

The Scientific Relationship of Albert Einstein  
and Mileva Maric

John Stachel

Paper prepared for the Symposium on "Creative  
Couples and Gender Complementarity: Cross-dis-  
ciplinary Perspectives," at the 1991 Annual  
Meeting of the AAAS, Washington, D.C., 15 Feb-  
uary, 1991.

I rise with some diffidence to speak on the announced topic of the scientific ~~collaboration~~<sup>relationship</sup> between Einstein and Marić at a symposium on Creative Couples and Gender Complementarity, for I fear that the title and setting promise something that I cannot deliver. There has been a great deal of publicity recently about the role of Mileva Marić, Albert Einstein's first wife, in the scientific work associated with his name, but what I have to report on this subject is almost entirely negative: the absence of any serious evidence for such a role-- indeed, the lack of such evidence for any intellectually creative work by Marić.

The best definition of the concept of creativity that I know is that of Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi. He begins by asking not what, but where is creativity. "All of the definitions ... of which I am aware assume that the phenomenon exists ... either inside the person or in the work produced," but "after studying creativity for almost a quarter of a century, I have come to the reluctant conclusion that this is not the case. We cannot study creativity by isolating individuals and their works from the social and historical milieu in which their actions are carried out. This is because what we call creative is never the result of individual action alone; it is the product of three main shaping forces: a set of social institutions or field, that selects from the variations produced by in-

dividuals those that are worth preserving; a stable cultural domain that will preserve and transmit the selected new ideas or forms to the following generations; and finally the individual, who brings about some change in the domain, a change that the field will consider to be creative."<sup>1</sup>

By its very nature, then, creativity is a public activity, which must be distinguished from talent. A talented individual who produces some artifact(s), does not thereby become part of a creative process. Such a process always involves the positive appraisal of such artifacts by the appropriate audience at some point. More than one person may participate in the production of the artifacts, and it is by no means automatically guaranteed that the appropriate individuals will receive recognition for their role.

In a somewhat caricatured nutshell, creativity involves talented individuals who produce some artifacts that are integrated into some cultural domain by the socially accepted arbiters of that field. The public fate of an artifact determines whether its production is part of a creative process.

By this definition, the body of work associated with the name of Albert Einstein started to play a creative role/during the <sup>in the domain of physics</sup> second half of the first decade of this century-- certainly not before 1905. There is no body of work in physics associated with the name of Mileva Marić: no articles signed by her; no experiments, devices or effects associated with her name; no body of correspondence with other physicists. Thus, any claim for her ~~role~~ <sup>place</sup> in physics must be based upon an evaluation of her role in the production of the body of work associated with Einstein's name.

I certainly don't rule out a priori the possibility that Marić

did make a major contribution to this work during the period when she and Einstein lived together. There ~~certainly~~ have been cases where women have been forced to present their work in the name of some man. As is well known, Colette was literally forced by her husband to publish her early novels under his name. But, in Collette's case, there is objective evidence to make the case for Collette: manuscripts, correspondence, her later work after her separation from Willy, etc. The <sup>point</sup> ~~problem~~ is that there is no similar evidence for the claims that have been made in Marić's name.

This circumstance creates a problem for such claims, <sup>which</sup> ~~that~~ we can see by contrasting the Einstein-Marić couple with two other couples-- both contemporaries of Einstein-Marić-- Pierre Curie and Marie Sklodowska, and Paul Ehrenfest and Tatiana Afanasieva. In both cases, there is <sup>objective</sup> evidence for the role of each of the partners in their collaborative work in physics. Moreover, in both cases, the husband died well before the wife, who continued to pursue a public scientific career until her own death. In these cases, whatever problems may exist in the assessment of the nature of the collaborative effort and the <sup>of each partner</sup> ~~their~~ respective roles in the production of their jointly-signed works-- the sort of problems that this symposium is meant to address-- there is no problem <sup>in</sup> ~~of~~ proving the very existence of the collaboration.

In the case of Marić and Einstein, there was no early death; but there was a separation in 1914. Marić lived thirty-four years after this separation. Any analysis of her role in the production of the works produced in Einstein's name must be compatible with the facts of her later complete scientific silence and his continued scientific productivity.

