and in due course recommend the appointment to the trustees.

Respectfully,

Harold Cherniss, Executive Officer
of the School of Historical Studies

MARSHALL CLAGETT

Date of Birth: January 23, 1916

Education:

1933-35 California Institute of Technology
1935-37 A.B., George Washington University
1937-38 M.A., George Washington University
1938-41 Ph.D., Columbia University

Professional Career:

1946-47 History Department, Columbia University, Instructor
1947-- History of Science Department, University of Wisconsin, Assistant Professor 1947-49; Associate Professor 1949-54; Professor 1954--
1959-- Director, Institute for Research in the Humanities

Affiliations:

Member, The Institute for Advanced Study, 1958-59; 1962/63, second term.
Member, The American Philosophical Society since 1960.
Fellow, American Academy of Arts and Sciences.
Fellow, Mediaeval Academy of America.
Member, Academy of International History of Science.
Member, History of Science Society (Vice President, 1958-62; President, 1963 and 1964).
Vice Chairman, United States National Committee of the International Union for the History and Philosophy of Science.

Bibliography

Books:

Giovanni Marliani and Late Medieval Physics, New York 1941

The Medieval Science of Weights (Scientia de ponderibus): Treatises Ascribed to Euclid, Archimedes, Thabit ibn Qurra, Jordanus de Nemore, and Blasius of Parma, (with Ernest A. Moody), 1952

Greek Science in Antiquity, New York 1955

The Science of Mechanics in the Middle Ages, Madison 1959. Republished 1961

In press or in preparation:

Archimedes in the Middle Ages, 2 vols.

De configurationibus qualitatum of Nicole Oresme, critical text with annotations.

Articles:

"Note on the Tractatus physici falsely attributed to Giovanni Marliani", Isis 34 (1942), p. 168.

"Some general aspects of medieval physics", Isis 39 (1948), pp. 29-44.

"The medieval heritage: political and economic", in Chapters in Western Civilization (New York 1948), pp. 3-73.

"The medieval heritage: religious, philosophic, scientific", ibid., pp. 74-122.

"Richard Swineshead and late medieval physics", Osiris 9 (1950), pp. 131-61.

"A medieval fragment of the De sphaera et cylindro of Archimedes", Isis 43 (1952) pp. 36-38.

"Archimedes in the Middle Ages: The De mensura circuli", Osiris 10 (1952) pp. 587-618.

"The use of the Moerbeke translations of Archimedes in the works of Johannes de Muris", Isis 43 (1952), pp. 236-42.

"Medieval mathematics and physics: a checklist of microfilm reproductions", Isis 44 (1953), pp. 371-81.

"The medieval Latin translations from the Arabic of the Elements of Euclid, with special emphasis on the versions of Adelard of Bath", Isis 44 (1953), pp. 16-42.

"A medieval Latin translation of a short Arabic text on the hyperbola", Osiris 11 (1954), pp. 359-85.

"King Alfred and the Elements of Euclid", Isis 45 (1954), pp. 269-77.

"Science has a long history", in The Challenge of Our Times (ed. Farrington Daniels and Thomas M. Smith), Minneapolis 1954, pp. 28-38.

"The De curvis superficiebus Archimedis: a medieval commentary of Johannes de Tinemue on Book I of the De sphaera et cylindro of Archimedes", Osiris 11 (1954), pp. 295-358.

"A note on the dating of the De curvis superficiebus Archimedis", Isis 46 (1955), pp. 281-2.

"The Quadratura per lunulas, a thirteenth-century fragment of Simplicius' commentary of the Physics of Aristotle", in Essays on Medieval Life and Thought Presented in Honor of Austin Patterson Evans, New York 1955, pp. 99-108.

"The Liber de Motu of Gerard of Brussels and the origins of kinematics in the West", Osiris 12 (1956), pp. 73-175.

"Three notes: the mechanical problems of pseudo-Aristotle in the Middle Ages; further light on dating the De curvis superficiebus Archimedis; Oresme and Archimedes", Isis 48 (1957), pp. 182-83.

"The impact of Archimedes on medieval science", Isis 50 (1959), pp. 419-29.

"Medieval mathematics, physics and philosophy: a revised catalogue of photographic reproductions", Manuscripta 2 (1958), pp. 131-54, and 3 (1959), pp. 19-37 (with J. E. Murdoch).

