PART OF THE MEANING OF JAMES "COMING OF AGE" IN 1885 was his promotion to the rank of professor of philosophy. In that same year, his colleague in the department, Josiah Royce, published *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy*. This book provided a challenge to James's philosophic talents because it defended a position that James found difficult to refute for many years.

The subject of psychical research is prominent in the letters of this chapter. James was instrumental in founding the American Society for Psychical Research, which held its first formal meeting in Boston on 18 December 1884. James thought that the election of the mathematician-astronomer Simon Newcomb as the first president of the Society was an "uncommon hit" because of his stature in the scientific community. Many people were chary of this kind of investigation. In fact, James and Newcomb engaged in a brief controversy over the interpretation of some automatic drawings in 1886. When the psychologist G. Stanley Hall of the Johns Hopkins University started his *American Journal of Psychology* (1887), he devoted a long review to the work of the English Society for Psychical Research. His colleague at Johns Hopkins, Christine Ladd-Franklin, won James's praise for her article in this first issue of the journal. She too showed some interest in the field of psychical re-
search. James did not feel that he was the right person to review Hall's new journal for the *Nation*.

Another topic of this chapter, which recurs throughout the correspondence, is James's generous efforts to help others, especially to secure teaching positions for them in the colleges and universities. One of these was George H. Howison, who was a long-standing and cherished friend for life. Howison had begun to teach philosophy at the University of California in 1884, but was for awhile a bit dissatisfied there.

Since James taught a course in ethics for the first time in 1888, it is not surprising that he showed interest in the people who were working in this area of philosophy.

On the personal side, William and Alice James lost their eighteen-month-old son, Hermann, on 9 July 1885. Their next child was a girl, Margaret Mary ("Peggy"), who was born on 24 March 1887. At the end of that summer, the family first used their new summer home "Chocorua," which was near the town of Tamworth Iron Works in New Hampshire. At the end of the 1889 summer, they moved into their almost completely finished home at 95 Irving Street, Cambridge. Shortly before that William had returned from a two month's visit to see his brother Henry and sister Alice in England and to attend an International Congress of Physiological Psychology in Paris from August 5th to the 10th.
Cambridge
March 19 [1885]

My dear Hall,

I rec'd your letter some time since, and am glad of the prospect of seeing you. Interested also in the Ashfield house you announce. Who ought I to write to about it? Is there any land? Is drainage good, etc? Water? etc.?

My wife has had scarlet fever for three weeks—none of the children. We don't want to take them back into the Appian Way house this spring, and must look for quarters for May and June. I suppose the Spring is pretty late in Ashfield. I am either incubating the fever myself or having a masked attack; Have been feeling excessively sick & queer for 4 or 5 days. Curious to hear what you are doing in Hypnotism. Psychic research very stagnant hereabouts.

Always yrs.

Wm James

You ask about Palmer. He would assuredly make you a good speech. But I fear he would decline.¹
95 Irving St.
March 21. [1885]

My dear Mrs. Merriman

I have at last read your beautiful article. I don't know how transparent it will be to the common herd—it is too original to be very popular, I am afraid. Indeed I think that the title shows a certain inaptitude on the author's part for making herself exactly popular—too much inside of her subject to feel how it looks and sounds from the outside, for who of the Andover Review's readers ever heard of "the school of 1830" by that name? I never did! But you are most originally and deeply inside of your subject, and see it out of your own living eyes, giving the reader the sense of new ways of getting at deep mysteries. The analogy, however, which lights up so much for you because you have lived so intimately with it, may not be so immediately clear to every one else. Of one thing I am sure, however, and that is that the article will be read over many times by those whom it strikes. There is a mysterious pithiness and pregnancy about these things which are written from original intuition, which makes one feel that he has not exhausted their significance; so one puts them carefully aside and after an interval reads them again. I have a number of articles which I treat in this way, and I know that such will be the fate of this. Not so much with me perhaps, for I think it is all tolerably clear to me, but with others.

Pray continue!

With warm regards to both of you, believe me always cordially yours

Wm James
Cambridge, Mass.
April 23. 85

Dear Sir,

I don’t know what your power is, unless it is ordinary mesmerism or hypnotism. I wish you would describe exactly the process. Do the persons know you are intending to operate on them? Is the power “not always with” you, even for the same persons under the same conditions? I can put certain “subjects” to sleep even without waving my hands, but I don’t regard it as any peculiar power in me, it is merely that they fall into that condition in presence of anyone who will see that they relax their muscles, empty their minds and wait a few minutes.

If your “power” is anything different from this, I should be much interested to hear some details.

