Upon James's recommendation Santayana was promoted to assistant professor in 1898. James himself was honored by being elected a corresponding member of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences at the Institut de France in February. However, this year was a turning point in James's life and career. He loved to hike through the Adirondack Mountains in New York. That summer he overexerted himself while hiking and developed an enlarged heart together with chest pains. The significance of this did not become apparent till later. It certainly did not stop him from taking a long trip to California in August and September, where he lectured at the University of California and repeated his lectures to teachers in nearby Oakland. James's lecture, "Theoretical Conceptions and Practical Results," made more broadly known Charles S. Peirce's "Principle of pragmatism," which James applied to certain topics. This visit included a camping trip to Yosemite National Park in the Sierra Mountains with Charles M. Bakewell, a former student, who was teaching at the University. Shortly after his return to Cambridge, James's Ingersoll lecture was published as Human Immortality: Two Supposed Objections to the Doctrine.

From December of 1898 through May of 1899 James engaged in a controversy about "involuntary whisper-
ings" with E. B. Titchener both through private letters and letters to the journal *Science*. Also, he was a bit upset by D. S. Miller's article on his Will to Believe doctrine. Münterberg's criticism of psychical research in his article "Mysticism and Psychology" was characterized by James as "a monumental exhibition of asinity." Tired of repeating the lectures to teachers, James had them published in April along with three other lectures as *Talks to Teachers on Psychology and to Students on Some of Life's Ideals*. Later in 1902 he remarked, "To tell the unvarnished truth, this book is better loved by me than any of my other productions, especially the essay on a certain blindness in human beings." In June he aggravated his heart condition by, as he himself put it, some "indiscreet climbing" again. This is when he became conscious of the seriousness of his heart disease.

With his wife and daughter, James sailed for Europe on July 15 to prepare and give the Gifford lectures at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland. The first lecture was scheduled for 15 January 1900. They landed in Hamburg, Germany, so that James could go immediately to Bad-Nauheim, Germany, to take a series of baths for his heart trouble during the month of August and most of September. He and Mrs. James afterwards headed via Switzerland for his brother Henry's country home (Lamb House) in Rye, England, for a short, one week visit, arriving on 3 October.

In order to rest and write his Gifford lectures, they then occupied Henry's London apartment on De Vere Gardens. However, James's heart condition became complicated by nervous prostration. A series of "Nauheim" baths were undertaken in London, during which he was forced to decline visits from his friends. He was especially upset by Schiller's review in *Mind* of Münterberg's book *Psychology and Life*. A doctor recommended that James spend some time in the supposed
more favorable climate of West Malvern, northwest of London. Since this venture also failed, the Jameses returned to Rye on about 15 December to stay for about a month. James's condition was so bad that he had to postpone the lectures for another year and ask for a second year of absence from Harvard.
To Charles William Eliot

95 Irving St.
Jan. 24. 98

Dear President,

I learn from Prof. Royce that the Corporation is making up its mind about the question of Santayana's promotion. I wish to say that I am distinctly in favor of it. He has fairly earned it, to begin with. And whatever shortcomings may go with the type of mind of which he is a representative, I think it must be admitted to be a rare and precious type, of which Harvard University may well keep a specimen to enrich her concert wthal. We shall always have "hustlers" enough—but we shall not often have a chance at a Santayana, with his style, his subtlety of perception, & his cool-blooded truthfulness. He is so modest that I dare say he never sent you a lecture to the Ladies Club at Buffalo, which they printed, so I send it with this.

It seems to me that when we possess a fellow of that quality it is a pity to lose him.

Sincerely yours,

Wm James

\(^{1}\)
Cambridge (Mass.) U.S.
le 17 Mars. 1898

My dear Sir,

Wishing to send to the Académie des Sciences M. et P. copies of the few books which I have written or edited, and not knowing whether the Institut has a common Library or whether the libraries of the several Academ- ies are distinct, I take the liberty of addressing the volumes to your care, and of begging you to transmit them to the proper official.

I consider this election even more as a compliment to my University than as an honour to myself. In both respects it is most gratifying.

I trust that in some future visit to Paris, I may have the opportunity of enjoying some of the privileges which this new confrérie offers, and of making the acquaintance of some of my illustrious colleagues, especially, my dear Sir, of yourself.

Believe me, with the highest respect, very sincerely yours,

Wm James

Monsieur Georges Picot
Secrétaire perpetual.
To George Herbert Howison

[May 18, 1898]

Dear Howison,

Palmer tells me that Bakewell is going to Bryn Mawr—why, I can’t imagine, for I should myself hate to be under that petticoat regime—and that he, P., has recommended Montague to you as his successor. Lovejoy, who has already been recommended by our department for our Walker travelling fellowship, reports that he is applying also for Bakewell’s place.

Lovejoy deserves all praise, and both personally and intellectually is first class, but Montague wishes to get at teaching immediately and has applied for no fellowship. Why not put in Montague for a year and try him, free to try L. when he returns from Europe?

Montague does a heap of work, and for originality and genuine metaphysical ability, goes ahead of anyone we have ever had as a student in my time. He is also a most modest tractable creature, with agreeable voice, and clear powers of statement, who, if he once found himself speaking ex cathedra would develop an ease and authority, I should think, which would make him a highly successful teacher, from the students point of view. We all believe him to have a great philosophic future. Try him!

Yours in haste

W. J.³
To James Mark Baldwin

Cambridge, Mass.
Oct. 11. 98

Dear Baldwin,

I am delighted to get your letter, particularly since it seems to show you to be in such good shape. Your activity of mind and body are both alike admirable, and only matched by your extraordinary social activity.

As regards your two queries: My instinct would be to leave out contemporary names, if for no other reason, for the reason that it is so hard to know when to draw the line among them.

