James tried a number of times to obtain the Ingersoll lectureship for Schiller but to no avail. But he was successful in having Perry hired for the next academic year on a one year basis as a sabbatical replacement. The proofs of the printing of James’s Gifford lectures were corrected and sent to the printer before he and Mrs. James sailed for England on 1 April. Before sailing James also arranged to see Oliver Lodge, while in England, on matters pertaining to the Society for Psychical Research.

The first lecture was scheduled to be delivered on 13 May. But before that they toured England for a month. First, James received an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from Edinburgh University on 11 April. Then, in turn, they visited Oliver Lodge in Birmingham, Edward L. Godkin for a week at Torquay, James Bryce in London, Henry James in Rye for another week, and Schiller at Oxford on 9 and 10 May. Then they headed north to Edinburgh.

James’s last lecture was delivered on 9 June. They sailed for home on the next day, cutting short their previous plans to stay longer. James was quite exhausted by the traveling and the lecturing. His book, *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study In Human Nature*, appeared shortly after the lectures ended. About the lec-
tures he said that they “are all facts and no philosophy.” He didn’t have the physical strength to keep his original plan for the second course “to defend radical pluralism and tychism.” James received many letters of praise from all quarters for this very popular writing.

On their return home, the Jameses retreated to their summer home in New Hampshire. The vacation was interrupted by his return to Cambridge in July to give two lectures in the Harvard Summer School of Theology. While at Chocorua he continued his efforts to secure a grant of money from the Carnegie Foundation of Washington for C. S. Peirce. He also tried to secure a teaching post at Harvard for his wife’s brother-in-law, Leigh Gregor.

Now that the “religious psychology phase of [his] existence was wound up,” James’s new philosophic interest was the preparation and presentation of a new course, Philosophy 3 (Philosophy of Nature), for the fall semester. It was the first time in his life that he gave systematic lectures without using someone else’s text as a basis. He was very enthusiastic about this endeavor. In this course he tried to construct before the students a sort of elementary description of the constitution of the world as built up of “pure experiences.” His readings were mainly along this line, e.g., McTaggart’s Studies in the Hegelian Cosmology, Wilhelm Ostwald’s Vorlesungen über Naturphilosophie and Henri Bergson’s two books Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience and Matière et mémoire. To concentrate on this course, James had to decline many invitations to give lectures and to write books. This course extended over into February 1903.
Jan. 7. 02

Dear President,

You may remember my suggesting to you the name of Canning Schiller, of Corpus College, Oxford, as the next Ingersoll lecturer.

I mentioned to him the fact in a recent letter. He says in reply: "I should be glad of such a good excuse to renew my acquaintance with the Great Republic and observe the improvements. Besides, I really want to lecture on the questionnaire material, which I am sure will make up into something interesting. Moreover I want to boom the inquest a bit, and get more answers, so that the book will be not merely stimulative but important."

The "questionnaire" is a circular regarding peoples' feelings (as distinguished from their beliefs). Schiller suspects that the majority don't care for immortality. I know of no one whose lecture could give new material except Schiller.

Faithfully yours

Wm James


\textit{To Mrs. Thompson} \par

95 Irving St. Cambridge
March 3. 1902

Dear Mrs. Thompson,

I send you the end of lecture XX and of the book, though I may conclude to add an Appendix to this lecture in a few days. I send back some additional corrections—you will be able to manage the galley part—I have lent the corresponding proofs in page. I shall not change the end of Chapter XVII, so you may proceed to the casting as soon as you like.

Sincerely yours

Wm. James

\textit{To Ralph Barton Perry} \par

Cambridge
March 7th [1902]

Dear Perry,

At our committee meeting this A.M. things jumped in an unexpected way. We decided to take no decisive measures for another year, but to ask you as a stop-gap, Palmer & Royce intending each to take a 1/2 year's leave of absence, and one man's work, including some part of
the big Phil. 1. to be given by you if you come. Münsterberg our chairman was to communicate with our president as soon as he could get him, and you will probably get an official letter soon.

You should distinctly understand that the appointment is for but one year, and that we are committed to absolutely no renewal of it. You have therefore to give up a highly desireable permanent place for a possibility. If you ask my advice I say "come!" nevertheless, for there will undoubtedly be a good many openings erealong, and this is a good place to start from if one can't stay here.

Personally, my dear fellow, I am delighted at the turn which things have taken.

