Besides writing the Hibbert Lectures, James continued writing on ‘truth.’ He had a very short and exact statement of his view privately printed in February and circulated among his friends. It was entitled “The Meaning of the Word Truth.” He also published an article, “Truth versus Truthfulness,” in March. A copy of the latter was sent to Schiller, Kallen, and, through Kallen, to Bertrand Russell, who had published an article “Transatlantic Truth” in January. James continued to be disturbed by some of the reviews of Pragmatism.

Before James sailed for England on 21 April, he had committed the manuscript of seven lectures to the University Press. He had still to compose the eighth lecture. He thought of giving the series the title “a critique of intellectualism” or “the present situation in philosophy.” He delivered the lectures to large audiences from 4 May to 28 May. He received from Oxford University the honorary degree of Doctor of Science on 12 May. While at Oxford James of course saw much of Schiller and his friends. He and Mrs. James also visited the Bertrand Russells at their home near Oxford. Their social life was full and overwhelming with lunches, teas, and dinners.

After the lectures were completed, the Jameses stayed two days with Mrs. Fiske Warren, who had recently won a “first” in “Greats” at Oxford. She was from Boston.
Then they spent four days at Miss Sands' home, "Newington House," at Wallingford, Oxford. There they met, among many others, Lady Ottoline Morrell and her husband. She was often referred to as the "high priestess of Bloomsbury."

On 10 June the Jameses left this whirl of activity for some relaxation and rest in the country. They spent nine days at Bibury, two at York, three and a half at Durham, where on 23 June James received another honorary degree, Doctor of Letters, from the University. They spent two weeks in the Lake District of England, particularly Patterdale. On 9 July they arrived in London for a week's visit with friends. With his daughter "Peggy," James took off for Rye on 17 July. Mrs. James went to Harrow to see some friends. While at Rye, James visited H. G. Wells and G. K. Chesterton, who lived next door to Lamb House. James was much pleased with a volume of essays written in his honor by some of his friends. On 21 August he left for Ostend to join his wife and daughter, who had been visiting Switzerland, for a two week tour, mainly of Holland. This trip, if for no other reason, prevented James from attending the Third International Congress of Philosophy at Heidelberg, Germany, 1–5 September.

With Rye as a home base, James made several trips to London—once to show the city to his son "Aleck" who had come abroad to study for a year; another time to attend the Moral Education Congress at the University of London on the 25th. Then there was a last visit to see Schiller again before they sailed for home on 6 October.

The Jameses reached home in mid-October. In November James repeated his Hibbert lectures at Harvard. He was almost enticed by Cattell to give a talk on Darwin at the December meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. A few other letters also deal with James's membership in scientific societies.
Cambridge
January 4, 1908

Dear Schiller,

I got your letter re my Hibbert lectureship a week or more ago. I have been too busy, variously, to reply; also too ½ hearted, meaning by that that my damned arterial degeneration (which gives me pectoral anguish when I make efforts or get badly fatigued) may in the end wreck the enterprise. For that reason I am saying nothing about it over here, having told Strong and Miller only. I accepted because I was ashamed to refuse a professional challenge of that importance, but I would it hadn't come to me. I actually hate lecturing and this job condemns me to publish another book written in picturesque and popular style when I was settling down to something whose manner would be more streng “wissenschaftlich,” i.e., concise, dry and impersonal. My free and easy style in Pragmatism has made me so many enemies in academic and pedantic circles that I hate to go on increasing their number and want to become tighter instead of looser. These new lectures will have to be even looser; for lectures must be prepared for audiences; and once prepared, I have neither the strength to re-write them nor the self-abnegation to suppress them. What I dread, however, more than the actual lectures, is the hospitality and sociability of Oxford. I find too many hours a day spent in talking, very fatiguing and in the month of May my tide of nervous energy is invariably at its lowest—a regular annual cycle. I must rely on you then, my dear Schiller, not to add one jot or tittle to my social burden by inviting anyone to meet me. Let me see first how I
stand the more ordinary and official sociability. If well, then you may take your turn. But I positively 

veto any engagements from your quarter made in advance. Now take me seriously as to this or there is danger that I may not go at all. I am a thoro invalid and have to live accordingly, in spite of my appearance of animation to people who see me briefly. So much for that damned disagreeable topic!

I got back a week ago from the meeting at Cornell U. of the Philosophical Association. Very nice: almost all the papers read were epistemological, but the ‘symposium’ on ‘truth’ was abortive, not being a discussion at all, but a delivery of five unconnected general essays on the subject, of which I gave the first. I enclose for your perusal a paraphrase of what I said, which I have just sent to be published in the report of the meeting. (My remarks at the meeting were unwritten). Your name was in many mouths, no one persuadable that you could possibly admit an ‘objective’ reality. I, being radically realistic, claimed you to be the same, but no one believed me as to either of us. Wouldn’t you subscribe to the paper I enclose? Isn’t the hulé which you speak of as the primal bearer of all our humanized predicates conceived by you, epistemologically, as an independent that which the whats qualify and which (in the ultimate) may be decided to be of any nature whatsoever? I hope so, for that position seems to me invulnerable and in the end must win against all the muddlers and misunderstanders. Don’t answer me too minutely; if tempted to do so, refrain; I only want to be able to quote you as agreeing. If you don’t agree, the bare fact suffices, the reasons can come later.