Let me now sketch some information about Marić and the Einstein-

relationship up to 1914. (As far as I know, no one has suggested any scientific collaboration after their separation.)

Marić was born in 1875 of Serbian parentage in the Voivodina, a region that was then part of the Kingdom of Hungary, itself part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Her father was a middle-level official in the Hungarian bureaucracy, ~~and~~ <sup>and the family</sup> was rather well-to-do financially. Her secondary education was quite unusual for a girl of that time and place; it included two years as a private pupil at an all-male Gymnasium (academic secondary school) in Serbia. In 1894, she entered a secondary school for women in Zürich, Switzerland, from which she graduated in 1896. After a semester studying medicine at the University of Zürich, she was admitted to the Swiss Federal Polytechnical School-- or Poly-- also in Zürich, in the fall of 1896. Both she and Einstein, who entered the Poly at the same time, ~~was~~ <sup>to study physics in</sup> enrolled in Section VIA, for the training of teachers of physics and mathematics.

After the French universities, the University of Zürich was the first in Europe to admit women. The Poly ~~had~~ followed suit in 1876, and by 1894 a woman had graduated from Section VIA. Most of the women who entered Swiss universities during the nineteenth century were non-Swiss, and a large proportion of them were from Slavic <sup>backgrounds</sup> ~~countries~~. Thus, while Marić was certainly unusual in the academic career that led her to the Poly, she was not unique.<sup>2</sup>

While at the Poly, Marić and Einstein took more-or-less the same required courses, but rather different electives. She dropped out of the Poly for a term, during which she attended lectures at Heidelberg; so she took and passed the intermediate examinations a term later than he did. They both spent a great deal of their time in Professor Weber's physics laboratory; ~~his~~ <sup>there</sup> work/led both of them

to prepare their experimental diploma theses under his supervision.

By the end of their studies, the two had become very closely attached, spending most of their time together. They undertook joint independent study of the classic works in theoretical physics to supplement the meager offerings of the Poly in this area. They had reached a firm decision to marry, in spite of the strenuous opposition of Einstein's parents.

Both took the final examinations in 1900. Since they were the only two students of physics in Section VIA that year, there is no basis for comparison of their grades <sup>with anyone's</sup> ~~except~~ ~~with~~ each other's. He had an average of 4.9 out of six and was passed. She had an average of 4.0 and was failed. Marić registered again at the Poly the following year, in the hope of passing the examinations and continuing on to a doctoral degree. Einstein was unable to get an academic post at ~~any~~ <sup>the</sup> university, or even at the secondary-school level. He lived from hand to mouth <sup>working</sup> at a series of temporary jobs until he got <sup>a</sup> low-level position as a patent examiner at the Swiss Patent Office <sup>in Berne</sup> in 1902. During this difficult period <sup>for both,</sup> in 1901, Marić became pregnant, failed the final examinations a second time, and <sup>returned</sup> ~~went home~~ to her parents <sup>home</sup> to give birth. The ultimate fate of their baby-- a girl-- is not known. Einstein and Marić were finally married in 1903, but despite his earlier-expressed intention to have the baby join them after their marriage, she never did. The couple had two other children-- both boys-- during their marriage. <sup>In spite of her earlier intentions,</sup> Marić never worked outside of the home during <sup>their marriage.</sup> ~~these years~~. Einstein remained at the Patent Office until 1909 when, as a result of his growing reputation in physics, he was offered an Associate Professorship at the University of Zürich. ~~Thereafter,~~ His academic rise was rapid: in 1911 he became a full Professor at the German University in Prague; in 1912 he was called back to the Poly; and in 1914

he moved to Berlin, where he became a member of the prestigious Prussian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Physics, and a Professor at the University of Berlin.

Marić and the two boys followed him on each of these moves. . . Something seems to have gone wrong with the marriage fairly early. As Einstein's prestige increased, the distance between the pair grew. There were overt signs of this rift by 1909, and by 1912 Einstein was involved with his cousin Elsa, who later became his second wife, ~~and was~~ then living in Berlin. Shortly after the move to Berlin, Marić returned to Zurich with the children, where she continued to ~~reside~~<sup>live</sup> until her death in 1946.