Hastily and heartily yours,

Wm James

* To Oliver Lodge *

Cambridge (Mass.)
March 23. 1902

Dear Dr. Lodge,

I am going to sail, with my wife, on April 1st for Liverpool. I have my Gifford lectures to give, and we wish to spend a few weeks with my brother at Rye. I ought to have, and should like to have, some little conversation with you about S. P. R. affairs, and if that time suited you, the surest and most expeditious way to meet you would I suppose be immediately, on my way from Liverpool to London. We ought to be arriving on the 8th or
9th. Will you kindly have a letter awaiting me in charge of the Cunard Steamship Company, indicating me as a passenger arriving on "Ivernia," and telling me inside whether this is a convenient time for you to see us if we stop at Birmingham. I do no psychical research work whatever now, nor have I for several years done any, but in a general way I follow Hodgson's work, and wish to talk to you about it. Mrs Myers is here, returned from California, & about to sail for home in the Oceanic, April 2nd. She read me yesterday reports of 2 1/2 sittings with Mrs. Piper. Myers came very poorly in the first one; but I confess that the dramatic impression which I received from the later two was favorable as regards sincerity of effort to communicate. The turn which the Myers communications here have lately taken improves in my estimation the probability that they may be real. But these are matter of "impression," and it is hard to give articulate grounds. I hope to bring you a batch of recent reports of Mrs. P.

I got the proof of your presidential address and admired the clearness and frankness of it.

Believe me, dear Dr. Lodge, yours ever truly,

Wm James
Dear Schiller,

I hope that all goes well wi'ye. I am flourishing like a green bay tree—corrected last page of proof of last lecture yesterday and leave on April 1st. for your Island to deliver the 2nd. course of Ingersoll [sic] lectures. Enclosure explains itself!

Ever truly yours,
W. J. 4

Charing Cross Hotel
April 18, 1902

Dear Schiller,

Your warm hearted welcome has but just come into my hands, we arriving only last night from Edinburgh whither we were whisked straight on landing (to get a LL.D.), thence to Birmingham for a day with Lodge to talk over the American Branch's affairs (He seems to me a very big man—"presidential size," etc. His 15 children a mere nebenwirkung), thence to Stratford for my poor

95 Irving St.
Cambridge, Mass.
March 24, 1902
wife's sake, though the country awfully pretty and now here for two days of shopping, etc., on Saturday to Torquay to spend a week with the Godkins and see a little of Devonshire (unknown to either of us), then to my brother's at Rye after a couple more days at London and to begin to lecture again at Edinburgh on May 13th.

You see that Oxford can't well come in till after Edinburgh. Between June 24th., where I am D. C. L.'d at Durham, and July 5th. when we sail, there may be a chance. I should like to know Stout, but I confess that I am growing more and more shy of seeing strangers generally, however good and great, for a soul meets some so little! You I should be greatly disappointed not to see, but it ought to be Switzerland and mountain sides together. In case Oxford is unfeasible, could you possibly come up here for a day some 10 days hence?

Write me at "Hatley St. George, Lower Lincombe, Torquay, and I will keep you informed. Yes! Rhodes' will makes him loom large!

Yours ever

Wm James

· To James Bryce ·

Hatley St. George, Torquay
April 23, 1902

Dear Bryce,

Our two last letters crossed, and it touches me profoundly that a man on whom the future of an Empire depends should spend so much time over so unworthy a
pair of "trippers" as ourselves. I couldn't write to you this morning because it was impossible before hearing from another quarter fully to determine our dates. It is now certain that on Wednesday the 30th and Thursday the 1st of May we shall be in London, and if you & Mrs. Bryce have a free hour on either of those days, we should be delighted to come to Portland Place—lunch, "tea," but not dinner, unless there be no other chance!

Godkin's good spirits and his wife's efficiency are spectacles for the Gods. I find him in better shape than I anticipated, both mentally and physically—but Heavens! if I were as reduced as he is from my natural estate, I should shrink from "society." It shows a much robuster grip on existence in his case.

