1914–2014:
One Hundred Years of
Editing and Publishing Peirce

André De Tienne

The Commens Working Papers
Preprints, Research Reports & Scientific Communications

Edited by Mats Bergman, Sami Paavola & João Queiroz

Pub 140718-2023a
URL http://www.commens.org/papers/paper/de-tienne-andr%C3%A9-1914%E2%80%932014-one-hundred-years-editing-and-publishing-peirce
ISSN 2342-4532
License Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike
1914–2014: One Hundred Years of Editing and Publishing Peirce

André De Tienne
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2014 Peirce International Centennial Congress
Christmas 1914 (December 24–29).

Following an agreement with Juliette Peirce (1857-1934), Prof. James Haughton Woods (1864-1935), chair of the Harvard Department of Philosophy, in concert with Josiah Royce, sent Victor Lenzen (1890-1975) to Milford to pack Peirce’s manuscripts and books, and bring them back to Harvard—to Royce’s office.

24-year-old Victor spent 5 days packing the papers with Juliette’s help (not all of them: Juliette had not retrieved everything yet), and retained a lifelong fond memory of her. He couldn’t have known that 45 years later, he’d devote the rest of his life researching Charles and Juliette’s past more relentlessly and minutely than anyone ever did.
John T. Quick transported Lenzen and twenty-four cases of manuscripts and books (1,200) from Arisbe to Port Jervis on his sled, which was drawn by two powerful horses. He drove with such speed that Lenzen feared the horses might slip on the snow-covered road. But they arrived at the Erie R.R. Station without mishap and in time.

Momentous day

December 29, 1914

Arisbe, Milford, PA

Safe trip back to Harvard, Victor!
Take good care of Papa's papers!
Juliette Peirce

Port Jervis train station

John Quick waving goodbye to Lenzen at the train station

John T. Quick waving goodbye to Lenzen at the train station
Dear Mrs. Peirce,

Last night about a dozen of us gathered to welcome the first instalments of the precious manuscripts, which you had entrusted to Mr. Lenzen’s care. Professor Royce delighted us by pointing out how many sciences have been illumined by Mr. Peirce’s genius. And we began on the spot to plan for the publication of at least three volumes of Essays. It will take many years before all the treasures which you are about to put into our care can be made known to the world. But you may be certain that we are fully aware of the opportunity and of the great obligation upon us to take care that every fragment is treated with reverence and preserved for generations to come. (...)

[Addressing items that still remain in Juliette’s house:]

Also notebooks containing even a few words might be important aids to a thorough and skilful editing of the manuscripts.

The definitions in the Century Dictionary would be interesting and valuable to examine with a view to deciding whether they could be published or combined with other papers for publication.

In fact anything that Mr. Peirce has even written and the books which he most frequently used might be indispensable to a complete edition of his works. (...)

We shall all be proud of having been used by you as instruments in adding to the fame of Harvard by giving the creations of Mr. Peirce’s intellect to the world.
March 1915 – September 1916: Josiah Royce, the grandfather of Peirce scholarship and the first philosopher to understand Peirce’s “New List of Categories,” hired a graduate student, William Fergus Kernan, to be his assistant and set him to work on the Peirce papers in his crowded office. The goal was to “rearrange them, restore them to order, dust them off, read them,” and then to edit and publish several volumes.

Kernan spent more than a year sorting out the manuscripts, which had arrived in bewildering disorder. He collaborated with Royce on the latter’s commemoration of Peirce (published in the December 1916 issue of the Journal of Philosophy), adding to it a sample list of titles of major Peirce manuscripts.

Royce died in September 1916. James H. Woods had Kernan file and docket all the papers into 83 cases. Kernan drew up the first catalog of the Peirce papers based on the organization of those boxes.
C. S. Peirce Manuscripts.

as arranged and numbered by W. F. Kernan.

I. Logic of Continuity.
   Logic of Mathematics: an attempt to develop my categories from within.
   Habit
   Causation and force

II. Lectures on Pragmatism.

III. Lowell Lectures on Logic

IV. Lowell Lectures on Logic

V. Lowell Lectures on Logic.

VI. History of the usual divisions of the mind.
   Induction
   On the Association of Ideas.

VII. Minute Logic: Chapters 1 and 2.

VIII. Reality: fragmentary.
   Ethics: Chapter 4 of "Logic."

IX. Logic: Chapter 3 "Essence of Mathematics."

X. Multitude.
   Logic of quantity
   Habit
   History of Science.
   Multitude and Quantity.

XI. Training in Reason.
   The first rule of Reasoning
   Types of Reason

XII. The Aristotelian Syllogistic: Chapter 9 of "Logic."
   The Logic of Continuity: Chapter 14 of "Logic."

XIII. Practical Treatise on Theory of Reasoning.

XIV. Philosophy and the Conduct of Life.
   Napoleon.

XV. Chapter 4 of "Logic."
   Basis of Pragmatism.
   Fragments on Pragmatism.

XVI. That Categorical and Hypothetical Proposition are one in essence.
   Time is derivative
   Dialogue on Pragmatism.

LXX. Redraft of Lowell Lectures on Logic: Continued.
   Sketch of Pragmatism.

LXXI. Correspondence.

LXXII. Mathematical Fragments.

LXXIII. Chemistry Notes.
   Acetyle.
   Classification of the Sciences: second papers.

LXXIV. Graphs: fragmentary.
   Telepathy.

LXXV. Fragments on the History of Philosophy.
   Syntax.
   Mathematical Logic.
   Pastoral Auguries.
   What is number?
   Chemical curves.
   Berkeley.

LXXVI. Notation: Fragmentary.
   Definition de la philosophie.
   Mackinnon
   The Doctrine of Chances.

LXXVII. Phaneroscopy: fragmentary.

LXXVIII. Fragments on Fundt.
   Galton's Law.
   Gosse.

LXXIX. Mathematical Papers.

LXXX. Mathematical Papers.

LXXXI. Mathematical Papers.

LXX XII. Lecture to Adirondack Summer School.
   Treatise on Vulgar Arithmetic.
Following his return from England, Victor Lenzen re-cataloged Kernan’s 83 boxes in December 1917, adding more details, including evaluations of the value or condition of documents. He moved back to California and became Assistant in Physics at UC Berkeley in August 1918.
James Woods’s efforts to find an editor for Peirce’s writings were relentless, from 1916 to 1925. Whom did he ask? Pretty much anyone the Department of Philosophy contemplated hiring. This included the following cast of prestigious prospects:

• **Bertrand Russell**, whom Woods invited on 23 September 1916, barely nine days after Royce’s death, to come back to Harvard to teach a seminar on Peirce and to edit two or three volumes of Peirce's writings, with the assistance of **Henry M. Sheffer** who would be devoting most of his time to the details. But as a result of Russell’s anti-war activities and consequent imprisonment, a visa was denied and he was unable to accept the offer. As to **Sheffer**, it is unclear whether he had any hand at any point in the preparation of the *Collected Papers* several years later, but he did travel at some point to Milford and brought back a few artifacts to Harvard, including Peirce’s microscopes (as C. I. Lewis told Lenzen —Lenzen to Max Fisch, 19 February 1960).

• **Victor Lenzen** himself, whom Woods asked in 1917-18 to assume the editorial task. “It is a harsh thing to say, but precisely the truth, that I spurned the invitation. This may seem incredible to a historian, but among other things, the Harvard philosophical method of education did not encourage historical work in that sense” (Lenzen to MHF, 7 July 1960).

• Lenzen indicates that Woods also asked **Marvin Farber** in 1925. Farber declined, presumably because of his association with Husserl.
• Woods then wrote to Morris Cohen on 9 September 1920, but reported that Cohen did not “seem very keen about it.” Cohen had another plan in mind, which was to publish Peirce’s Illustrations of the Logic of Science and his *Monist* metaphysical series three years later.

• **C. I. Lewis** was actually asked twice to work on the Peirce papers.

  (1) It was first Ralph Barton Perry who wrote to C. I. Lewis on May 17, 1917, and told him: “As to the Peirce manuscripts, there is some sort of understanding that Lenzen is to work on them. Lenzen is at present abroad on a Fellowship and owing to the war we hear from him very irregularly. In all probability it would be easy for you and Lenzen to co-operate in the work. There must be enough for both of you to do so. Provided this is the case, the Department would be very happy to turn over a part of the job to you.” Lewis wasn’t ready, though, and stayed in California.