It seems clear that, ~~at some point~~, Einstein not only cooled emotionally, but also ceased to communicate with Marić about his ideas in physics. Just what was the relation, if any, between the intellectual and the emotional distancing, and when each occurred, are extremely difficult questions to discuss on the basis of the evidence that we currently have, and I shall not ~~try to~~ speculate about these matters here.

With this all-too-brief background/ I now turn to the question of evidence that <sup>might</sup> bear on Marić's role in the scientific work associated with Einstein's name. The most significant evidence would be contemporary documents-- i.e., from the period 1896-1914-- bearing on this question. Practically the only evidence of this nature that still exists are ~~some~~ letters exchanged between Marić and Einstein, and some that she sent to a friend. ~~Unfortunately,~~ The most significant portion of this correspondence consists of fifty-one letters exchanged before their marriage, i.e., between 1897 and 1902. ~~Unfortunately,~~ ~~because~~ these letters <sup>all</sup> antedate the <sup>onset of the</sup> ~~period of the~~ creative ~~process~~ associated with Einstein's name,

which began around 1905.) These letters-- 41 by Einstein, 10 by Marić-- at first sight seem to reveal a great deal about their collaboration during this early period. Several times, Einstein writes of "our work" on two problems: a theory of molecular forces that formed the subject of the first two papers published in his name, in 1901 and 1902; and on the problem of "relative motion," a <sup>topic</sup> ~~problem~~ that formed part of the <sup>problem</sup> ~~complex of problems~~ that ~~ultimately~~ led in 1905 to what is now called the special theory of relativity. But a closer reading of the letters raises a number of questions about <sup>the ~~total~~</sup> ~~a simple~~ interpretation of Einstein's comments. The only help that Einstein asks <sup>for</sup> from Marić in these letters is to get him certain books, and to look up certain data <sup>with him</sup> in tables. Whenever he speaks of "our work," he does not add any information that could make clear <sup>why he refers to it as</sup> ~~what makes it~~ theirs, as opposed to his. Whenever he <sup>only discussed</sup> ~~is specific~~ in ~~describing~~ some new idea or experimental proposal, he uses the first person singular pronouns: "I," "my," "mine," etc.

The letters make it quite clear that Einstein was emotionally quite dependent on Marić at the beginning of their relationship; he even <sup>go</sup> ~~commenting~~ on how strange and difficult he found it to study when they were apart. (<sup>Obviously,</sup> ~~They only corresponded during their school years during holiday~~ periods when they were separated.) Judging from the letters, something happened in their relationship towards the end of 1900 that seems to have led to a gradual reversal of ~~their~~ roles. Marić became more and more emotionally dependent on him, especially after she became pregnant in 1901.<sup>3</sup> ~~Several of~~ Einstein's most striking comments about "our work" occur, not in the context of his <sup>many detailed</sup> ~~numerous~~ discussions of physics, but in the context of his repeated assurances of love and devotion.

Unfortunately, none of Marić's surviving letters contain any

response to the comments on physics in his letters; indeed, they contain very few comments on physics at all. These are confined to a <sup>account of</sup> ~~comment~~ of a lecture she attended, comments on ~~the~~ examinations she must take, etc., none of which give any insight into novel contributions that she might have made <sup>to their discussions.</sup> There is no reference to the problem of relative motion in her letters. In a letter to a friend, she speaks of the ~~first~~ paper on the theory of molecular forces as having been written by Einstein, and praises his work-- excessively by <sup>the</sup> standards of physics, if not <sup>by those</sup> of love. In another letter to this friend, she <sup>mentions</sup> ~~writes about~~ a dissertation that Einstein wrote on the application of this theory to gases-- a work that was submitted <sup>in 1901</sup> to the University of Zürich by Einstein, but rejected for still-obscure reasons.

