1896–1897

The absence of Münsterberg complicated the promotion of Santayana and also necessitated hiring E. B. Delabarre of Brown University to direct the psychological laboratory for the academic year 1896–97. There was some rumor that Baldwin would take Münsterberg’s place. In June of 1896, Schiller began to express his desire to leave Cornell. James wrote testimonials in his behalf to secure a teaching position at other institutions. Because of Schiller’s publications, James saw in him an ally in his own attack on the established philosophical position called “Monistic Idealism.”

James agreed to contribute some articles to Baldwin’s proposed Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology. One of his pleasures from summer reading was Santayana’s new book, The Sense of Beauty. But most of his extra time was spent in lecturing. At the end of August, he traveled even to Chicago to repeat his “talks to teachers.” Soon after school started, James received from Princeton University on October 22 an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws. This rash of activity was topped off by the Lowell Institute lectures in Boston on “Abnormal Mental States” in October and November. It was about this time that a change in James’s interests was taking place. He wrote to a friend, “I feel as if I had bought the
right to say good-bye to psychology for the present, and turn myself to more speculative directions."

Since the fifth annual meeting of the American Psychological Association was to take place in Boston, James invited Baldwin and Schiller to stay with him. Afterwards he wrote to a friend about Schiller: "I find him a most peculiarly delightful fellow. His philosophy and mine run abreast in an altogether gratifying way to me."

James's first book in philosophy proper: *The Will to Believe and Other Essays in Popular Philosophy* was published in February 1897. In the preface he wrote that the philosophical attitude which the essays express could be called "radical empiricism." When it became clear that Münsterberg would return to Harvard as professor of psychology, James expressed his preference that his title in the department revert to professor of philosophy. This title change became effective on 31 October 1897. In this capacity he gave the second Ingersoll lecture, "On two supposed objections to the doctrine of a future life," in the Fogg Museum at Harvard on 10 November.

Instead of attending the sixth annual meeting of the American Psychological Association in late December at Cornell University, James went to Chicago and Buffalo to lecture.
· To F. C. S. Schiller ·

95 Irving St.
Cambridge
Jan. 9, 1896

Dear Mr. Schiller,

Many thanks for your Riddles which I shall, I know devour with voracity, though probably not with promptitude for reasons connected with the course of life, that you probably know as much about as I do.

It seems a swindle that my remark should have made you give me the book. I shall certainly give you my next one if such a thing exists. I was just thinking of ordering your volume when it arrived.

Many thanks once more!

Yours sincerely

Wm James¹
To Charles William Eliot

Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.
Jan. 24. 1896

Dear President,

Royce informs me of his talk with you about Santayana, and says that you may settle the matter on Monday. As I can not see you between now and then, I venture to write my own opinion, which is briefly this.

S. is a very honest and unworldly character, a spectator rather than an actor by temperament, but apart from that element of weakness, a man (as I see him) of thoroughly wholesome mental atmosphere. He is both a "gentleman" and a "scholar" in the real sense of the words, an exquisite writer and a finished speaker. Those qualities ought to weigh, when one considers the personal crudity of so many of our candidates.

We sorely need a Greek-philosophy specialist. It seemed to me a ray of light when S. expressed his desire to be that, for in that field his merits would count for more than his defects would be noticed. Moreover he is the only man who knows something of scholasticism, & we oughtn't to let a man with such a point as that slip lightly away.

I know of no available man to teach Greek philosophy who would be as safe as S. Bakewell might develop into something even better, or we might send abroad—but there is the possibility of disappointment later, and here we know the worst. I therefore advise keeping Santayana.

But I see the pecuniary difficulty which may occur if Münsterberg returns. Would this be possible?—To let
S. go next year on the understanding that he returns
promoted in case the psychology business can be more
cheaply arranged, but with as early promotion as possi­
ble in case a new full-salaried psychologist has to be
paid. I think that no pledge of promotion at all would be
taken (as it seems to me rightly taken) by him as notice to
quit.