As regards Royce's article. I confess I find it difficult to give a decided opinion, being completely ignorant as I am, both of it, and of the other articles of its class which you have. On general principles I believe that books of reference should have very short, concentrated articles, bristling with points of information, and referring to places where more extended treatment could be found. I do not believe in essays or explanations in a dictionary like this. Following these general principles I should incline to rule Royce's article out. I suppose it would be impossible to abridge it, and I suppose the "Philosophical Review" or "Mind" would gladly publish it in its present form, so his labor would not be lost. At the same time these opinions of mine are not decided, for the reasons above given. I shall not mention this matter to him.

I went for a couple of months to California this summer, and enjoyed it greatly, and am now hard at work,
with all of our philosophy courses bigger than they ever were before.

From yours very truly,
Wm James

Warmest regards from us both to Mrs. B., as well as to yourself.4

· To Wincenty Lutoslawski ·

Cambridge
Nov. 4. 98

My dear Lutoslawski,

Your 3 post-cards, one from Lomza, 2 from Helsingfors, have duly come, along with the Individualism pamphlets. I answered the Lomza card some 3 weeks ago, and I am afraid sent my reply to Lomza instead of to Berlin Poste restante, in which case I much fear you will have missed it. You see how incorrigibly careless I am! My letter explained, without excusing me, how your inquiry of last Spring came to be left unanswered. I will not infandum renovare dolorem by repeating here what I said in explanation, or how I went on to tell you that there was no chance of the authorities here inviting you to come over from Europe. Only the greatest sommités & celebrities can be so invited, and though you are sure to become one, you are not one yet.

Can't you come at your own risk. You might then, with your great versatility and facility, get a number of
paying lectures at different places. But at the moment you are known only as a somewhat eccentric genius of whom people will be afraid. One of our Greek professors told me he distinctly did not wish his students to be put to such unintellectual work as counting Plato’s words etc.

I have to confess to my shame that I have not read your Plato, although you sent it to me. A genius of our own who was staying with me shortly after the book arrived fell upon it and devoured it, and so I gave it to him, as he said he wished to write a notice of it for the Nation. Neither notice nor book have I seen, and being driven to death for the next 2 years on absolutely incongruous lines, I fear it will be long ere I get back to it. The moderate tone of your reply to Shorey is very pleasing.

I have read your individualistic pamphlet with extreme satisfaction, and can easily place a dozen more copies where they will do good, if you should care to send them. It is exceedingly clear and complete, and altogether has struck me as the type of a new sort of philosophic statement, affirmative rather than polemic, yet clearly setting forth the contrasts with other theories. I can’t write letters, or express myself on paper without an almost deadly effort, so I make no criticisms and express no doubts. On the whole your philosophy is also my ideal. It must be worked out into clearness. At the same time the monistic or universalistic view seems to have an authority that altogether goes beyond reason. No monist can ever be converted—you get no “purchase” on him at all, you don’t start him. An unsatisfactory state of things!

Forgive! forgive! forgive! my delay, and believe me, with cordial sympathy your colleague

W. J.\(^5\)

174
Dear Mrs. Merriman,

Did you think you were never to see your precious MS. again? At last, le voici! The secret of its over long detention is a long story. I was about 1/2 way through it some 4 weeks ago, but a sudden wave of desperation came over me, at the fact that for nearly two months that the term had lasted I had hardly put in one hour of work on my own task the Gifford lectures, and I resolved that instead of trying to do other business first so as to clear the way for that—and never clear it, I would do no other business on any day till I had put in at least one hour on that. Since then I have been happy; but many letters have had to wait, many requests to be declined, and some manuscripts returned without reading. But I have actually done some of my work, though the daily hour was often not given, and I have now read with great interest the whole of the Religio pictoris. Strange that I should live to 56 before finding out that one must do one's work first, or never do it.

Now for the MS. Last summer I was with Prof. Howison in California and asked him why he wrote so little seeing he brandished so fine a style. "Ah!" he said "that is what I like to hear. Nobody talks to me like that. James, what we philosophers need is praise. I perfectly crave it and never get it. Harris (to wit the Philosopher W. T. H., of the Journ. of Spec. Phil.) calls it recognition—I've known people to call it criticism, critical
notice, but it is praise, praise, that we need.” Now you, my dear Madam, have expressly asked for cold “criticism.” But, being a true philosopher, I am sure that you must conform to the type of the genus, and in your heart of hearts also desire a touch, *tant soit peu*, of praise. So I will say that the essay seems to me an extraordinarily distinguished piece of work, from the point of view of its harmonious inner beauty and cleanness of style. Not a slouchy sentence anywhere; everything precise, varied, effortless, and concrete, as from a copious yet easy pressure of thought. The analogies from painting form an extraordinary happy feature, and the illustrations from a high-born lady’s housekeeping problems are no less felicitous, and both give a great air of sincerity & reality to the performance.