In the light of this evidence, the Editors of Volume One of the Einstein Papers, including myself, drew the following conclusion. "Although the possibility that she played a more significant part cannot be excluded, the available evidence suggests that her role was that of a sounding board for Einstein's ideas, a role also played on occasion by his friends Michele Besso and Conrad Habicht."<sup>4</sup> Einstein seems to have <sup>felt the</sup> ~~needed~~ to discuss his ideas with others as a part of the <sup>development</sup> ~~of his theories~~, <sup>and</sup> ~~so we meant~~ no disparagement <sup>is implied</sup> by the use of the term "sounding board." But let us suppose that this interpretation of Maric's role is quite wrong, and that she made a much greater contribution to the <sup>three</sup> papers published in his name <sup>by the end of</sup> ~~through~~ 1902. These works are quite minor contributions to physics-- the first two were explicitly disavowed by Einstein a few years later, when he refused to send copies to a ~~foreign~~ physicist who had requested all of his earlier papers. They belong to the pre-creative period, the threshold of Einstein's public career,

no Besso's story about Maric

and derive almost all of their interest retrospectively, in the light of later glories. They form part of his <sup>appearance</sup> ~~partnership~~ in physics, and ~~are~~ not creative contributions to ~~physics~~ <sup>the field</sup>. So giving Maric the benefit of every doubt would <sup>still</sup> not establish a strong claim for her creative role.

What we would really like to know is what happened during the next period, culminating in 1905, when four ground-breaking papers were published bearing Einstein's name. But this is just the period about which we have the least evidence. ~~Their~~ Marriage in January 1903 effectively cut off their correspondence just when we would most like to have it. The only references to Maric in Einstein's letters to third persons describe what good care she is taking of him as a Hausfrau (my word not his); the only references to him in her letters describe the brilliant things he is doing. (There are very few <sup>said</sup> ~~of these~~ <sup>said</sup> ~~references~~.) ~~and~~ There is no other contemporary documentary evidence. Any attempt to use Einstein earlier reference to "our work" on the problem of relative motion in 1901 to support a claim for Maric's role in production of the 1905 special relativity paper flies in the face of at least one major obstacle: everything we know about the development of that theory suggests that the crucial developments took place much later, probably in 1904-1905.

Recently, the claim has been made that ~~such~~ <sup>supporting such a vote</sup> documentary evidence was seen by the Russian physicist Abraham Joffe. He is said to have written that he saw the manuscripts of three of the 1905 papers, including the one on special relativity, and that they were signed "Einstein-Maric," indicating that she was originally listed as a co-author. There is no time to go into details (I will be glad to do so if requested), but this story constitutes a glaring

~~example of the~~ misrepresentation of documents. Joffe made no such claim in any of his writings. The source of this story is the only biography of Marić, written by a Yugoslav scholar, Desanka Trbuhovic-Gjuric,<sup>5</sup> to which I shall refer shortly.

In the time available I cannot give a detailed analysis of this and other claims recently put forward about Marić's role in the production of the works signed by Einstein. This ~~will~~ gives an unintendedly dogmatic tone to my comments, so let me just emphasize here that my views-- which ~~are~~ <sup>have been</sup> and will be expounded at greater length elsewhere-- ~~have been~~ and continue to be corrigible in the light of new evidence, as and when it turns up. Here, as so often in life, one must proceed to make provisional judgements on the basis of the evidence at hand; while hoping-- and searching-- for additional evidence that may confirm, but may well amend or even reverse one's current best judgement.

Aside from the small amount of contemporary documentation I have discussed, almost all of the evidence cited recently in support of the claims made for Marić are drawn from the Trbuhović-Gjuric biography. The author certainly made an important contribution by unearthing and publishing a number of documents about Marić's life. She also collected and ~~uncritically~~ recounted a number of anecdotes <sup>about</sup> and recollections of Marić and Einstein by ~~family members,~~ <sup>relatives of Marić,</sup> neighbors, friends, etc. in Yugoslavia. Some of this material is interesting, some of it is obvious nonsense, some ~~of~~ <sup>parts of the material</sup> contradict other parts-- the problem is that it is <sup>all</sup> repeated uncritically, with a certain tendentiousness: to stake out a larger role ~~for~~ Marić in Einstein's life and work. Now it is certainly true that the treatment of Marić in the existing biographies of Einstein is in need of drastic revision, and I hope to contribute something towards such a

