ON 8 JANUARY 1890, JAMES'S ACADEMIC TITLE WAS changed to professor of psychology. This was a more appropriate title due to the nature of his teaching and writing since 1885. He had agreed in 1878 to write a textbook in psychology for the Henry Holt Publishing Company. He finally finished writing the book in early 1890 and spent the summer in proofreading. It appeared in September in two huge volumes as *The Principles of Psychology*. This work was too large to serve as a textbook, so the publisher asked for a smaller version for such a purpose. James worked on this project in 1891. The book appeared in 1892 as *Psychology: A Briefer Course*. In the preface he wrote that he regretted not being able to supply a chapter on pleasure and pain. Interest in this topic led him to enter into a long correspondence with Henry R. Marshall, a New York City architect, whose articles on this topic had begun to appear in the English journal *Mind* in 1889. Also in 1891 James was asked by the Harvard Corporation to give a series of lectures on psychology to the Cambridge teachers. This series was begun in the late part of the fall semester after James had returned from a ten day visit to England to see his sister Alice, who was failing rapidly in health. It was also in this year that James began an inti-
mate correspondence with the Swiss psychologist, Théodore Flournoy, which lasted to James's death.

After all this exhausting work, James welcomed the chance to take a year's sabbatical leave from teaching. Reminiscent of his father's earlier venturousness, William took his whole family with him, which had been increased in size by one. Alexander Robertson had been born on 22 December 1890. The family sailed for Antwerp, Holland on 25 May 1892. They stayed in Germany most of June. About two and a half months were spent in Switzerland. While there, James contacted the young German psychologist, Hugo Münsterberg, who was about to begin teaching at Harvard. They then moved on to the more moderate climate of Florence, Italy, for the fall and winter months. In early December James was honored with degrees of both Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Letters by the University of Padua.

Though on sabbatical James continued to write for the newly founded Philosophical Review. In 1893 he also engaged in a controversy with F. H. Bradley, the English philosopher, in the journal Mind. G. F. Stout had become the new editor in 1892 after the death of G. C. Robertson. With the coming of spring the family moved back to Switzerland. Mr. and Mrs. James took off by themselves for London in the months of June and July for some type of respite. After returning to get the children, they sailed from England on 25 August.

James found it difficult to get back to teaching again after so long a time away. In fact, he became a little melancholic. However, he was enthusiastic in obtaining subscribers for the new Psychological Review (1894–), of which J. M. Baldwin and J. M. Cattell were co-owners and coeditors. James attended the second annual meeting of the American Psychological Association at Columbia University, 27 and 28 December.
Cambridge
April 29 [1890]

Dear Mrs. Franklin,

Do you happen by any accident, still to have a letter which I wrote you last year (or possibly earlier) about the illusions of motion, and the primitive condition of our sensation of motion being that of the relative motion of background and moving body. I happen to be writing on the subject again, and feel as if what I then said might help me. But it is hardly possible that you should have kept the letter.

Sincerely yours

Wm James

·  To G. Stanley Hall  ·

95 Irving St.
May 16. 1890

My dear Hall,

I am shocked to hear of the stunning blow that has fallen on you, & must send you a word of sympathy. Yet, death for death, who could wish a better one? I hardly know whether the little girl going too makes it worse or better.
That such big things can happen so easily gives one a strange suspicion that our instinctive ways of feeling about things are wrong and that if we knew reality even this might seem light and benign. But I can express nothing but my heartfelt pity, my dear old friend, and pray that ere long you will find yourself again zurecht. I am sorry that I can never see her again.

Bless you!

Wm James

· To Christine Ladd-Franklin ·

Cambridge
May 19 [1890]

Dear Mrs. Franklin,

Here is your document at last, since you wish it back. It is simpler than I tho’t and I need not have sent for it. Congratulate me! I have this day finished the manuscript of a “Principles of Psychology” which ought to be out in September, and which has been sticking to me like an old man of the sea for the last 8 or 9 years. I feel like a barrel with its hoops gone! and shall grow young again.

As for your logical papers you can perhaps now understand why I have not read them. I have not passed 5 minutes since last August which was not in some way connected with that infernal manuscript. I mean now to begin to read something, but am quite brain fagged at
present, and am anyhow absolutely non-mathematical and non-higher-logical, so I’d better wait for a more propitious moment for your articles. I have found some of the C. L. F. abstracts in Hall’s Journal very good.

Poor Hall! what a blow! A friend who was at the funeral tells me that he bears up very well.

With respects to your husband, believe me

ever truly yours

Wm James

---

To G. Stanley Hall

Tamworth Iron Works, N. H.
June 20. 90

My dear Hall,

I am most happy to hear from you directly again. Your trial will still be a heavy one, no doubt, but there is a momentum in the lives of us individuals which makes its way through everything, and you will find yourself in equilibrium again in spite of the tremendous shock. Your boy’s face is a most noble one; and he will be a comfort.

I wish that I might get to Ashfield; but I sent off my big Psychology MS. to Holt a month ago and expect to be confined here all summer with the proofs. I may be obliged to break away for a change in September and then if ever would be the time. But can’t you come up here for a week, almost at any time you may find convenient, the sooner the better. I should like to show you
my little place, and we have lots of Psychology arrears to make up in the way of talk.

