

830 S. Pugh St.
State College, Penna.
December 28, 1962

Jose Ferrater Mora
915 Wyndon Ave.
Bryn Mawr, Penna.

Dear Jose,

I'm sorry that things worked out so badly with respect to our getting together over the vacation. Unfortunately, I could not remain in the area any longer at that time. As you no doubt know by now, I gave the Leibniz chapter to Hugues to pass on to you with a few brief comments. The main consideration at this point concerns the orientation of what is to follow. I have no objections to continuing along the lines we had outlined earlier--the distinction from Suarez to Kant, more or less. And as my note suggested, I will next treat Descartes, Locke, and Hume. But it occurred to me that you had once felt that the bulk of the treatment might concern Leibniz. As you will realize from the Leibniz chapter, there is plenty there (and not there) which could be expanded and treated in greater depth. Then it might be more appropriate to concern myself only with his major predecessors--Suarez, Bayle, Locke, Descartes, maybe Spinoza, Arnauld (and Nicole), maybe Ramus and Jungius, maybe Hobbes, and so forth, to the extent that their views influenced his. Or perhaps a treatment of Leibniz alone, with only occasional reference to predecessors, would seem to you more promising. In any event, I'm sure that there is enough in the Leibniz chapter now in your hands that you can judge better than before what strikes you as most fruitful.

I feel that I should be getting even more done on this, but I also feel that I got as much done as I might have hoped to in view of the new teaching responsibilities. I would be interested in knowing how you feel about this--i.e., whether you've got me classed with sluggish Miss whatshername, or whether you're delighted with the progress, or whether you're indifferent, etc.

Last term I taught two Humanities sections and an introductory Logic course. In this coming term I shall teach Humanities, Logic, and a course in Plato and Aristotle. The spring term will be about the same. I am tentatively scheduled to teach their advanced Logic course next fall, which is gratifying (but difficult, I expect). My appointment was renewed for next year. You will remember that mine is a one-year appointment until I get the doctorate. At first I thought that reappointment was rather automatic, but it turns out that the two other men appointed with me this year, who had much the same background as I, were not reappointed--which at least means that I met with some approval. Part of that was no doubt for an abbreviated version of the Leibniz thing which I delivered to the Philosophy Colloquium here, and on which I understand that Dr. Perelman reported to you.

I hope that you are having an enjoyable vacation, and that you will accept our warmest best wishes to you and your family for the new year.

Sincerely,

Eril Wrisso

Jose -

I'm still not sure quite where this is going, but I do feel that I ought to work out the positions of

Hobbes (?)

Descartes

Spinoza (?)

Locke

Berkeley (?)

Hume

Kant

Hobbes, Spinoza, and Berkeley would not be so important, but might be done for completeness and continuity.

Also, I should fill in some of the Continental links between Leibniz and Kant. If you had no objections,

then, I'll work on Descartes, Locke, --
and Hume, probably in that order, next.

I'd appreciate any comments
on the Leibniz section; I think it's
pretty good, but in need of some
polishing which, however, oughtn't
to be done till I've gotten more
of the other material worked out.

B¹¹

830 S. Pugh St.
State College, Penna.

Merry Christmas — etc.

Alternative, if you like the idea: a dissertation
more specifically on Leibniz (+ perhaps his
immediate + most relevant predecessors), in
much more depth + detail. There's a lot more
to be said.