Taylor was in great force and very jolly, on his feet, rapid, incisive and interesting, apropos of almost anything. His own paper shows him to have left his Elements of Metaphysics far behind him. He called Avenarius the greatest philosopher (so, by the way, did
Norman Smith in his paper, advocated a sort of monadistic pluralism and realism, defended external relations, and professed belief in (as I understood it) indeterministic "freedom!" If he goes on monkeying, he will get a vision of his own in ten years and then have the personal weight and authority he now lacks so greatly. His intellectual liveliness and jollity gave me an impression that, if he and I lived near each other, we should get along very well together socially, if not philosophically. Meanwhile I am told that he lets himself out freely on the vulgar tone of my Pragmatism.

Kallen writes great things of you, somewhat at the expense of the rest of Oxford. He needs to have his sentiments of respect developed! Pray show him the enclosed sheets, as well as the proof I mailed you 10 days ago. Give him my love and a Happy New Year also. Ditto to your inestimable self. If I heave in sight about May 1st., 'twill be with my wife and possibly our daughter. College rooms not to be tho't of therefore. We shall be best suited by "lodgings." I suppose there are plenty.

Addio! "Yours for the truth"

W. J.¹

¹
Cambridge, Mass.
Jan. 5. 07 [1908]

Dear Kallen,

Your jolly good letter arrives yesterday, and gives a good account. I'm glad you find so much in Oxford, particularly as to Schiller and Russell. I had mailed a letter to Schiller an hour ere yours came in asking him to communicate its content to you, so I won't reduplicate any of it, being very busy and tired. Ask him for the whole letter. I send you a revision of the paper on truth which I sent Schiller. I ticked it off this A.M. I don't see how any one can misunderstand it in so simplified a shape. Possibly you might show it to Russell, since he has been writing on the subject. Odd, to be called a scoundrel for saying such reasonable things.

Keep the paper, and the moment need of that 100 is in sight let me know.

Yours always truly

Wm James
Dear Lovejoy,

Thanks for your letter and enclosure returned. The great thing to aim at now among all us discussers of "pragmatism" is *ein Verständigung*. Calling each other scoundrels ought to stop—(this is not meant as a damper on the project of publishing your letter as a last atmosphere-clearing thunder clap!). So I send you the shortest statement I have made yet; please return it. It is practically just what I said at the Cornell 'symposium', and the longer statement which you return I am sending to Woodbridge as an independent article.

I can see no difference between what I call 'truthfulness' and verifiability; nor can I augur havoc from an infinite regress of certifications. I only call your attention to this: that if the statement now enclosed is admitted to pass muster in its present shape, then everything else about truth that Schiller and I have contended for must also be admitted. I confess I am sick of such *blind* criticism as McTaggart's in the current number of *Mind*. No one can write for readers who are resolved not to understand. They will always find their opening in the dot omitted from some *i*.

Yours truly,

Wm James

Cambridge, Mass.
Jan. 11, 1908
Dear Wister,

I now "twig" as to the connexion between pragmatism & incredibility—truth happening etc.

There do seem to be a germ of sterility in Boston. Only I don't think it lies mainly in Cabot & Putnam but in the whole medical crew which regards them as dangerous cranks and sentimentalists.

Poor Gay Waters! The most humble-minded of cranks. Were I able, I would pension him. As things are, I have to avoid even "whistling" to him. I've no doubt he did shed real salt tears over your letter.

Faithfully yours,

Wm James

- 464 -
Laid up with a bad attack of grippe (6th. day). I find myself at last growing impatient with the critics of Pragmatism and beginning to share your temper towards the reigning Oxford influences. McTaggart, e.g., in this month's Mind, means to be perfectly annihilating, but some of his interpretations wd. be discreditable to my terrier dog. Ditto Lovejoy in the Journal of Philosophy. I'm getting tired of being treated as 1/2 idiot, 1/2 scoundrel and beginning to assume an écrasey l'infâme state of mind. Écrasons l'infâme!

W. J. 5

Dear Schiller,

Your splendid letter from Rome of the 10th. arrives this morning. I am grateful for your praise of my "Misunderstandings" article—also for your strictures. I agree with both! You see that you and I are following different tactics and I believe that your strategy will gain rather than lose by my simultaneous operations, tho' they are dic-
tated not wholly by strategic considerations but partly by personal ones. What I define as the "pragmatic conception of truth" is my old one publich in Mind in 1885. It assumes the notion of "reality" uncritically. This seems to me a necessary preliminary step towards your far more inclusive doctrine of Humanism (treated separately therefore in my lectures), which in part is an account of reality as well as of truth. I naturally fight with zest for my own peculiar doctrine. It is the easiest first step to make. Once made, the way to Humanism lies open. But I think that one great trouble so far has been that everyone was fighting all over the lot at once. If "Pragmatism" gets settled, "Humanism" follows in due course. Certain opponents, like Strong, are thoroly friendly in spirit, but they are incapable of using the word "truth" in a concrete way. It will always mean for them that resident thing in a belief that makes it potentially susceptible of verification, a quality ante rem, not in rebus. Meanwhile they don't deny any of the pragramatic facts. It seems to me that when things have come to this pass, of pure loyalty to a word used in one way rather than another, the only thing to do is to keep on writing in one's own way and wait for the next generation.