Let me hear from you as soon as possible.

Yours most affectionately

Wm James

95 Irving St.
Aug. 13. 1890

Dear Katharine,

This is only to bid you a hearty god-speed. Both Alice and I have racked our brains to think of some token to send Alice, or of something to give you for the voyage—but see what a sterile thing is a critical intelligence—nothing that is imagine[d] will stand the test—so nothing goes. We have both written notes to poor Alice. And I do hope you won't have too bad a time.

You're a blessing, as perhaps you yourself know.

Affectionately yours

Wm James

2
To Kenneth Mackenzie

Tamworth Iron Works, N. H.
Sept 22. 90

Dear Dr. Mackenzie,

I feel much touched by your thoughtful regard for me, and shall be much interested in reading the little book you have sent. I don't know whether, if unconverted, I can give you a very articulate account of the reasons why not, but we shall see. These things are always excessively complex. I confess that in my own case it has so far been the Bible itself, both old Testament and New, which has seemed to me the document most fatal to the claims of the traditional christian theology. All changes in theology have had their source and authority in ways of reading the Bible. The merely humanistic way which comes so natural to men of this generation hangs together with a way of looking at things with which the christian scheme of salvation is (I may say almost invincibly) incongruous. And the Bible-text lends itself so unconstrainedly to the humanistic interpretation, that anything beyond that seems artificial. I am of course a most convinced Theist, as you know.

Thanking you again, I am always,

Yours

Wm James
95 Irving St.
Cambridge, Mass.
[October 16, 1890]

Dear Mrs. Franklin,

I thank you for your most appreciative note. My book is too long for any one to read, but if you read anything I wish it might be last Chapter of all. It needed re-writing, but I had no time. I should like to know, however, from you particularly, whether it seems to you that I have given any sort of pitch forward in that Chapter to the old quarrel over the existence of a priori propositions and necessary truth.

I had read the two reviews you sent me from the Nation, and suspected their authorship. Your reviews are really useful. Did you also write the review of M. Ch. Henry's work in last week's number?

Always sincerely yours

Wm James
To Simon Newcomb

95 Irving St.
Cambridge, Mass
Oct 22, 90

Dear Prof. Newcomb

Thanks for your note. It is flattering to have anyone react on one’s book, especially when the reactor is a man like you. I have never seen your articles in the Independent, nor can I get them here. But I agree with you that a lot of the discussion that goes on is logomachy from not defining terms. I think that “materialism” is very well kept with the vague meaning (said to be ascribed to it by Comte) of “the explanation of the higher by the lower.” But of course one may define it as one will; and I, so far as I can remember, have abstained from using the term at all in my book. I think the word “freedom” is deplorable from its ambiguity. Once you speak of “indeterminism” you have a clear objective issue before you, about which it seems to me that there is the most serious issue that philosophy contains, no less than that between monism and pluralism überhaupt. I stand out for pluralism against the whole line.

As for mental states that are not states of consciousness, I don’t know what can be meant by them. Brain-states I know, and states of consciousness I know, but something that is more than a brain-state yet less than a state of consciousness I know nothing about, nor do I see the use of discussing its existence. I am sick of the subject of psychology for a while and shall lie fallow for a year.

Yours always truly

Wm James

70
To James Mark Baldwin.

95 Irving St.
Cambridge, Mass.
Dec. 7. '90

Dear Mr. Baldwin,

I am afraid that the readers of Science may not be as deeply interested in our dispute as we are, so I send you my remarks on your last letter in the shape of a private communication. And to save trouble I will paste your text in, and say what I have to say in the shape of notes thereupon. I confess that I find a certain difficulty in being sure that I catch your reasoning. To me the alternative is this: Are certain sorts of stimuli (objects at a certain distance felt by the eye) natively correlated with paths leading to the right hand? or are the paths natively indifferent, and is the choice of the right hand for response to such stimuli due to reminiscences (explicit or implicit) of former experiences in which the right hand showed itself most fit to react upon them? If the latter view be adopted, then another alternative comes up, thus: Are the reminiscences those of "afferent" or "efferent" experiences?

The fact that all movement was inhibited when the stimulus was too far away, looks as if reminiscence had something to do with it, for I suppose (and you will know whether I am right) that originally the child would have been excited to grasping movements of both hands, by objects presented beyond reaching distance. He has now learned the uselessness of this, we will suppose; and similarly must have learned for a certain range of distance the superior usefulness of the right hand, we will say. In your words: "The new element must represent
the influence of former experience. I see no way to avoid this alternative. This is what I meant by 'memories,' merely some kind of a conscious modification which alters future re-actions. A purely physical modification would not suffice, for it would have its full force also in cases which involved no effort. Now, we may hold that such 'memories' are exclusively of afferent nerve processes, or that they involve also a conscious modification due to efferent nerve processes. If the former, we may attribute them to the greater 'promptitude, security, and ease' of right-handed movements, as Professor James suggests, or to former movements of the eyes, involved in the visual estimation of distance (which I am astonished he does not suggest). [James: Of course the present eye adaptation must be the cue which calls up the memories of the arm movement whichever they be.] The first alternative which Professor James asks my ground for rejecting, is inadequate for the following reasons. If such memories of afferent processes be of movements with effort, they are already right-handed, and the question is only thrown farther back.