Very truly yours,

Wm James

Chas. Marseilles Esq.
Cambridge
Apr. 26 [1885]

Dear Sir,

Nothing in your letter proves to me that your power is anything different from ordinary mesmerism, animal magnetism, or whatever you call it. It is still a mooted question among the learned in such matters whether some individuals really have a native "power" that way, or whether their greater success is due to collateral circumstances, as awakening more expectation from the "subjects" etc. If you ever come this way I wish you would let me know of it in advance. I might be able to test this power in you. You make no allusions to the literature of the subject, which is very large, especially in the French tongue. I advise you to read what Carpenter says in his "Mental Physiology." As to the differences found in his patients by your "rubber" friend, I have no opinion to offer. The whole matter of personal healing powers is beyond my understanding at present.

Very truly yours,

Wm James
To Charles Marseilles

Cambridge
April 30 [1885]

Dear Sir,

Nobody understands Mesmerism. Dr. Carpenter's book will not explain it, only describe it. Not in one case in a million has it the slightest connexion with will power in the operator. It is merely a peculiar condition into which the subject is liable to lapse and in which he will obey the suggestions of persons with much weaker will than himself. Whether the millionth case is different, is a mooted question about which the best authorities disagree.

Hastely Yours,

Wm James

To Alexander Graham Bell

Cambridge, Mass
May 8, 85

A. Graham Bell Esq.

Dear Sir,

I hope that my scientific purpose will excuse the liberty I take in invading your precious time with a question. I imagine you are better able to answer it than anyone in
the country and it has important theoretic connexions in my mind.

Are you acquainted with any cases or records of cases, in which a *normal* child has been bro't up to the age of four or afterwards without being taught to speak? The only likely way of its happening would be in the case of a hearing child brought up in a deaf and dumb family without neighbors. Are there any such cases known? I want to discover how easy or how difficult speech is to learn when the natural age for learning it is past. The Indian wolf-children are the only examples I can find, but they are too dubious and excentric to set any store by. Hoping a reply may not inconvenience you too much,

I am very truly yours,

Wm James

**To Katharine James Prince**

Cambr.
June 1. 85

Dearest Kitty,

The lectures are over, the examinations begun, the quarter's salary paid! Would it were bigger. I'm going to see a materializing medium to night,—the most promising we've yet got hold of,—in the Institute of Technology. Don't you think it is a harmonious locality? Alice goes with me,—the first enjoyment we have had in com-
mon for a long time,—barring the Julius Caesar. . . .

Good night.

yrs ever affect.ly

W. J. 6

· To Katharine James Prince ·

Cambridge
July 1. 85

My dear Kitty,

Your letter came yesterday morning, with its precious and munificent clinching of the invitation to Amherst,—I had to laugh at the six dollars—the "Daily Strength etc" and the two lovely bookmarks which we shall both use till they are worn out. The Daily Strength shall also be tried by us both faithfully. Many thanks for all, and especially for the good news you give of yourself.

I got home the day before yesterday. Our poor little baby is in a very critical condition, and we are prepared to have him called away. It is too bad, for he is the flower of the flock—but we can simply be expectant, never knowing in these matters what is best. Alice bears her broken rest wonderfully and her goodness of character is a lesson. The thing will probably be decided in another 48 hours, and whatever comes we shall cheerfully accept. If he goes it will make the others more precious. I
will write to you again soon. I hope to get to Amherst before September, but can make no definite plans just now. I am not sure yet what disposition to make of the six dollars—the journey being so far ahead, and I so rich! I am going to wait for light! Meanwhile I am very sensible of your delicate generosity. Pray continue well, and believe me ever affectionately yours,

Wm James

· To G. Stanley Hall ·

18 Garden St.
Cambridge
Nov 25th [1885]

My dear Hall,

I ought to have written you long since to explain the pleasure with which I read your *Sensations of Motion* paper in *Mind*. It is a wonderfully thorough piece of work—and as far as my knowledge goes nothing like it has yet been produced out of Germany. I hope you will go on in the same line.

Can you tell me the name of any work on General Pedagogy from which one may get hints of real practical value to be woven into psychological lectures. Pedagogic literature seems to contain such vast quantities of chaff that one hardly knows where to seek for the grain.

As usual I can make no report of progress myself. I have been working so hard that I am already much fagged, but it is all over teaching and *Bekanntes Zeug*. I have 120 men to teach in Logic and Psychology, 6 in advanced Psychology.
I suppose you have heard of Jim Putnam’s engagement to Miss Marian Cabot. With best wishes

Ever yours

Wm James

To Katharine James Prince

New York
Dec 25. 85

My dearest Kitty,

A Merry Christmas to you from this merry place, where I arrived a few hours since, to smooth the way for the coming of Mrs. Gibbens and her daughter Margaret, who sail tomorrow A.M. from Jersey City. I have been to see the steamer, which is a fine one, and find they can spend the night on board. I have also made arrangements for taking their baggage across the city with no loss of time, when they arrive to night. I feel almost tempted to elope with them, the weather is so perfect and the boat looked so good. I hope my dear Mother in law will enjoy it when once she is on the other side. I don’t think she carries a very light heart away. It will be a great separation for Alice. But the years fly rapidly by now, and she won’t spend more than two of them abroad.