This last article of mine will probably do some good to the younger crew. Even Royce has already changed his purely ironical tone and went so far as to say to me the other day, that after reading it he had thought it well to give some account of it to the young men at his seminary whom he had not long previously treated to another account of what I was driving at. McTaggart in Mind is simply infamous, so (to a great extent) is Lovejoy in the Journal of Philosophy. I agree with you now in full that our enemies of the absolutist school deserve neither respect nor mercy. Their stupidity is only equalled by their dishonesty. Kallen writes me that the egregious G. E. Moore has been annihilating me at the Aristotelian
Society. Kallen has been much impressed by B. Russell. It seems to me that, if the pragmatic notion of truth has any merit, it is to have rid the world of such diseased *Wucherungen* as the Moore-Russell-Meinong epistemology. It cuts under them so completely. Don’t think, dear Schiller, that I don’t see as in a blaze of light, the all embracing scope of your Humanism and how it sucks my pragmatism up into itself. I doubt if I shall trouble myself to write anything more about Pragmatism. If anything more about truth, it will be on the wider humanistic lines. This is my 15th. day of the grippe and the biggest intellectual effort I have made in that time. I don’t feel much as if I were going to lecture at Oxford just now! The job I have set myself is a hard one and, unless I can pull it off handsomely, I won’t try at all. It depends on how long this grippe will prove to have thrown me off the working track. My “margin” in these days is very narrow indeed.

My regards to the Thaws. How I wish I were at Rome with you!

Yours fondly

Wm James$^6$
· To Frank Thilly ·

Cambridge, Mass.
Feb. 1, 1908

Dear Thilly,

I sent you one page of type-writing for the report of our Association meeting. I had a duplicate which the person I lent it to has lost. It is so compact a statement of my account of truth that I wish to have a copy on hand, since your report won't appear till April. Will you kindly send me what I sent you? I will then copy & return.

I duly got the longer statement back.

Sincerely yours,

Wm James

· To Mary Whiton Calkins ·

95 Irving St.
Cambridge
Feb. 1. '08

Dear Miss Calkins,

I have been a-reading of you in the J. of P. Jan 30th., as well as in the Psych. Bull., Jan. 15. The vividness with which your mind focusses on everything is extraordinary. Also your good faith, I mean candor etc.
You bring me nearer to the "Self" in the J. of P. than I have ever been before. But as between you and Pillsbury, isn't it a palmary case for treatment by the pragmatic method? *What difference* in the particulars of anyone's experience is implied by our saying "Self" or saying "dynamic entirety of experience," etc.? Can't you work your contention along those lines? I still fail to see any great difference, and "Self" and "Stream" seem to me but two names for the same facts.

But I didn't write to say this—only to urge you most vehemently to become intimate with Bergson's writings. His last book will at least entrance you as literature. It may be that his way of representing the life of the individual (discarding intellectualist categories altogether and) representing the actual past as telescoping into the actual present, is the promising way out of what seems to me at present a somewhat loggerhead position in psychology.

I fully admit that the term "Self" should have the right of way.

Pardon my garrulity! 

[unsigned]
To Arthur Oncken Lovejoy

Cambridge, Mass.
Feb. 12, 1908

Dear Lovejoy,

I have read your “Pragmatism & Theology” with great interest, and high admiration for your literary style. You are one of our very few first rate philosophic writers. I also find some of your distinctions to advance the subject. Naturally I like your anti-monistic adhesion.

I agree to your conclusion about pragmatism No. 1, at the bottom of your page 129—at any rate the main pragmatic use of that principle is to distinguish concepts whose differences are futile from those whose differences are weighty. Even verbal differences have emotional consequences, so you can’t say that any concepts don’t differ at all in meaning, so long as they are spelt differently! So, vigorously, I agree to your p. 131. As for “matter” and “God,” I am glad I forestalled you in my “misunderstanding” paper in the note about “automatic sweethearts,” tho your pp. 132 & 133 are vastly more telling.

But we are both on pragmatic ground here, both applying the pragmatic method to find the meaning of the concepts under discussion. I have therefore much fault to find with your pp. 122–124, in which you take “ejects” (W. J.’s consciousness) as a case of concepts not explicable, as to their meaning, into particulars. I wish you would define my consciousness, so as to distinguish it from John Smith’s, without employing its empirical consequences. “My” consciousness is only known as that which animates a certain body, expresses certain sentiments, does certain acts. These are not “future” neces-
sarily, but your relations with each and all of them may be future, so futurity, on which you insist so, must be allowed for. Abstracting from these, my “that which” means the same as John Smith’s—both shrivel into a contentless locus to be recognized by you as existent. And what does “existent” mean except another “that which,” that which we must acknowledge and take account of. An object of knowledge that had no relations, not even relations of kind, to anything in the world except your “true” knowledge of it would be an absolutely indeterminate object. What would be meant by knowing that object truly, or knowing it rather than any other object, I can’t imagine. So I continue thinking that the pragmatic method No. 1 holds good radically. And why you (and almost everybody else) keep churning the irrelevant question of futurity into the discussion, I can’t well imagine.