I don't see the force of this objection. The right hand we must admit to be natively the cleverer. Grant that both hands set in movement by a stimulus so far away that it is reached with difficulty, and it will inevitably happen that in continuing the movements the child will feel its right hand succeeding oftener than the left. This "success" is unquestionably realized in various pleasant afferent feelings and the absence of unpleasant ones, sympathetic contraction elsewhere etc (whether efferent feelings be present or no). It seems to me that some sort of right-handed achievement "already," is an essential element in every possible explanation by reminiscence, of the facts observed. You continue: "but, if they be of effortless movements, then their motor influences would be perfectly indifferent, as I said in my former letter."

For effortless read "easy," and I suppose it can be
admitted that either hand reaching the goal promptly, no discriminative memories of the right hand’s superiority would be stored up, and both hands might continue to be used.

[Baldwin] "My experiments show this. If there had been differences in ‘promptitude,’ etc., the child certainly would have shown preferences for the right hand in effortless [James: not so for the reason just given] movements during the latter six months of the first year. But, on the contrary, it was only when making violent effort that there was any preference at all. [James: because only then had the right hand’s native superiority manifested itself in former trials.] Even after she developed such preference in cases of effort, the use of her hands when no effort was required continued to be quite indifferent. Does not this indicate that the traces left by former afferent processes of the same sense are not sufficient?" [James: not sufficient, merely, for choice of right hand where either hand had previously done the work with success.]

[Baldwin] "Moreover, in the absence of all feeling of the efferent movement, what could sensations of ‘promptitude,’ etc., be but the consciousness of better adaptation and co-ordination of movements? But at this stage of life all the child’s movements are so ataxic that there seems to be no practical difference between two hands in regard to the lack of the tactile delicacy in which pathological cases show motor ataxy to consist."

My view is just this, that the right hand is natively less “ataxic” than the left, and, having proved itself so, is thereafter chosen more than the left. The ataxia is originally not a fact of sensibility, but of motor coordination. The experiences of “failure,” however, of retarded reaching the goal and groping, and continued contractions, which lead to the left hand being inhibited when the eyes see an object 14 inches off, are sensible experiences.
[Baldwin] “If we seek the needed “memory” among the sensations of eye-movements in the case where the stimulus is weaker (more distant), it is possible that we may find an afferent element which brings up the intensity of the hand memories to the necessary pitch. There may be a connection between the centres for feelings of eye-movement and feelings of hand-movement, so that their united “dynamogenic” influence is the same as the high intensity of the color stimulus.”

It would not have occurred to me that the stimulus needed to be more intense, for the right hand to be chosen. It happened, indeed, to be so in your observations with the colours, and I noticed it as a remarkable fact. A certain sort of stimulus produces a certain sort of reaction, there is a specialized native adaptation of movement to visual sensation—that was what the observations on colours seemed to me to show. By analogy there might be a similar native specialized adaptation of right-handed movement to a certain range of accommodation and convergence, whether more or less intense. It actually is less intense in the case we deal with.

[Baldwin] “But, while freely admitting such a possibility, it only pushes the question farther back again; for how do we know that these eye-memories do not involve consciousness of the efferent process which innervates the eye-centre? And, besides this, there is another element in the hypothesis that afferent elements from other senses may furnish the “kinaesthetic co-efficient” for a given voluntary movement, namely, that such activities of the other senses invoked took place along with movements of the attention, which might, and probably do, contribute an efferent element to consciousness. This possibility I have never seen anywhere recognized.”

All this seems over subtle and I don’t need it. You have been misled by my quoting the bright colours into
supposing that I required an intenser stimulus everywhere, for the discharge of the right hand.

[Baldwin] "But in this case my experiments show conclusively that eye-movement memories did not re-enforce the intensity of the arm-movement memories; for, when the distance was more than fourteen inches, the re-action was inhibited altogether. The distance of the stimulus as apprehended by the eye, therefore, instead of giving the increased motor excitement which we require, rather diminishes it, and makes the need for some other explanation all the more imperative.

It appears, therefore, that the element needed in consciousness to explain the facts cited in my former letter is some kind of a difference in sensation corresponding to the outgo of the nervous current into the right arm, be it as vague, subconscious, and unworthy of the name of "memory" as you please, that is, I still think that my experiments support the traditional doctrine. On any other theory, right-handedness would have been developed independently of effort." J. Mark Baldwin, Toronto, Ont., Nov. 18.

Not so, as I think you must admit, if by effort be meant retardation & difficulty of execution owing to an original ataxy which is least in the right arm!

Admitting the experience hypothesis, (which I adopt from you now, since I have made no observations and your sense of what is likely in this regard seems to me to have great weight) the way I represent the matter to myself is this: the child originally responds to all optical excitements which strike his attention by bounding up & down and moving both arms. Erelong the movement becomes one of grasping with both. Some graspings prove easy, and the original bilateral mechanism continues for a while associated with these. Others are protracted, and the superior native efficiency of the right hand in reaching the goal here, acts so as to inhibit the
left hand altogether when the stimulus suggests a case of
this kind. Others again never succeed, the object being
beyond range altogether, & all movements are inhibited
for these at last.

