This Edition

Scope and Objective

This edition contains the letters exchanged between Charles S. Peirce and the Open Court Publishing Company (OCP) from 1890 to 1913, roughly the last twenty-three years of Peirce’s life. OCP published more of Peirce’s philosophical writings than any other publisher during his lifetime, and played a critical role in what little recognition and financial income he received during those difficult yet philosophically rich years. This correspondence is the basis for much of what is known surrounding Peirce’s publications in The Monist and The Open Court, and is referenced often in Peirce editions dealing with his later work. Peirce’s OCP correspondents included Paul Carus, editor; Edward C. Hegeler, founder and owner; Thomas J. McCormack, assistant editor and translator; Francis C. Russell, Chicago attorney and OCP editorial contractor; and various other OCP editors and staff members. Also included in this edition (Appendix) are enclosures and other material related to the letters, with some exclusions noted in the text. Not included are letters exchanged within the OCP organization that make reference to Peirce. Significant portions of those letters are quoted or referenced in editorial notes, but their entirety is not necessary for a full account of the Peirce–OCP relationship, and for now falls out of the scope of this edition.

The date range for this correspondence (1890 to 1913) is determined by the first and last extant letters. While the beginning of the correspondence is fairly certain in 1890, the exact end of the correspondence is debatable. The correspondence paused from 1911 to 1913 due to Peirce’s preoccupations and declining health, and was revived with a brief exchange between Carus and Peirce in August and September 1913. No other letters are found and no textual evidence suggests that any letters are missing, but it is possible that the exchange continued into 1914 until Peirce’s death. This edition determines the end of the formal correspondence to be in 1913 based on the end of the extant material, but assumes that the Peirce–OCP relationship remained intact to some degree until Peirce’s death.

The objective of this edition is to provide for the first time a complete and accurate text of this oft-cited correspondence, with contextual annotation and textual apparatus. By so doing, this edition sheds critical light not only on Peirce and OCP, but also on the context, relationships, and concepts that influenced the development of Progressive Era American intellectual history and philosophy.
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Editorial Method

Text and arrangement

The text for this edition comes from manuscripts, typescripts, and letterpress typescript copies housed in the Peirce papers in the Houghton Library at Harvard University and in OCP records in the Morris Library Special Collections at Southern Illinois University—Carbondale. Most of the material used is what was actually exchanged in correspondence, and the remainder consists of carbon (letterpress) copies of missing typescripts, second-hand OCP copies of missing manuscripts or telegrams, and unsent drafts of letters. The letters are arranged chronologically based on dates provided or estimated (typically the date a letter was written or sent, not necessarily received), except for unsent drafts of letters, which immediately follow the final letter sent even if predated (e.g., an unsent draft of 19 July would follow the sent version of 26 August). Multiple unsent drafts are, however, ordered as chronologically as possible. Letters are divided by correspondent instead of consolidated as a single thread, to highlight the relationships Peirce had with each of his OCP contacts. A headnote preceding each division summarizes Peirce’s correspondence with the person and identifies significant themes and events in their relationship. Those with whom he held no regular correspondence, or unknown correspondents with a generic (typed) “Open Court Publishing Company” byline, are grouped under “Peirce and Other OCP Staff.” In few cases, letters signed generically but in a known hand are included in a specific correspondence where applicable, such as McCormack to Peirce 9 December 1896 (signed “The Monist” in his hand). Letters typed or written by an OCP amanuensis as dictated by Carus or Hegeler are included in the Carus or Hegeler correspondence—such letters typically contain dictator/transcriber initials following the signature, such as “PC/N” for Paul Carus dictation transcribed by J. G. Nattinger. Missing letters (deduced from the context of extant material), gaps in correspondence, and other critical context are addressed in inter-letter editorial notes enclosed in horizontal rules.

Bibliographical notes, headings, and closings

Bibliographical notes precede each letter and identify the sender and receiver, the type and source of the document(s), stationery or postal information, whether the letter was unsent, external notes found on the document, and any other bibliographical context. Where multiple documents exist for the same letter, such as a typescript and an accompanying letterpress copy, the first listed is given priority
and used to establish the text. For example: “TS: RL 77. On OCP Stationery B. LPC: SIU 91.12.” The text for this letter comes from a typescript on OCP stationery B found in the Houghton Library, a letterpress copy of which is found in SIU Special Collections. Any variants between excluded letterpress copies or manuscripts and the transcribed document are noted in textual endnotes, as explained in “Contextual annotation and textual apparatus”. Images of OCP stationery A–D are provided for reference throughout the Peirce–Carus correspondence at locations indicated in the list of figures in this edition. All other stationeries and letterhead are transcribed directly.