reevaluation. But what the book offers ~~us~~ is not critically evaluated evidence, but vague claims that are impossible to substantiate. For example, Einstein is said to have told Mileva's father: "Everything that I have created and attained I owe to Mileva. She is my genial inspiration, my guardian angel against mistakes in life and even more in science. Without ~~her~~ her I would never have begun my work nor finished it" (p. 76). Even if entirely accurate, such a statement would offer us little concrete evidence of anything but Einstein's ability to <sup>pay</sup> ~~make~~ rather <sup>and conventional</sup> ~~state~~ tributes to his beloved. But <sup>Maria</sup> ~~it~~ is attributed <sup>to the statement</sup> to a journalist who had an interview in 1929 with a close friend of Maric's. Thus the quote is at <sup>fourth</sup> ~~third~~ hand from <sup>Einstein</sup> ~~Maric's~~ father (<sup>fifth</sup> ~~fourth~~, if you count Truhović-Gjurić). The general tenor of Truhović-Gjurić's approach ~~to such questions~~ is illustrated by the following <sup>1905</sup> quotation from her discussion of the/special theory of relativity: "We cannot help being proud that a great Serbian woman, Mileva Maric participated in its origin and preparation. Her spirit lives in its words. The simplicity of the equations almost undoubtedly indicates her style, which suited her equally in mathematics and in life. Her path was always free of unnecessary complications and pathos" (p. 77).

Einstein did thank someone for help on ~~this~~ paper, not Maric, but Michele Besso, ~~who~~ mentioned earlier as one of Einstein's sounding boards in the ~~the~~ early years. The extensive correspondence between Besso and Einstein has been published, and ~~it~~ shows that they continued to discuss physics, among many other topics, over the fifty years of this correspondence. Yet no one has claimed a creative role for Besso in the work on the special theory of relativity, <sup>nor should they on the basis of the evidence</sup> I think one should be <sup>very</sup> ~~very~~ cautious about claiming such a role for Maric on the available evidence. <sup>similarity</sup>

During the years between 1907 and 1914, Einstein wrote joint papers with four other physicists. Yet he never authored a joint paper with Marić, nor acknowledged her help in any paper. What are we to make of this? If we really believe that she made major contributions to the work published in his name, we cannot escape the conclusion that he was a plagiarist. Yet there is no evidence that he ~~ever~~<sup>otherwise</sup> failed to acknowledge ~~help from~~<sup>such</sup> others; rather, he had a reputation for being rather generous in this respect. Then, there is the problem of <sup>explaining</sup> the period after their separation, during which he published over 200 scientific articles and she published nothing. I think one should be very cautious and demand a lot more evidence than has yet been offered before convicting Einstein of plagiarism.

There are many interesting questions raised by the Einstein-Marić story, which call for further study. At the outset of their relationship, both of them intended to pursue careers in physics. He expressed contempt for the traditional "philistine" values<sup>6</sup> in marriage, and a determination to continue ~~their~~ joint <sup>work</sup> ~~study~~ <sup>in</sup> physics after their union. Serious obstacles lay in both their paths. Marić failed to graduate from the Poly. Einstein failed to find any sort of academic position after graduation, and was overjoyed two years later to get a minor job as a patent examiner, where he worked for the next seven years. The violent opposition of Einstein's parents to their relationship troubled them constantly. Marić's pregnancy, the ensuing separation for about a year, the secret birth, and the fate of the child-- whatever that fate may have been-- must certainly had been devastating events for Marić, and not easy ones for Einstein to bear. Yet they did finally marry, and Einstein was ~~able~~<sup>ultimately able</sup> ~~finally~~ to pursue a triumphant career in

physics. Some of the interesting questions to me are: Why did Marić never attempt to resume her career in physics? Why did their marriage, whatever its bohemian aspects, fail to avoid the "philistine" traps of stereotyped sex roles; indeed, why did it fail altogether, ending with the typically "philistine" husband's affair with another woman? Why was there no collaboration between Einstein and Marić that resulted in joint publications?