With warm regards to both of you, from each of us, I am,

Ever truly yours,

Wm James

- To F. C. S. Schiller -

Hatley St. George, Torquay
April 24, 1902

Dear Schiller,

I have read your Essay but once as yet, and am about to proceed to read it again, pencil in hand. It is a superbly splendid thing, a big synthetic program for endless filling in and a genuinely vital piece of philosophizing, which ought to insure your recognition as a leader of
thought. It inspires me greatly and I should like to spend
the rest of my life building it out. Thank you for men­
tioning me so often. I will soon write again or rather,
since I hate to write, I will talk with you of it in more
detail when we meet. In case we should stop at Oxford
on our way North say May 10th. (or 9th. and 10th.)
should you be there and disengaged? We have also to
see the Diceys (Albert) and Louis Dyer. Address B. S. &
Co.

Yours “for the truth”

Wm James

* To F. C. S. Schiller *

Hatley St. George, Torquay
April 24, 1902

Dear Schiller,

You are a good letter writer! I am always surprised at
your prompt returns. Pray let the degree rest—those
vanities and humbugs literally turn my stomach. Now for
your questions. You and I are so well understood now to
be of the same gang and you praised my Will to Believe
so inordinately in Mind, that I should think it might be
better if Ward were to notice this new book of mine. Its
only originality consists in the suggestion (very brief)
that our official self is continuous with more of us than
appears (subliminal self) which accounts for the “strik­
ing” experiences of religious persons; and that this
“more” on the farther side lies open to transempirical
realities, and this might allow for the sense of "union" and other mystical experiences being true. Ninety nine one hundredths or more of the book is descriptive and documentary and the constructive part is a mere indication. I confess that I should rather, for my own curiosity, hear how Ward takes this than how you take it, for of your hospitable reception I am assured in advance. I engage you for my next book which will be philosophical and constructive! How is Ward? He looked terribly when I saw him last August.

2) I will review your essays for *Mind* with the greatest alacrity and glad of the opportunity. It rejoices me that they should be out so soon. This is another reason against your reviewing me, it would look too much like log-rolling.

Didn't I write to you that Eliot—no, I remember that I only wrote anent this year! Well the man is an ass in this respect—he not only said he couldn't appoint you, but actually wrote a note explaining how foolish it was for a man to hope to gain anything of value by such a circular. This attitude of his leaves, I fancy, little to be hoped for the future. I will nevertheless go at him again. Why will people be omniscient asses when they are asses? Eliot is no ass in practical affairs, but the habit of authority infects the mind. As for Stout's Essay, I will wait for the book.

Yours ever

W. J.

If you meet Dicey (not otherwise) you might mention our probable advent. To what Hotel should one go?
April 29, 1902

Dear Miss Thomas,

Professor Leuba writes to me that you are in need of some testimony as to the value of his "original work."

I am acquainted with nothing but his articles on Religious Psychology in several Reviews. He suggests that I should send you my opinion of them. I have been steeped in literature relating to that subject during the past three years, but have read almost nothing as instructive as his contributions. In this field he is certainly one of the most important living writers.

Sincerely yours

Wm James

Lamb House
Rye
May 2, [1902]

Dear Schiller,

Your daily letter never fails—nor mine! You scare me by the awful amount of sociability in prospect. How can you and I innocently philosophize at all? And how can my
jaded nerves recuperate? But since *le vin est versé, il faut le boire*.

I accept your Saturday dinner and Sunday lunch. I really don’t think I can stand the President’s breakfast too, unless it be short and simple. But I’ll wait till he asks me. How, by the way, *heist er*? I’m ashamed of my ignorance and of my general rusticity of nature towards “mixed company,” loving only as a rule sweet dalliance with friends.

Sunday night there must be no dinner engagement, as the [train] for Edinburgh leaves London at 10 A. M. and I have to guard against fatigue pretty carefully still.

Ever yours

W. J.

Thank you for the “Useless Knowledge” which I shall gladly re-read. Of course I gladly accept the lodging you so kindly offer me. *Das versteht sich von selbst.*

· To F. C. S. Schiller ·

27 Alva Street, Edinburgh
May 17, [1902]

Dear Schiller,

I return herewith your MS which alleviated my journey North very much. It is in your best vein as regards “atticism” and persiflage. You seem to me quite unique at that. As for the practical scheme, altho’ I think it well worth ventilating, for the reason that all such ventilation
awakens the public conscience on the general interest involved, I have such a noted aversion to examination rule and rulers überhaupt and the priggish element involved is so strong that I don’t feel like hurrah-ing immediately. I hark back to Galton’s suggestion of dowries for girls coming from numerous families (if I remember aright) as better. The whole business of sex relations and breeding is so awfully complexly conditioned, I fear the effects of rationalism on the result and when I think of the probable composition of any jury who should try to mould it, I should rather trust to the chances of individual choice, with all their danger.