I spent yesterday & last night at Kitty Temple’s at Pelham. I never saw anything more salubrious & robustious and physically and morally sound than her brood of six—and Kitty is a worthy mother of them—
very stout & buxom. They were at their Christmas revelries nearly all night.

Mrs. G's departure leaves us with a house with a spare room in it, which some time you must come and occupy. I shall return by way of Newport & the Tweedies. I've been working pretty continuously and feel entitled to a little holiday. Alice & the children are well. I hope your condition keeps on a good level. Your dayspring arrived & will doubtless ere this have given great pleasure. I left home on Wednesday. I hope all goes well with the Seelyes with a happy New Year for them, my remembrances to Mr & Mrs Scott, and a warm embrace to your self. I am ever your affectionate

Wm. J

· To Simon Newcomb ·

Cambr.
Feb. 12. 86

My dear Mr. Newcomb,

I have just read your reply in Science of today's date. I suppose it's no use troubling the public with any more talk. But I immediately took my pencil and with tight-shut eyes scrawled the figures I enclose. The effect of the short practice is well shown by the difference between the [drawing] in the sheet marked 1st, and in the sheet marked 2nd. attempt. I admit entirely that the figures in the "Proceedings" are remarkably good for closed eyes. All I contend for is that they are not so far out of the range of ordinary work of that sort as to brand the whole
observation to which they belong as probably spurious. The boy who drew them is said to be a mesmeric subject. Such subjects occasionally have a fabulously accurate use, in writing, of the muscular sense. It may be that his concentration of mind in guessing these figures gave him something of this power. It may be that he has had much practice; it may be that he is naturally a very accurate draughtsman. With these possibilities open, it seems to me, to say the least, as wise to accept the testimony of the Committee as to his being able to draw such figures blindfold, as by the impossibility that other individuals should draw them, to conclude that he must have "peeped."

As regards the general question, notwithstanding all that you & Preyer say, it seems to me that the presumption, after the English testimony, is against such a mass of it being all explicable by mystification, conscious or unconscious, on the part of the actors. But of course that presumption, so long as possibilities of deception remain, is any thing but proof. The lesson of the recent controversy to my mind is simple—find out more apparent cases—and hunt them down. Conviction either way now can only come from a much larger mass of fact observed.

Very truly yours

Wm James
My dear Hall,

Here are the 11 dollars, with many thanks. New England air makes one feel like a man again. The most impressive of all my experiences during the week away—more so even than the sight of the tomb of Washington—was the sight of you at your work. Hitherto I have seen you at ease, or working for yourself alone. Now I have an image of you as master, with your burden of responsibility, and I assure you without flattery that it is a truly august figure which remains on my mind’s eye. Only you are worked down to the bone, and must take things more easily.

Ever yours

W. J.

My dear Hall,

I am told by Mr. Hiram M. Stanley of his intention to apply for a philosophical fellowship with you, and have promised him to send you a recommendation. He is a
stubby little fellow with no manners or social gifts, but with genuine grit and power of productive work in a rare degree. His printed things will speak for themselves. I have seen a manuscript essay of his which showed an unusual mastery of Hegelian thought—without belief in it—and I expect a very good Ph.D. degree from him this year. He is modest, self respecting, but very reticent & hard to get at personally. He missed our Walker travelling fellowship in Philosophy last year by a close shave, being considered an exceptionally strong candidate intellectually.

As between him and Strong I should find it very hard to decide. Strong is the more complete man all round, and much the more polished one. Whether he has as much native vigour & originality as Stanley remains to be seen. Stanley turns all his work to account—can show something definite for it—a very rare thing. He is older & needier than Strong. On the whole I might think it my duty to appoint him. Both are unusually strong men. Either would be a good appointment. Stanley, if made a fellow, would probably keep much to himself. Strong would circulate more.

(Have you rec'd the eleven dollars I returned to you in a registered letter? My wife just tells me that P.O. receipt for it has arrived.)