Enough! I am sending you tomorrow a revision of my remarks at Cornell. I thought well to print them.

Yours, as ever,

Wm James

[marginal addition on the letter] Have Leicester, Elizabeth, & marriage no pragmatic contents of meaning, and even if that marriage be not verifiable directly, does it not belong to things of a verifiable class, and may it not pass for true if its falsity is unverified?
To Horace Meyer Kallen

Cambridge, Mass.
Feb. 12. 1908

Dear Kallen,

I have to thank you for 2 letters, of which the 2nd came this morning along with Russell's article. I have already ordered a copy of the Albany from England, so I return your sheets with some marginal scribbling on them, which Russell may read if you think fit to show them to him. I thank you for sending them. Russell's article is splendidly written, but R. errs from failure to have grasped my central position. The only way to understand anything is to jump into its centre and work outwards.

Poor childish Moore! Thank you again for sending me his Aristotelian paper, which I keep—he might have had the grace to send it himself! He is too weak & silly for any comment at all, so I won't waste a minute on him. A monument to the folly of pretending to have no vision of things, but to admit anything as possible and then select by "logic" which is most probable! He crawls over the outside of my lecture like a myopic ant over a building, seeing only the spot he touches, tumbling into every microscopic crack, and not suspecting even that there is a centre or a whole at all. Bah! Non ragionam di lui, ma guarda & passa!

As for Russell, I find fault with his insisting on the word "useful" in the narrower sense (for so the reader will take it) to show how absurd I am in saying that the truth is what is "expedient" or "what pays." Much truth is useful in the narrower sense, so is much falsehood; but much truth "pays" without being "useful" in that sense. A developed pragmatism will have to discriminate the
various types of truth-making satisfactoriness. Our critics try to head us off from doing this by insisting in limine that we shall recognize no other kind than the economically or emotionally satisfactory. Then Russell, because I say that truth means "satisfactory leading towards an object," first equates "the true" with "the satisfactory" at large, then "the satisfactory" with the "useful," and performs his reductio ad absurdum by the mathematical process of substitution, leaving all reference to the "object" out!! The real way to refute me would be to offer a tenable and intelligible alternative, but this no critic tries to do.

However, we shall certainly win thru, and I personally have no fault to find with the tone in which they handle me. Russell's article tickles me by the splendid style of it, so clear and English. Lovejoy also is writing very well, tho' fearfully off the track in parts.

I am in funds again, owing to "Pragmatism," and take great pleasure in sending you the $100 I promised. Spend it for luxuries! My grippe is over and 4 days ago I began to work again. The lectures at Oxford look more possible, but a clear 4 weeks have been lost.

Yours ever truly

W. J.

You don't mention my "Misunderstanding" paper, which I sent you. I hope you think it conducive to clearing up. I will send you tomorrow a copy of my remarks at Ithaca, which I have tho' it well to have printed, so much misrepresentation is in the air.
To F. C. S. Schiller

Cambridge
February 22, 1908

Thanks for your delightful letter and paper on exams.—Still giddy from the grippe. Can hardly think or work, so I only say this, that in my opinion we have perfectly definite "theoretic" interests distinct from the "practical" ones, but that they themselves have a utilitarian and humanistic history.

W. J.10

To F. C. S. Schiller

Cambridge
March 20, 1908

Dear Schiller,

Another letter to thank you for, and the Albany Review with your article, and the splendid Protagoras pamphlet in addition. The latter ought to clinch the nails in the absolutist coffin. Have you, by the way, read Münsterberg's onslaught on 'relativismus' in his new book, Philosophie der Werte? So childish! as if you altered your relation to a reality by saying of your statements they are absolutely true rather than by saying they are true! The reply to [B.] Russell is very clear and simplified. You work the distinction between truth as claimed and truth
as validated more than I do and to great effect. You write
that you shrink a little from my use of independent real-
ities, etc. No need of shrinking! They are an indestructi-
ble common sense assumption and the discussion is kept
on terms more intelligible to the common man, if you
also assume them. Moreover, in relation to the indi-
vidual man the object is an independent reality with
which his thought can “agree” only by its pragmatic
workings. Allowing it prejudices in no whit a final hu-
manistic treatment of the whole of the reality thus as-
sumed. Your note on p. 17 covers the ground.

Ever thine

W. J.¹¹

· To Herbert George Wells ·

Cambridge, Mass.
April 15, 1908

My dear Wells,

You enrich the lean earth on which you have consented
for awhile to incarnate yourself! I have just read New
Worlds for Old and am unable to restrain my loud and
prolonged applause. The bigness of its temper! the per-
suasiveness of its method! the artfulness of its construc-
tion! the sincerity of its spirit, and the excellence of its
style, will probably render it an “epoch-making” and
tremendously influential document. I say no more.