I have given 2 lectures and feel like a humdrum citizen. Excitement never strikes twice in the same place and I am low-spirited, neurally tired, and long for the job to be done, so that I can at last recuperate with fair play in my own native conditions in New Hampshire. It isn’t exactly fair play now.

We move on Wednesday to 5 Athol Crescent, whither anything had better be addressed. I enjoyed amazingly my day of dissipation at Oxford, especially the Stout part of it (after the Schiller part, of course). We are about to go out to Hawthornden for lunch and a 4 hours conversation (no shorter train interval) with the good Campbell Fraser and his family. Too long!

Yours ever

W. J.⁹
To George Archdall O’Brien Reid

5 Atholl Crescent
Edinburgh
May 30th [1902]

My dear Reid,

Let us drop titles of dignity & honour!

Here I am, you see, finishing up my Gifford Lectures, and your letter has been forwarded to me. Many thanks for Wells’s book, which I do not own, but which I recently read with the utmost avidity and shall make my boys read out of your copy. He is eminently a “growing man,” and destined through the type of his imagination to exert an influence on the rising generation. I cannot but believe that many a young man, who will have to be counted on in our future social evolution, is now having the type of his character and aspirations fixed by that and other writings of Wells’s. He makes a sudden daylight break through innumerable old blankets of prejudice. But, in my opinion, with his belief in the “efficient” and “functional” type exclusively, he leaves out too much of human nature, which, if the past is any indication, will always continue to set as much store by the aesthetic and useless as by the practically needful. When I think who, of my acquaintance, who be on the High Commission of the Intellectual élite who should castrate or behead the rest of us in their wisdom, I shudder, and would rather take my chances on the old fashioned basis. I could write long on W.’s book, but am too tired just now. Thank you again.

I give my last lecture next Monday and sail from L’pool on Tuesday. You will receive the volume of them next week some time. If you deign to read them, you will see why I am not out and out with Wells, though I have
relished him so amazingly & think his way of hitting the
nail on the head and his impatience with conservative
stupidity perfectly kostlich.

I wish you would write s’thing purely psychological. It
couldn’t fail to be important.

Thank you—I am vastly better than last year, only I
find that the past month has consumed my “margin”
rather faster than I like.

Yours very truly

Wm James

---

To F. C. S. Schiller

Edinburgh
June 8, [1902]

Dear Schiller,

You by this time have got my volume and I trust that I
shall not be long at home without receiving yours.

I sail on Tuesday, quite used up in “nerves” (damn ’em) by the escapade abroad. But once on my native
ground in New Hampshire the interrupted process of
“recovery” which went on so well last winter will resume
its reign. I pant for simplification of life and am now in
the midst of terrible confusion.

Yours ever fondly

Wm James

June 9th. Just home from my last lecture, thank God!
Audience very cordial, but end of lecture flat—composed by mind debilitated by fatigue.

Now hey for home and vogue la galère. I’m going to work on Eliot about your Ingersollship as strongly as I can.  

---

*To John Shaw Billings*

Cambridge
June 20th [1902]

Dear Dr. Billings,

I wrote some time ago to the Carnegie trustees in favor of Charles S. Peirce’s Logic, as a good object for aid. Peirce writes me that he fears your vote may be cast against him, so I scribble this line to you to say once more that he seems to me a perfectly ideal case for help. Grant everything that can be urged against him in the way of character and practical eccentricity and irresponsibility—the plain fact remains that he is one of the first intellectual geniuses of our country, and that his writings invariably contain original contributions to thought of the highest value. This logic of his will certainly if published be one of the great human efforts in that line, in spite of whatever capriciousness and obscurity certain pages or parts of it may show.

I state this as my deliberate opinion. I know that my colleague Royce would say as much.

No answer! of course.

Yours sincerely,

Wm James

---
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To Charles William Eliot

Silver Lake, N. H.
June 25th. 1902

Dear President,

Just home from Scotland, somewhat the worse for wear. I come up here, and almost my first act is to write an office-seeking letter!