And when I come to supply the ‘criticism’ which you also want, I find myself very hard put to it, because it seems to me that the thing must be taken as a whole or left—to that degree has it unity. The part up to p. 84 seems to me well nigh perfect—not a jot or a tittle can be altered. After that the composition strikes me as a little looser, and I am not sure that it would not gain by abridgment between, say, pp. 110 & the “Conclusion.” At any rate this part was what bit into me least in the reading. Your own sense for compactness will be the best guide as to this; I can make no suggestions in detail. Altogether, I am the worst possible critic for such a piece of work. There is no use in crowding foreign categories upon a work like this. Unless the critic works out from the author’s point of view and simply suggests ways of making the author’s work more of an harmonious whole, he does harm, not good. And, as I have often explained to you, my point of view is exactly opposite to yours. The master of Baliol [sic] would be your man, for he would *develope* you. I would only impede you, were I to try to ameliorate your thought after my own fashion. You regard the whole as secure, and a point of departure to
return to. I as an ideal to be creatively achieved. To me, such terms as "whole," "the law of the whole," "relations" etc., are merely formal and empty when taken abstractly. I ask, which of the many possible wholes, laws, relations, etc. And I still ask which, in spite of your fine pages about monist & pluralist, etc. in the beginning of your "Conclusion." It is as good as Emerson in its way, but not sufficient for the technical philosopher d—n him! But to you this requires no farther analogies, for these terms already indicate the deity, are deified. But would I have you go beyond this wholeness of your own thought, resting in these its categories? Never! for that would break a beautiful vessel from which the ointment would be spilled, and nothing integral gathered up out of the ruins. The form of your thought, being integral, is vastly superior to that of any possible analytic attempt to define the matter farther; and my whole effort is to do that, with complete disregard of "form" of any kind. I am sure that you will find a large & appreciative audience of persons who are hungering for just what you give them, and who will miss nothing of the diseased technical side which I care for so exclusively. Write for them, affirmatively. The beauty of your thing is largely due to the serenity of it. It is not querying & wrangling, but round. Leave it so. Care nothing for more "analytic" minds. You are analytic to fine effect, within your circle.

When I see the enormous circulation of so many of these works from what I call the mind-cure side, I realize the immense demand there is for religious philosophy that is both unconventional and untechnical, and your treatise is so superior in every point, style, illustration, reasoning, etc., that I shouldn’t wonder if it had quite a surprising success. The only practical suggestion I can make then is that you should consider a little the question of condensation, in the 3rd quarter of the work.—See how useless I am!—Tell your husband that I rec’d his Philippine sermon with hearty sympathy and ap-
proval. Results show that youth and barbarism still rule the world.

Merry Christmas to you both.

Affectionately,

Wm James

--

To Elizabeth Glendower Evans

95 Irving St.
Jan. 13. 99

Dear Elizabeth,

Many thanks to Mrs. Hill, and still more to you.

I have given P. 25 of your 50 dollars, and shall give him the rest next month. Mrs. Hill's the month after.

He sent me last week a paper criticizing certain of the traditional views of the syllogism—perfectly sound and good—I should be proud had I been able to write it myself. I sent it to the Philos. Review, whose editor Creighton, in acknowledging reception, and promising reading, adds: "Peterson's style is certainly charming, and reminds one, I think, of the older english philosophers." I can't imagine a greater compliment.

Yours til deth

W. J.
Cambridge, Mass.
Jan. 18, 1898 [1899]

Dear Cattell,

I am horrified at your idea of returning me the 100 dollars—which belongs to the Review. I refuse to take it back; it was a free & willing gift which I am very glad to have been able to make.

I thank you for the Psych. Rev. for Nov. 1897. I never dreamed of your having to send it yourself.

I note with exquisite gratification your benignant words towards psychical research. Continue along that line and you will be saved, will very likely after "passing away" become a "cabinet control" and instruct the younger generation in spiritual things.

"Yours for the truth"—(as we always subscribe ourselves when writing to each other)

Wm James

When I asked Münsterberg to come to Mrs. P., he said: "I am hypnotizable, and if I got such results as you relate, I should simply conclude that I had been hypnotized." I said: "then bring your wife and sit by, & see what she gets." "Oh no! I should never suffer my wife to go to such a place." I call that real sportsmanlike keenness for new phenomena! However, it is what Titchener calls the "straight scientific path!"
Dear Dr. Jacobi,

I ought long since to have thanked you for your criticism of Flechsig, which I confess opened my eyes to much in his system that I had not realized in my hasty reading to be there, and much more (the order of development etc) which I did not know to be still contradicted by his own earlier observations and by others. You took him seriously all through and squeezed him hard. His intellectual centres for example I took in the roughest designative way as places where association fibres met and crossed with certain relays. But I see that your reading of him is altogether the proper one, and I am glad he has been so thoroughly criticized. I have always felt a lamentable want of general culture and philosophic intelligence in F. Your scientific barbarian is a bad kind because he is always so arrogant.

Believe me, with best regards, sincerely yours,

Wm James

Cambridge
Jan 29. 99
Dear Meyer,

I only learned quite recently that you were back at Worcester, entirely well, and doing your old work. Pray believe that this news gave me profound pleasure. I only wish that I had heard it directly from yourself.

Can't you spend "next Sunday week," the 12th, with us? I say Sunday meaning to include Saturday, Monday, and as much margin, anterior and posterior, as you can put in. I think it very likely that Dickinson Miller of Philadelphia may be here at that time—a charming fellow—and you and he ought to be acquainted.

Very truly yours

Wm James
Dear Howison,

We have been asked to nominate a philosophy instructor at Adelbert College, Cleveland, and have written in favor of a man named Buck, altho' if we had thought Montague’s chance with you were nil, we should have put him forward, as the Cleveland place is a good one, and M. is the more powerful man. But we hope still for Berkeley for him, as being the more important place. Palmer said lately to me: “If Howison only had Montague for a year near him, he would end by perfectly adoring him”—and I fancy he was perfectly right.

The moment you are sure you don’t want him, let us know and we’ll try to get him into something else. But take your time, otherwise. Far be it from me to wish to force your hand!

Warmest regards and good wishes to you both from yours affectionately

Wm James

I enclose another copy of my Philippine letter. Give it to somebody. Our nation is in a bad plight with that mismanaged job. A delicate psychological problem settled by the simple method of Huns or Tartars!¹¹
Messrs. Henry Holt & Co.