I doubt whether you have made quite enuf allowance
in the last chapter for the necessary austerity of life. I
myself believe that a compulsory blood tax paid in
mines, or freight-trains, winter cod fisherman, garbage
collecting and dish washing at the Club and hotels will
have eventually to take the place of the military blood
tax, and will make the race more manly but no one can
foresee the exact way in which the socialism of the future
will realize itself.

Yours admiringly,

Wm James

I sail on the 21st. to give some Hibbert lectures at Man-
chester College, Oxford, during May.¹²

· To F. C. S. Schiller ·

68 Banbury Road
May 20. [1908]

Dear Schiller,

Have you by any chance kept some “Syllabuses” that I
sent you from Stanford University? I am trying to patch
up a last lecture and should like to help myself out with
the last few pp., on the Will to Believe, if you have
them. I forgot the number of the sheets and forgot equal-
ly to bring a copy with me. If you have that last sheet (4
or 6 pp.) I should be greatly obliged for the loan of it.
Wicksteed is a brick and writes a first rate letter.

Yours ever,

W. J.¹³

· 476 ·
Dear Russell,

In a nutshell my opinion is this: that instead of there being one universal relation sui generis called "truth" between any reality and an idea, there are a host of particular relations varying according to special circumstances and constituted by the manner of "working" or "leading" of the idea through the surrounding experiences of which both the reality and the idea are part.

It is the particularity of these experiences that I have always had in mind when I have called the workings "practical," for only with particulars and concretes do we have practical relations. One ought thus to be able to define empirically what the truth-relation consists in in every instance, and one will probably find it different in most instances.

The ordinary conception makes it the same abstract thing in every possible instance. Direct verification by sensible presence is one kind of leading. Where no kind of verification is possible to us it seems to me that the question of our idea being true is irrelevant, except as meaning accord with some enveloping authority who has the verification which we are cut off from, and our accord with that observer has itself to be defined pragmatically. I imagine that these views are Schiller's.

Truly yours

Wm James

[May 24, 1908]
Dear Lady Ottoline,

It is needless to say that your friendliest of notes has gone to the right spot. "C'était cette voix du coeur qui seule au coeur arrive"—and if the U.S.A. had been the scene, and you the visitors, it is the sort of letter you would have received first from us. We should not so modestly have waited! How good the personal sympathies are that overleap the national boundaries and local differences. Those days at Newington House have been the climax of our visit, and the family relation, so to speak, with so many good people, you and your husband *imprimis*, have meant a real enlargement of our moral horizon.

Alice has sent for one of Prentice Mulford's volumes as a specimen, and perhaps will have the pleasure of laying it in your hands later. I have ordered Jane Addam's two volumes to be sent to Miss Sands, and she will doubtless make them over to you duly.

We were well advised in coming to this Cotswold region. The villages and towns, the streams and views, are endlessly perfect in their way and interesting. A country in equilibrium with itself, and to Yankee eyes, fabulously antique & finished.

We shall certainly let you know, and call at Bedford Square when in London—unfortunately I can't set dates yet—and either on this continent or ours keep you in sight. As "advanced sociologists" Mr. Morrell and yourself must make the obligatory American tour some day,
and then see the inside of our humble abode, where no one will ever have been more welcome.

Believe me, dear Lady Ottoline, with warmest regards "to both from both," yours and Mr. Morrell's most sincerely,

Wm James

· To F. C. S. Schiller ·

Bibury (Glos.)
June 15, 1908

Dear Schiller,

Your letter, inclosing Knox's (wh. I return) is very welcome. It is funny that the intense and rapid fire logician Knox should be standing up for "psychology" against me the slow witted logical waddler. I think I see his main point, but I think it is too fine for this rough world and I wish he could be drafted off to silence Joseph who, at Mrs. Warren's last dinner, seemed to need a kind of correction which my addled brain was in no condition to apply on that occasion. As things now appear to stand between you and Knox on the one hand and myself on the other, I think that the whole ground is strategically covered as it would not be, if either your statements or mine were the only ones used by our party. We and our critics are all alike born into a mental world which has long since evolved the notion that statements are about something and that to be 'true' of that something, they must in some sense "agree" with it. You start with the
psychological subject claiming a statement of his to be 'true' and verifying it by working towards conclusions which lead him to say 'these are the something or the proximate marks of agreement with the something, wh. my statement meant'. I start with the something (calling it 'reality') and ask what makes the statement 'true' of it, replying by instancing your verifying workings, as constituting the agreement in concreto. We both deal with an identical universe, given us by common sense and traverse it in opposite directions. We are both abstractionists in starting with one pole only and filling in the rest. Our critics don't demur to the filling in as such, they only call it a psychological concomitant of the truth relation and deny that in your statement it leads to any possible reality or belief on your part in a reality. They fail to see that what 'satisfies' in the workings is just that belief and that, apart from what our beliefs postulate, reality there is none for either pragmatist or absolutist. But because I start by postulating the reality which you only end by verifying, they are willing to say that I talk sense (at least some of them are!) but that you mean something different. From my point it is easier to make them see that the notion of agreement may after all mean nothing but the concrete workings, especially if you gladly admit (as I do, but you seem less willing to make the admission explicit) that the workings may be purely 'theoretical', in the sense of having other truths as their termini, or as terminating in the direct inspection of such 'eternal' realities as triangles and numbers and the relations of likeness and difference among them. Thus, it seems to me, is the whole arena of 'truth' successfully and exhaustively occupied and in the way that minimizes opposition. But I'm in such a 'dopy' and confused state cerebrally, being only in my 4th. day of relaxation after the steady tension of the last few months, that I can't tell whether I write anything intelligible.
Our last 4 days at Oxford were spent at Miss Sand's, at Newington House, Wallingford, a beautiful place and humanly very delightful from the unworldly atmosphere and the presence of some very interesting people, high bred and well bred M P's who were radicals, etc.