All these points I think should be considered in your
decision.

Very truly yours

Wm James

* To James Mark Baldwin *

Jan 29. [1896]

Dear Baldwin,

I forgot yesterday to notice your demand as to my re­
marks in the discussion on Weismannism.

The Secretary has also asked me for them, but has
seemed quite satisfied with my answer that there was
nothing in them fit to print, and that the best service one
can do the race in this overprinted age is to print nothing
when one has nothing to say.

Pray accept this answer also for the Review.

W. J.²

* 141 *
95 Irving St.
Cambridge
Feb. 22. [1896]

Dear President,

I hope that you will be able on Monday if possible to settle the question of Delabarre being invited to direct the laboratory next year and give the course in Physiological psychology which is almost exclusively practical. He says he can make arrangements to come from Brown University 3 days in the week, but appears impatient to know his fate, and we too must make our announcement soon.

He is the best man for the purpose any of us can think of—very solid, already with a good reputation, and pupil both of Münsterberg and of myself.

I can make myself useful enough outside of the laboratory. What is proposed by me so far for next year is the psychology-part of Phil. I, a 1/2 course in English Philosophy, the "Philosophy of Nature" course, and a seminar in Kant's Philosophy.

Very truly yours

Wm James
March 9. 96

Dear Baldwin,

How absurdly rumors fly round! Of course I call Harvard a promotion, but Harvard itself would be promoted in turn by having you here. I still hope however for Münsterberg the great and glorious in spite of his finite mortality. Allin visited us t’other day, and we may get him for a “fellow” next year. Our graduate students are at a low ebb this year. Singer on the other hand is proving stronger and stronger, an absolutely satisfactory man.

We found the Pension Gottlieben at Hinterweggen near Luzern a delicious place in May and early June. Frau Tschopf the landlady an excellent woman. Rooms with balcony overlooking the lake. Vers chez les Blanc is too retired for you, but just the place for the children.

Yours always

W. J.
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To David Peck Todd

Cambridge
March 28th. [1896]

Dear Sir,

I thank you for the volumes of the Columbian Knowledge Series, and your flattering invitation. To the latter I have to return a sorrowful negative. It will be quite impossible for me to write such a book or booklet as you propose. Apart from the labor—I write with incredible slowness and difficulty—I cannot express myself on these old subjects in new ways, and should have simply to copy my own "psychology." Moreover I am deep in arrears of other work long since pledged and overdue.

Regretting to be so disobliging I am truly yours

Wm James

Professor Todd
Amherst

To F. C. S. Schiller

Chocorua, N. H.
June 9, 1896

My dear Schiller,

(I propose that we cease Mister-ing each other). I should in any case have written to you today even had I not received your letter, simply to express the pleasure with
which I have just read your article on Lotze in the last Philosophical Review. You carry me with you in all your positions. I have always been a special enemy of the principle that the alternative: absolute unity or absolute disconnectedness between things, is exhaustive and you have put the matter splendidly. What I admire as much as the matter of your article is its classical simplicity and directness of style and arrangement. I feel a little more tender towards Lotze’s Idealism than you seem to. If I remember rightly, he first establishes his One to account for interaction, without specifying its Nature and then he hypothetically gives it the thinking nature since in our own thought we have the sole example known to us of manyness in oneness. The argument for the One is the weak thing. The idealistic hypothesis can stand on its own legs and need not be that of an absolute Thought in any case.

I am profoundly sorry, now that your request comes, that I haven’t yet looked into the Riddles of the Sphinx. Not a moment of time. But it was laid out to be my first philosophical reading of the vacation and would undoubtedly have been begun next week. I am brain jaded now and have bro’t up here nothing but some novels to recuperate upon. I go back to Cambridge on Saturday. I am sorry you want to leave America but on the whole am not indignant. Here is my humble word of praise for you. I would apologize for the paper but believe the original is not to be seen.