(2) And then James Woods asked Lewis again on 21 September 1920: “Would you, by the way, care to transfer any of this interest and leisure next year to the editing of the published papers of Charles Peirce? Do think the matter over. We have a little money to use for the purpose and are not getting anywhere at present.” This was during Lewis’s first year as a Lecturer in philosophy. **Lewis accepted**, and even though he did not end up editing anything, he did work with the papers for two years, got to know them deeply, and his appreciation for them made it easier for the *Collected Papers* project to get underway.
“At the time of this 1920 appointment [as Lecturer in Philosophy], the Harvard department was concerned about the manuscript remains of Charles S. Peirce. . . . There was obviously some expectation that I would be interested in them—and I was. The large room in which they were stored became my study, and I practically lived with them for two years. They seemed to include everything Peirce had ever written. . . . One could easily conclude that Peirce had no wastebasket, and had never discovered such conveniences as files. By far the greater part of these papers were simply loose sheets, now piled on shelves and tables and around the room. Such earlier attempts as had been made to introduce order into the chaos had amounted to no more than a good beginning. It quickly became apparent that merely to bring together what belonged together would involve the examination of the greater part of them, page by page. I had no understood duties in the matter. . . . But I used such time at the university as was not otherwise occupied in becoming acquainted with these Peirce materials and, little by little, identifying and putting together what might turn out to be pieces of continuous writing. I never went beyond that in dealing with these manuscripts. . . . [T]he final selection and editing by Paul Weiss and Charles Hartshorne resulted in *the Collected Papers*. . . . As one who should know, I wish to express my admiration of their patience, their good judgment, and their achievement.”

In the year 1924–25, a student of C. I. Lewis was allowed to spend a great deal of time reading the Peirce manuscripts unsupervised. He managed to completely disrupt the order achieved by Kernan and Lenzen. Lewis became very angry, and the student was dismissed from Harvard. Max Fisch speculated that this was Norman T. Byrne, a Ph.D. student who indeed left Harvard in 1924 without finishing his degree, and who became infamous in WWII when he took advantage of his position as an American Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives officer to loot museums all over Europe. The consequence was that Hartshorne and Weiss faced a challenge greater than Lewis did in 1920.
The first collection of Peirce’s philosophical writings ever published was Morris R. Cohen’s *Chance, Love, and Logic: Philosophical Essays by the Late Charles S. Peirce — The Founder of Pragmatism*. It appeared in 1923, only nine years after Peirce’s death. Cohen’s excellent introduction remains an example of clear-sightedness.

“I am inclined to think that the publication of Morris Cohen’s collection of essays and his interest in Peirce was an important factor in getting the job done by Weiss and Hartshorne” (Lenzen to Max Fisch, 7 July 1960).
• After C. I. Lewis gave up, Woods turned to George Santayana (in 1922). Santayana rejected the offer but provided instead a crucial piece of advice. As he told the story to Martin Firuski on 23 December 1926, he answered Woods as follows:

“I am glad that Charles Peirce left copious materials yet unpublished, but I am not at all the person to undertake editing any portion of them. Find some young philosopher or mathematician, in whose career such deserving work might be of use and profit. . . . As a philosopher Peirce has come late to be recognized, but his quality is unmistakably good, far better logically than Wm. James’s, and anything speculative from his pen would be welcomed, I think, by the learned public.”

• Woods and Lewis followed Santayana’s advice and in 1925, after Farber turned down the offer, they hired a young Ph.D. by the name of Charles Hartshorne. Lewis ushered Hartshorne into the Peirce room, where the papers were lying on a table in about eleven big piles, with on the shelves 52 empty boxes that had been labeled in a “reasonable way.” Of Kernan’s organization, that was all that was left.

• Early in 1927 Hartshorne was joined by Paul Weiss, another philosophy graduate, and together, and with the occasional help of various members of the department, they selected the papers and established the tables of contents for what became the six volumes published between 1931 and 1935 under the title Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce. Hartshorne and Weiss excluded most of the mathematical and scientific papers, and concentrated on the logical and philosophical writings, which they organized thematically according to Peirce’s classification of the sciences. As a result, textual and chronological considerations were given low priority.

“Lecture series were broken apart and published in separate volumes, single papers were cut in two, and under a single title might appear excerpts from writings composed more than thirty years apart. As a compendium of hitherto unavailable writings of America’s greatest philosopher the Collected Papers is invaluable, but as a dependable resource for the critical study of Peirce’s thought as a whole it is notoriously inadequate.” (Nathan Houser)
The second collection of Peirce’s philosophical writings was undertaken under the aegis of the Harvard Department of Philosophy. The task was given to two brilliant minds, each of whom became major philosophers in the twentieth century: Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss. Together they produced the first six volumes of the *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*, published between 1931 and 1935. This was a major feat of scholarship.

Two more volumes were produced in 1955 and published in 1958 by Arthur W. Burks. The *Collected Papers* saved Peirce from oblivion and guaranteed his recognition as “America’s most versatile philosopher.”

Max H. Fisch’s set of the *Collected Papers*, gloriously annotated and battered.
Perhaps it is not right to call these categories conceptions; they are so intangible that they are rather tones or tints upon conceptions.

In my first attempt to deal with them, I made use of three grades of separability of one idea from another. In the first place, two ideas may be so little allied that one of them may be present to the consciousness in an image which does not contain the other at all; in this way we can imagine and without imagining blue, and vice versa; we can also imagine sound with melody, but not melody without sound. I call this kind of separation Dissociation. In the second place, even in cases where two conceptions cannot be separated in the imagination, we can often suppose one without the other, that is, we can imagine data from which we should be led to believe in a state of things where one was separated from the other. Thus, we can suppose uncolored space, though we cannot dissociate space from color. I call this mode of separation Precission. In the third place, even when one element cannot even be supposed without another, they may at times be distinguished from one another. Thus we can neither imagine nor suppose a taller without a shorter, yet we can distinguish the taller from the shorter. I call this mode of separation Distinction. Now, the categories cannot be dissociated in imagination from each other, nor from other ideas. The category of First can be prescinded from Second and Third, and Second can be prescinded from Third. But Second cannot be prescinded from First nor Third from Second. The categories may, I believe, be prescinded from any one other conception.
C. S. Peirce; Contributions to symbolic logic and mathematical theory (Welles, vol. III?)

Introduction

1. On an improvement in Boole’s calculus of logic. (Publ. 1867) 12
2. Upon the logic of mathematics. (Publ. 67) 10
3. Description of a notation for the logic of relatives. (Publ. 70) 80
4. On the application of logical analysis to multiple algebra. (Publ. 73) 2
5. On the algebra of logic. (Publ. 81) 33
6. On the algebra of logic. (Publ. 85) 25
7. The logic of relatives. (Publ. 82) 15
8. The algebra of relatives. (Publ. locally, 82) 8
9. On the logic of number (Publ. 81) 10
10. Of existential graphs (Unpubl.) 35
11. The regenerant logic (Publ. 90-91) 150
12. The critic of arguments. (Publ. 92) 5
13. The reader is introduced to relatives (Publ. 92) 5
14. Note on Grassmann’s calculus (Publ. 97) 2
15. On the relative form of quantifiers (Publ. locally, 92) 1
16. Excerpts from the unpublished mss. (Publ. 93) 50

4473
Hartshorne and Weiss acknowledged the help received from several persons in the course of editing the 6 volumes of the Collected Papers. Two of them stand out especially in their marks of gratitude: **Henry Leonard** and **Isabel Stearns**. Both became, like the majority of their predecessors in the Peirce business, reputed philosophers in their own right. **Alfred North Whitehead** held both of them in highest esteem. To **Leonard** (who like many other Peirce editors became a division president of the American Philosophical Association), he wrote that his work “held me with intense interest. The lucidity and ‘depth’—or, rather, ‘width’—of your thought is beyond praise.” Leonard was the author of a 620-page *Introduction to the Principles of Right Reason* (1957) and also, intriguingly, of *Principles of reasoning: an introduction to logic, methodology, and the theory of signs* (1967). Of **Stearns** Whitehead said that she was “the most talented female philosopher in America.” The author of a significant book on *The Nature of the Individual*, Stearns taught at Bryn Mawr for 35 years and was the fourth president of the Peirce Society in 1952–53.
The *Collected Papers* were granted an extended lease on life in 1994, through the InteLex electronic edition of the *Collected Papers* on a searchable CD-ROM (now online through institutional subscription) at the initiative of