This country is exquisitely lovely, tho’ cold and sunless from the American point of view. We stay till Friday morn. and then go to Durham via York. On the 24th. to London for a few days. Address Coutts & Co., 440 Strand

Ever thine,

W. J. 16

To Horace Meyer Kallen

Bibury (Glos.)
June 16th. 08

You have sent a plenteous shower of notes, to wh. I make this scant return. Glad Santayana likes your thesis—I shan’t read it till at Rye, possibly a month hence. The Oxford tutors woke up during the last week of my stay, and I heard a good deal of philosophy discussed, but my own brain was too confused and addled to play any effective part. It is a uniquely precious bit of furniture in the world’s showroom, but the world is not all showroom, and I doubt whether other places ought to emulate Oxford, except in this detail or that. Any how, they could never catch up if they did! The social whirl is over—both its instruction & its fatigue, and the summer
opens restfully in the country. But little sunshine! Bad for an American skin. Love to all "inquiring friends."

Yours,

W. J.

---

To F. C. S. Schiller

Bibury
June 17, 1908

Your letter is satisfactory tremenjusly. Your tactics are doubtless much the best ones for Oxford, where to smash the malevolent adversary is the thing required, mine the best for America, where to convert the perplexed truth-seekers is the problem. Let us each stick to his line! What I mean by calling your starting point an "abstraction" is that the "claim" of "truth" belongs to a universe of which the notion of a reality to be true about is also an integral member. You abstract vorläufig from it, altho' the content claimed and verified is only our statement of what it is.

W. J.
· To F. C. S. Schiller ·

Ullswater Hotel
Patterdale
July 6th, [08]

Just one line to report biography since we parted: 9 good days at Bibury (Glos); 2 at York, 3 1/2 at Durham (which was tremendously impressive) and where I found Jevons very simpatico, likewise the splendid old liberal minded octogenarian of a "Dean." Since then here in the lake district, where my nervous condition makes little progress owing to a virulent and pestilential "cold." Shall be at Garlant's Hotel, Suffolk St., from Thursday to Monday, when I go to Piddington for a few days. Thence to Rye. I dare say that you're already on the Continent. I don't think of "Truth" any more!

W. J.\textsuperscript{17}

· To Herbert George Wells ·

Lamb House
Rye
July 18th, [1908]

Cher et illustre maître,

Your hospitality is evidently genuine—not that I ever suspected it wasn't. Arriving here last night I find your note, bulging with Chesterton, whom my brother hasn't
yet seen, though he lives next door. I shall myself ad­
mire to see him (as we say in New England) if the chance
be allotted, but I shall probably see you first. My wife
unfortunately cannot, being for the next ten days with
some friends at Harrow; which makes me ask whether I
might not bring our daughter (aet. 20) instead, and ask
also whether from next Wednesday p. m. to the friday
morning would be a propitious and convenient time to
yourselves. Pray address me here, and believe me most
sincerely yours,

Wm James¹⁸

· To Herbert George Wells ·

Lamb House
Rye
July 25, 1908

My dear Wells,

This is to report our safe arrival home from our most
delightful visit, with which we have regaled our respec­
tive wife and mother, who got back yesterday afternoon
from her week at Harrow, making her wish she had been
“along.” To reward you for your hospitality I have caused
a copy to be made of a letter which the postmaster of Rye
gave my brother yesterday, as a specimen of the sort of
information which he is expected to supply to the popula­
tion of the Kingdom. It seems to me a precious document
in illustration of the phase you dwell on so much in our
present civilization—the survival of the habits and ges­
tures of something that once was strong, in microscopic
form. This lady goes through the form of requiring things on account of her innate gentility, and of shedding benefactions, tho she has nothing either to pay or to give. Dreadful person!

I am sorry to have to ask you to return the letter.

Peggy also sends her joyous regards, and I am, with the same to you all, including the ferocious redskins,

Very truly yours,

Wm James

P. S. It has occurred to me that if you should come and spend a couple of years in America, say in California, you’d get all sorts of nutritious lights on the way the future is being made. Think of it! Even one year might do.