Although I have made every possible concession to
the experience theory, as adopted by you, I must say
that the notion of a specialized native impulsiveness for
the right hand when certain distances appeal to the eye
lingers in my mind as that of a natural possibility. Surely
the similar native impulsiveness when bright colours ap­
peal is a suggestive analogy. In neither case however,
should it ever have occurred to me to resort to efferent
"memories." They seem quite superfluous; nor do I un­
derstand why you should so cling to things confessedly
impossible to isolate by introspection, devoid of signifi­
cance in speculative regard, and apparently only tending
uselessly to increase, if they should exist, the complica­
tion of our machinery.

I am taking a terrible vengeance on you by sending
you this long letter. But you began! I will promise to
make no reply if you write.⁶

[unsigned]
To Samuel Pierpont Langley

95 Irving St.
Cambridge, Mass.
Jan 3, 1891

Dear Professor Langley,

I am sorry to say, in response to your inquiry, that I know of no such article on hypnotism as you describe. Everything that I am acquainted with is either too long or too insignificant. I am, however, a poor person to apply to, for I don’t follow the more popular magazines, & there might be lots of things in the Revue des deux Mondes, or the Deutsche Rundschau, etc., which never would come to my knowledge. Hodgson tells me of an article by one Herter in the Pop. Sci. M. 1887 or ’8, but I don’t know it. I am very sorry not to be more helpful.

The S. P. R. fund doesn’t mount up brilliantly. Even your letter wouldn’t draw anything from Mr. Forbes. But we will enter upon our first half year of 1891 and trust to Providence to pull us through.

Very truly yours

Wm James

7
To Thomas Sergeant Perry

95 Irving St.
Cambridge, Mass.
March 23. 1891

Dear Thos.

I have read every word in your book about the Greek philosophers, and can’t refrain from expressing my high satisfaction with the manner in which ’tis done. It couldn’t be better for the purpose, Plato especially. Readable, light, varied, and full of accurate information. Many of your sentences I have used in my lectures. It was a good test for I read half a dozen other accounts simultaneously, always with an eye to practical use, and yours had no appearance of insolidity, altho so much lighter and more agreeable to read than the more technical accounts. Keep on! One thing has struck me about your book. When a thing is as big as that it takes a rather heroic reader to go at it at all. Does not such a reader want the originals? In other words, is there need of “popular” books on that scale? Make your roman literature short & bright.

Yrs ever

W. J.$^8$

-78-
Dear Mr. Marshall,

I got your reprints of Pleasure & Pain etc duly, but not before I had cracked my brains over the articles in Mind’s own pages. You have certainly come to closer quarters with the question than any previous analyst, and your scheme seems to cover more facts than any other—in fact there is no other which seems to have been framed under such a pressure, from all sides, of the facts which it was bound to keep account of. Other writers give far more the impression of starting off "at a tangent." One thing occurred to me as an objection of a rather radical sort when I was reading, but I didn’t note it down, and it doesn’t come back to me now as I write. It doubtless will ere long. The great trouble with the theory is its extremely abstract character. One doesn’t represent to one’s self at all just what is meant by your two energies and their relation. The formula has, however, to be ultra-vague—the “energy of the stimulus” especially must be kept vague. You can’t mean a real numerical relation, for the stimulus, numerically taken, may be vastly less than the reaction, & probably yet give pain. In the case of muscular reaction Matteucci found the relation to be 27.000 over 1 when the stimulus was a galvanic current applied to the motor nerve. What your formula means is evidently greater than the normal ratio, which normal ratio must differ from one organ to another, and from one person to another of different habit-
ual experience. Nevertheless the formula expresses a
real, as distinguished from a merely ideal relation.

I regard it as one of those things which one must keep & use before one can know how much or how little there is in it. So far I can truly say that it is the deepest thing I know on the subject—the most scientific. It is hard reading—so very deficient in concrete illustrations.

One of my students offers a report of it to our "Semi­nary" next Wednesday evening. Others have been reading it, and I wish that you might come to the discussion. Can you? I can put you up, and you might find it a lark—though I can't offer to "pay your travelling expenses."

If you can't come, can you at least let me have before next Wednesday evening an elucidation of a point which I have found obscure? From the passage on p. 352 it would seem that the pains of obstruction are vascular pains. Do you mean anything more definite by this than appears? It appears somewhat like an hypothesis because there must be one—a stop-gap to round out the form of the scheme. It is not fair to judge your theory definitely till one sees what it will do in the sphere of aesthetics proper. You apply it now only to simple pleasures & pains. The pleasures & pains that come from mutual furtherance & hinderance of processes might be conceived as pleasures of enhanced reactive energy and as pains of obstruction. Do you carry the thing all the way through on the same lines?

I hope I am not troubling you. The upshot of my reading this fall is to make me realize how few ideas there are in the literature of this subject, and how we still wait for an entrance to the method of treatment which is to prove really scientific. So far I confess you are ahead of anyone.

I do hope that you may come.