Dear Sirs,

I have yours of the 23rd., and am glad your estimate of the advertizing expenses is so low. You might fill in fifty dollars; or leave the pencilled emendation which I marginally suggest. The latter would seem better to cover all eventually [sic] possibilities.

I see that your right to sell signifies more than I supposed, though I should imagine this particular contract not to have any great market value. So I agree to it.

The terminability of the contract seems to me however an absolutely fair mutual provision; and I hope you will agree to it—six months notice being given by either of us to the other.

No matter for the voucher clause since the advertizing is so inconsiderable. The commission notion was my own idea, which I discussed as a possible alternative.

I corrected the last page proofs to day, and the plates will soon be all cast.

On Monday I will send you the "talks to students" part. It has a somewhat different character from the teachers part, and might possibly justify a slightly different advertizing. The book will cost me, bound, 56 cents per copy at the present estimate, and contain 317 pp. all told. How many copies ought I to give away for publicity? And can you judge of the right price from these
facts? or must you have the book in your hands? I will send you dummies of binding as soon as they are got out.

Truly yours

Wm James

P.S. I send the last pp. now instead of Monday.  

- To Henry Rutgers Marshall -

95 Irving St.
March 31. 1899

Dear Marshall,

I do so hate discussion and explication of differences of opinion, that I owe you a perfectly colossal debt of gratitude for publicly defending me so completely and successfully against D. S. M.'s curiously irrelevant paper. You have written a beautiful article—in point of style more graceful and persuasive, I think, than anything that ever came from your pen. And you have made a contribution to the philosophy of the subject that will be of lasting value.

I wish I could agree more completely with your view of the ancestral experience derivation of so many of our religious tendencies. It seems to me a fact that one can hold with the same passionate persuasion with which "conservative" opinions are held, great novelties in the way of morals and religion. The "subliminal" roots of these things are hard to lay bare. You and Caldwell are here on identical ground, though I must say that C's
paper seems so carelessly and obscurely written that yours is to it as Hyperion to a Satyr.

I think I shall leave Miller in your hands, & not make any reply myself.

Always faithfully and gratefully yours,

Wm James

---

To Edward Bradford Titchener

Cambridge, Mass.
May 6, 1899

Dear Professor Titchener,

A letter to Science re our late little "scrap" over Lehmann's "unwillkürliches Flüstern" etc., has just been published, and I venture to call your attention to it, if it has escaped your notice. You will, I am sure, take no umbrage at the "gentle irony" with which I express myself. Psychical research in these days of scant justice from the scientists, has to avail herself of every possible weapon by which to score a point.

It is but fair that you should see Lehmann's original letter, which I enclose, begging you to make return. You will observe that he absolutely succumbs to Sidgwick's and my contention as to the indemonstrative character of his own experiments, and that he adopts Sidgwick's hypothesis that the coincidence between his errors and Sidgwick's was probably in large part due to the accidental coincidence of similar number-habits in the experimenters.

On the main point, of "telepathy" being established,
he doesn’t give in. That was hardly to be expected of him. As between you and myself, however, the only point under discussion was whether Lehmann had experimentally refuted Sidgwick. I think, if you will re-read Sidgwick’s criticism, you will now agree with Lehmann.

Sincerely yours

Wm James

P.S. Unfortunately “fortgesetzte Versuche” are incapable of settling this particular question, for the Sidgwick’s own experiments were only about 1300 in number, and that I judge from my own results to be much too small a term of comparison. 14

· To F. C. S. Schiller ·

Cambridge
May 19, 1899

My dear Schiller,

Your review of Münsterberg’s unimaginable asinine rot is the sweetest thing in that line I ever read. I believe no more classic model of that kind of composition was ever written, with its humor, irony and logic all durcheinannder. You are in sooth an almost Godlike being. The trouble is, I fear, that poor M. himself won’t feel hurt. Not that he has no sensibility to irony, humor, and logic
as formal modes of thought, but that he is so fatuously stuck in his silly metaphysics as to be beyond the reach of any rational effect from them in this case. Real life excludes psychical research, because it offers phenomena in time and the real life is timeless. Science excludes them, because they are mystical. So there is no place for them in God’s great universe at all. Happy M. to be the owner of so convenient a philosophy!

And now my dear Schiller, I am going to run the risk of taking a certain liberty with you, which I hope you will condone and at any time take your revanche, if it should turn out to subject you to any inconvenience. Some friends of mine in New York, the Goldmark girls, are about to start for a summer abroad with one or two feminine companions and should be at Oxford for a day or two about the middle of June or a little later. They are friendless and inexperienced and when Miss Pauline G. was at my house the other day, I told her that I would write to you and you might possibly put her and her sister in the way of seeing something at Oxford that otherwise she might miss. She will, in consequence, probably make bold to send you a card or a note when she arrives. If you have no time to call, all you need do is to write and excuse yourself. They absolutely expect no entertainment or hospitality—just a word of advice. She and her sister Susan (who is lame) are Bryn Mawr graduates and great friends of Miller. Pauline is a biologist, has done practical philanthropy work among the poor in N. Y., is athletic, a trapper and camper, and lover of nature such as one rarely meets, and withal a perfectly simple, good girl, with a beautiful face—and I fairly dote upon her, and were I younger and “unattached” should probably be deep in love. Be friendly if you can, to however slight a degree, and I will in turn send letters, to precede your arrival, to the presiding dignitaries in the realm of the blest—with whom my influence is peculiarly great.
So be a good boy, and thank me for throwing so charming an acquaintance in your way. Would I could be there myself, simultaneous!

My own plans are hardly settled. I shall leave probably about the middle of July and go with my wife for six weeks to some German Bad-ort. After that, whether England or Germany, I know not. I must write two courses of Gifford lectures within the year (have done practically nothing as yet on that job and am now in my spring condition of brain tire) so I feel as if I must place myself in good condition for work and stay there.