John Deely
Justus Buchler, 1914 – 1991

Ph.D. 1938 Columbia University
Dissertation: Charles Peirce’s Empiricism (pub. 1939)

1940: The Philosophy of Peirce: Selected Writings
(London: Routledge & Kegan Paul)

Republished in 1955 as Philosophical Writings of Peirce (New York: Dover Publications)
Knight Warner McMahan (1911 – 1994)

CATALOGUE OF THE C.S. PEIRCE MANUSCRIPTS

CONTENTS

I. Sciences of Discovery .................................. pp. 1-26
   A. Mathematics ................................................. 1
      (Archive box 1-A and wooden box 1-A)
      (Boxes 1 & 2, inclusive).
   B. Philosophy ....................................................... 8
      1. Pragmatism and the Categories ............... 8
         (Box 1) .................................................. 8
         (Box 2) ................................................. 12-8
         (Box 3) ................................................. 14
      2. Normative Sciences (Logic) ..................... 16
         (Box 1) "Grand Logic" of 1893. .......... 16
         (Box 2) "Finite Logic", Ch. I and II ........ 21
         (Box 3) "Finite Logic", Ch. III and IV .......... 22
         (Box 4) Lowell Lectures, 1903-4 .......... 25
         (Box 5) Logical Graphs .......................... 31
         (Box 6) Graphs, Formal Logic. .......... 34
         (Box 7) Formal Logic. ......................... 37
         (Box 8) Early Writings ......................... 39
         (Box 9) Definitions and various attempts at books on logic ......................... 44
         (Box 10) "Logic of Science" 1866
                  "Detached Ideas" 1898. .......... 47
         (Box 11) Logical Critic. ....................... 52
         (Box 12) Logical Critic. ....................... 59
      3. Metaphysics ............................................... 62
   C. Idioscopy ...................................................... 71
      1. Psychogony .................................................. 71
         a. Psychology ........................................... 71
         b. History ............................................... 72
         c. Linguistics ......................................... 80
Restricted

Released from restrictions
As of Nov. 7, 1952, by W. V. Quine, Chairman, Dept of Philosophy — K. C. E.

Dear Professor Fisch,

I write to inform you of a happy turn of events regarding the Feikes material at Harvard. During the past two months four more boxes of the restricted material have been opened to the public by Professor Quine and there may possibly be more to come. The contents of the boxes, mostly correspondence, are as follows:

Books, Publishers and Institutions:
- E. Appleton and Co., Dr. Card
- Carzan, Co., B. E. Smith
- Clark University, J. Stanley Hall
- Garrison of the "Nation"
- National Academy of Science
- "The Open Court Group": Dr. Jurs
- Glenn and Co., A.A. FIling
- G. 3. Putnam and Sons, J. K. Jettell
- Saltmarsh, Langley
- Also, including Dehne, the printer who did Petrus Peregrinus (1993); Mr. Hedrick of the Lowell Institute, and others.

Y.B. Business
- Financial, Investments, Money-making Schemes, etc.
- Geo. S. Morrison
- Conte d'Albyle
- Bleaching and monotypes (of box 105a)
- Almanacs
- GPI's correspondence courses and letters dealing therewith, including student's examinations.

Y.B. Business
- Financial, Investments, Money-making Schemes, etc.
- Geo. S. Morrison
- Conte d'Albyle
- Bleaching and monotypes (of box 105a)
- Almanacs
- GPI's correspondence courses and letters dealing therewith, including student's examinations.

Y.B. Official, Coast Survey (arranged chronologically)

- To Carnegie Institute, July 13, 1902, with several hundred pages of drafts of application in which GPI set forth plans for 36 memoirs on Logic; together with copies of the letters of recommendation (James Logan, etc.) and other correspondences dealing with this matter.

In the hope that this information will be of interest to you,

I remain,

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
On 2 May 1944, Roderick Chisholm (as he recounted in a 15 January 1963 letter to Max Fisch) attended a party in Cambridge where he learned that Harvard was contributing to the waste-paper drive and that someone had decided that “much of the paper in the Peirce collection would be of value for this purpose.” He was told that if he wanted any of it himself he had better come the following day. Chisholm was appalled. The next day he “went frantically through the boxes of material with the idea of bringing back to Boston” as much as he could. Because paper was valuable, he wasn’t allowed to take as much as he wanted but managed to go away with a sizeable package. He wrote out a list of what he took and sent it to Ruth Allen, the Department’s secretary.

The next day Harvard decided to call off the contribution to the paper drive, and Chisholm was asked to bring back all the material. C. I. Lewis, who had given permission for the give-away, wrote to Chisholm on May 12 to confirm the request. On May 16, Chisholm brought back three-quarters of what he had taken, but put the last quarter (“comprising what seemed to be the most interesting material”) “in safekeeping”—without telling Harvard.

He ended his letter telling Max Fisch: “So if you think Harvard University can now be entrusted with it, you may forward it to the Librarian with my compliments, telling him the story if you would like. Otherwise, may I ask you to return it to me?”
The list of manuscripts Chisholm took with him before returning ¾ of them

**Manuscripts**

§ 12. Division of Formal Science
Review of Duff's *Principles of Ethical Philosophy*
Languages and dialects of the Holy Bible
Training in Reasoning
The Vindication of Susan
A number of fragments and apparently incomplete manuscripts on "evolutionary poets:
Review: *Le Définition de la Philosophie*, by Ernest Mankell
Review: *The Psychic Factors of Civilization*, by Lester F. Ward
"What is reasoning?"
"Few persons care to study logic..." (on belief & the evolution of doubt)
Review: A History of the Valence of Science and Theology, by Andrew D. White
Review of translation of Boethius' *Consolation*.
An illustration of the use of Boolean Algebra
Ms on Darwinism & synthesis
Early ms. on the fruition of belief
Part of a ms. on selfishness & political economy
Fragment on logic
One, Two, Three: Kantian Categories
The Association of Ideas
A Guess at the Riddle [Numerous drafts. Typewritten by the editor?]

---

Review: *The History of their Language*, by C. P. Conder
Reply to the *etymologist*. Notes on Chemical Suffixes & Prefixes
Religion & Politics. [Part of a ms. typed by the editor?]
Subsidiary purpose [on ideology]
Fragment of a ms. on intensity of belief
Fragment on First, Second, Third Ms. on "the mixed condition of philosophy" [typed by editor?]
Clipping from the *Monist* "Mr. Patterson's Proposed Discussion"
Fragment on the 'innateness of ideas'
Random comments on someone's literary efforts
Leibniz's *On the Anxiety of Geometry* [Typed by editor?]
The Beauties of Gribben

---

Notebooks
Lectures on deductive reasoning [notes]
Notes to Pearson's *Grammar of Science*
Phenomenology
Undergraduate essays

---

over
Department chair C. I. Lewis’s letter to Chisholm, 3 May 1944, setting the conditions of his permission for Department faculty and students to select items from the Peirce Papers before their destruction.

**Harvard University**
**Department of Philosophy**

**Emerson Hall**
**Cambridge 38, Massachusetts**

May 3, 1944

Dear Chisholm:

Miss Allen tells me that you would like opportunity to go through the final remains of the Peirce Papers which are to be destroyed and that you even suggested your keeping the whole of them. I am now writing members of the Department and making announcement to our graduate students that they are privileged to go through this material and select items they would like to keep. I suppose members of the Department take precedence to you in this matter, but certainly you take precedence to our graduate students. I think, therefore, that it might be appropriate to say you could do as you please with what remains after members of the Department have made their selections, if any; but if you want to get ahead of the graduate students before May 30th well and good. Also, if you really want to remove all that remains fairly promptly after May 30th, I see no objection to that.

Sincerely yours,

C. I. Lewis

Chairman

Mr. R. W. Chisholm

P.S. If you want all after May 30, the graduate students should have the privilege of some before that date.

C. I. Lewis’s letter to Chisholm, 12 May 1944, asking for his returning the Peirce papers.

**Harvard University**
**Department of Philosophy**

**Emerson Hall**
**Cambridge 38, Massachusetts**

May 12, 1944

Dear Chisholm:

The people in charge of the archives in the library have changed their minds about these last remains of the Peirce Papers, and want to have Mr. Jackson go through them all again. Sometimes, and as soon as you can without too much trouble, will you please return those which you have. I shall certainly keep it in mind that if they do not keep all of these, you have a special claim to at least something from what is left.