One word about the comparative amount of your chemical work & hours. I happened to quote what you told me Professor Remsen had said concerning publications in his chemical journal to Prof Jackson here, who told it to Hill, who denies it in toto. He told me yesterday he had gone over all the numbers but the last, says the relative number of pages is 100 for Harvard to 62 for the J.H.U., of titles 100 for H. to 75 for J.H.U. Harvard has given as many titles as J.H.U. & Yale put together. Of quality he says nothing—leaving that to other judges but hopeful of their verdict. I wish you would quote this
to Remsen, and I think Hill & Jackson wish it too.

In haste,

Yrs. ever

W. J. 11

· To Simon Newcomb ·

Cambridge
July 7th [1886]

My dear Mr. Newcomb,

I took pains à propos of our little correspondence about the diagrams, to lay the matter before Edmund Gurney, two communications from whom I enclose, as is but right, since my own superior skill (!) in blindfold drawing made you drop your original objection and the drawings herewith enclosed are of a nature decidedly to strengthen it, in your eyes. You will observe that Gurney admits this himself.

The problem suggested is interesting. I feel as if the evidence for thought-transference were very good, and I must say that the a priori arguments of your presidential address were far from shaking the effect upon me of the whole body of concrete experience in favor of something of the kind. The moment a context is found to make it continuous with other phenomena, I shall be much surprised if it does not become an orthodox scientific fact, realized like many other facts, in individuals of a certain idiosyncracy. I am very much disposed to doubt your suspicions in this case. Possibly Smith, like many hyp-
notic subjects, may have had a temporarily exalted sureness of hand when doing these experiments. But obviously your objection is a pertinent one, and it will be much for Gurney’s interest to clear it up by further observations upon Smith.

Very truly yours

Wm. James

---

To John Forrester Andrew

18 Garden St
Cambridge
Jan 13. 87

My dear Forester,

Let me still call you by the name under which you were known to me ere you were old enough to “run” for governor. You probably know that you were elected into the Society for Psychical Research the other night. It has languished in the midst (as I believe) of plenty of material for study, simply because none of its members seem to have time or inclination to work. The enclosed circular explains the plan for remedy. I don’t know how much either you or Mrs Andrew cares for the objects of the Society, or how much you could spare from other needs for it, if you did care. I write this only to say that in my opinion this plan merits help. Mr. Richard Hodgson, one of the Council of the English Society—the same whose report fatal to Madame Blavatsky made so much noise,—will come and give us all his time and the benefit of his experience for one year for 1500 dollars.
If you feel like subscribing to the fund proposed, you will gratify no one more than yours always truly

Wm James

P.S. We trust to vote you into the State House yet.\textsuperscript{13}

\textit{To Katharine James Prince}\textit{.}

Cambridge

Feb. 3. 87

My dear Kitty,

It is long since I have written—my life has been so chopped up with multifarious things. I got your last letter duly, with the extracts from the sacred anthology and the almanac. The extracts I enjoyed, though, as you well know, I have not the power you have, of nourishing myself on \textit{scraps}—I need something with a good long rhythm and context, to produce a very strong effect. As for the Almanac, I smiled, as I thought of your experience with Howard jr. To tell the truth, I haven’t in years missed so many afternoon naps as since the year began. Or to put it better, I haven’t taken so few—I cannot count more than three. One reason is that I have had late morning sleeps (after a vigil between 3 & 6 A.M.) & they always make the afternoon nap impossible. Another reason is that I have made 10 visits to a mind-cure-doctress, at either four or five P.M., and postponed my doze till I should be seated beside her. Another is social or other duties which invaded the hour. I think I am getting into a state where loss of sleep doesn’t affect me as much as
heretofore—a consummation devoutely to be wished, for the P.M. nap, as a regular obligation, is an excessively inconvenient feature in the economy of my life. I cannot see that the mind cure has done me any positive good, though I shall go twice more, having resolved to give the good woman at least a dozen sittings, for fair trial's sake. She has done wonders for some of my friends.

I am just back from a day at Lake Chocorua, N.H. talking with a carpenter about what can be done to make the buildings on my new estate habitable for the summer. The day, Tuesday, was one of the most crystalline purity; I don't think I ever saw such blinding light as was made by the sky & the snow together, and the mountains looked most exquisite. In doors, too, the finest wood fires I ever saw in a hearth. But wood fires and pure snow, however dazzling, are a lean diet for the soul for 4 months without a break, and I believe the countries where the earth is bare and wet, with occasional snows in winter, are the richest environment for a human being.

Alice is well. She expects her confinement about the first of April, and it is astonishing to see how busy she keeps notwithstanding, looking after the children and other duties. Little Billy has grown asthmatic, and, as his grandmother wishes an excuse to go south herself, she has agreed to take him for 2 or 3 months, probably to Aiken, S.C., though we are not yet sure. Harry is very well and a model of schoolboy vigor. We are plying him with such books as Pilgrim's Progress, and the Iliad & Odyssey, which he enjoys hugely now, read aloud, because we feel sure that when he once begins the more highly seasoned contemporaneous literature for boys, and is able to read to himself, these simpler things will seem insipid.