Always affectionately yours

Wm James

I am writing a word about the girls to both Merriman and Dyer, but have said nothing to Pauline about it. Will you therefore notify their arrival to them, leaving them thus free to see the girls or not?

· To Edward Bradford Titchener ·

Cambridge, Mass.
May 21, 1899

Dear Professor Titchener,

I got your letter of the 8th duly, and postponed answering till I should have seen your letter to Science. Being in New Hampshire during the past days, I have only just found it on my return.

I must say that in my humble opinion you don’t seem
to reinstate the value of Lehmann’s paper very effectively, and I have said as much in a still later letter to Science. This, however, I fear Cattell will not print, leaving you in the public eye with the unanswerable word.

I seem myself telepathically to discern that, like all Scientists, you felt so absolutely sure that any criticism of telepathy must be essentially sound, that you didn’t read the talk the other way with sufficient care. If you didn’t think that Lehmann had successfully interpreted Sidgwick’s results as whispering, what had he done that made him worth quoting at all? Surely his general remarks about telepathic evidence don’t exhaust the subject.

Of course he disclaims an *exacter Beweis*. The nature of things excludes that; but he does claim to have made the alternative explanation, whispering, overwhelmingly probable. He has failed to make it *probable*. Therefore he has failed altogether *in re* Sidgwick, as he admits himself.

I think myself that the *experimental* evidence for “thought transference” is lamentably poor in amount, and for the most part in quality, to serve as basis for admitting a phenomenon so subversive of our scientific beliefs. I think the Sidgwick series, however, an excellent model of research; and I hardly see what any one can do, but “hang it up” as something unexplained. That seems to me the attitude of the truly “scientific psychology”—“facts,” however anomalous, are worth more than all our theories, however many *other* facts the latter may explain.

I candidly admit that what has made me hospitable to telepathy in general, is the particular case of Mrs. Piper, who so far outdoes these experimental things, and to me is absolutely inexplicable today. Such investigations are fearfully tedious and in all sorts of ways uncontrollable, but they awaken conviction if one works at first hand, without prejudice and gives time. My colleagues for the
most part, when invited, have simply refused to see Mrs. Piper. Royce, e.g., who had only to step from the next door but one into my house. Münsterberg said it was no use; if he got such results, he would know himself to have been hypnotized. I said "bring your wife, sit in the corner and observe and see if your accounts agree." He replied "I should never allow my wife to visit such a performance." I call that real sportsmanlike keenness for new facts!

No matter! truth will prevail.

I echo your wish that we might meet. I heard of your being lately here, but you didn’t look any of us up, and I was sorry. I am to leave Cambridge for almost the entire month of June, and to sail to Europe the middle of July—to be gone throughout next year. That looks like a meeting long postponed! I hear splendid things of your success as professor at Cornell, and of your admirably systematized methods in the laboratory.

I take the liberty of sending you a little volume of mine, just out, light stuff enough!

Very truly yours

Wm James
To Edward Bradford Titchener

Cambridge, Mass.
May 31, 1899

My dear Titchener,

I am much pleased with the tone of your letter and I feel as if the episode had on the whole tended to promote understanding rather than to increase misunderstanding.

I gave a false impression if I suggested in any way that psychical researchers were suffering from martyrdom. I don't think that I myself have sacrificed anything by having my name associated with the cause. The only feeling I carry into the matter is one of irritation that in a subject, which to my mind, is one altogether of empirical details, in which no general philosophic tendencies have as yet begun to reveal themselves, so many of my colleagues should keep in the attitude of "authoritative aloofness."

You deserve credit for your small departure from this attitude; Lehmann still more credit for his large departure, but you must admit that there was a certain insolence, and an insolence that felt itself secure from impunity, in the last paragraph of your original article, where you almost apologized for condescending to touch the details of such a subject. I see from what you now say that you were thinking of the whole Lehmann-Sidgwick controversy in a more superficial way than it deserved, and I do hope that hereafter you may keep on the deeper level. The stuff is fearfully dry and its personal aspects are very repugnant to me, but I believe it is a genuine "find," and I do think that those who won't come to close quarters with it in detail, ought not to pronounce ex cathedra judgments.
I, for example, decline to discuss Münsterberg's article with him. I have served my time with a priori arguments, and henceforward will only listen to those who bring definite talk about particular facts.

You say that you have a right to fight for your side as I have a right to fight for mine. What I deny is that at the stage at which things now are, anybody has the right to fight for either side by abstract generalities.

Of what you call "the wretched Schiller business" I know nothing, except the bare fact that he lost his degree. Nutt has done nothing but praise your laboratory methods; Cogswell I have not seen, so pray don't think that any bill is rolling up in this quarter against Cornell.

After this correspondence, dear Titchener, we shall meet somewhat as old friends. I wish that it were not likely to be at so remote a date. If you should pass through Boston any time before the 15th of July, you must not fail to look me up. Believe me,

Always sincerely yours,

Wm James\textsuperscript{17}
To Ralph Barton Perry

Westport, N. Y.
June 10 [1899]

Let me know (Adirondack Lodge, North Elba, Essex Co., N. Y.) when you expect to be up here and what your Lake address is. I hate to go off without seeing you again. If you could come up to the Lodge which is one of the most wonderful forest sanctuaries in creation, we could have some fine days together. Miller will be thar. Let me know. I shall be at least a fortnight between there and Keene Valley.