Very truly yours

Wm James
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My dear Marshall,

I have read your reply to Sidgwick with interest, though it seems to me that the case is insoluble in general terms and without making discriminations which (as you say) language has not provided for. I found Sidgwick’s article instructive, and as I use the words “desire” and “painful” have felt like subscribing to it. Most desires, like most volitions, lead immediately to action and even incipient gratification seems to neutralize effectively whatever may be unpleasant in the desire, just as the sensations of an accomplished muscular contraction eclipses instantly the image which defined it to the mind as an object of volition. If the action is thwarted, we have an “uneasiness” which leads to “pain” if the thwarting becomes strong or prolonged. But whenever there is a crescendo in the direction of prompt satisfaction, to my consciousness, its pleasure is much stronger than the potential pain of the desire, in ordinary cases.

Delboeuf somewhere asks whether the beginnings of sexual desire are not pleasant. I suppose most men would say yes. Only after considerable thwarting will “pain” come in.

That is all I can say of the matter just now.

I thank you for your invitation to the Century. I can’t tell now how many hours I can spend in N. Y., but I will let you know in time.

Yours very truly

Wm James

Of course send your rejoinder!10
Dear Mrs. Franklin,

It gives me great pleasure to receive your letter which in business like and expeditious manner, I must answer point by point. I had no idea you were abroad and on the whole congratulate you on the opportunity. I am myself to have my “sabbatical” next year, and take the family in July to Germany. Possibly you and Professor Franklin will still be there.

Thank you for your continued indulgence as to the Psychology. The last chapter however is the one for which I mainly craved your approval as a logician & mathematician, and now it turns out to be the one which you chiefly disapprove! The unfathomable ways of woman! If I ever do revise the book you shall go in with the horopter. I didn’t mention that because it seemed to me to have much more mathematical than psychological interest—in fact hardly any of the latter except what your illusion gave it.

I have a sort of terror of Müller as of all mathematically minded geniuses including yourself. But I’m glad you & he are such good friends—of course we are going to have women in Harvard soon—Göttingen mustn’t be allowed to get ahead there. But which theory of Hering’s do you mean—he has so many? Is it colour, space, contrast, what? I rather admire Hering all round. Helmholtz of course is much the greater man, and yet he probably has made more mistakes. I shall be greatly interested in your article, whenever it appears.
I shall be delighted to read your Intuition and Reason in the MS., and to do what I can to recommend it. Don't you want the Pop. Sci. M.?

Always faithfully yours

Wm James

· To Hugo Münsterberg ·

Vers chez les Blanc, sur Lausanne
9. 8. 92

My dear Münsterberg

I have but just received your letter from Freiburg of the 2nd August. I am excessively grieved to hear of your illness. That it should have come at just this particular moment is indeed a most unhappy stroke of fortune, for the visit to the London Congress would have been not only a most agreeable but also a most instructive experience for you, and the assembled psychologists ought certainly to have had the advantage of seeing the face and hearing the voice of one whose works have excited so much of their attention in recent years! You speak of a gastric fever—an acute gastritis is a pretty serious thing, and I hope it is not that from which you have suffered. But since you speak of being already convalescent, and of travelling away again soon, I assume that all cause for anxiety must be over, and I only hope that you may never have a relapse.

I am using certain scraps of paper which are all that I can lay my hands on. I only arrived here last night, and
my wife who has the paper supply locked up is gone off on a walk. It would appear from your letter that two of our epistles have gone astray. I never received the letter you say you wrote me from Berlin, the last letter I had from you being at Lucerne, on the eve. of your departure from Freiburg. You on the other hand appear never to have got a letter I wrote you from Lucerne (about the 8th of July?) in which I advised you to telegraph to Mrs. Gibbens to take the rooms in Sumner Street for you. I did this in consequence of a letter from her, and am glad to hear that Royce has already taken them. I sent my letter to the care of your brother Otto in Danzig. I hope you have already received the $600 for travelling expenses concerning which I wrote to President Eliot. A letter from him of July 20th says "There will of course be no difficulty in M's getting the $600."

As for ourselves, we are both feeling well, and I have had a certain amount of walking in these beautiful mountains, though less than I could wish. I am just back from a flight of 8 days to the Engadin and Italian lakes, solus. "The educational problem" is still infernal! Our boys are at present in the families of 2 pastors, one at Lausanne, one near Vevey, learning french, and I think that in no case shall we go to Paris. It looks as if we might stay hereabouts. But I hanker after Germany; and having just heard of the Realgymnasium at Stuttgart with Willman at its head, I am turning over the whole question again, and may, in a few days, run off to Stuttgart to see whether the place looks tempting for a winter abode. Had I forseen this trouble, I should not have brought the children, nor taken my year of absence but simply given myself a long vacation of 4 months, bringing Mrs. James for perhaps two months, and gone back to work in Cambridge next year. At present I envy you your prospect. I hear nothing from Nichols and shall be sorry if he goes away to Cornell, for you will find him very useful if he stays. If he does go, I should think that Mr. J. R.
Angell would be the best man to appoint in his place. Angell is young, but exceedingly clear headed and practical, and made a more favorable impression on me last year than any student I have ever had, from the experimental point of view. As this is only a one year’s appointment, we can hardly secure a better-known man. But I must leave that whole question to Royce, Nichols, you, and the President.