My bro. Harry is still on the Continent. Sister Alice is in his London rooms, rather poorly again, I fear.
I hope & trust you are doing well, and long to hear of your housekeeping possibilities. Write when you can, to yours ever affectionately

Wm James

To Eliza Putnam and Margaret Merrill Gibbens

18 Garden St.
March 24. 87
9.30 A.M.

Dearest Mother in law & Belle-Soeur!

This morning with the Frühroth came a daughter—the living image of her Mar. I kept talking of it as he & him, from force of custom. Alice was in pain only about 2 hours and a half. Everything promises well. She took hardly any ether. Dr. Call has left, and will be back this evening. The whole thing was so quiet and Miss Lespierre has foreseen all contingencies so neatly that one would hardly notice that such a thing was going on. I will send you daily bulletins. We are having a cold snap. Ground hard frozen up again—but the sun shines bright today. Love to both of you. Margaret mustn’t trifle with the New Yorker’s affections!

In haste
yrs. ever

Wm.J.
The child was born just before the Doctress arrived—tho the latter got here in an hour and a half from the time I left the house to go to the stable.\textsuperscript{15}

\textit{To G. Stanley Hall}

Tamworth Iron Works, N.H.
Aug. 1. [1887]

My dear Hall,

I write this to the accompaniment of the carpenters' hammers, which are nailing together the boards of my Château. I never felt so oppressed by the weight and value of my material possessions, and for the past 24 hours have felt like setting fire to the whole concern, so as to own nothing any more and be free.

As for going to Ashfield I fear it is more impossible than ever. I've been there twice. You must come here. It is on the White Mountains division of the Eastern R.R. 17 miles south of N. Conway. The Station is West Os­sipee. I thought the place a great bargain when I bought it, but the unforeseen expenses are going to ruin me. We shall probably be in a fit state for guests in September, and you must then come.

As for your Journal, it is the greatest confidence game in N. America. Collecting subscriptions a year nearly before its appearance! It must be good, when it does appear. I do hope & trust you'll publish it on date like Mind, or else not date the numbers like Pflüger's Archiv etc.

I do nothing but manual work. My eyes have had a bad period for the past three months, & are apparently
no better. I have no chance to try them, however, at present, and they may respond when I do. But my inability to study fills me with despair.

In the matter of Palmer, he ought to be President of Wellesley. I fear the trustees don't know what a prize they would gain in him. I long to see you & talk over the prospects of Psychology.

Yrs ever

W. J. 16

· To Jacob Gould Schurman ·

Cambridge, Mass.
Oct. 30, 1887

My dear Schurman,

I have to thank you for your charming little book on Ethics, which I duly received, and should have acknowledged earlier. But I waited to read it, and even to obey the "Nation," by scribbling a notice of it, which I have just put into an envelope to mail. You certainly write most charmingly. I myself kept wishing as I read for some more radical carving, but after all there is no public of readers with just my wants. I imagine that you will clear up the ideas of the clergy very much in both ways. I profited most by Chapters V and VI. I did not know how weak Darwin's derivation of conscience was until I read Chapter V. And, (altho I speak as one ignorant of these matters), your demolition of McLennan & Co. seems quite conclusive.
I trust that you enjoy things at Cornell. Pray give my regards to Strong when you see him. I hope he takes hold easily.

I send you herewith reprints of the last three numbers of my paper on Space in Mind. I sent you Part I when it appeared.

Thanks again, from

Yours always truly

Wm James

To G. Stanley Hall

18 Garden St.
Cambridge
Nov. 5th '87

My dear Hall,
Is Kandinsky's thing a book or an article? Can you without trouble send me date and place of publication?

Your letter about the Nation notice, I confess embarrasses me a little. Garrison wrote to me enclosing a torn-off bit of your letter and asking me to write a "longish notice" which would have been sent before your note came had not an attack of stiff neck stopped my writing.

I think I will now withhold my hand till I hear from you again. You implore me so vehemently to pay it no general compliments that for fear of displeasing you I am quite paralyzed, and think that possibly Jastrow or some one else whom the Nation will doubtless accept at your suggestion, might write something that would please you better.
It would be quite unprecedented for the Nation to devote a special article to a number of a Review as technical and esoteric as this, nor should I think, bearing its readers in mind, that it would be proper to go at all minutely into any of the articles. What I proposed doing was to state the results of the four principle ones (with a cry of admiration at Mrs Christine Franklin) quote some passages from your Psychic Research article, and then make some general compliments of the sort that you say you don’t want on the probable great utility of the Magazine, and the devotion of its Editor. You see, my dear fellow, one can’t deal with a multifarious aggregate like a periodical except in a “general” way.