Wm James

To Katherine Rodgers

Villa Luise, Linden St., 1
Bad-Nauheim
Aug 5. 99

Dear Katie,

You don’t know how pleasant it was to receive your letter, forwarded by Harry, on my arrival at this place five days ago. I had wondered before leaving home how long it would be ere we establisht communications through J. S. Morgan & Co., and here they are already establisht, telepathically apparently, for I don’t know how you heard of my intention. I am here with Alice, all the boys
being at home, and the girl at the Ceresoles above Vevey. My particular trouble is a dilation of the heart (d–n it), for which these baths etc. are supposed to do wonders, and here we must stay for 6 or 7 weeks probably, leading that vile, inert, cowardly professional–invalid life, with which you girls are by this time grown so familiar, probably, as to have forgotten that there is any other. I envy you your Swiss outlook and air. I fear I am cut off from the mountains forevermore; for the chief part of my trouble is due to indiscreet mountain climbing, and I dare not trust my self to the presence of temptation. “This losing is true dying, this is lordly man’s downlying, etc.”

You poor children, entirely made over again into a new order of creature by your well nigh 10 years in Europe. How I should like to see you! But I fear I may not now. I am booked to give 10 lectures in Edinburgh, beginning Jan. 15, only one of which is written, and that in the roughest draft. So I cannot lose a single day, and as work will probably be impossible under these bath conditions, I shall have to shoot straight to Rye, and settle down in the country near there and write for dear life, as soon as I get released from this purgatory. I am glad of the good news you give me of your own and Henrietta’s condition. Pray write more at length, telling me of your peregrinations. Where do you feel most at home now? My wife sends her love, and so do I, to you both.

Your ever affectionate

Wm James
Dear Lutoslawski,

I received your letter of the 23rd. the day before yesterday, and yesterday I completed my "preface," such as it is. I didn't send it immediately, or write, because you spoke of a supplement to your letter, to be written the next day, and I wished to reply to every thing together. But since the supplement does not come, I write immediately.

First, as to the preface. In finishing the reading of the book it seemed to me aesthetically absurd that so original and vital a production should be "introduced" by any third person. It is like a candle introducing an electric light, or some little schoolmaster introducing the book of revelations. Then it seemed out of place that I should write the introduction, because you splash round in the full deep ocean with your faiths and thoughts, whilst I wet my toes in the surf, and am entirely given over to all sorts of technical scruples and objections, which come up incessantly, apropos of the detail of what you say. It is ridiculous. Life needs no introduction from half-life. Nevertheless, I fulfilled my purpose in the only way in which I could fulfill it—disengaging my responsibility for detail, and applauding the general spirit as I could sincerely and admiringly do. The result will seem, I fear, a little patronizing to you, and the compte-rendu one-sided. Therefore I simply say to you—do what you like with it. Don't print it, if you have the slightest feeling that you would rather appear in your own stark naked
person. Max Müller published his "centennial" translation of Kant's *K. d. r. V.*, in two volumes, of which the first consisted of an Essay by his friend Herr Ludwig Noiré. This always seemed to me a reduplication of the famous entrance of Pontius Pilate into the creed. Now my preface has a similar impertinence. So I sincerely beg you to use it or throw it into your waste-paper basket, as you prefer. Or rather, if you don't use it, send it back to me, and when the book does come out, I can let most of it appear as a review, somewhere. I suppose that from the publisher's market point of view, such a preface will be all right.

I am exceedingly sorry for your poor condition of nerves. No matter! It is probably very transient. When you get students again, it will in large part disappear. As for your visit, I shall be too happy; and can see you every day from 5 to 8 o'clock P.M. My case is not so very bad. But, before proposing anything practical, I want to hear from you again.

My wife sends her best regards to you both; and I beg you to thank her for her kind autograph message.

Always truly yours

Wm James
To Katherine Rodgers

Hotel St. Gotthardt
Luzern
Sept. 23, 1899

We got here, after two days of intoxication (moral) (produced by being discharged from the “Kur” and by the advent of beautiful weather) last night; and the first thing I did this A.M. was to telephone to Sonnenberg to see if you still were there. Alas no!—But we shall turn up at Geneva within 10 days, and of course proceed for your sweet sakes to the Hotel de la Paix.—No more then at present except that I hope we shall find you well, from

W. J.20

To F. C. S. Schiller

De Vere Gardens, W
October 11, 1899

Dear Schiller,

Your letter and we arrive here almost at the same time and after its round about journey it deserves an immediate reply.

Your Oxford cordiality delights my soul as an abstract principle of my being, but in the concrete it makes me crouch and wince. The truth is that I am in no very good ways as to the health, and the delays have been such that
only today has it come about that I have been able to take out some paper and give two hours of serious labor to the Gifford job. I composed this morning an introduction to the first lecture, advertised to be given at 4 P. M. of Monday January 15th., with 9 others to follow. You see what a spurt I must make, the which, with sleep bad, eyes bad, brain bad, heart bad, no excitement, fast walking, sudden movements or energy of any sort allowed (I must return again to Nauheim in April) doesn’t dispose me to play the part of a lion of however small a size. Therefore don’t expect me at Oxford at present! Having come to this rest, I must stay here, with my wife, the world forgetting, by the world forgot, incognito, buried, and see if strict hygiene, early hours, plain diet, omnibus rides for recreation, etc. will pull me through. A year hence (Deo Volente) after two more Nauheim courses, I have hopes. I look well enough, but have had very disagreeable chest symptoms since leaving Nauheim. Today, however, they are slight; and I imagine that they are matters of mere innervation that needn’t make me anxious.

I am glad you have pitched into Münsterberg’s philosophy too. It seems to me awful trash. Have you kept, and can you send me Hodgson’s accounts of his plaints? He certainly ought not to be allowed to see Mrs. Piper. He will be hypnotized, if he gets anything—if not, he will have exploded the phenomenon. It is too late!