I hope that Mrs. Münsterberg is refreshed by her “Kur,” that you will have no sea sickness, and that after the first shock of our American butter, bread, street pavements and various other things, you will begin to like the new life very well. You had better address me in case you write again before you leave (but I hardly think you will do so) Pension Cruchon, Vers chez les Blanc, sur Lausanne, Schweitz.

Always heartily yours

Wm James

To James Mark Baldwin

Pension Cruchon
à Vers-chez-les-Blanc (sur Lausanne)
Switzerland
9. 8. 92

Dear Baldwin,

On returning from a 10-day trip solus to the Engadin, I find your letter of Aug 5 relative to an “extraordinary Congress in America next year,” and containing the flattering suggestion that I should be its president.
You ask for an immediate reply. I confess this gives me some embarrassment, for I do not yet fully understand the plan. Still, whatever it be, I don’t see how I can possibly be “President” next year. All my plans are at present laid to continue in Europe with my family until the very last day of the vacation next summer and I am by nature so little of a man for Societies, organizations, secretaryships, presidencies, powers, principalities, & politics (even the politics of Science) that I can’t bring myself to change them. So that to that part of your letter I must return a regretful but decided “no.” Either you or Stanley Hall would be a vastly more efficient president than I, even were I to be on the ground.

Next, as to the existence and organization of the proposed reunion. Prima facie, I can’t say that it seems to me desirable to have the “International Congress” diminish the emphasis of its great meetings by intercalating extra meetings anywhere, though you who have been on the ground this summer may have seen reason to believe in good effects from more continuous intercourse. As a member of the International Congress, I should be rather opposed to this irregular offshoot. If, on the contrary, it is to be considered as a purely American affair, I think it ought to be referred to the newly constituted American Club of Psychologists of which you have doubtless received notice from Jastrow. My own sentiment (which may, I confess, be entirely subjective) is that we Americans should do better to aim at the 1904 meeting. By that time, the beginnings which are so promising now with us will, I trust, have borne some rather solid fruit, and we might well expect to produce a somewhat startling impression of our activity on the foreigners who might come over. Just now we are hardly mature enough to offer them any very striking results. I say, therefore, bide our time and claim the 1904 meeting! I see no great use in the meeting you propose for
next year, which will be neither genuinely American nor genuinely international. Aim at an American Club pure & simple, and get all its members interested in working towards a great success at a meeting of the International Congress in America twelve years hence! Psychology, I opine, is at present hardly a massive enough subject to bear too frequent international assemblages. Hoping that this churlish sort of a response will not displease you too much, and feeling sure that my humble opinion will have very little practical effect on you more active men, I am ever faithfully yours,

Wm James

P.S. I have my boys in pastors’ families near here learning french, but the winter abode is still unsettled. You tell me nothing of the Congress, but I expect to hear all about it from the Myerses who are to arrive here tomorrow. I hope it was a great success. Poor M’berg writes me from Freiburg that he is down there with “gastric fever.” I am sorry.13

· To Jacob Gould Schurman ·

I hope you ordered the fee for the article in Nov. No. about deaf-mute sent to the d’Estrella California Institution for Deaf & Dumb, Berkeley, Cal., as I asked you in the Spring. It reads delectably, I think. My fees might be sent in checks payable to order of Mrs. Eliza P. Gibbens (Irving St., Cambridge, Mass) until my return. I suppose or [sic] ought to review for you Fouillé’e’s 3
Idée-force volumes, when the two latter ones appear. I think the review keeps up well.

Wm James

16 P.ᵃ dell' Indipendenza
Florence
Nov 21. 92⁽¹⁴⁾

· To Carlo Francesco Ferraris ·

16 P.ᵃ dell' Indipendenza
Florence
Dec. 12. '92

My dear Sir,

Back at home again, after the festivities of last week, I must write a word to express to you my appreciation for the great courtesy which was shown to me in common with all the delegates, and my admiration of the beautiful and admirable manner in which the ceremony was carried out. To you especially our thanks are due for your indefatigable attention to every detail. I should think you would need a month's vacation to recover from the fatigue!

Long live the University of Padua and its present indomitable rector!

Believe me always admiringly & respectfully yours,

Wm James

Professor Ferraris
Rector of the University
Padua.⁽¹⁵⁾
To George Frederick Stout

16 Piazza Indipendenza
Florence
April 9 [1893]

Dear Mr. Stout,

I send a reply (which I wish were more short and less arid) to “E. Ford’s” criticism in the current Mind. Why will people not write their names in full? I don’t know whether Ford is he, she, or it, Mr., Mrs., or Miss. I suspect “Miss,” I know not wherefore; but I have left blanks in the text, for you to fill out with the proper sexual titles & pronouns, and have put “carets” in the margin to guide your eyes to them. I dare say that Ward will also have replied, in which case there may be too much of the matter.

I have been much interested in Bradley’s article this time. He has taken pains to make his meaning clear, and succeeded perfectly.

I shall leave Florence in less than a week and make my way gradually North.

The best address to send proof to will be 34 De Vere Gardens, London West, where I may arrive in a fortnight. If not, things will be forwarded to me on the Continent.