I don't think any of these questions have easy answers. One could speculate about many factors/<sup>that might have</sup> contributions to these ~~many~~ failures, but ~~there is not time to do so here.~~ But I do not feel that a real contribution to the discussion of these questions is made by putting forward unsubstantiated claims for the extent of Marić's talents or her role in the production of Einstein's major works, coupled with facile references to his male chauvinism. Einstein was certainly no plaster saint, and those who think he was are bound to be disillusioned by a serious examination of <sup>such</sup> ~~these~~ questions. But it should be possible to do justice to Marić without making a monster <sup>out</sup> of Einstein.

1. See Miklos. Csikszentmihalyi, "Society, culture, and person: a systems view of creativity." In "The nature of creativity: contemporary psychological perspectives," Robert J. Sternberg, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (1988), pp. 325-339.
2. For information about the early years when women were first admitted to the University of Zürich and the Poly, see Else Forrer-Gutknecht, "Universität Zürich/Eigenössische Technische Hochschule," in Die Frauenstudium and der Schweizer Hochschulen, issued by The Swiss Association of University Women. Zürich: Rascher & Cie. (1928), pp. 19-87.
3. I am indebted to Professor Françoise Balibar of the University of Paris for this observation.
4. The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein. Vol. 1. The Early Years. John Stachel et al, eds. Princeton: Princeton University' Press (1987). "Introduction to Volume 1," pp.xxxv-xli.
5. Desanka Trbuhovic-Gjuric, Im Schatten Albert Einsteins/ Das tragische Leben der Mileva Einstein-Maric. Bern/Stuttgart: Verlag Paul Haupt (1983).
6. "Philistine" was Einstein's favorite pejorative word in his early years. See Vol. 1 of the Collected Papers, passim, for numerous examples.

## QUOTATIONS FOR STACHEL PAPER

"... what we call creative is never the result of individual action alone; it is the product of three main shaping forces: a set of social institutions or field, that selects from the variations produced by individuals those that are worth preserving; a stable cultural domain that will preserve and transmit the selected new ideas or forms to the following generations; and finally the individual, who brings about some change in the domain, a change that the field will consider to be creative."

Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, "Society, culture and person: a systems view of creativity," in The Nature of Creativity, Robert J. Sternberg, ed. (Cambridge University Press).

"The outstanding Russian physicist Abarham F. Joffe (1880-1960), director of the Applied Physics Institute, later the Institute for Semiconductors in the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, called attention to the fact in his "Remembrances of Albert Einstein" that Einstein's three epoch making articles of 1905 were marked in the original "Einstein-Maric." Joffe as an assistant to Röntgen, who belonged to the board of trustees of the Annalen, had seen the originals that the editor had forwarded for review. To this work Röntgen pulled in his summa cum laude student Joffe who had the opportunity thereby to see the manuscripts that are no longer available today."

Desanka Trbuhovic-Gjuric, Im Schatten Albert Einsteins: Das tragische Leben der Mileva Einstein-Maric (Paul Haupt 1988), p. 97. Translation from Evan Harris Walker, "Ms Einstein."

"For physicists then, particularly for those of my generation, contemporaries of Einstein, the appearance of Einstein upon the scientific stage is unforgettable. In 1905, in the Annalen der Physik, there appeared three articles, which initiated the three most current directions of twentieth century physics. These were the theory of Brownian motion, the photon theory of light, and the theory of relativity. Their author was a hitherto unknown functionary of the Patent Office in Bern, Einstein-Marity (Marity- the family name of his wife, which according to Swiss custom is added to the husband's family name).

Abraham Joffe, "In memory of Albert Einstein," in Uspekhi Fizicheskich Nauk, vol 57, 1955, p. 187.

"The results on capillarity that I recently discovered in Zurich seem, in spite of their simplicity, to be completely new. When we get to Zurich, let's try to collect empirical data on the question with the help of Kleiner (Professor of Physics at the University of Zurich- JS). If a law of nature results, then we'll send it to Wiedemann's Annals (AE to MM, 3 October 1900, Vol, 1, p. 267).