If this programme suits you, let me know and I will proceed. If not, I shall not feel at all put out if you get Garrison to confide the job to some one else.

Your Ladd article I think admirable in every respect, and fully agree with each word of it. About the Psychic Research criticism I could say much if I had time. The gist of it all would be that, to take sides as positively as you do now, and on general philosophic grounds, seems to me a very dangerous and unscientific attitude. Where observations are in process of accumulation, and one doubts them, the best thing is to wait. There never could be an observation so minutely recorded that a critic bent on proving the observers dupes, might not find such possible reasons for his faith as you bring forward in the omissions of the record. Nevertheless, if the observations multiply, all such objections fall to the ground. The history of Hypnotism is most instructive in this respect. Now what these English fellows are doing is to try to multiply observations. And that seems to me the only healthy thing. The fact that no more new cases are found is, to me, far more damaging to the existing cases than any number of cavils about the record of the latter, could possibly be. Any how the non-appearance of new cases is puzzling. Fraud and hyperaesthesia ought to be recur-
ring causes as much as "thought-transference." I cannot but regret that you should try to pin the latter upon Gurney & Co. in the form of a spiritualistic theory. Gurney has no positive theory whatever as to what the thing is, and has repeatedly said that he uses the word merely to cover some agency outside of the common channels of sense. You ought not, by the way, to quote Ochorowicz as an opponent of thought-transference. Ochorowicz, if I understand his position, though I confess I have not read the whole of his book carefully, believes there are cases which neither fraud nor hyperaesthesia can explain. The only really important things in your notice as it seems to me, were your accounts of the sniffing and toe cases, (I wish you had explained the latter more fully)—those were positive hypotheses to account for the kind of results recorded, and not mere general suspicions of dupery. And why do all the critics spend so much time over the Creery children when all the really important evidence lies in the later cases? Hodgson tells me that Gurney and Mrs. Sidgwick have had the Creerys again and caught them cheating and will soon publish a full account of it. But hold! I am giving you a deluge. I should express the difference between our two positions in the matter, by calling mine a baldly empirical one, and yours, one due to a general theoretic creed. The Gurneys, Sidgwicks are baldly empirical. I don't think it exactly fair to make the issue what you make it—one between science and superstition.

Always truly yours

Wm James$^{18}$
My dear Hall,

I have been trying to write the notice of the Journal for an hour or more, but find that all spontaneity has left me for the purpose, and that between my conscience towards the Nation, towards you, and towards myself, I feel so paralyzed that to copy the prospectus and table of contents is all I am good for. It doesn’t do to have a slight job made formidable. I read in your letter of yesterday “I desire most of all such a notice as Science gave to the J. of Morphology.” My wife took the letter & read “dread”!!

I will write a line to Garrison saying “I am so occupied that it is impossible for me to write the notice,” and you may, if you like, simultaneously tip him a hint as to who might do it easily.

Pray don’t think me “put out” in the least. I started to write with the heartiest good will to the job, but found myself so subtly inhibited that it would not go. Tameness incarnate became the only possible line—and that would please you as little as it pleases me.

I have relished your three reviews—McCosh, Dewey, Bowne amazingly. There is a palpitating and unexpected quality in your style which makes it recognizable anywhere. Beware however of Germanisms, and sentences with too many coordinate & subordinate clauses, parentheses and adjectives—I fear they are growing on you! Need “protocol” be used instead of “record” or “notes?” I find the fine print a little too small. It does for a lot of short notices, but articles of such importance as
your long reviews and Charles Peirce's are hard to read by such eyes as mine. On the other hand, the large type is perhaps unnecessarily luxurious.

Robertson wrote me last Spring asking if an agent for *Mind* mightn't be found. After being rebuffed by a couple of publishers I went lately to Heath, who said he must consult you. Yesterday he writes, enclosing your note, and saying he should like to hear from Wms. & Norgate. So I've sent his letter to Robertson. In the end, however it might be in a year or two, these Journals must help each other, and prepare readers for each other.