Sincerely yours,

C. I. Lewis

Chairman

Dr. R. W. Chisholm
160 Strathmore Road
Brighton, Mass.
In November 1945, **Frederic H. Young** “sent, to the chief philosophical journals of Britain and America, a notice in which he announced his intention of founding at Milford a Charles S. Peirce Society.” Paul Weiss and Charles Hartshorne were his advisers.

The Peirce Society was founded on **22 February 1946** between 5:15 and 6:00 PM at Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, New York, after the tea for the American Philosophical Association.


Elected as officers: President, Dr. Paul Weiss; Secretary, Rev’d Frederic H. Young; Treasurer, James K. Feibleman.

Following Arthur O. Lovejoy’s suggestion that the Society organize a “cooperative volume which bring Peirce’s whole scheme of ideas into clearer focus and present the most thorough critical examination both into the validity of his reasonings and the consistency of his conclusions,” Young and Philip Wiener edited, as Peter Hare put it, “a classic of Peirce scholarship,” *Studies in the Philosophy of Charles Sanders Peirce*, published in 1952.
Selected key events of the 1950s

• Philip Wiener and Frederic Young publish *Studies in the Philosophy of Charles Sanders Peirce*, first series, in 1952.


• Vincent Tomas publishes *Charles S. Peirce. Essays in the Philosophy of Science* in 1957.

• Arthur Burks publishes volumes 7 and 8 of the *Collected Papers* in 1958.

• Murray Griffin Murphey finishes writing his famous book in the summer of 1959.

• The Harvard Department of Philosophy appoints Max H. Fisch as the official biographer of Charles S. Peirce in 1959. This status provides him unparalleled access to the Harvard holdings, as well as the credentials necessary to access other archives and elicit the trust of a whole cast of witnesses (in Milford and elsewhere). Max Fisch will spend the rest of life amassing an enormous body of information regarding every aspect of Peirce’s life and writings.

• Victor Lenzen offers his research services to Max Fisch, and will send him hundreds of reports over nearly two decades covering all aspects of Peirce’s work as a scientist, as well as essential elements of Peirce’s biography and Juliette’s identity.

• Max Fisch, whose first contact with the Peirce MSS took place in 1949, begins surrounding himself with a large circle of dedicated collaborators, including John Boler, Carolyn Eisele, Richard S. Robin, Don D. Roberts, Edward C. Moore, Richard Tursman, David Pfeifer, and Kenneth Ketner (to name but a few over the years). Central to that circle is Max Fisch’s wife, Ruth Bales Fisch (1901 – 1974).
Philip P. Wiener (1905–1992)

Founder of the *Journal of the History of Ideas* (1940)

- “Peirce’s Metaphysical Club and the Genesis of Pragmatism,” *JHI* 7 (1946), 218–233

From 1960 to 1990
The Era of Max Harold Fisch
1900 – 1995
Ruth and Max Fisch, summer 1972
Charles Sanders Peirce

An Interim Catalogue.

(The material catalogued here has been maintained separately from that covered by Knight McMahan's catalogue. It may be, however, that in the preparation of the Collected Papers parts of manuscripts and fragments originally in the McMahan collection were not returned and ended up here. Similarly, a good many review drafts from among these papers have been incorporated into the McMahan collection, for which I have prepared a separate listing which has been inserted in McMahan's catalogue. The system of classification used here is not the same as McMahan's; and, in order to keep the two collections distinct, I have begun with capital letters rather than roman numerals.

Houghton Library
July, 1960
John F. Boler

A. Biographical Material

(1) Harvard Class Notes (?)
   (a) "Mathematics" A.M., notebook, np.nd., 17pp. (loose).
   (b) "Chemical Curves" A.M., notebook, np.nd.
   (c) "History and Math Notes" A.M., notebook, np.nd.
   (d) "College (?) Themes" A.M., portfolio, np. variously dated from 1857-1859.
   (e) "Notes to the Lectures of Prof. Peirce on Mathematics" A.M., notebook, np. 1857-9?
   (f) "Notes to Lectures on Mathematics...1853" A.M., notebook, np. 1853.

(2) "Think Again" (An article on Shakespeare for the College Magazine?) Photostat.

(3) Miscellaneous Pamphlets and Books
   (a) Membership lists: National Academy of Sciences, 1900; London Mathematical Society, 1904.
   (b) National academy of Sciences: nominations, proposed amendments.
   (c) Social Register, August 1893.
   (d) De Initiatis Christi, Four Books.

G. Editor's Material (4 boxes)
   (This consists of typescripts prepared for the editors of the Collected Papers, cuts from journals and other copy for the printer, and perhaps most important, cover sheets containing data on manuscripts, reason for not including some material in the Collected Papers. The material should be retained until a complete ordering of the manuscripts has been accomplished and it can be definitely established that all manuscripts of which typescripts have been made are available in manuscript form. In addition, at this time, the editorial cover sheets should be filled with the pertinent manuscripts.)

H. Some Useful Printed Material

Box 1. (1) Johns Hopkins University Circulars; Coastal Survey Offprints. (This is material which is often difficult to obtain in libraries)

(2) Copies of some articles published by Peirce. (There are some handwritten annotations in these.)

I. Reprints of Articles not by Peirce but in His Papers
   Small Books and Journals, some with annotations (Note: U. Settlement, Die Erde has the notation "C.S. Peirce first set specimen eyes upon this book 1861, Nov. 11."

(2) Various Books and Small Journals
   (a) Tables of Logarithms, precipitation charts, temperature, etc.
   (b) Proceedings of the Assay Commission.
   (c) Some small books on games.

John F. Boler
(1929 – 2009)
John Boler’s July 1960 statement about how to organize the Peirce manuscripts

Purpose: It seems essential that the manuscripts be put in order more adequately for scholarly purposes than that to enjoy. First of all, because the demand for consultation not stated and probably will not. And secondly, in or for the whole collection to be microfilmed. The press of the manuscripts is not so good as to last too long, much handling.

Immediate Steps: One thing, at least can be done, and put up all the manuscripts in Haughton, where temperature control will give them the best chance. When Dr. Price I would suggest that the material he is working with (maintained in the archives) transferred to Haughton with McManus’s catalogue which is still in the Archives will also serve to bring the material together at least if not in spirit. If possible, it should be listed under two numbers. As it is, the material on the other is not only not under one file number, but not even one catalogue (some at Haughton, some at the Widener).

Projected Organization: First of all, consider the principles of organization. The idea that the material is grouped according to content as a basic system of order. One is that Petrie wrote with too many digressions to work with any ease; eventually some index would be in order. This tends to cancel out the reasons for ordering by the first place. Secondly, an ordering by chronology favored at first, does not seem possible. Too much undated (and guessing doesn’t help matters much) and a that has been reworked (as in drafts for Peirce’s logic—comments on earlier articles, etc.) gets rather badly.

In short, if there is some one good principle of: I have not come upon it. On the basis of my own work the manuscripts, I would suggest the following: I have put much on the basis of expediency, which means both execution and helpfulness to scholars who might want to use the manuscripts.

(1) Using Burks’s bibliography in the Collected volumes eight, locate the Ha for each entry and file it accordingly. (With McManus’s catalogue, and the one I supplied for the Haughton material, this should be done earlier than before.) This will provide at least an order for the published works (for which there exists an index in the Collected Papers).

(2) Put alternate drafts (and identifiable fragments) with the above material. (Note that in many cases, this would not involve two separate steps; McManus has many alternate drafts already so filed.)

(3) From the remaining unpublished material, there will probably be some that could be filed as alike in content with the above. I am not altogether sure that this would be too helpful for the bulk of the material -- as I once thought. The decision will have to be made on the basis of usefulness.

(4) Of the remaining material, especially complete drafts or identifiable fragments, may be filed chronologically. I repeat, some of the material may lend itself to this.

(Note: I have become disillusioned about the idea that steps 3 and 4 will take care of the bulk of the material. I hope that I am wrong.)

(5) The remaining material should be arranged by content, with the first consideration, however, being that of keeping drafts as complete as possible, and alternate drafts as close together as possible. This should NOT be done on some artificial scheme. I think that McManus was taken in by Peirce’s own classification of the sciences, which is a good bit more arbitrary than McManus seemed to realize and which, after all, was not devised as a way of classifying Peirce’s own writings. Rather, the manuscripts will have to be “scraped” and allowed to generate their own order. I cite as an illustration (by no means as a shining example) my own division in the catalogue to which I prepared. I used “Dictionaries and linguistics” together with “Logic and mathematics” in Peirce’s notebooks of the otherwise identifiable fragments seems to be classifiable as either. Generally, I arranged the manuscripts as much as possible by content and achieved a sort of spectrum. Then I simply drew the lines at the most salient breaks, making no great effort to impose more order or classification than I found.