Wishing you success—though as an American I hate to lose you, I am always,

Truly yours

Wm James
To James Mark Baldwin

North Elba, N. Y.
Aug. 25 [1896]

Dear Baldwin,

Replying to yours of date Munich 10th inst. wd. say "Barkis is willing, but damns you all the same."

I envy you your glorious tour. I have had a somewhat unwholesome but instructive summer lecturing and gabbling with strangers. Only 8 days now of real vacation, up here. Off to Chicago tonight to lecture again.

I wish that you had gossiped more about the Congress and less about the dictionary! I tho’t I had answered your M–g letter—possibly I didn’t because you sailed so quick thereupon. I haven’t your fears. The talk about his insulting his assistants all comes from one [Mr. X] of Philadelphia who was his assistant, and is I think practically insane. M. is idolized as a lab. chieftain by every one else. M. has his weaknesses “as who has not?”—but take the algebraic plus & minus, and it gives a strong sum to the good. I don’t fear him at all in the University—quite the contrary, although personally we are so bad a conversational blend. He follows his inner destiny as a psychologist unmodified by the communications of others—and for the matter of that we all do, more or less.

As for your neurologist conundrum, how about Herrick, editor of the J. of Comp. Neurol.? Why can’t you duplicate a university, though? If you can, there’s Donaldson of Chicago, and Parker of Harvard. Good luck to you!—and to Mrs. B.

Sincerely yours

Wm James

· 146 ·
Dear Professor

Your card from Lomza reached me the second of June and I am much to be reprobated for having left it so long unnoticed but I have been overworked and traveling and interrupted by all sorts of experiences, so that my correspondence in general has been neglected and I am only now beginning to catch up. It flatters me that you should express a desire to hear of my news. I have read your two articles in the Monist with much interest and I was particularly interested in the anonymous paper on Polish Individualism in the Geneva periodical. It inspired me with a lively desire to read Polish history, which I hardly need say, has been followed by no active results. I am growing, myself, more and more pluralistic and individualistic in my general views of things; and I think that against the monism which dominates everywhere the philosophic mind, men are needed to stand stoutly up for that opposite view. Probably the rest of my life will be devoted to defending it more and more.

You do not say why you left Kazan or whether political unpleasantnesses had anything to do with it. As you are fond of going to congresses I daresay you may have been at the Munich Congress. Unfortunately I could not go.

I shall be much interested in seeing your work on Plato when it appears, although as you probably know, Greek philosophy is not my forte.

Thanking you for remembering us and with cordial greetings I am

Always truly yours

Wm James
P.S. Are you going to remain permanently in Spain, or is this an interlude to be followed by university work somewhere else? Does the diet of nuts still “obtain?”

· To F. C. S. Schiller ·

Beede’s, N. Y.
Sept. 15, 1896

My dear Schiller,

I have at last read your Riddles and though you are probably out of the country and very likely have shaken off its dust forever, (I have learned nothing of the success of your candidacy), I must sit down whilst the warm fit is on me and express my very great delight. How strange that a book so capitally written, so “live,” so original, so bold, should be so little known! That I myself who am so exceptionally in accord with its fundamental positions, should until now have ignored its contents! But don’t fear! It will be known and little by little quoted and then some fortune will be made. It is too rich as it now stands. It is a young man’s work—he puts in at once all his system. When you dole out hereafter the small change of many of your chapters more technically and formally, attention will be drawn to the whole thing. The speculations of the last chapter are foreign to my range—I am too timid—but they have struck me very much. I only mean this for a general hurrah, so I go into no detail. I can foresee a more or less systematic siege of monism and absolutism on my own part for the rest of my days (so far as I may retain ability to do anything) and it cheers and enlivens me immensely to find a gleichgesinnten Menschen of such superior power to follow. I hope you will come back to this country, which after all has its
good “p’ints.” E.g. the political campaign is really inspiring and ennobling. Such admirable documents! even on both sides.