Thanks for your offer to send Kandinsky. The title was all I wished—I have just ordered the book. Always truly yours

Wm James

· To Felix Adler ·

Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.
Jan. 11. 88

My dear Adler,

There seems but one impression of your lecture, which is that it is the greatest address ever delivered in that theatre, except perhaps the extraordinary oration of Wendell Philipps (sic) 9 or 10 years ago. Our fortune was great in "securing" you! The impression will be lasting. I found myself the next day addressing my students in a strain of impassioned eloquence to which they were al-
together unused. I hope I didn't even imitate the sound of your voice—the source of my inspiration would have been too obvious then. Meeting Frank Peabody the following morning, the first words he uttered were: "It's lucky that that man has no religion. If he can do so much without one, he'd smash everything if he had one." He then gravely allowed that you had a religion without knowing it; and I agreed with him that if you try to base such a moral idealism as yours theoretically (i.e. save it from being an individual caprice) you are led to a superhuman mind as its ground. However, no theories now. This is merely to thank you once again, and to say that, with warmest regards to Mrs. Adler from both of us, I am always yours

Wm James

P.S. We were mortified at not having provided a carriage for you to come—and especially to go. I don’t see how it came not to be thought of by any of the cooks that had care of the broth. It was quite inexcusable, but the less said about it now the better."

· To David Jayne Hill ·

Cambridge Mass
Jan 21. 88

President D. J. Hill

Dear Sir,

I have to thank you for the gift of your Elements of Psychology, which came to me a couple of days ago. I myself believe it more intellectually profitable for
the student to go more minutely over a more limited field, if he has not time to master a larger book than yours. But I cannot but admire the skill with which you have kept things short, and yet at the same time supplied so much information about recent psychologic work.

Thanking you again, I am very truly yours

Wm James

To Christine Ladd-Franklin

Cambridge
April 12 [1888]

Dear Mrs. Franklin,

Your letter interests me very much, because the account you give is similar to accounts which I have heard from others of the influence upon them of the hand of a certain Mrs. Wetherbee who is a "magnetic healer" here, and who, on members of my wife's family, has certainly "charmed away pain" in a most surprising manner. I know Dr. Crockett also, and like him. I have had hitherto only his own accounts of his performances, not knowing any of his patients but one, on whom he failed.

But I am very dubious of the poor little Soc. for Psych. Re. accomplishing much by seeking to "investigate" these things. Of all earthly things, therapeutic effects are the hardest to run to ground, and convince a skeptic of. There will always be a dozen loopholes of escape from any conclusion about therapeutics, and the mind will take which ever one it prefers. I think the history of
opinion about homeopathy (or about the single drug alcohol) is enough to make anyone hopeless of making therapeutic evidence satisfactory to all. Money was offered to the Society for the purpose of investigating the "mind-cure." It was (as I thought, rightly) refused. Practical physicians are the only ones who can say an influential word in these matters; and they must have already made themselves influential in other matters, or they will simply discredit themselves by speaking of such things as those of which you write. A Charcot can afford to risk his reputation in this way; a common practitioner cannot. Meanwhile such experiences as yours, mentioned by such a person as yourself, will accrete with others and little by little invite the attention of the competent.

I think the "Journal" of the Society, which we are seeking money to get published for circulation among members, would be a very good place to receive such contributions, if their authors were willing to have them appear.

I came very near noticing Hall's Journal of Psych. for the Nation. Had I done so, I should have burst into loud cries of admiration over your horopter article, which seemed to me by far the best thing in the number. To discover a new optical illusion is already a great feat. To explain it, and to use it for another purpose, as you have done, is simply, what,—delicious! Excuse my enthusiasm, and believe the admiration and respect with which I subscribe myself.

Very sincerely yours

Wm James

P.S. There is a great bulk of printable matter already on hand; but no money to print or to edit. Hodgson is an admirable fellow, but one man can't do everything, and
he is well nigh single-handed in the matter of investigation, every one else being either busy, lazy, or incompetent.²²

· To Charles Marseilles ·

Cambridge
April 14 [1888]

Dear Sir,

Of the effects of oil on waves I know nothing, except that there was in the weekly “Science” during many numbers last year a discussion of the theory and a recital of facts.

Of the quotation’s original I know nothing, nor, I am sorry to say, do I know anything of Meuzel who wrote “Christian Symbolism.” I never heard of the book.

Regretting to return you so ignorant a reply, I am very truly yours

Wm James²³

· 55 ·
Cambridge
Feb 28. 89

Dear Mrs. Franklin,

I am highly pleased at having converted you so easily. As for your own interpretation of the putty experiment, I don't see why it won't do perfectly well. I like hugely your general formula that what we are conscious of is what precedes the innervation, and that when this is usually followed by a movement we assume invariably that it must be so followed even when the movement fails to occur. I had never expressed the law in that general and radical way, though if you turn to pp. 255–6 of No 3 of the Proceedings of the American Society for Psychical Research you will see that I came very near to it.