(6) When this is done, there will remain a number of unidentifiable fragments, which can be simply classed as such (for future scholars to resolve); and a number of worthless fragments which, if one dares, should be disposed of. There can be no question that Petrie was either too poor or too stingy to use clean paper for scratch paper.

(7) A catalogue of all this material should be prepared, describing to some extent the unpublished manuscripts (and not just naming them as an aid to the text editor). A catalogue of amendments and a list of secondary sources, especially articles and these (more complete than “selective”), it would be a valuable little pamphlet.

(8) The material should be microfilmed. Depending upon the money available, it might be well for some Peirce scholar to select the material to be filmed; many notebooks and fragments seem too sketchy and too technical to require the outlay to films them all. After all, if a good bit of the material gets to Mohammed, he can always come to see the rest.

A Note: No one should be allowed to tear any of the existing organization down until he has shown some promise of being able to build something better. No matter how dissatisfied he may be with existing structure, or lack of it, it behoves him to work on manageable segments. I say this from my own experience. I have underestimated the amount of time and effort required and vastly overestimated my own organizational imagination. The material which I worked on had probably gone through more than four hands before it reached mine, and everyone had done the same; read all the way through, started to do some organizing, and once he had seen the stuff, lost interest in the grubby job of straightening it out physically. And I felt the same way about it myself. It may be possible to compress some of the steps I have outlined, or to devise a better plan over-all. But whatever the scheme, it should allow of step by step completion, one phase at a time, and these as manageable (without disturbing what is already done) as possible.

An Estimate: I do not think that the first six steps of my plan could be accomplished in less than 300 man-hours; and I wouldn’t be surprised if it exceeded 500. It is not simply a matter of putting older here and there. Many manuscripts are in desirable order, unpaginated and sometimes scattered. In addition, the task of identifying much of the material is really time consuming; although the extent of the researcher’s acquaintance with Peirce texts may prove some aid. If the work is done carefully, and good records are kept, the task of preparing a catalogue may not be too long. I rather suspect, however, that it will amount to another 200 or 300 man-hours. The microfilming will also be a difficult task at times, since many manuscripts are to be found on the bank of others, and the burden of keeping this straight may exceed the limits of what the microfilm itself considers his task to be.

Possible Publications: In the light of Mierer’s nice job on the Peirce-Gasquet correspondence over the “How on Horse” material (in Values in a Universe of Chance), it seems likely that there is even more corner publication. As a doubt that another one of the Collected Papers would of much help, but there are probably some manuscripts where careful reference to alternate drafts would give rise to a worthwhile and informative publication. In general, however, I do not see that any of this is going to be of enough quantity to give any promise of financial gain.
Selected key events of the 1960s

- **Murray G. Murphey** publishes *The Development of Peirce’s Philosophy* in 1961 (its galleys were thoroughly proofread by Max Fisch).

- **Richard S. Robin, Edward Madden, and Edward C. Moore** meet in 1962 in Moore’s home. Their conversation laid down the plans to launch a new journal of philosophy, as well as a plan to publish an anthology of papers on Peirce to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of Peirce’s death.


- The *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* begin publication in 1965 under Ed Moore’s editorship. The journal quickly establishes itself as a major influence on and stimulus of Peirce scholarship. For the period between 1966 and 1968 Robin joined Moore as Associate Editor. Moore resigned at the end of the 1960s and Edward Madden took over the editorship. Madden resigned in 1971, at which point Robin became the journal’s sole editor. In 1974 he was joined by Peter Hare, and till his appointment as Editor Emeritus in 2001, Robin co-edited the journal with Hare, taking prime responsibility for the Peirce submissions.

- **Richard S. Robin** publishes the *Annotated Catalogue of the Papers of Charles S. Peirce* in 1967. He had been working on that catalogue since about 1960.
In the draft of an unpublished short review of Murray Murphey’s book on *The Development of Peirce’s Philosophy* for the journal *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* (at Marvin Farber’s request, c. 1963), Max H. Fisch wrote:

“It is a powerful book and its impact will be felt for decades to come. It breaks the bonds in which Peircean studies have been held by the *Collected Papers*. **In the first place,** it uses unpublished papers on such a scale as to demonstrate that the material contained in the *Collected Papers* is insufficient for the understanding of Peirce’s philosophy. **In the second place,** it uses unpublished papers to trace an intelligible order of development in Peirce’s philosophy, to which we had been blinded by the systematic arrangement of the *Collected Papers*. We need not conclude that a chronological arrangement would have been better for that pioneering edition, and we need not abate a jot of our gratitude to Hartshorne, Weiss, and Burks for their editorial labors; but it is now apparent that the *Collected Papers* must be (not replaced but) supplemented by an edition along strictly chronological lines, including a fresh selection of so far unpublished paper. **Such an edition is now in preparation.**”

[MHF Papers, Murray Murphey folder, Peirce Edition Project, IAT]
Max H. Fisch to Murray Murphey, 20 Jan. 1966: “A large part of my time for six years has gone into piecing together and identifying manuscripts; that goes for my wife also, and for Don Roberts. (As you know, others have had a hand — Carolyn Eisele, Dick Robin, John Boler.)”
The 1970s: A Rich and Uberous Decade

• Charles S. Hardwick and Kenneth L. Ketner found the Institute for Studies in Pragmaticism at Texas Tech University in Lubbock, Texas, in 1972-73. It is the first and oldest organized center for research on Peirce. Its mission is to facilitate study of the life and works of Peirce and his continuing influence within interdisciplinary sciences.

Charles S. Hardwick (1931 – 2001)

• The long-mulled plan of starting an entirely new, comprehensive, and chronological edition of Peirce’s writings is taking definite shape. Much of the final planning took place at the Institute for Studies in Pragmaticism, where Max Fisch was a visiting professor from 1972 to 1974.
• In the summer of 1974, Max Fisch and a team of Texas Tech University collaborators that included Kenneth Ketner and Christian J.W. Kloesel (plus Joseph Esposito, Thomas Cadwallader, and William Fisch) turned the entire 1964 microfilm of the Peirce Papers into a xenographic copy. Each sheet of that enormous set was stamped with its corresponding Robin catalogue number and Bates-stamped with a page number. The team traveled to the Houghton Library to annotate and check that set leaf by leaf against the existing papers in the archives. They completed the set with copies of missed pages and made various improvements to the arrangement.

Max Fisch, Christian Kloesel, Ken Ketner, and Joe Esposito in 1974 at the Houghton Library
The Peirce Edition Project was created in 1975-76 and set up at Indiana University Purdue University in Indianapolis under the general editorship of Max H. Fisch and the directorship of Edward C. Moore, then Professor of Philosophy, Executive Vice Chancellor, and Dean of the Faculties at IUPUI.
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Charles Sanders Peirce: Contributions to The Nation
Part One: 1869-1893
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1975 –1979, 1987

Charles Sanders Peirce:
Contributions to The Nation

Part One: 1869 – 1893 (1975)
Part Two: 1894 – 1900 (1978)
Part Three: 1901 – 1908 (1979)
Part Four: Index (1987)

Volumes 1–3 compiled and annotated by Kenneth L. Ketner and James E. Cook (based notably on the work of Haskell and Fisch); vol. 4 (index) edited by K. Ketner (Lubbock, Texas Tech Press, Graduate Studies).

The 3 volumes gather Peirce’s hundreds of book reviews for The Nation, the hunt for and identification of which took many years. This was again a major gift to scholarship for which we may principally thank Ken Ketner.
That bibliography incorporated all previous bibliographies (eight of them, compiled between 1916 and 1974 by Morris Cohen, Irving C. Smith, Daniel C. Haskell, Arthur W. Burks, and especially Max H. Fisch, who did half of them).

This fantastic bibliography accompanied another major product: a collection of 149 microfiches titled *Charles Sanders Peirce: Complete Published Works, included Selected Secondary Materials* (Greenwich, CT: Johnson Associates, 1977). This collection was subsequently made available by the Philosophy Documentation Center under the title *Charles S. Peirce Microfiche Collection*. It was completed in 1986 by 12 supplementary microfiches.

In 2013, that entire collection was digitized and ported online at http://www.pragmaticism.net/works/csp-pub.html, where it can be viewed through 1248 downloadable PDFs.