Yours sincerely

Wm James

I hope (not doubting) that your fellowship was duly renewed!
Your pleasant words and pretty good night were duly received, and should have been responded to long since. But I hoped from day to day to be able to tell you something more definite about our own plans, and indeed even to be able to propose to you to come to the Verschez-les-Blanc pension above Lausanne (of which I spoke to you) and help beguile our time there, for we have been playing fast and loose with the notion of going there ourselves. Now, at last, we have finally written them that we don't come—so that dream also fades. My wife, meanwhile, who has been to Munich for a week by herself (her first absence from the marital roof since our marriage) enjoyed it so much that she meditates a visit to Vevey and Geneva next week, when our little nursemaid (now on a visit to her folks at Aigle) shall have returned, and will do herself the honour of waiting upon you. I hope that she will find you at least as comfortable as I did, and at most infinitely more so. Life must be pretty monotonous for you both. We have been quietly breathing the air and absorbing the view here ever since I left you. Two sisters from Boston are with us, one an invalid, and Harry came down from Paris and stayed ten days in Luzern, finishing some work and walking, sailing or driving to us every afternoon. He said he hadn’t had so soothing a time in many a year. His life seems to
condemn him to cities. Alice sends you her most sympathetic greetings, and I my love.

Yours (both of you) affectionately

W. J.17

To George Frederick Stout

Vers-chez-les-Blanc
Switzerland
June 5, [1893]

Dear Mr. Stout,

I am too happy to lift up my feeble voice in your favor, and I hope you will get the place, for among the younger men in your Island I am acquainted with none more able.

July will be early enough for me to receive my quietus from Bradley. I hope to be in England in a week’s time, shall soon make my appearance in Cambridge, and trust then to be able to see you face to face.

Truly yours

Wm James

P.S. On proceeding to write a few lines (re your appointment) to whom it may concern, I suddenly find myself embarrassed by the miserable character of my memory which loses every detail of anything it may read, and
retains only a sort of generic wraith of its quality. Your Herbart articles I remember well enough; but of two other articles of psychological analyses by you, I have forgotten even the titles and subjects, and can only recall the impression of their thorough and acute texture. Five minutes glance at a file of Mind would bring the whole thing back to me. I read these articles last year when I was in a state of bad brain-fog, and I am appalled at the vacancy of my mind now in respect of all work done at that time. Perhaps I had better postpone my testimonial till I reach 34 De Vere Gardens London W, and if you could meanwhile send thither reprints of these articles (Ob. & Subject in Cognition?—or is that Shand?) together with the name of the body whom I ought to address, that will perhaps be best.

W. J.18

· To George Frederick Stout ·

34 De Vere Gardens, W.
June 16 [1893]

My dear Stout

(Isn't it time to begin to stop betitling each other?) I got here last night and began feasting on your articles at 1/2 past 6 this A.M. At half past 8 your note of yesterday arrives (the one sent to Switzerland has not yet come), and finds me primed for my testimonial. Your achievements are certainly far in advance of those of any possible other of the younger candidates. The Apperception and the Tho't and Language I had not read. The other
two articles revived as soon as I saw them. I got behind
hand with my reading through getting my books pub-
lished. The year 1891–2 was one of such bad brain-fog
that I was obliged for reasons of safety to stop work and
come abroad for the year. I am all right now; and men-
tion this merely that you should see that the reasons for
my vagueness concerning articles as important as yours
are physical rather than moral.

I enclose the word to the judges or whatever they are,
and hope you will get the place.

What is the matter with Adamson?

Very truly yours

Wm James

---

To the Council, Owens College

34 De Vere Gardens, W.
June 16 [1893]

To the Council
Owens College, Manchester

Dear Sirs,

Hearing from Mr. G. F. Stout that he is a candidate for
the Professorship lately held by Prof. Adamson, I desire
to add my humble word to the testimonials that you will
already have received in his favor.

I know Mr. Stout only as Editor of Mind and as con-
tributor to its pages. His Editorship is admirable, and his
articles on various psychological and philosophical sub-
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jects are of an importance which entitle him to a place amongst the three or four first English writers on Psychology. I can hardly imagine that you should have a candidate whose scholarship, clearness and originality were equal to those of Mr. Stout.

Believe me, with great respect, yours very truly,

Wm James

(Professor of Psychology
Harvard University
Cambridge, U. S.)

To James Bryce

34 De Vere Gardens, W.
July 8, 1983

My dear Bryce,

The American Academy, etc. is one of the oldest and most respectable learned bodies in the United States, and contains all the wisdom of our “section of the country” in its sheltering folds. The only trouble about it is that it is rather too respectable and its meetings too slow. It has lost importance as a publishing body now, on account of the rise of so many special Journals. But it is really an honor to be elected by it, and you need not hesitate to accept. Cooke & Jackson are Harvard Professors of Chemistry. The Academy has also a section for historical and philological science.

I echo your wish about London. To lie on one’s back under a tree on the mountains, early in vacation time is
the only satisfactory position for human intercourse, in my opinion. Then what people have in them comes out—doesn’t have to be pumped out or drawn out etc. May a kind Providence some day provide that mode of coming together for you and me and several of “we-uns”, is the wish of

Ever yours

Wm James

London
July 17. 93

Dear Schurman,

Another book-review—would I could make them shorter, but my pen will run away.