Date and address lines and closing and signature lines are standardized flush right, per common practice for most of the letters, with vertical lines occasionally in place of line breaks as an economy, such as “New York | Aug 7 | 1896”. Where closings and signatures are occasionally on one line, such as, “Yours truly, P. Carus,” two lines are used. Elements of the date and address line that are part of the stationery, such as “LaSalle, , 189 ” in OCP stationery, are included silently. Other letterhead elements not part of the date line are described in bibliographical notes. Estimated dates for undated letters are enclosed in italicized brackets in the date line. All signed names in the letters, including typescripts, are genuine hand signatures, so as an economy, the editorial note “[signed]” has not been used, except in two unclear cases: in McCormack to Peirce 9 December 1896, where McCormack signs “The Monist”, and in a draft of McCormack’s “Translator’s Preface” to Mach’s Science of Mechanics (Appendix), where he genuinely signs although not a letter.

Unsent letters and drafts of letters are identified accordingly in italicized brackets above the date and address line. An “Unsent” letter is one that was aborted, unsigned, crossed out, or otherwise estimated to be unsent based on textual, contextual, and bibliographical evidence. An “Unsent draft” is an unsent letter, whether aborted or complete, replaced by a sent version of the letter. Whether an unsent letter is truly a draft of another is sometimes debatable (see Carus to Peirce 19 May 1893, for example), but the general rule is that an unsent and a sent letter from the same time and with enough similarities to be considered versions of the same message are identified as drafts.
Formatting and layout

Paragraphing and spatial features are generally retained to convey the physiognomy of the letters, but not necessarily their exact appearance.

Example:

Mr. Charles S. Peirce  
12 West 39th Street,  
New York.

Instead of the more precise:

Mr. Charles S. Peirce  
12 West 39th Street,  
New York.

Diagrams, logical graphs, unique symbols, and other drawings, however, are duplicated more precisely than standard text to ensure that potentially meaningful nuances are portrayed (e.g., see the diagrams in the draft material from Peirce to Russell 10 July 1908). Other examples of spatial elements and variations that are observed include: the greeting on its own line or occasionally part of the first paragraph; extra indentation sometimes used in the first paragraph; unique indentation and spacing in lists, equations, and block quotes within letters; the alignment of tables or table-like text, often including ditto marks ("""") referring to text directly above; and extra spacing between words used instead of punctuation in telegrams. Examples of spatial elements typically not observed include: extra spacing between paragraphs (unless used deliberately to divide sections or ideas); exact line breaks in the body of letters; and conventions with heading and closing elements, which are mostly standardized as described previously.

Underlined text is instead italicized in transcription, and double-underlined text is italicized and single-underlined. Underlining is overlooked when used to count words or when added by another hand, typically by the recipient while adding accompanying comments—such cases are often noted in textual endnotes. Superscript and underlined superscript characters are retained.

Spelling and punctuation

In most cases spelling and punctuation have not been polished or normalized, in order to preserve the informal style and texture of the letters, and out of respect for
Peirce’s strong defiance of the “tyrant” of unnecessary orthographical convention. In a draft letter to The Nation sometime between 1907 and 1914, Peirce wrote:

I would suggest that every man who thinks that the tyranny of orthography ought to be broken down should regard it as a duty to begin spelling a few words,—not so many as to shock people very badly,—in a rational way; and let every man make his own selection, for the very purpose of disproving the popular prejudice that all educated people spell one way. For instance, I have for some time been asserting my individual liberty so far as to write most words in *ise* by *ize*, to spell *intrinsec*, and to indulge a few other protests against the tyrant. I know very well that I am in consequence of this heroic deed, generally set down as a semi-educated crank and nihilist; but I mean to wear the crown of martyrdom with a smile.¹

In this light, idiosyncratic and non-standard tendencies that have been retained in the text include: British or non-standard spellings such as Peirce’s *favour*, *marvellous*, *develope*, and *proceedure*; Russell’s *-ly* for *-lly*, as in *realy*, *totaly*, *especialy*, and *metaphoricaly*; Peirce’s *that* for *than*, as in would “rather have him do so that to go”; varying forms of contractions, such as *didnt*, *cant*, etc. with no apostrophe, or archaic *did’nt*, *could’nt*, etc.; varying forms of compounds, such as *anyone* and *any one*, *any way* and *any way*, *today* and *to day*, etc.; recurring variations in the spelling of proper names, such as *Kepler* for *Kepler* (who himself occasionally added the extra *p*, as discussed in *W 8:452*.), *Schröder* for *Schroeder*, *McCormack* for *McCollack*, *Halsted* for *Halsted*, *Lobatchewsky*, *Lobatchewski*, or *Lobachewski* for *Lobachevsky* (or *Lobachevski*), and *Gramercy* for *Grammercy*; Russell’s period following other end punctuation (“text?.”, “text!.”, etc.); and omitted final periods occasionally at ends of paragraphs.