1977: Publication of a major bibliographical and research tool.
Charles Sanders Peirce: Complete Published Works, included Selected Secondary Materials (Greenwich, CT: Johnson Associates, 1977)

149 microfiches (1977) + 12 supplementary microfiches (1986)
The same year the Peirce Project began operation, Carolyn Eisele (1902 – 2000) published a major collection of Peirce’s writings, focusing on his mathematical work. This was the astounding “four volumes in five” titled *The New Elements of Mathematics*, published by Mouton in 1976. This was an extraordinary feat of years of painstaking work.
Carolyn Eisele’s papers and library are part of the Peirce Project resources. At left is an archival box containing copies of Peirce manuscripts Eisele edited for the New Elements. These documents allow us to understand the rationales behind her selection and editing decisions.

At right: two sheets with Eisele’s editing inscriptions and directions to the transcriber.
Carolyn Eisele also published another two major volumes, the *Historical Perspectives on Peirce’s Logic of Science: A History of Science* — a large collection of Peirce’s scientific observations, experiments, articles, essays, lectures, in which Peirce reflects especially on the logic of sound scientific reasoning and its implications for logic, semiotic, epistemology, and metaphysics (Mouton, 1985).
A New Critical Edition

• The *Writings of Charles S. Peirce* are a selective but comprehensive chronological edition designed to document the development of Peirce’s thought and promote the critical study of his intellectual growth and interdisciplinary impact.

• Unlike all previous collections of Peirce’s writings, the *Writings* were conceived from the start as a critical scholarly edition, based on rigorous principles of manuscript organization and selection, transcription, proofreading, editing, and annotations, meeting international standards of production and publication.

Max Fisch in 1982, sorting out copies of Peirce’s manuscripts in a large room that was the first home of the Peirce Edition Project on the IUPUI campus, before the Project became an integral part of the IU School of Liberal Arts in 1983.
How does a “Critical Edition” of Peirce’s texts differ from other editions of his works?

• Every editorial decision, no matter how minute, follows rigorous principles of analysis, comparison, correlation, contextualization, and application of appropriate textual theory to make sure every modification of the original text be justified according to criteria that seek to preserve the author’s recoverable intention.

• Readers have access to a complete record of all changes made by the editors to the original text.

• Readers are provided a description and an explanation of the editorial policies that have governed the entire set of modifications, whether they concern spelling, punctuation, additions, deletions, or displacements of textual units (letters, words, sentence fragments, sentence, paragraphs).

• The editors’ decisions rigorously comply with Peirce’s pragmatic maxim (a maxim about logic itself): consequences about future interpretations are always taken into account.

• The author’s habits of expression have been respected or restored if they had been modified by non-critical editors at some point in the past.

• The final product offers all readers a common standard that is trustworthy in two ways: the author’s expression has been preserved or reconstituted with meticulous care, and the editorial work has been conducted unfettered by any bias.

• The final product is to that extent authoritative without being authoritarian. It provides the basis for all future interpretations completely openly, and it welcomes corrections and criticism.
Leaders of the Peirce critical edition

Christian J. W. Kloesel
1942 – 2006

Began editing Peirce’s *Writings* in 1977
Director of the Peirce Edition Project, Editor of the *Writings*, 1984 – 1993
Long-time secretary-treasurer of the Charles S. Peirce Society
Co-edited with Nathan Houser the first volume of *The Essential Peirce* (1992)
Don D. Roberts, the author of the first book on Peirce’s existential graphs, was a student and assistant of Max Fisch, and established a satellite operation of the Peirce Project at the University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada. He was an Associate Editor of the *Writings* for many years, and chaired the PEP Advisory Board. Considerable work, especially on Volume 4, was produced in Waterloo under his direction, in collaboration with Nathan Houser.
Nathan Houser

Began editing Peirce’s *Writings* in 1980, first in Waterloo, Canada under the mentorship of Don D. Roberts; then moved to Indianapolis in 1983 to work at PEP with his wife Aleta.

Director of the Peirce Edition Project, General Editor of the *Writings*, 1993 – 2008

Co-edited *The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings*, volumes 1 and 2.
Houser brought in new people, including Tom Short (as chair of the Advisory Board), Kees de Waal (as Assistant Editor), Albert Lewis (as Associate Editor), while also relying on the advice of Arthur Burks and Paul Weiss.

Under Houser, the critical edition rethought and improved its editorial policies and scholarly practice thoroughly. The Project adopted new transcription methods compliant with the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) Guidelines, and began producing camera-ready copy of the volumes, using FrameMaker + SGML as its core production software under the guidance of Albert Lewis.
A joint venture between IUPUI and l’Université du Québec à Montréal, the “Projet d’Édition Peirce” (PEP-UQÀM) was established in 2001 following an initiative launched by André De Tienne, François Latraverse, and Nathan Houser. The central objective: producing the largest and most complex volume of the entire edition: Volume 7, entirely devoted to Peirce’s 1883–1904 work on the Century Dictionary & Cyclopedia.
A marvel of software engineering: PEP-UQAM’s online production platform by

Marc Guastavino
Jérôme Vogel

Lagrange (1736-1813). — Lambert’s theorem. (a) The proposition that the focal sector of an ellipse is equal to

\[
\frac{1}{2} \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} (x - \sin \frac{x}{2} + \sin \frac{x}{4}) \, dx \quad \text{where} \quad \sin \frac{x}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{r + r^2 + c^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sin \frac{x}{4} = \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{r + r^2 + c^2},
\]

\(r\) and \(R\) being the focal radii of the extremities, \(c\) the chord, and \(a\) the semi-axis major. (b) A proposition relating to the apparent curvature of the geocentric path of a comet. Both are named from their author, J. H. Lambert (1728-77). — Lacret’s theorem, in solid geometry, the proposition that along a line of curvature the variation in the angle between the tangent plane to the surface and the osculating plane to the curve is equal to the angle between the two osculating planes. — Landen’s theorem, the proposition that every elliptic arc can be expressed by two hyperbolic arcs, and every hyperbolic arc by two elliptic arcs, given in 1755 by John Landen (1719-90). — Laplace’s theorem, a slight modification of Lagrange’s theorem. — Laurent’s theorem, a rule for the development of a function in series, expressed by the formula

\[
f(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{2\pi} f(Re^{i\theta})/(R^{n} e^{n\theta}) \, d\theta
\]

\[+ \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} \int_{0}^{2\pi} f(R' e^{i\theta})/(R'^{n} e^{n\theta}) \, d\theta,
\]

where the modulus of \(x\) is comprised between \(R\) and \(R'\); given by P.A. Laurent (1813-54). — Legendre’s theorem, the proposition that if the sides of a spherical triangle are very small compared with the radius of the sphere, the sum of the three angles is very nearly equal to \(\pi\).

Workflow state: To be validated

Composing remarks

Edition of Theorem (JH), October 2005: (Modification in June 2008: We should add W7UQAM-3370 (MS 1597 A) "existence theorem"; W7UQAM-16025 (SN96); W7UQAM-16208 (MS 1596 A); W7UQAM-16211 (MS 1596 A); W7UQAM-16220 (MS 1596 A); W7UQAM-16228 (MS 1596 A).)

Obviously an important entry; I have chosen nearly all our materials. I think we should put W7UQAM-3198 (MS 228 A) under a note.

Some theorems in W7UQAM-15100 (MS 1599 A) are already in our (1597 A) documents, but it would be hard to cut inside. I have also included some 1597 documents for just bibliographical references from Peirce. Beware that W7UQAM-3385 (MS 1597 A) "Weierstrass’s factor theorem" is currently (2005-10-20) under "factor".

\(\) The NOUN 1 (Definition +

Remarks

We have the text of "Existence theorem" under "existence". (FL) WE SHOULD SEARCH THE ENTIRE DATABASE TO SEE IF IT IS THE CASE ALSO FOR OTHER ENCYCL. ART. (FL)
Those lectures have never been published in full due to the immense complexity of their documentary basis. Paul Weiss was so repelled by that complexity that, when Ernest Nagel regretted that the Collected Papers had not printed those lectures in their entirety, he replied: “I am sorry to say that they are not comparable with the lectures of Russell or of Whitehead. They contain a variety of disjointed discussions most of which are little more than simplifications, popularizations, and tentative presentations of what has been much better done elsewhere.... It seems quite clear from the way in which they were written and preserved that Peirce had no intention of ever publishing them.... I do not believe that anyone, including Peirce, would care to have the whole series reprinted” (Journal of Philosophy 31 [1934]: 251).