· To F. C. S. Schiller ·

Lamb House
Rye
August 4, 1908

Dear Schiller,

I’ve been here for a week and feel much more like my natural self again. I shall stay for 10 days longer, wife and daughter being at present at Geneva. I suppose that you are also in Switzerland by this time and hope that you’re secouer-ing the dust of pupils and examination books. Would I had your vigor. I write now merely to say that I have just read the vol. of Essays in my “honor” in Henry
James's copy and that the excellence of its content makes the volume trebly honorific. Dewey's article seems to me uncommonly massive and weighty and I write mainly for the purpose of telling you not to fail to read it. The day will come when people will wonder how there could have been any different notion of truth held by anyone. So let's hammer away.

Yours as ever

W. J.19

· To James McKeen Cattell ·

Lamb House
Rye, Sussex
Aug. 5, 1908

Dear Cattell,

"The proudest moment of my life" was that in wh. you handed me the volume dedicated to my memory, but I am prouder still since reading it. Your copy was too handsome to travel, so I have only mastered the contents of it now, in my brother's copy, which Miller sent him. It's a masterly book, full of vigorously original thought, beautifully exprest. I've no doubt that it marks an epoch, or just the eve of an epoch, in American philosophy. I say the eve for one connecting touch is needed to make all that epistemology shoot together. Who will make the spark shoot?

I find your own contribution extremely suggestive. Along with my pages on inhibitions, etc in the 2nd vol. of
my Principles, with Münsterberg's "Actions Theorie," with W. McDougall's chapter on mental retention, with Bergson's general account of the brain's function, etc. it seems to me to force on us a general revision of the whole subject of "consciousness" in relation to brain activity. Difficult enough! You have certainly thrown in a lot of points of view to be taken account of.

I thank you, each and all, most heartily for the splendid volume.

Yours ever truly

Wm James

· To Arthur Oncken Lovejoy ·

Lamb House
Aug. 6, 1908

Dear Lovejoy,

I write to express my tremendous gratification over the Essays "in my honor," and to thank you for your share in their production. Owing to certain circumstances, I have only just got round to reading the volume, which seems to me masterly throughout, and almost to eventuate in a definitive epistemology. At any rate the essays on that subject bring one up to the very verge of a pragmatistic realism. Almost without exception too, they are excellently well-written. You and Adler on Kant are very strong. I didn't know how much of him had been anticipated in this country—Cudworth I knew about but not Collier. I doubt whether Kant knew either, he seems to
have read so little philosophy. A delightful old *crackle*
about his mind; but the only thing that ever seemed to me
to have any permanent value in his system was his argu­
ment for Idealism based on the antinomies, and now you
show that that was anticipated by an englishman:—hur­
rah! Of course Kant developed the idea more thoroly—
with his pun on gegeben & aufgegeben.

Did Lamont send you a card of inquiry of mine as to
who wrote the review of Duncan’s Spencer? It was you,
and a *most* masterly thing indeed! Are you a fixture at
Columbia, or are you going to Wisconsin?

Very truly yours

Wm James

---

Dear Schiller,

I got your letter from Dresden duly a few days ago and I
suppose that this will find you already arrived at Oxford.
I had heard nothing of the Heidelberg meeting and was
very glad to learn from you that Pragmatism was so much
to the fore. I had never supposed that the German mind
would even look at it. But that mind is shoreless and
measureless, so who knows? Are you sure that other
topics were, as you say, “nowhere” in comparison? Of
course where *you* were, Pragmatism was the fore-
ground, for you were the foreground. So I wait for im-
partial or inimical corroboration! I'm sorry that Bergson
didn't go. Strong is back in N. Y. Our own departure has
been postponed for a fortnight, till October sixth, on the
daughter's account, and we shall be at Oxford again for a
few days, at the end of next week probably, when I can
hear more of the Congress, and of the Truth generally
from you. I will therefore write no more now, but will
notify our day of coming and place of abode to you in
advance.

I am going to spend a night with James Ward tomor-
row—thence again to Rye. We had a very pleasant 2 and
1/2 weeks on the Continent, mainly Holland.

Yours as ever

W. J. 22

· To F. C. S. Schiller ·

Charing Cross Hotel
London
[October 5, 1908]

I had an exquisite evening and morning, so far as
weather and landscape went, at [William] McDougall's
and a very satisfactory talk—but I forget that I told you
that at the Station! Superb weather and landscape at
Torquay, too. No hope for Bergson at Oxford. He can't
go there this week, but wishes that you could notify him
when next you pass thru Paris. He will meet you any-
where. He is a marvel intellectually and a very easy
talker, I found him, but very shy and timid I think, with
bad nerves and habitual fear of their playing him tricks. Like *me*, du reste!

Yours

W. J.²³

---

*To Ralph Barton Perry* ·

95 Irving St.
Oct 27 '08

Dear Perry,

I am off again to Chocorua, sorry not to have seen you yet. I shall be back on Wednesday Nov 4th. at latest. I send to you the program of my lectures at Oxford, rather than send it to the office direct, for you may know some reason why one day or hour is better than another. They ought, I suppose, to be "open to the public," tho they are rather abstruse. Scheffer seems to block the way to Mondays & Fridays. I don't know when Kallen means to chip in. Any hour except 2.30 will suit me, and any day you may appoint, after Nov 4th.