Fraternally yours,

Wm James

· To James Mark Baldwin ·

Cambridge, Mass.
Oct. 9, 1896

Dear Baldwin,

Poor Nichols! Why does the Creator make men with such brilliant qualities and deny them the gift of seeing things in their right perspective? I haven’t read his American Naturalist yet; Cattell wrote that it was off the mark.

Santayana is your best aesthetic man, but he is traveling in Europe, and probably is unavailable. The next best I know is Benjamin I. Gilman, of the Boston Art Museum, a thorough scholar and an extremely conscientious man, but he may be too hard pressed to do your job.

I am sorry, but I cannot do Head. Too fearfully busy with my new courses. I hear that Münsterberg has been called to Zurich. I am eager to see you on the 21st.

Always yours

Wm James

P. S. No! I can’t add anything to my review of Hirsch.
Cambridge
Oct. 17, 1896

Dear Schiller,

I trust you are going to the Psychology Association next Christmas, which you will observe meets in Boston. I write you thus early to bespeak you as our guest while it lasts. The Baldwins, I hope, will also be here, so do not refuse. Your letter received ten or more days ago gave me great pleasure, as I hardly need say.

Always truly yours,

W. J.11

Cambridge, Mass.
Feb. 9, 1897

Dear Baldwin,

The editor in you is decidedly getting the upper hand of the philosopher and friend of the human race. I am ex¬cessively sorry that you should have spent so much precious time in writing arguments to me by which I cannot be convinced—with your own hand too, instead of by stenographic aid, which in your position you ought to
employ for all correspondence. I say I am not convinced because, although trash may have sometimes to be uttered under the spur of official duty or what not, to put one's self down in print is a deliberate act for which one is held accountable. And as I really have nothing to say on this subject, I respectfully decline to spend any time in trying to make it look like something. Very sorry to disoblige you, but you see what I am gaining already by having my name left off the title page.

Always affectionately yours,

Wm James

· To Charles William Eliot ·

95 Irving St.
Feb. 21. [1897]

Dear Mr. Eliot

In re Münsterberg I feel like making a few comments additional to what Prof. Royce informs me he wrote you. I believe that M. is far and away, all things considered, the best man in the field.

Baldwin, all things considered again, is a close second. He hasn’t anything like M’s experimental fertility & originality, but he is full of ideas otherwise, and tremendously energetic. He will write many books. He is one of the founders of the Psychological Review; editor of a great philosophical dictionary, soon to appear; a gentleman; and a most agreeable man socially with no angles or anafractuosities in his moral character that one has to

· 151 ·
make allowance for. If invited here, they will no doubt make every effort to keep him in Princeton, and may succeed.

The alternatives come in longo intervallo, none of them promising to be men of the "size" that we should like to have permanent figure heads in our philosophical department. The most important are

Delabarre;
Sanford, now at Clark, a good & careful, but not original experimentalist;
Witmer of Pennsylvania U., energetic, intelligent, but not heavy weight;
Titchener of Cornell, very energetic and reputed a great success as a teacher, but apparently not original in the way of ideas, and (although from Oxford) quite a barbarian in his scientific and literary manners, and quarrelsome in the extreme;
Jastrow of Wisconsin, perhaps the most deserving of American psychologists after Cattell for his experimental work, but a narrowish intellect, I am afraid, and (possibly) with uncomfortable peculiarities of character;
Scripture of Yale, energetic but shallow, and a complete barbarian;
Finally Jim Angell of Chicago, a fine mind & character, but too young to have shown his hand much yet.

I don’t mention Cattell of Columbia, who is very strong in all ways, because he is getting involved in editorial work which will more and more arrest his laboratory activity. Besides he probably would not leave his very peculiarly arranged berth at Columbia.