Books edited:

Critical Problems in the History of Science, Proceedings of the Institute for the History of Science at the University of Wisconsin, 1957

Twelfth-century Europe and the Foundations of Modern Society (with Gaines Post and Robert Reynolds), Madison 1961

H. Lamar Crosby, Jr.: Thomas of Bradwardine: His "Tractatus de proportionibus". Its Significance for the Development of Mathematical Physics

Curtis Wilson: Medieval Logic and the Rise of Mathematical Physics

C O P Y

C O P Y

4 rue de Navarre
Paris 5

6 Nov. 63

Dear Robert,

I have just received your letter of Oct. 31 and hasten to answer. As you have rightly surmized the news that the Institute considers offering a professorship to Marshall Clagett gave me a great pleasure. I think that it is a very good idea and I can only approve. Indeed, in my opinion - and it is not only my opinion but the communis opinio doctorum - Marshall Clagett is a scholar of the very first rank and one of the very best historians of science - certainly nulli secundus - not only in the States but also abroad.

As for his own field, that of the history of medieval science and its relations to the ancient one, a field the importance of which I do not need to stress, I think that he has no rival. This not only because he is at home in both - cf. his Greek Science in Antiquity and his truly magisterial Science of mechanics in the Middle Ages with its amazing erudition - but also because of his extraordinary ability to follow and to clarify the so subtle and, for us, so often so strange and so foreign reasonings of the scholastics.

This being so it seems to me that Marshall Clagett's appointment will be as profitable to the Institute as to himself.

With affectionate regards

Yours as ever

/s/ Alexandre Koyré

C O P Y

C O P Y

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
Princeton, New Jersey

November 2, 1963

Professor Harold Cherniss
Institute for Advanced Study
Princeton, New Jersey

Dear Harold:

In reply to your letter of October 31 concerning Marshall Clagett I can formulate my opinion as follows: his scholarship in the area of mediaeval mathematics, mechanics and general scientific thought is absolutely solid, in close contact with the very complex source material and greatly enhanced by his knowledge of Arabic. This alone places him far above the majority of his colleagues in the "History of Science." He is a hard worker and there is all good reason to expect him to continue turning out useful and respectable work. One may well say that this is the most urgently needed type of contribution in the study of mediaeval sciences, and very rare indeed.

On the other hand I do not think that there will be ever anything brilliant or really programmatic come out of Clagett's work. His book on Ancient Greek Science is a rather poor compilation. Kantorowicz, Huizinga, March Bloch would never have written a pedestrian essay, even outside their field of real competence.

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 much be changed by moving him from Wisconsin to Princeton. And about the same could be said for the Institute.

As to the second paragraph of your letter I think Gaines Post seems the person to express an opinion on Clagett as a mediaevalist.

Most cordially yours,

/s/ O. Neugebauer

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

Department of History

November 6, 1963

Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer
Institute for Advanced Study
Princeton, New Jersey

Dear Dr. Oppenheimer:

Thank you for your invitation to submit my opinion of Marshall Clagett's work and of the appropriateness of his being asked to come to the Institute as a professor. It is a pleasure to be able to write about a colleague whose scholarship I admire so much. It appears to me, indeed, that his presence at the Institute would be singularly fitting from all the relevant points of view: that of the historiography of science, that of Professor Clagett's own career, that of the scholarly community in Princeton, and finally (if I may say so) that of the Institute itself in its school of historical studies. Let me address myself to these considerations in turn.

Taking thought of the whole state of the art, I believe that most of us who are striving to develop the history of science as a fully professional scholarly and academic discipline would consider Professor Clagett's work to be the most valuable, the most irreplaceable, currently being contributed by a scholar who is in the fullness of his powers. He is working as you know in that area where the discoveries of scholarship in the last generation have been most surprising, specifically in medieval mechanics. There his Medieval Science of Weights gave promise of what his Medieval Science of Mechanics has comprehensively confirmed and established: a just appreciation of the accomplishments and a prudent estimation of the limitations of thirteenth and fourteenth century statics, kinematics, and dynamics. Professor Clagett has brought to a considerable art the integration of his own exposition with presentation of the texts in carefully established edition together with translation. Thereby he puts other scholars in the way of seeing the essential evidence and also of knowing what he makes of it. It is to be noted, moreover, that most of the other titles, which I will not detail, in the Wisconsin series on medieval mechanics are in a very direct way extensions of Professor Clagett's scholarship expressed in the persons of students and colleagues. He has formed a school, and that does not often happen in American scholarship.