Professor Pape has studied the Lowell Lectures of 1903 for three decades, long enough to conclude that Paul Weiss could not have been more wrong: the Lowell Lectures definitely constitute one of the most significant sequences of writings in the Peirce corpus. A large DFG grant allowed him and younger colleagues to reorganize the whole set of notebooks and come up with a sensible table of contents that will form the bulk of volume 22 (including also the famous Syllabus that Peirce wrote to accompany the lectures). The Peirce Project plans to produce vol. 22 as soon as vol. 11 is finished.
The Peirce Project depends on the community of Peirce scholars and other scholars with expertise in Peirce’s many fields of inquiry, including astronomy, chemistry, color theory, geodesy, geometry, lexicography, linguistics, logic, mathematics, philosophy (nearly all branches), and psychology. Those scholars who produce valuable contributions become contributing editors to the edition. There have been many over the years. Here are three especially prominent contributing editors, who will serve as a sample of this much appreciated category of helpers.

PEP CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Shea Zellweger
Ivor Grattan-Guinness
Irving Anellis (1946 – 2013)

Volumes 7 and 9 are scheduled to appear in 2015, after numerous delays.

Indiana University has been supporting the edition from the start, shouldering about 90% of its cost.

The National Endowment for the Humanities, and numerous donors often encouraged by the NEH’s matching requirements, have financed the other 10%.
The Max H. Fisch Papers at the Peirce Edition Project: our most important resource, the sum of half a century of dedicated research, now supplemented every day.
Using the PEP Manuscript Panopticon
PEP’s Chronological Catalog, the fulfillment of Max H. Fisch’s 1961 intention

Chronological Catalog
May 1890–July 1892

The chronological catalog in this volume continues the catalog begun in W6 and follows the same policy and practice in matters of manuscript reorganization and chronological arrangement (see W6:512 for an explanation of the departure from the “Chronological Lists” in W1–W5). The editors make every effort to identify, resequence, repaginate, and date all documents deemed publishable, together with the documents that are genealogically related to them. Documents clearly unpublishable are cursorily identified, entered into the Project’s manuscript database, stored in a folder, and given a catalog entry. All other documents undergo the usual reorganization process, until their publishability is determined.

508 Writings of C. S. Peirce 1890–1892


92. [Sample List for a Color Table, Intended for the Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary]

Holograph, 10 sheets. Houghton, Peirce Papers, R 1048:66, R 1019:2–8, R 1048:67, R 1500:16; spring 1892 (paper, handwriting, letters from the Funk & Wagnalls Company dated 5/11/1891, 6/3/1892, 3/23/1893, 3/27/1893; tight connection with R 1500). Alphabetical list of 222 color terms followed by a proportional breakdown in terms of R, G, U, and V values, the addition and subtraction of which totals 100 for each color. This table is apparently a draft of a sample list Peirce submitted to the Funk & Wagnalls Co. for publication in the Standard Dictionary. Peirce’s failure to complete the list, to make it more serviceable to average readers, and to read the proofs of color terms led to its not being published.

93. [Numbers 1 through 10 in 14 different languages]

Holograph, second part of small notebook, 15 inscribed pages. Houghton, Peirce Papers, R 1590:9–16; spring 1892 (date attributed to the rest of the notebook).

94. [Sand Key Poems]

Holograph, 3 sheets. Houghton, Peirce Papers, R 1565:4, 2, 3; spring-summer 1892 (paper identical to some documents composed in the spring of 1892, handwriting). Three untitled poems transcribed with modifications from pages 5–8 and 10–11 of the anonymous 1890 book Send Key (The Key to All).
Examination of the texts

Genealogical history of the text
Correspondence: letter from Peirce to William James (28 Oct. 1885)
Related writings: MS 545
Source materials: Royce’s *Religious Aspects of Philosophy* (spring 1885)
Draft MSS: 540, 541
Draft typescript: MS 525

Comparison of each text version

Consolidation into a master list

Historical collation — establish a list of changes
MS 540 ≠ MS 514 = MS 424
Harvard Text: misses the first three pages of MS 542

Other documentary evidence

Reconstruct text transmission

The stages of composition and publication
MS 540 ↓ Complete rewrite
MS 541 ↓ Very little revision
MS 542

Analyse textual history

Current Peirce Project Work Flow

Copy-text determination
MS 541

Transcription Workflow

Editing Workflow

Transcription

Proofreading

Corrections

Establish full records of alterations and other inscriptions

PERFECTED TRANSCRIPTION

EDITING COPY

Select significant alterations for publication in apparatus

Recovery of author’s intended text

List rejected substantives (MS 542)

Emend text following critical methods

Genealogical headnotes

SCHOLARLY RESEARCH

Annotations to the text

Bibliography

Chronological Catalogue of Manuscripts

Full Volume Consolidation
Preparing the transition to new production and dissemination technologies:

**Workflow of the Peirce Project Critical Edition**

**STEP**

- Database
- Images of manuscripts
- Online journals
- Books
- Scholarly websites
- Scholarly Community
- CORPUS

**Current Peirce Project Work Flow**

1. Copy-text determination
2. Transcription Workflow
3. Editing Workflow
4. Evaluation of text merits
5. Manuscript selection
6. Transcription
7. Proofreading
8. Corrections
9. Perfecting transcriptions
10. Editing copy
11. Recovery of author's intended text
12. Genealogical notes
13. Full Volume Consolidation
14. List rejected substantives (MS 542)
15. Textual notes
16. Annotations to the text
17. Bibliography
18. Chronological catalogue of manuscripts

**The stages of composition and publication**

- MS 540
- Complete rewrite
- MS 541
- Very little revision
- MS 542

**Genealogical history of the text**

- Correspondence: letter from Peirce to William James (28 Oct. 1885)
- Related writings: MS 645
- Source materials: Royce's Religious Aspects of Philosophy (spring 1885)
- Draft typescript: MS 645

**Comparision of each text version**

- MS 540
- MS 541
- MS 542

**Reconstruction of text transmission**

- The stages of composition and publication

**Consolidation into a master list**

- Evaluation of text merits

**Analysis of textual history**

- Other documentary evidence

**Historical collation — establish a list of changes**

- MS 540 + MS 541 = MS 421
- Harvard Text: misses the first three pages of MS 542
About STEP

Scholarly Text-Editing Platform

STEP is an open-source, online and in-browser Text-Encoding Initiative (TEI) XML document encoding platform allowing critical editions to transcribe, critically edit, annotate, format, and lay out highly structured digitized versions of original or digital copies of manuscripts, without needing to rely on ever-changing and expensive proprietary software.

Partially funded through an NEH Digital Humanities grant and powered by several open-source web-technologies, such as Drupal, PHP, MySQL, and JavaScript, STEP will be a robust tool for creating and managing content throughout the rigorous and exacting requirements of critical editing, with features such as revisions of saved content throughout various editing stages, permissions between editing groups, content locking to prevent accidental overwrites, end-user affordances to facilitate content creation both individually and collaboratively, context based authoring to mitigate invalid TEI documents, and more.

If you would like a demonstration account, please fill out this form and someone with the IAT will get back with you.

There is currently 1 user online.
STEP TEI-compliant XML-based Transcription Interface

```xml
<TEI>
  <fileDesc>
    <sourceDesc/>
  </fileDesc>
  <revisionDesc/>
  <teiHeader/>
  <text>
    <front/>
    <body>
      <p>term it, <hi>compounding</hi> two graphs, the definition of it in terms of permission will be</p>
      <p>let the definition of the definitum, if its permitted to scribe a</p>
      <p>the sheet of assertion a replica of a compound graph, then it is permitted to scribe on the sheet of assertion a replica of either component. Or, stating this in terms of transformations: Any replica of a compound graph <add>may</add> on the sheet of assertion be transformed into a replica of either component. That is to say, <add>under a</add> more <add>practically aspect</add> any partial graph may be erased or cancelled.</p>
      <p>predicating the definitum of the</p>
    </body>
    </text>
  </TEI>
```
Add-ons to the Scholarly Text-Editing Platform

(1) **STEP Transcriptor** — A fully customizable TEI/XML transcription application

---

**STEP Transcriptor**

![Image of the STEP Transcriptor interface]

- **Import Text for TEI Tagging...**
- **Export Transcription to STEP...**
- **Insert Special Characters**
- **Tagging Tools**
- **Export Alteration Descriptions to STEP**
- **Customize Tags/Menu**
- **Export TEI Description to STEP**