These are the only obvious names, and that of Delabarre seems to be the one with fewest minuses, though I fear he will be inferior in point of productive energy to some of the others.

If I myself had the responsibility of the decision, I should prefer half a year of M–g with the chance of his
perpetuity, to an irrevocable arrangement with any of these men, beginning next year.

M. will probably come for the whole year anyhow if you insist, but if he should not, I don’t regard the half year arrangement as being quite as fatal as do Royce and Palmer. It is more a matter of appearance and advertisement than of reality, though of course I admit some grave objections.

My own strong conviction is that the Harvard policy ought to be that of always striking for the most distinguished man in the market when we have a vacancy. This means a mature man with a good salary elsewhere. But we can economize then in the grade and rapid rotation of our assistants. This is why I go in for Münsterberg or Baldwin, altho’ I fear that neither of them can be counted on for more than 5 or 6 years longer to pay very assiduous personal attention to the laboratory work. But Assistants will long after that work well under their inspiration, and they will never fail to be leaders in some way, and men whose names will be an honour to us, whereas your conscientious mediocrity with no marked aggressiveness [sic] or originality becomes only a wheel in the machine, which the machine then has to be trusted to keep running.

I hope you are getting well fast, and though I send this in today, I trust you won’t read it till you’re better. Of course you will make no reply. Nor does the hurry of a decision now seem as great. The department can reserve 5 hours of Psychology for the incumbent whoever he be, and arrange the announcement of its other courses without delay.

Sincerely yours

Wm James
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Cambridge, Mass.
March 6, 1897

My dear Schiller,

I am shocked and outraged at what you tell me of Cornell no longer requiring your services. Their finances must be very much straitened indeed to make them confront such a decision. If only we might get you here! You and I could then found a regular school of pluralism and sweep the country. But the devil of it is that there is absolutely no place here for anyone new but an experimental psychologist who, we hope, will be [Hugo] Münsterberg. But the money question as regards him is an excessively difficult one to solve and of course a man of your type (unless I should die or resign to make room for you) is out of the question. It cannot be that you will lack employment for long and I will write you testimonials by the yard, whenever you apply to me for such a thing. You are certainly one of the two or three constructive philosophers in the country. I don’t include Silberstein among the sacred number. The story of that book is a long one and I am glad that Seth has noticed it at all, for I suppose that Silberstein would rather be sunk by the shots of an enemy than let the waters of Lethe close over him with no human being becoming aware of the fact. Believe me,

Always truly yours,

Wm James

---

13
Cambr.
Mch. 23 [1897]

Dear Doctor,

If I had the thing written out, I should give it to you, but as matters stand with me, it is quite impossible to write Deg. & Gen. out for an indefinite period.

Yours always truly,

Wm James LL.D.

(verso)

Cambr.
March 29 [1897]

Dear Gilder,

Here, just recovered, is the note to you (in reply to your request for my lecture on Genius for the Century Magazine) which swapt envelopes with the letter you kindly sent back to me.

Forgive yours truly,

Wm James

Cambr.
March 29 [1897]
To F. C. S. Schiller

Keene Valley, N. Y.
April 22, 1897

Dear Schiller,

I have just got yours of the 16th. forwarded from Cambridge. I write by the same mail to the "President" of Corpus [Christi,] though that seems to me an incredible title.

Second thoughts—I will put "Head" on the outside and apologize inside for my ignorance. I shall wait to be asked before writing to London. I recommended you last week to Professor King of Oberlin (who had written for advice) as the best man I know who was out of place. He replied that he had his eye on you already. Oberlin would be a good sociological study, though I fear you are not gospel-hardened enough to stand such an environment.

I am up here for the holiday week; thermometer 6° yester morn and I with "pink-eye"—so no more.