I dislike to appear to pull wires for my brother in law—another brother in law this time—but not knowing just what changes Bôcher's death is likely to occasion, it occurs to me to suggest that Prof. Leigh R. Gregor of McGill College should not be left entirely unconsidered in case there should have to be a new Assistant Professor or Professor. I only fairly made his acquaintance last winter, and his perfect gentlemanliness and liberality of character are such as would decorate our french department, or any of our departments. Concerning his scholarship I am not in a position to judge.

Pray take no notice of this in the way of replying!

You should have received my Gifford volume earlier. It was a mistake of my son's. The lectures were a great success as far as the audience's curiosity went, but the Scotch are unco cautious about committing themselves in the way of praise. I seem to myself to have made a very objective study of the subject. I judge this to be the case, because I can see what different reactions will inevitably be aroused by my pages in different readers' minds.

I am glad to hear of Mrs. Eliot's recovery—what an illness she must have had! With best regards to you both, I am ever truly yours,

Wm James

---

13
To John Shaw Billings

Chocorua, N. H.
June 28, 1902

Dear Dr. Billings,

I never dreamed that you would answer my remarks about C. S. Peirce,—I hope it is not your habit in similar Carnegie matters, for too much correspondence has been the bane of lives less valuable than yours.

Since you have answered, however, I will make one more remark, which is that I fully appreciate your doubts as to Peirce delivering the goods “on time” if paid for in advance. Nevertheless I feel strong confidence in his finishing that book some time, for it is the nursling of his life; and I believe that if you should award payments chapter by chapter only, and only when the chapter is completed and sent in, you would supply a stimulus to punctuality which would in all probability be effective. A very considerable fragment of the book is already written out. A severe contract, from which you could peremptorily withdraw in case of non-fulfillment on his part, would in any case be necessary.

Your Institute will be collecting endless material for a future book on “the tragedy of genius”—especially that of semi-genius. Peirce is a tragic personality, but he is a real genius, of a discontinuous kind, and with all his arbitrariness, has a very lovable side to his character. I never knew a human being like him.

Sincerely and apologetically yours,

Wm James
Cambr.
July 14. 1902

I should long since have thanked you for your kind letter of end of June. I am glad you sympathize so much with my book, which I think must be a genuinely objective account of things, for it seems to confirm every one’s prepossessions—making them loathe or love religion according to their bias. I got so deep into my own individualistic hobbies in composing it, that I found myself off your ground altogether and feel guilty at having given you only that contemptible little reference. But I left out much besides. I am now hoping to get well, having that long job behind me. I am here for two summer school lectures—family at Chocorua. Can’t you come that way? I admire your vigor.

Wm James¹⁴
To Wincenty Lutoslawski

Cambridge
July 18th. 1902

Dear Lutoslawski,

Your card of June 30th has just come to me. I suppose that you will have received before now a letter which I wrote to you (and my Gifford lecture book also) the day before I left Edinburgh, addressing both if I remember rightly, to Geneva (since that was given as your "regular" address in the little Mickiewicz pamphlet). I have got home, and improved my neurological condition very much by "living close to nature" on my little sylvan farm in New Hampshire, for 3 weeks. I have had to come down here to give a couple of lectures to the Harvard Summer School of theology,—lectures eigentlich supplementary to my aforesaid book, and now that they are over I feel free and as if that religious psychology phase of my existence were wound up, and, the burden once removed, I might get well with a good deal more essor and stimulus, and address myself to more properly philosophic tasks. So much for the Ego. The family is well, my two elder boys in especial, turning out very satisfactory indeed.

I rejoice in the news of your own better health. Also in your being about to do some purely scientific work again. I confide more in your scientific than in your practical powers, but you’re a great man anyhow and must settle your true vocation with God.

Have you seen the review of your Plato by my colleague Santayana in the International Review of a few months ago. I have but just discovered its existence, and
will send it to you, if you have it not. Good fortune attend you!

Yours affectionately

Wm James

・ To Oliver Lodge ・

Chocorua, N. H.
Aug. 8. [1902]

Your letter and paper about prayer came to me and were read a long time ago. Yours is what I call a philosophical mind truly—ready for any hypothesis whatever, provided it can be interpreted "pragmatically" and bro't to any experimental test. Keep it up! I've just been reading with great delight (though I'm afraid to throw away the whole molecular business) Ostwald’s Vorl. üb. Naturphilosophie—also a big & free man. I'm delighted to hear from Piddington of a new automatic writing subject of great importance. Sorry for the delay in Myers's book.

Best regards to you all.