However, anomalous misspellings (including of proper names), slips, repeated words, and other typos that fall outside of the special treatment described above, as well as idiosyncrasies that compromise readability or overly distract the reader, have been emended and noted in textual endnotes (denoted with an [*E*]). En dashes and other marks used as dashes (such as Russell’s “=” as in “text = text”) have been rendered as em dashes throughout the text. Peirce’s combination of punctuation and spaced en dash (“text, – text”) has been rendered as the given punctuation and em dash (“text,—text”). In some cases additional punctuation, such as necessary commas and closing quotation marks or parentheses, has been inserted silently for clarity, particularly for Russell who tended to omit commas in ways that belabor comprehension. For example (all commas mine):

I am too sensible of the favor accorded me, too sensible of the value and engrossment of your time to ask any such thing…. I have been in the habit ever since your “Illustrations of the

¹ *NEM 1:x–xi*, from R 1204.
Logic of Science” were published in the Pop. Sci. My. of picking up the numbers containing the six parts, taking out the leaves on which they were printed, binding them together, and then of donating such to . . .” (to Peirce 22 Jan 1889).

With this selective approach to emendation, gray areas are bound to arise since what counts as a significant variation versus a mere mistake is not always clear. More concrete alternatives previously considered for this edition were to establish a stricter diplomatic text and note all authorial errors and peculiarities or simply warn the reader of them in advance, or conversely to normalize virtually everything and note all editorial interventions. But such polarized approaches would result in a text that either is excessively rough (the former) for an edition with a larger readership than the intended audience of the original letters, or is excessively smooth (the latter) and neutralizes the personal touches inherent in letters. This edition therefore attempts to strike a balance between these public and private considerations, and employs best editorial judgement in debatable cases.

Equations and special characters

Peirce was a highly technical philosopher with an extensive background in mathematics and science and a passion for formal logic. He was also deliberate with his notation and occasionally used custom symbols. The dense mathematical and logical equations that appear in these letters, primarily between Peirce and Russell, have therefore been transcribed with utmost care and have not been normalized or emended. Three unique logical symbols have been custom designed for this edition: Peirce’s cursive claw or sign of inclusion (\(\prec\)), often represented as \(-\prec\) in print; his sign of relative addition (\(\Join\)), often represented as the overly “stiff” \(\Join\) in print; and his sign of logical addition or nonexclusive disjunction (\(\lor\)), often represented similarly as \(\lor\) in print. The basis for their design rests largely on Peirce’s detailed instructions and illustrations sent to McCormack 2 September 1896 and to Carus early November 1896 during the typesetting of his “The Logic of Relatives,” as well as on Peirce’s recurring usage of them in his manuscripts. Similar treatment has also been given to Peirce’s logical diagrams and graphs.

Contextual annotation and textual apparatus

Numbered footnotes provide background and contextual details, identify manuscripts and works, and cross-reference relevant letters and sources. Works sufficiently cited in the text are not footnoted; for these, readers can refer directly to the Bibliography. Peirce’s contemporaries mentioned repeatedly in the letters
are identified in the Biographical Register and typically not footnoted in the text, while persons mentioned incidentally or those deemed to be well-known historical figures (e.g., Kepler, Kant, and the like) are not included in the Register and are footnoted in the text as needed. Notes are not intended for in-depth philosophical analysis or other extensive commentary on the letters, although occasionally the temptation has been yielded to.