Item, have you a reprint of your paper in Mind? My Mind goes to America and is not reforwarded hither.

Pauline Goldmark wrote me of the extreme kindness you had shown them at Oxford, and of her gratitude. Accept mine once more, and draw on me ad libitum for corresponding gracieusetés to any friends of yours who may come to Cambridge, Mass. If you knew the above Pauline Goldmark as well as I do, you would have fallen in love with her. She has the best working qualities, and will make the best wife of any girl I know. Probably you
saw her too short a time, and not in the mountains, etc. Anyhow, receive my eternal thanks.

A pleasant letter from Miller today, who to my great delight is letting my eldest boy Henry chum with him.

Affectionately yours

Wm James

We are here indefinitely and you mustn't fail to come in, if you ever come to town. I certainly meant to send you my address before: c/o Brown Shipley & Co, London and now superseded by De V. G. Yes! Ward’s Gifford lectures are good and, in the actual state of thought, important.

• To Henry Havelock Ellis •

34 De Vere Gardns, W.
Oct. 17. [1899]

Dear Mr. Ellis,

Here goes the preface: valeat quantum!

My illness and hardpressed condition prevent me from copying it out. But I fancy that this pencil draft will be legible both to you and the printers. I should be thankful for any suggested amendments to the proof; and I still feel that a preface from me is rather impertinent.

Sincerely yours

Wm James

• 199 •
To F. C. S. Schiller

De Vere Gardens, W.
October 19, 1899

Dear Schiller,

I ought to have sent these things back earlier. I am much obliged to you for sending them. Also for the Educational Review. How playfully you can write!—it seems as 'twere easily too, but it may not come so easy. The Educational Review article gives me a much better insight than I have possessed into your Oxford system. A priori it seems to me vicious, as regards the relation of the teachers to the examinations—but the abstract worst is often the concrete best—and one must live in a system to judge it. You don't get “production” on a scale commensurate with our education; but from the point of view of the wider philanthropy, I am not sure that the frustration of much writing is not genuinely the good to be aimed at. I suppose it may be safe to say that the indispensable genius will be irrepressible and that their truths will leak out. On the other hand a lively debate-publicity seems to be a great raiser of the general level of discussion—which in Germany is high. I think you might easily with a page or two more have made your article on Münsterberg in Mind more effective. You treat his absurd a priori dogmatism of Science too much as a separate doctrine. It hangs together with the others; and all are about equally vulnerable. He would be more sensitive himself to an attack along the whole front, than on the one position. I am grievously disappointed in the sort of philosophic rubbish he is hatching out, though like much of his psychologic work it may prove valuable by being anregend, and discussable. I think your tone in
the Mind article *tant soit peu* reprehensible for its patronizing quality. Only the Mysticism article deserved that tone. No more at present, from,

Yours ever

W. J.

Oh! I ought to acknowledge gratefully your puff of my Oxford reputation. But how comes it that Caird has never let Royce’s *Spirit of Modern Philosophy* afloat there? Royce is so unscholastic in his form, that I hate to hear of his lack of world fame—that seems to me such a transcendent merit. Also re the Goldmarks: I hope you don’t think I introduced her as a candidate for Corpus Fellow’s fiancée! Never! I used the words in general praise of her exalted character to which I feared you might be lacking in sensitiveness. She isn’t *brilliant* unfortunately. Surely Münsterberg chose a queer form in which to incorporate his polemic against my emotional metaphysics! His own real life also is *all* emotion.\(^23\)

\[To \text{ Macmillan and Co.}\]

34 De Vere Gardens
Nov. 7. ’99

Messrs. Macmillan & Co.

Dear Sirs,

I regret to say that I must make the same reply to your note of the 6th which I made to your inquiry of a year ago.
For many reasons I should like to publish under your auspices, and your offer is a liberal one, but unexpected illness has obliged me to postpone the date of my Gifford lectures, the writing of which is hardly yet begun. Until I possess the manuscript complete I prefer to postpone the question of a publisher.

I will keep note of your proposal, and very possibly communicate with you again before the year is out.

Thanking you for your interest in my work I am

Sincerely yours

Wm James

To George Herbert Howison

34 De Vere Gardens
London W.
Nov. 9, 1899

My dear Howison,

Baldwin was here on Wednesday and reported having seen you only once, adding that you seemed to go about but little, and that he had not seen Mrs. Howison. I fancy that you feel in Oxford, as I do in every foreign country, very shy of intruding upon the natives, shy both personally and naturally. But it doesn’t do to carry this too far—on natural grounds I should not like to think of Mrs. Howison not becoming widely known.

I myself have been here for a month unfortunately with a bad organic heart trouble of which I can’t cypher out the issue. Only 6 pages of Gifford lectures are writ-
ten out and for a month to come at least I am forbidden to make any exertion, physical, social or intellectual. Yesterday the doctor forbade me absolutely to receive any more visits—so I must postpone my meeting with you until a brighter day. I hope that you are profiting by Oxford and enjoying it and getting on with your written work. Pray drop me a line and tell me how things are. I live on letters just now and the thought of old friends. With warmest regards to Mrs. Howison who, I hope is well and happy, and the same to yourself. My wife joining too

Always affectionately yours

Wm James (by A. H. J.)

34 De Vere Gardens, W.
Nov. 11, 1899

My dear Stout (can’t we drop the handles to our names?)

I am pained beyond expression to have to write such a reply to your so friendly note, but the Doctor has just given me imperative orders not to see anyone whilst the Nauheim baths are going on. Every visit I have had so far has produced disagreeable cardiac symptoms, and although I have been slow in coming to it, I now see that I must for the present forego all society save my wife’s. Fortunately we are on good terms. I must see you some time. I found your Analytic Psychology a most genuine
and vital performance which I could understand and enter into. Your presidential address the other night is from the same tap, and interests me much. I have had no chance at your new book yet,—Sully praised it to me highly. I trust that in the matter of us four meeting, aufgeschoben is not aufgehoben, and I will write to you again.