Yours ever

Wm James
Cambridge
June 5, 1897

Dear Marshall:

Since your letter reached me with the reprints I have been so miscellaneously, not to say tumultuously, occupied, that I have not had an instant to cast my eye upon the Religious Instinct. It will give you an idea of my busy life when I tell you that perhaps the thing that I have wanted most to do in the way of reading this year has been Santayana's book; but although I have had it by my bedside, in view daily, I have only found an opportunity as yet to read about fifty pages of it. But the college year is hastening to its close for me, and I am hoping to clear out to the country in a very few days. You speak of coming on here before the 12th. Would it be possible for you at that time to take a trip, with two or three boon companions of the higher sort, to the Adirondacks or to Nova Scotia? I am wavering between a trip of that kind, to start in about a week, and going straight to my own place at Chocorua, and cannot decide for a few days. Let me know promptly what your possibilities are, and we will take the Religious Instinct along and jabber about it on the way.

Always truly yours,

Wm James

H. R. Marshall, Esq.
To F. C. S. Schiller

Cambridge, Mass.
June 5, 1897

Dear Schiller,

I heartily congratulate you on the appointment, though I am very sorry indeed that we are to lose you. I was always hoping that you might become an inveterate yankee. There is nothing I should like better than to have a long talk with you before you go, but I can make no appointment for a few days, since my own plans are uncertain. I am rather used up with the year’s work and find that the best thing is to clear out of Cambridge at the first possible moment, for the doorbell rings all day and admits cranks and bores of every description to devour one’s time and life and the month of June seems to be their flowering season. I am trying to get off early next week, but whether it be to my own place in New Hampshire or for a trip with some friends to Nova Scotia I do not know. What is your earliest possible date of arrival?

Always truly yours,

W. J. 17
To James Mark Baldwin

Cambr.
June 8. 97

Dear Baldwin,

I have received a paper by Bastian from you for notice. I will look it over and see what I can do—possibly get it done by some one else.

I return the pamphlets you sent me last fall, sorry to have been unable to touch them. My powers are too slight!

What are your summer plans? I suppose you go to Toronto, being a man of affairs. I don’t! I shall stay at Chocorua, bating 10 days here at summer School, until Sept. when to Keene Valley.

Best regards to you both

In haste

W. J.18

To Charles William Eliot

Cambridge
June 9. 1897

Dear President,

If you are making re-appointments etc. just now, I send you a word in writing about my title.

If Prof. Münsterberg be called by my present title
“Professor of Psychology” it will (first) surely please him, and (second) make him exclusively responsible for a department which he is better fitted to swing than I now am or for the matter of that ever was. All which does not mean that I shall not be willing to give help in the psychology teaching whenever it seems objectively best. For instance I am down for the Seminary next year.

The title I should prefer would be “Professor of Philosophy.” Royce also prefers this. Palmer is quite willing, though he says that his preference would be for “Professor of the Philosophy of Nature,” on account of the principle of specification which he believes in.

I should rather have either than my present title, and leave it entirely to the Corporation.

Sincerely yours

Wm James

P. S. A rumor reaches me that you are still somewhat unsettled as to the usefulness of J. J. Hayes, Instructor in Elocution. Fresh from a great debt to him, I feel like expressing my gratitude. A week before my “effort” in Music Hall I suddenly bethought me that I should need some advice from Hayes. He tried me in the Sanders theatre, with the result of revealing an awful vice of intonation, from which in two more lessons he entirely freed me. I should in many ways have been lamentably bad if I had simply followed my instincts. I consider Hayes an admirably sensible critic & skilful teacher.
June 10. 97

Dear Mr. Eliot,

It just occurs to me that before 1890, when I became “Prof. of Psychology,” I was called “Prof. of Philosophy” pure and simple. What more natural, in giving place now to Münsterberg, than to resume my former title? Psychology is not a big enough subject to be represented in the titles of two full professorships.