My disciple Miller sent me a letter from you in re an article of his of whose editorial treatment he had complained. It was very good reading, and the aforesaid Miller seems to have enjoyed it hugely, in spite of the fact that you had chewed him up so. He said it gave him a great appetite for your acquaintance, although he could not agree in your doctrine of editorial duties towards articles that were signed. It gave me no envy of your editorial tasks! He is a delectable young fellow, of whom the world will doubtless hear more.

I return home, a somewhat saddened and impoverished man, on August 24th, and on the whole shall
be glad to be in harness again—even as a tub may be glad to feel the hoops driven on tight.

I write by lamp light at midday, a classical green London fog having descended on the town!

Best wishes and greetings, from Yours ever,

W. J.22

· To Parke Godwin ·

95 Irving St.
Cambridge, Mass.
Sept. 4. 1893

Dear Mr. Godwin,

I have just got back from Europe to find a mass of reading "matter" on my table waiting for me, and amongst it your address on poor Geo. Curtis, which has caught my eye and compelled perusal to the end. It is extraordinary that at your age you should have written a thing so full of fire & literary vitality. Of course the subject was one that appealed to your heart, but the result is of the happiest, and worthy of the admirable man and citizen who is gone.

I stayed a couple of days in Paris with the good Pillons—the best of human beings both of them, but with that curious french timidity about the outer world which made me think of two mice living in a hollow cheese. It would never enter their conceptions of possibility to take, e.g. a journey to England, seven hours away. Pillon told me that you had ordered his photograph, and
seemed to wonder greatly at this inscrutable unknown American who followed his career with such sympathy. Have you, by the way, read Renouvier's paper on Schopenhauer in the last Année Philosophique? R. is 80 and almost deaf, but he never wrote anything more vigorous or deep-cutting, and the form of this paper makes it one of his best works.

And now comes something which I tremble to write, and which I might best have begun by. I am about to beg, and I never should have the thought of begging of you if you hadn't sent me the oration, and if the matter of Pillon's photograph hadn't reminded me of your paying for the index to the Critique Philosophique many years ago. This made me think that you might wish to waste money on philosophy or psychology, and might help me out of my present scrape, which is briefly this.

We are starting, that is Baldwin of Princeton, Cattell of Columbia, and practically all the good psychologists of the country with two exceptions, a new psychological Journal. We have vainly tried to get Hall of Clark University whose American Journal of Psychology is considered by all to be carried on in too narrow a way, to consent to enlarge it and better it, and are determined now to have a thoroughly broad and worthy thing which will cover the whole field. There are enough trained men in the country now to make the journal a success as regards quality, but we need to guarantee the finances to the publisher for the first couple of years. The publisher will be Macmillan, probably, and the first number appear Jan'y 1st. I have undertaken to raise a few hundred dollars. Are you willing to contribute one hundred (or more if you wish) to such a cause? It may all come back to you in a couple of years.

An early answer will oblige and put me out of my misery. If negative just write "No" on a post card and I will understand.
Remember that you have brought this on your self! and believe me your once young and now senescent friend

Wm James

To James McKeen Cattell

Cambridge
Dec 30. 93

Dear Cattell,

I hope that after life’s fitful fever you sleep well. I think that the whole thing was a success, and that you distinguished yourself by your tact, good humor and flexibility of intellect! I am only sorry that poor Baldwin had to absent himself the second day.

I enclose a check for 100 dollars towards the expenses of the review, being 2/5 of the 250 which Münsterberg & I promised to raise. You may perceive that it is from that veteran man of letters Parke Godwin and not from Harvard University, which had a big deficit last year and is lying low at present. Knowing Godwin’s weakness for philosophy, I successfully applied a stimulus calculated to elicit this generous reaction—I imagine that even Scripture would not despise the operation because the time was not accurately measured. The remaining $150.00 will be supplied whenever you notify us that they are needed. If you endorse this check to Macmillan’s order it will be a voucher to the good Godwin that the money has found its destination. He ought also
to be added to the free subscription list. I have lost his N. Y. address which will be in the Directory.

Happy New Year

W. J.

I suggest that copies of No 1 be sent also to Henry Holt, Thos. W. Ward, and Gouverneur M. Carnochan in N.Y. (Address in Directory) and to George B. Dorr, of 18 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston. They may be tempted to subscribe. Also to Dr. W. S. Bigelow, 70 Beacon St., Boston.

Happy New Year,

W. J.24

· To James Mark Baldwin ·

Cambr.
Dec. 30. 93

Dear Baldwin,

Life was such a fitful fever on Thursday and Friday A. M. (I having made an appointment to visit the Wards Island Asylum) that I had no chance to look you up and see how you were. I hope your ailment was a brief one. You were missed at the various meetings and at poor Alexander’s dinner, which went off very pleasantly, and I dare say that you yourself lost a little of that curious solidification
of one’s sense of what the concrete psychological Treiben and industry is in our country, which I gained from hearing the other men talk on the second day. I think Cattell appeared to great advantage all through, and I received from Ladd a curious impression of a consciousness in him of his own commanding position. With best wishes for your health and happiness next year, yours and all of yours, I am ever cordially

Wm James$^{25}$