Sincerely yours

Wm James

To George Frederick Stout

34 De Vere Gardens, W.
Nov. 17, 1899

My dear Stout,

I have just received two letters from Harvard, written by Münsterberg and Palmer, our professor of Ethics, respectively, and both in a state of furious indignation over Schiller's animadversions on M's English in the October Mind. I myself deeply regret these animadversions, for M's style (in the larger sense of the word as distinguished from grammar) is excellent, and his English, however uncouth, highly creditable for a foreigner. He says himself rather pathetically "I find I am whipped and not welcomed in the house where I came as a guest."

Both these friends seem to expect me to do something about the matter. Münsterberg says that he must now confine himself to the German language in all future writing, which would be a pity.

I am advising them to write directly to you, for I can in
no way take a hand in such a quarrel. I wouldn’t, even if my cardiac condition permitted any controversy, which it does not. Pray show this to Schiller. I think it my duty to warn you of the storm which is about to burst upon your heads.

Very truly yours

Wm James

• To F. C. S. Schiller •

34 De Vere Gardens, W.
November 17, 1899

My dear Schiller,

Just one word! I have written to Stout a letter I want you to see. I do regret your criticisms of Münsterberg’s English.

As regards the Proceedings article I hope that you have prepared a postscript for the next Proceedings, printing the full context of the “undignified” quotation and expressing regret. Hyslop made the same omission in the Psychological Review and Münsterberg has the strategical cleverness to fall back on this misquotation as his sole reply to both of you. It is a pity to leave him in possession of so labour-saving a coign of vantage.

Heart has been very bad, but begins to show some signs of mending. As ever,

Yours

Wm James (by A. H. J.)
My dear Münsterberg,

Your and Palmer’s letters both received. Hurrah for the laboratory and Seminary!

As regards the Schiller matter I can myself do nothing. You and Palmer must write direct to Stout. My cardiac condition absolutely forbids work and a fortiori getting mixed in controversial matter.

I deeply deplore Schiller’s remarks on your English which is wonderful for a foreigner, and Schiller should have been more courteous. But don’t take it too seriously, and for Heaven’s sake don’t carry out your threat of confining your printed utterances to German hereafter.

I wrote to Schiller as soon as I saw his notice protesting against his tone, and I have just written briefly to Stout, a private letter about your and Palmer’s state of mind saying I sympathize with it, but I can absolutely do no more.

As regards Schiller’s other article I think you have no just cause of complaint. Your mysticism article, to speak with perfect candour, seems to me a monumentally foolish performance. The time is passed for metaphysical dogmatism about natural phenomena and I think it was a great compliment that he should have discussed your paper at all. If discussed, how could it be discussed but in a comic vein? Pardon these sentiments, my dear colleague, you can easily understand them; brevity forces me to be blunt.
And for Heaven’s sake, don’t stop writing in English. Your style, in the large sense of the word style, is admirable.

We both hope that the Münsterberg household is well. Only illness has prevented my writing to express my admiration of your article on Germany and America.

Always truly yours

Wm James

Private post-script
Dear Mr. Münsterberg,

Mr. James is very ill, and every excitement affects his heart unfavorably, so pray, if you write again, avoid controversial subjects. These two letters about Schiller have quite upset him, so I am constrained to sound a note of warning.

Very truly yours

Alice H. James

· To Charles William Eliot ·

Lamb House
Rye, Sussex
Dec. 20th '99

Dear President,

The enclosed petition to the Corporation will acquaint you with the scrape in which I find myself, if you have not already learnt it from other quarters.

· 207 ·
Dr. Bezly Thorne, the first English heart-specialist, thinks I ought, with repeated Nauheim baths, to get into working shape again. Meanwhile, so far, the progress has been down hill and it is impossible to foretell how the balance will ultimately incline. If favorably, I hope to be able, by remaining in Europe, to give next year that first course of Gifford lectures from which I have had this year to withdraw. My second Gifford Course would then be indefinitely post-poned.

Should I be able to resume my duties at Harvard in 1901, it seems certain that they would have to be in diminished amount, probably reduced to one full course or its equivalent, with proportionate decrease in pay. I should greatly deplore having to resign entirely from the College, for I feel as if my philosophical out-put might, at last, begin to be important. My project of staying here next year rather than returning to Cambridge, is determined by the practical necessity of being near Nauheim. If I don't get better by mid-summer, having taken my Spring Course there, I shall return home and make the best of things as I may.

I am ordered by the New Year to proceed to a more out-of-door climate, probably Hyères or thereabouts.

It is particularly painful to me to ask for this favor for a year when Royce was planning to take his first Sabbatical. Nothing but absolute necessity could bring me to do it. With Miller already in training perhaps Royce can get off. Miller's intellect and character are both of distinguished quality, and Palmer writes that his teaching is a success. If you need a second man, I should like to urgently recommend Ralph B. Perry, a Ph.D. of last year, now filling Professor Russell's place ad interim at Williams. I have the very highest opinion of his talents and character and I am sure of his successful development.

I hear splendid things from Palmer and Münsterberg
about our department, things which make me glad and homesick.

We both hope that you and Mrs. Eliot are well and I hope the Faculty meetings have not yet made you curse God and die.

What a squalid thing is this Boer war! But the sobriety of temper of the papers and people seems beyond all praise.

Believe me, with profound regret for the contents of this letter.

Faithfully yours

Wm James⁴⁹