Truly yours

Wm James

Chocorua, N. H.
Aug 19. 1897

Dear Professor Creighton,

You will have received a Ms. on Hume by a friend of mine, J. B. Peterson, for which I should like to venture to bespeak a more favorably careful examination than usual, on account of the circumstances of the writer. You will see immediately how clear and euphonious his style is, and note that his criticisms are just. Whether at this date so minute a criticism of Hume is called for is for you to decide.

Peterson is a self taught man, unable to do anything
but philosophize, and consequently in the direst poverty, since the book-notices on which he lives bring in so little. If you print this, it will make him think his life less of a failure. If you decline, it will be rather a stab; so do all you can conscientiously. The odd thing about P. is that he is just the reverse of a crank, having no hobbies, but a fair open aired mind of common sense conservative type.

Sincerely yours

Wm James\textsuperscript{20}

\textit{To James Mark Baldwin}

Cambr.
Oct. 9. 1897

Dear Baldwin,

The Harvard Nat. Hist. Soc. is an undergraduate & graduate student affair, to be associated with which is, \textit{an und für sich}, neither glorious nor wealth giving. All these societies give \textit{themselves} glory occasionally by inviting lecturers. Much as I should like you to come here (staying with us) I advise you under the circumstances not to do so, for your own sake. It is very hard to get out a really big audience for any of these extra evening lectures—we have too many. On the other hand the audiences being select, are more specially interested than in smaller places when they are general.

I got your card a week ago, and am very sorry to hear of your breakdown. Too much \textit{editing}? dictionary etc?
Too much ambition? disinclination to say no? pride? spirit? etc. I fear so. Go slow, my dear friend and all will be right again. Never lecture for less than $100, & they'll let you alone.

I got a letter from Fullerton about your successor at Ithaca. I cd. only think of Hyslop, who is rather deadly; and, among the younger men of J. R. Angell. But I had no list, and have been expecting to hear something from Cattell, whose proposal would probably be judicious. Of course Münsterberg would make the best speech of anyone of the remnant, but he may be better to keep for another year. What do you think? Who is your candidate? I shall not go to Ithaca at all.

I had a shining month in Keene Valley—3 weeks rather, but was wakeful all the time. The rest of the summer very well (but doing no work) at Chocorua. We are all now well here, and the first week of the College year gone by with very little of the usual Pech. I do hope that with prudence you will soon recover. You do work enough for 3 ordinary men.

Best regards from us both to Mrs. B. & you

W. J.²¹

-To Frank Thilly-

Cambridge
Nov 24. 97

Dear Prof. Thilly,

I am ashamed to say that my acquaintance with Paulsen's Ethics is limited to 2 or 3 chapters from the middle of the book. One lives on an inclined plane of hopes as regards
reading, on which like the snail of mental arithmetic one slips back more in 24 hours than one gains. I can therefore give you no opinion of the sort you ask for; but I will send your letter to my colleague Palmer, the Moralist, and possibly he may have something to write you.

Our colleague Wiener read me the other day (confidentially) some passages from a letter of yours in which you alluded to certain trouble which the bigots of your environment were giving you. You have my heartiest sympathy. Stand firm! If you should lose that place you surely after a year could get a better one. Our country is pretty barbarous, there is no doubt about it; and we in Cambridge, in the midst of our freedom, don't sufficiently realize the fact.

Believe me sincerely yours
Wm James

To Charles William Eliot

95 Irving St.
Dec. 2 1897

Dear President,

I was most agreeably surprised yesterday by the check from the Treasurer, showing an increase instead of the diminution of salary for which my mind was prepared. I cannot help expressing to you my thanks, and my resolve to "deserve" the confidence shown.

And whilst I am writing this, let me ask one more question about what the Ingersoll lecture requires. The New World (and later the Atlantic) has begged me for it.
Does the Ingersoll printing preclude other printing, or not? I care nothing for the matter myself, one way or the other, but Prof. C. C. Everett is pressing me for a definite reply.

Always truly yours

Wm James\textsuperscript{23}