"Albert has written a paper on physics that will soon prob-

be published in the Annals of Physics. You can picture to yourself how proud I am of my dear treasure. It is in fact no every-day piece of work, but very significant, on the theory of fluids. We have sent it privately to Boltzmann, and really would like to know what he thinks of it, we hope that he will write us."

(MM to Helene Savic, 20 December 1900. Vol. 1, p. 273)

"I have given him a copy of our paper." (AE to MM, May 1901, Vol. 1, p. 300)

"A good way of investigating how a body's relative motion with respect to the luminiferous ether affects the velocity of propagation of light in transparent bodies occurred to me in Aarau. I have also thought of a theory on this subject that seems to me to be very plausible. But enough of this! (AE to MM, 10 September 1899. Vol. 1, p. 230)

"I am writing to Professor Wien in Aachen about the work on the relative motion of the luminiferous ether with respect to ponderable matter..." (AE to MM, 28 September 1899, Vol. 1, pp. 233-234)

"On the investigation of the relative motion of matter with respect to the luminiferous ether, a considerably simpler method has occurred to me .... If only relentless fate would grant me the necessary time and peace!" (AE to Marcel Grossmann, 6 September 1901, Vol. 1, p. 316)

"I am now working very eagerly on an electrodynamics of moving bodies, which promises to become a capital paper. I wrote you that I doubted the correctness of the ideas about relative motion. But my doubts were based solely on a simple mathematical error. Now I believe in it more than ever!" (AE to MM, 17 December 1901. Vol. 1, pp. 325-326)

"I spent the whole afternoon with Kleiner in Zurich and explained my ideas on the electrodynamics of moving bodies to him. ... He advised me to publish my ideas about the electromagnetic theory of light for moving bodies together with the experimental method. He found the experimental method proposed by me to be the simplest and most appropriate one conceivable. ... I shall most certainly write the paper in the coming weeks." (AE to MM, 19 December 1901, Vol. 1, p. 328)

"I now want to buckle down to work and study what Lorentz and Drude have written on the electrodynamics of moving bodies. Ehrat must get the literature for me." (AE to MM, 28 December 1901, Vol. 1, p. 330)

"Right now Michele (Besso-JS) is staying in Trieste at his parents with his wife and child and only returns here in about 10 days. You need have no fear that I will say a word to him or anyone else about you. You are and will remain a holy shrine to me, into which no one may enter; I also know that, of all people, you love me most deeply and understand me best. I also assure you that no one here either dares to or wants to say anything bad about you. How happy and proud I will be when the two of us together will have

brought our work on relative motion to a successful conclusion. When I look at other people, then I truly realize what you are!" (AE to MM, 27 March 1901. Vol. 1, p. 282)

"You must now continue with your investigation-- how proud I will be when quite probably I will have a little Ph. D. for my treasure, while I still remain a quite ordinary person." (AE to MM, 13 September 1900, Vol. 1, p.260)

"Don't worry about that position in Zagreb. ... If you don't get it, that position, but I really get the job in Bern, then I herewith appoint you my dear little investigator of nature." (AE to MM, 30 April 1901, Vo. 1, p. 294)

"when you are my dear little wife, we shall zealously work together scientifically, so that we don't become old philistines, right? My sister seemed so philistine to me. You must never become like that..." (AE to MM, 28 December 1901, Vol. 1, p. 330)

"Well now I'm an honorably married man, and lead a very nice, comfortable life with my wife. She takes care of everything exceptionally, cooks well and is always happy." (AE to Michele Besso, January 1903, Albert Einstein/Michele Besso Correspondance, ed. Pierre Speziali (Hermann, 1972), p. 3).

"I am, if possible, even more attached to my dear treasure than I already was in the Zurich days. He is my only companion and society and I am happiest when he is beside me." (MM to Helene Savic, 20 March 1903, unpublished)

References above to Vol. 1 are to The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein, vol. 1, The Early Years, 1879-1902, John Stachel et al, eds. (Princeton University Press, 1987)