William James
To F. C. S. Schiller

(Chocorua)
August 29, 1902

Infinite gratitude for your contribution to the Nation. For a eulogistic notice, I couldn’t have imagined one that better fills the bill, giving just the résumé required and abounding in such adjectives as “incomparable.” Thanks again! The summer is waning and I still waxing, tho’ I remain finite ever. Am in the middle of the McTs Studies in Hegelian Cosmology which I greatly enjoy for its pellucidity of manner. He’s an Hegelian who is not a prig. I envy you your mountain climbing powers.

Cordialest regards!

W. J. 17

To Jane Addams

Chocorua, N. H.
Sept. 17, 1902

Dear Miss Addams,

I have just been reading your Democracy and Social Ethics, and with such deep satisfaction that I must send you my tribute of thanks. It seems to me one of the great books of our time. The religion of democracy needs nothing so much as sympathetic interpretation to one
another of the different classes of which Society consists; and
you have made your contribution in a masterly manner. I have
learned a lot from your pages. But just whither the said reli-
gion of democracy will lead, who knows? Meanwhile there is no
other, in human affairs, to follow.

Gratefully yours,

Wm James

To Mary Corinna Putnam Jacobi

95 Irving St.
Cambridge
Oct. 17. [1902]

Dear Mrs. Jacobi,

The "Roberts-Hawley Lymph-Compound" is the name of
the animal extract. Dr. Joseph R. Hawley, 3421 South
Park Avenue, Chicago is the medical promoter of it, and
whether you use the stuff or not, you will find his book,
analyzing the results of three years (or more) experience
of it, and some of the Bulletins of the American Animal
Therapy Association, very good reading. Hawley in-
spires me with confidence, and I advise you to write to
him for the literature.

Dr. Baldwin of Rome, who first introduced me to the
substance, told of the extraordinary rejuvenation of his
father (78 years old) under its use. B. himself had Graves
disease, badly, & is now practically well. I believe it to
have softened to some extent my sclerosed arteries, and
it certainly has had a highly beneficial effect on my acute neurasthenia.

The doctors here all seem shy of it, except J. J. Putnam, who has got differing results in different cases, some very favorable. I hope that, if you try it, you may be one of the appropriate subjects. With sympathy and warm good wishes, I am very truly yours

Wm James

To Macmillan Co.

I have read Mr. Strong's MS. of "Why the Soul has a Body," in its unrevised shape. I can unqualifiedly recommend it for publication, as a sterling work, admirable for clearness of statement, & thoroughness of discussion, luminous, and likely to be much used by students of philosophy.

Wm James

Harvard University
Oct. 22. 1902
Cambridge
Nov. 1, 1902

Prof. Arthur O. Lovejoy
Washington University
St. Louis, Mo.

I have just “got round” to reading your article on Rel. & the T.-P. and cannot refrain from expressing my satisfaction with its conclusions, and my admiration of its execution. You write as if you were 50 years old, and it makes one proud of Harvard training to see such good work done.

Wm James

Cambridge, Mass.
Nov. 21, 1902

Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co.

Dear Sirs,

. . . As regards application for press copies, I suppose it to be the cheapest way of advertising, and I am continually struck by the fact that the existence of books is only revealed by accident to the persons who most need
them. Many have written to me to know where this book is published. In the case of a former little book of mine, published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., I was literally bombarded one whole winter with letters from people (in cities too) asking where they might get it. The old fashioned bookseller seems either to have gone out of existence, or to have abandoned his function of keeping acquainted with the book market. In small towns he is replaced by the "periodical depot," with magazines, bananas, soda water, etc. Sad age!

Apropos to which, would it be worth while to advertise this book especially for Christmas? It might be a good sort of gift book.

Item, would a leaflet with contents & press notices do good? I could supply the latter out of all the clippings which you have sent me.

Sincerely yours,

Wm James

· To Henry Rutgers Marshall ·

[late December, 1902]

My dear Marshall,

I am both touched and flabbergasted by your letter. There isn't a page more of possible psychological literature in this child's mental organism. Do you know Ladd's "primer" of psychology pub'd this fall, which I have not read, but which is called his best work by those who have read it? I have never got so many invitations to
give lectures and write books as this winter. Our reputation first begins as our talent commences to decay. It is fortunate that there are such compensations! Thanks for thinking of me so kindly, and a merry Christmas to you, from yours always truly

Wm James²³