I devoutly hope that you are *much* better, but hang all summer schools, say I! With greetings to the Missus,

Yours ever

W. J.²⁴
Dear Lady Ottoline,

Your extremely pleasant & friendly letter to my wife was duly received in the last days of September, and I volunteered to write you a word of reply and farewell. In the press of getting off it got postponed, & that bred farther postponement—until now! The envelop that covers this was as far as I got, on our homeward pitching steamer. You express the divine discontent of the reforming mind with many of your nation's things and ways. Were you to come to this country you would realize, as we have done since arriving, that the general environment spread out before a people's eyes has more to do with the value of their lot in life than the sociologists, with their exclusive attention to income & expense, old age provision and other immediately personal conditions, are apt to realize. And the tidiness, beauty, stimulating power, & general interestingness of this environment are to a great extent the work of very rich or powerful men with ambitious plans of their own, executed by the toil of others. In this country of small peasant proprietors, the only adjective that the face of nature brings to one's lips is 'scurvy'. The most unnatural mixture of rawness and decay, perfectly shocking after the stoutness, roundness, tidiness, and endless feast for the eyes of all the English landscape I was in this summer. England has done things well, some of which some of us are at most hoping that we may some day do! Ah me! One oughtn't to be torn both eastward and westward in this heartbreaking way. Please give my warm
regards to your husband. Those three days at Miss Sands' were an oasis in the desert of life, and the best thing in them was making your acquaintance. My wife is in Cambridge. I have been here since Oct 17 when we landed.

Believe me, dear Lady Ottoline, with sincere affection, yours,

Wm James

---

To James McKeen Cattell

Silver Lake, N. H.
Oct 30. [1908]

Dear Cattell,

After a day devoted to heavy scientific papers on evolution, the three evening speeches ought to be short, the shorter the better. You may put me down for a maximum of 10 minutes. God help us all!

I was much struck by Simon Patten's recent remarks apropos of pensioning professors, etc. It seems to me that the concept of improving environment is one of great utility. "Scurvy, scurvy, scurvy!" is the one adjective that has risen to my lips at the sight of our American environment after my five months spent mainly in rural England, where the poorest farm laborer has spread-out permanently before his eyes the environment of tidiness and beauty and "interestingness" which the American millionaire has to spend thousands of dollars to go & see.

Woodworth writes me that you are taking your sab-
batical year. Prithee where? & how? This invitation to me doesn't look much like it.

I hope that you are all well at Garrison. With best regards, I am always,

truly yours,

Wm James

· To John Shaw Billings ·

Cambridge
Nov. 7. 08

Dear Dr. Billings,

I am just back from 6 months in Europe with a mountain of arrears to attend to, and consequently can't go to the National Academy meeting at Baltimore. Count me absent, therefore, from the Anthropological committee's deliberations.

Truly yours,

Wm James
To James McKeen Cattell

95 Irving St.
Cambridge
Nov 25. 08

Dear Cattell,

I accepted your invitation to make an after dinner speech on Darwin the other day as the bird accepts that of the “fascinating” serpent to fall into his jaws. I was just back from Europe, and disposing of my accumulated mail with lightning speed; I knew your diabolical perseverance and ultimate success (also I felt grateful for your part in the memorial volume), so I just said yes as the coon came down. But I’ve been repenting of it ever since, for I haven’t found a single word to say about Darwin, and the thought of the whole thing has become an obsession. Last night I went to another dinner where I had to make a speech about some one else, and the whole kind of thing disagrees with me so profoundly, morally and intellectually as well as physically, that I am writing to Howard that I am not to be at the meeting, and that he must look to inviting someone else.

More and more I perceive that big crowds are not my proper element. There are lots of men who like it, so why should I feel any duty. Therefore, dear old Cattell, say to me “absolvo te” and look among the names in your American Men of Science for some one more worthy than yours always truly

Wm James

Wm James
To John Shaw Billings

95 Irving St.
Cambridge, Mass.
Dec. 19. 08

Dear Dr. Billings,

Replying to yours of the 12th (after a delay of which I am ashamed) I concur with the criticism of Dr. Minot’s suggestion. Biology & medicine are the best partners.

I also think that “anthropology” covers too much ground (unless as a legal pretext for certain otherwise excentric nominations) and that the proposed 3 subdivisions are a logical improvement.

As for the names, Dewey is one of the 2 first philosophers whom we have, the other being Royce. Bowditch is too much of an amateur gentleman. Fewkes has work’t hard, but I don’t know whether his general power of mind is up to standard. I doubt it, but haven’t followed his career at all of late.

Sincerely yours,

Wm James

Unofficial P. S.! I think seriously of resigning from the Academy. I appreciate the distinction of being a member, but my use for it ends there, and my only relations with it till I die will probably be in the line of helping to peddle out the distinction to other people. But isn’t that rather childish, and can man live by distinctions alone? Moreover, if I resign now I shall do one human being a concrete service—Royce namely who if I remain will in all human probability have the onerous task of writing
my *éloge funebre*. I really don’t see (with so many other organs of publication provided) what function except that of drawing a social line between the “ins” and the “outs” the National Academy subserves. I don’t suppose that any member has resigned yet, but I suppose that one *can* resign, if so perversely impelled.

Very sincerely yours,

Wm James²⁷