There is a further factor to be emphasized, which is that Professor Clagett is primarily and preeminently a professional historian of science. It may be that thereby his work loses certain sharpnesses of perspective which appear in the work of others who come to their subject-matter from some more special point of vantage. His is not so exact a vein as that of Neugebauer. It is not so alive to metaphysical nuance as that of Koyré. It is not so sensitive to the inwardness of scholasticism as that

Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer--Page 2

of Anneliese Maier. But admirable and valuable as their works are (not to go back to comparisons with Duhem or Tannery), behind the intrinsic excellence of those scholars in themselves their special qualities arise from their having come to the history of science from mathematics or philosophy. I think it is fair to say that Professor Clagett is of the first generation to set out as professional historians of science, and in my opinion -- I shan't labor comparisons to the disadvantage of others -- he is the best of us in any field of the history of science. He brings to his work, moreover, the distinctive, you may perhaps think as compared to Koyré or Neugebauer the more modest, but still the essential touch of the historian: his account never lacks body and never loses its sense of the context. It is, moreover, -- and now no comparison is intended -- very thorough. It may be a defect of this quality that he has no gift of simplification or popularization. The one book that is not good is also the one that he never intended as a contribution to scholarship: Greek Science in Antiquity.

Yet a further feature of Professor Clagett's career impresses me. He is gathering momentum as he reaches middle age, is becoming still more productive, and is currently upon two studies both of which will be even more original in their scholarship than his work in mechanics, which for all its careful collection and scrutiny of the texts does to some extent still depend upon the impetus given originally by Duhem. I refer here to his forthcoming study of the transmission of knowledge of Archimedes through Islam and in the Latin West and his current studies of Oresme. The former is in proof -- correcting the proof for this is itself a work of scholarship in Arabic, Greek, Latin, and Geometry -- and the latter is in its formative stages.

Professor Clagett's career, then, is at a point where he would derive the utmost benefit from continuing it at the Institute. His method of working is achieved. He needs texts or copies of texts and early editions on which to work intensively and without interruption. He has done his part (it would seem to me) in the institutional development of our subject. He is completing his term as President of the History of Science Society and has been faithful in consulting with the National Science Foundation and other bodies who favor our work. He has been Chairman first of the Department of the History of Science and now of an Institute for the Humanities at the University of Wisconsin. He has left the former and could leave the latter in flourishing condition. These are important enterprises, but others now have come along who could administer them. My sense of Professor Clagett's own desire is that he would now like to devote all his energy to scholarship.

It is evident that it would be a great enrichment to the historical community in Princeton if Professor Clagett were to be doing his work here. I also venture to think that it would be important for him to have access to good company in the history of science, and perhaps it will not be amiss if I mention that we are in the midst of significant development at the University. It will not be a breach of confidence to say that President Goheen has recently given assurances about the

Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer--Page 3

support the Administration will give to our intention to create studies in the history and philosophy of science on a scale second to none. We are planning and hoping for several appointments, one of which you know about. We mean, too, to have work in history of biology, in Islamic science, and in that of classical antiquity, though matters are not yet such that names can be mentioned. I go into it this far only because it would obviously not be appropriate for me to support Professor Clagett's appointment in the thought that his presence would relieve us of staffing problems. We intend to provide fully for our responsibilities in instruction both of undergraduate and graduate students. Nevertheless, the presence of a group of historians of science on a considerable scale would clearly be welcome to Professor Clagett, and the presence of one of his standing would be an inestimable encouragement to us. If it happened, further, that he wished to have a seminar on occasion, whether of faculty or graduate students or both, and his doing so were acceptable to the Institute, there would always be a standing invitation, but never I trust an exploitation. We have a lively and intelligent group of graduate students at the present time and I am hopeful that the subject will prove increasingly attractive to able and qualified people coming on to graduate school.

I hope, finally, that it will not be impertinent if I write a word about the Institute itself. Quite apart from the accident of my being at Princeton, it is my feeling as a historian of science that the appointment of a professor in our discipline in the School of Historical Studies would be a great encouragement to us and entirely in keeping with the commitment of the Institute as a whole. The matter of the Rosenwald Collection needs only to be mentioned. It has meant everything to Alexandre Koyré to work therein, and no one else comes to mind whose particular cast of work is so well suited as is Professor Clagett's to continue to make the most of those resources. Beyond that remark, however, it would be intrusive of me to venture, and I shall, therefore, simply express the hope, which I feel confident would be shared more widely by my colleagues than in the case of any other candidate, that the Institute will indeed see fit to name Professor Clagett to a professorship.

With all best wishes,

Very sincerely yours,

/s/ Charles C. Gillispie

Charles C. Gillispie

CCG:ss