---

**Syntaxical descriptions of alterations**

- **Automatic Descriptions**
  - XML
  - Edit Descr.
  - XML

---

**Pragmatic descriptions of alterations**

- **Automatic Descriptions**
  - XML
  - Edit Descr.
  - XML

---

**Example**

- **Autotag...**
- **Extract...**
- **Save**
- **Restore...**
- **Archive...**
- **Import...**
- **Print...**
- **Clear All...**
- **Close**

---

**Add-ons to the Scholarly Text-Editing Platform**

**STEP Transcriptor** — A fully customizable TEI/XML transcription application.
(2) **STEP Emendator** — prototype of a TEI/XML compliant emendation application

**Current Emendation:**

Prof. James, — which becomes

**Location:** Line 3 XML-ID: LL3L3w3

**Type of emendation:** MANDATORY

**Reason for emendation:** MANDATORY

**Suggested Emendations**

- Line 1.2: Gentleman becomes +/spelling Gentleman
- Line 1.9: Source: -ADT, MS3
- Line 1.9: Type: spelling
- Line 2.3: Reason: contextual
- Line 2.8
- Line 7.8: Edit Suggested Emendation Remove Suggested Emendation

**Current Transcription:**

Ladies & Gentlemen,

Since we last met Herbert Spencer has gone, and you have read his characterism by Prof. James, — which neglects no side of the philosopher or the man, and which contains no word that is not true. What is said of the man’s personal character is a very wonderful thing to be so true. As to that I have heard many authentic anecdotes and can report two small facts from my own experience. I was in London in 1871 a young man more obscure if possible than I now am. Spencer heard of my being there [NOTE 02/01] and being, on the board of the Athenaeum Club, set me down as one of the twelve non-members who are admitted at one time. There was no possible motive for his doing that except his desire to encourage a sincere inquirer. daily meeting I give him I thus came to meet him daily during that season although my not playing billiards; prevented my seeing as much of him as I desired.
For a propositional term to be a subject, it must have “informed depth,” that is, it must have real characters that can be attributed to it also “with logical truth on the whole in a supposed state of information.” The informed depth is measured not according to the number of “mere names” that can be attached to the subject, but to the number of distinct properties a devotee of the pragmatic maxim could sincerely distinguish as really belonging to the subject of the proposition. This implies the possibility of testing comparable objects and subjecting them to an inductive inquiry. Peirce indeed shows that induction, by enlarging the breadth of predicate terms, actually increases the depth of subject terms—by boldly generalizing the attribution of a character from selected objects to their collection—while hypothesis, by enlarging the depth of subject terms, actually increases the breadth of predicate terms—by boldly enlarging their attribution to new individuals. Both types of ampliative inferences thus generate information.

The mediating interpretant fulfills two distinct functions: one is to identify the potential predicate by correlating it with formerly sealed representations, determining that the current situation is actually akin to them, and stating that kinship to future interpretants by blessing the copulative union of subject and predicate; and the other is to recognize that a representational claim is being offered for validation and continuation. Couching in terms of Peirce’s mature semiotic theory, it means that, first, the interpretant is being determined by the sign to represent the object in the same triadic fashion that the sign itself claims to be doing (that is, the interpretant is being determined by the sign to determine other interpretants relative to the object); and second, the interpretant must also represent, not merely the object of the sign, but the very relation of the sign to its object—thus turn that relation into its own object, and offer it to another interpretant. For this to be possible, one needs to remember a crucially important outcome of the argument of Peirce’s 1867 “New List of Categories.” As he was describing the
The integral \( \int F_s \, ds \) + C, where the constant of integration C is the energy. What an odd notion that simply because these do not involve the time, therefore, it represents a substance! There are lots of other such constants in dynamics that arise from integration and do not involve the time. Such is the rotation area, for example. Why are these not supposed to be substances? If a substance has any quantity, it ought to mean something to assign a definite value to that quantity. So it would for the rotation area, and in fact Foucault's pendulum experiment shows that the rotation area of the string is zero. This is a dynamical fact, that remains relatively independent of the Newtonian view of real space or the body "alpha," or whatever other absurdity has been or can be suggested. But what is the total energy of the universe? If two bodies points attract one another inversely as the square of the distance, and E is the energy, they would have if both were at rest at an infinite distance from one another, then energy when at rest at any other distance would be \( E/L^2 \), where the modulus of attraction E = k, so that for \( r < r0 \) the energy would be negative, unless we make E infinite and take the infinite movements as deceptions of an infinite quantity! In short, it seems absurd to give the energy any definite value without an allowance to be negative, which is not, like a substance. Moreover, there is not the slightest reason to suppose that the parts of energy have any individual identity, if a ball, for instance, elastic cushion, parts with energy, and then receives as much energy again, as far more can discover it means nothing in and whether it takes back the same energy it had on
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Peer-review Process

My Workspace > My Reviews > Ongoing Reviews > New Thinking of Pierce’s Theory of Categories

[Review] New Thinking of Pierce’s Theory of Categories

Review Checklist

1. First read through the author’s draft, What is your initial reaction to it?
2. Now look at the draft more closely and try to evaluate it from the aspect of originality, importance, theoretical contribution, clarity of presentation and organization.
3. Does the paper contain sufficient and appropriate references?
4. Does the author accurately identify the system to which his/her object belongs? If not, can you make any suggestions?
5. What do you consider the draft’s greatest strength? A weakness you suggest the author consider?


Please rate each point below, and explain why you gave that rating.

Originality:

- Why?
- Excellent □ Very Good □ Good □ Fair □ Not applicable

Importance:

- Why?
- Excellent □ Very Good □ Good □ Fair □ Not applicable

Clarity of presentation:

- Why?
- Excellent □ Very Good □ Good □ Fair □ Not applicable

OVERALL EVALUATION: 5 (strong accept)
The Continued Legacy of Joseph Ransdell (1931 – 2010)
ARISBE: The Peirce Gateway

ARISBE
The Peirce Gateway

A philosophical website, providing access to resources for the life, work, and continuing interest in the American philosopher, scientist, and humanist

Charles Sanders Peirce

Hosted for the Institute for American Thought (home of the Peirce Edition Project) by the Indiana University School of Liberal Arts

From ROBERT LANE:
July 2, 2014: PEIRCE CONGRESS: FINAL CALL FOR REGISTRATION...
June 23, 2014: PEIRCE CONGRESS: HOTEL & REGISTRATION DEADLINES; UPDATED PROGRAM; AUDIO-VISUAL INFO...

NEW PAGE BEGUN AT ARISBE: Images of Peirce’s Marginalia...


- Chapter 9: Mind, God, and cosmos. Emceed by SØREN BRIER. Continuing...
- Links to threads of the Peirce Centennial Seminar at peirce-l...
Correspondencia europea de C. S. Peirce: creatividad y cooperación científica

Viajes europeos de Charles S. Peirce

- El primer viaje por Europa (18 de junio de 1870-7 de marzo de 1871) [Financiado por el PIUNA 2007-2009]
- El segundo viaje por Europa (2 de abril de 1875-agosto de 1876) [Financiado por el MCI: FPT2011-24340 y el PIUNA 2012-2014]
- El tercer viaje a Europa (13 de septiembre de 1877-18 noviembre de 1877)
- El cuarto viaje a Europa (abril de 1880-agosto de 1880)
- El quinto viaje a Europa (mayo de 1883-septiembre de 1883)

Querido Jem,

Siento escribirte con tanta prisa como tengo ahora, pero lo prefiero a posponer otro día. Mi viaje de Rotterdam a Berlín, que debería haber durado unas 18 horas, en realidad duró cerca de cuatro veces ese tiempo. No hay trenes ahora en el norte de Alemania regidos por horarios y sólo hay una cada dos o tres días en la mayor parte de las líneas. Te aconsejo firmemente que no trates de venir aquí. De todos modos Berlín es un lugar horroso. Los pueblos olores de Londres son los más dulces perfumes aquí, al estar todas las alcantarillas abiertas. La arquitectura y la escultura tienen una apariencia muy adormida y artificial, generalmente imitaciones del estilo clásico y no tienen ningún efecto real, incluso aunque debas reconocer que es bonito. Lo más bonito es la Victoria sobre la Puerta de Brandenburgo, que hace el efecto de un pequeño

C. S. Peirce en Berlín (1875)

Familia de C. S. Peirce

Otros contactos

Corresponsales europeos
Thank you so much for your attention!

André De Tienne: adetienn@iupui.edu