Your observations on pressing the eyeballs are highly curious. On what the structures revealed may be, I will not risk an opinion, tho' your description is very suggestive. Many years ago I used to indulge in the pastime and got entirely different symptoms. I have refrained from repeating the experiment since reading in Helmholtz, I think, that it was quite dangerous and might lead to detachment of the retina, or something equally formidable. Thanking you very much

I am faithfully yours

Wm James

24
Cambridge
March 22. 89

Dear Miss Thomas,

I learn from Mr. Mead that he is unable to leave his present work.

Meanwhile there is Santayana, whose romantic fascinations I couldn’t help smiling at to myself after you were gone—I had so emphatically dwelt on them. I think it most likely that if you saw him you would not find them to exist, and would wonder what I could have meant. They consist mainly in youth. As I said, he is the best intellect we have turned out here in many a year, and if you are aiming this year at a pro tem appointment on a low salary, I should think it might be very wise to try him.

I ought to say that it is possible that Santayana may be asked to give some instruction here next year at a still lower salary. If so, he may conclude to stay rather than change his abode.

Very truly yours

Wm James

P. S. Many thanks for your Program and the XIXth Century. As I have already read Miss Smith’s article and have the magazine, I send back this copy, that you may “place it where it’ll do most good.”

· 57 ·
To George W. Ross

34 De Vere Gardens, W. London
July 26. [1889]

Hon. Geo. W. Ross
Toronto

Dear Sir

I am asked by two friends Professor Howison of California, and Mr. James G. Hume of Toronto for recommendations for the vacant professorship of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Toronto.

Howison is a well known man, an admirable lecturer and writer (tho for some reason unknown to me he writes but little) and very learned in the metaphysical field. Personally also he is agreeable, and his moral character is spotless. Of his actual success as a teacher you will doubtless learn through some ancient colleagues at the Technological Institute in Boston, and directly from California. I have no observation on that point. I can only say that I regard Mr. Howison as one of the ablest philosophical minds in our country.

Mr. Hume is, of course, more of an unknown quantity. He is one of the 2 or 3 most promising students of philosophy whom I have had in 15 years experience at Harvard College, and I hope and expect a brilliant future for him, especially in the way of writing. Of his other qualifications & attributes you can judge from nearer witnesses than I.

Believe me with high respect

Yours very truly

Wm James (Prof. of Philosophy
Harvard University)
My dear Howison,

Delighted to see your handwriting again, and well pleased to think that you may be coming East, though I supposed you were happy in California, and that it was a better Professorship than the Toronto one.

As for the latter I wrote immediately (2 days ago) on the receipt of your letter, to the Minister of Instruction. Strangely enough I received by the same mail a letter from a student who was with us last year, reminding me of my promise to recommend him. There was no comparison possible, as he is (although a very strong man I think) all in posse, whereas you are an accomplished fact as well as an accomplished philosopher. I wrote about both of you, saying as much.

Hume was the favorite pupil of the former incumbent, Prof. Young; he seems to have warm personal friends in the University, and he is now in Toronto. I know not what other candidates there may be.

I am, as you see, in London, taking an heroic vacation, and bound for an "International Congress of Physiological Psychology" in Paris Aug 5. I shall be back home by Sept 1, I trust. The necessity of these expensive vacations is one that I hardly enjoy, but only on such conditions does life seem to go on. I am just packing for France, which makes me brief.

Yours ever

Wm James

34, De Vere Gardens. W
July 27. 89
My dear Howison,

I regret to inform you—though I suppose you know it already, and can hardly regret it very much yourself—that the Toronto vacancy has been filled by two men Baldwin of Lake Forest, who recently pub’d the Psychology and Hume a recent Toronto graduate who studied here last year and has one of our fellowships. The campaign appears to have been most singular. Baldwin was the candidate of the clerical party, Hume that of the recent graduates who were anti-clerical and devoted to the memory of Prof. Young whose favorite pupil Hume had been. Baldwin was pushed by McCosh, Patton & Co. The city newspapers took up the fight, Hume being a Toronto boy. The minister of education seems to have feared to offend either side, and so made a new professorship. Both are good men. Hume full of strength & promise—but the place must be very crude and the climate harsh enough. Bowen resigned here last month and the President told me yesterday that the Corporation had voted the place to Palmer. Confirmation by the overseers is, I suppose, a matter of course. Royce is working like 3 men, and thinking like 100. I slug along, much kept down by a constant deficit of sleep.

Pray write and give me a hint as to why you are anxious to leave Berkeley. It has been a great surprise to me. Of course I have mentioned it to no one. Your young friend Mezes has presented himself but not yet given me your letter. He looks promising. Please give my regards
to your new Classic colleague Richardson and believe me with respect to Mrs. H. & best wishes

Yours ever,

Wm James$^{28}$