Referenced line numbers with an identifying lemma serve as the textual apparatus to record authorial alterations, editorial emendations, and other textual features, such as “4 new ] inserted above” (i.e., the word “new” on line 4 was inserted above the text in the manuscript). If the same lemma appears more than once on the same line, then a superscript numeral indicates which instance of the lemma the note refers to, such as “4 new² ] inserted above” (i.e., the second instance of the word “new” on line 4 was inserted above the text in the manuscript). As an aid, line numbers are displayed in the margin of each page. The elements of the textual apparatus convey to the reader the state of the manuscript and of the writer’s mindset at the time of writing, and in many cases expose substantial content omitted in the letter or in a previous draft. For each variant, to the left of the closing bracket is the final state of the text in question (the lemma) as it appears in the edition, and to the right of the bracket are one or more of these: a notation of the authorial alteration, the uncorrected authorial text before editorial emendation (denoted by [E]), or the variant or altered text in another copy or draft not included (denoted by [MS], [TS2], etc.). A combination of descriptive and symbolic notation is used for indicating alterations, which allows the editor to choose one in cases where the other would break down or obscure, or to use a combination of the two for optimal clarity or concision. Typically, descriptive notation is used in simple revisions and symbolic notation in more complex revisions. For example, “new ] inserted above” instead of “new ] \new/” or “new ] \~/”, but “the new paper, I presume] the two \new/ papers, \I heard papers, \I heard /presume\” instead of several descriptive notes: “new ] above two”, “paper, ] final s deleted and comma inserted”, etc. A simpler alternative to recording variants that is used in many editions is to note the lemma to the left of the bracket, as usual, but indicate the original pre-revised text to the right of the bracket without tracking revisions. The same example above would then become “the new paper, I presume ] the two papers I heard”. Readers could deduce many of the revisions that took place and would be spared from notation and symbols, but because this convention does not explain how the revisions were made (inserted above or below, superimposed, etc.), nor reflect re-revision and heavily worked-over content, readers cannot get a full sense of the state of the manuscript or of the writer’s thought process. The more detailed approach described here has therefore been used to preserve these elements. Alterations in typescripts are made in pen un-
less noted otherwise ("his \textit{over} her" vs. "his \textit{typed over} her"). Editorial emendations in endnotes are indicated with an [E], and in-text editorial notes, conjectures, and other notations are set off with italicized brackets distinct from Peirce’s own roman brackets. In some cases, substantive alternate portions of a letter are included in footnotes instead of the textual apparatus for greater accessibility to the reader.

Below is a summary of the editorial notation and symbols used in this edition. Occasionally more detailed descriptions than what is here listed are used, with or without a lemma, as in “Alter his ... the sponsor.] across header and down right margin” or in another case simply “This paragraph up left margin”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{inserted}</td>
<td>Simple insertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{above, below, in-line, etc.}</td>
<td>Insertion above or below another alteration (typically deletion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{above, below}</td>
<td>Example: critic \textit{above} writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{over}</td>
<td>Superimposition of whole words or false starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{after}</td>
<td>Indication of alteration (typically deletion) relative to lemma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{text}</td>
<td>Deletion of text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{&lt;text&gt;}</td>
<td>Deletion within deletion in complex revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{&lt;punctuation&gt;}</td>
<td>Deletion of punctuation in complex revisions, where strikethrough is unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Example: Nor do I \textit{after} \textit{didn’t} \textit{don’t}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples: &lt;,&gt; vs. \textit{\tau}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{&lt;---&gt;} vs. \textit{—}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Superimpositions in complex revisions or in partial-word substitutions (text B over text A)

Examples: Your | Although *y*Your discoveries | discover*y*ies

\text/ Insertion above in complex revisions

/text\ Insertion below in complex revisions

^text^ Insertion in-line in complex revisions

[E] Endnoted editorial emendation

Example: aware ] award [E] (i.e., the MS reads “award” but has been emended in this edition to “aware”.)

[MS], [TS1], [TS2], etc. Endnoted variant or alteration from an excluded draft or copy

Example: sent ] delivered/ sent [TS2] (i.e., an excluded second TS copy [TS2] contains a correction that was retained in the final document transcribed.)

[text] In-text editorial note or added word for clarity

[?text] In-text conjecture of illegible word or words (handwriting is unclear or MS is deteriorated or torn)

[?] Illegible word or words (handwriting is unclear or MS is deteriorated or torn)

[ ] End of content before page end, likely aborted

[...] Missing connecting page, before or after

[..] Editorial ellipsis for partial transcriptions in endnotes
## Abbreviations

Below is a list of abbreviations widely adopted in Peirce editions and used in this one. The format chosen is similar to that used in the *Writings* and *Essential Peirce* editions by the Peirce Edition Project. Also included are bibliographic abbreviations specific to this edition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPB</td>
<td>Letterpress copy of a typescript letter found in OCP Letterpress Book in SIU Special Collections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>Generic letterpress copy of a letter in general OCP correspondence in SIU Special Collections, not in OCP LPB and containing no LPB copy number. LPCs are of typescripts unless noted otherwise (e.g., “LPC (MS)”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCP</td>
<td>Open Court Publishing Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R [ISP #] A manuscript from the Peirce papers in Houghton Library at Harvard University listed in Richard S. Robin’s *Annotated Catalogue of the Papers of Charles S. Peirce* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1967). Letters are denoted RL [ISP #]. For the most part, Russell–Peirce MSS are in RL 387 while all other Harvard letters are from RL 77. The full citation to these letters is: Charles Sanders Peirce papers, MS Am 1632 (L[77/387]), Houghton Library, Harvard University.


SIU [box #.folder #] A letter or document from OCP company records in Morris Library Special Collections at Southern Illinois University. The full citation to these letters is: MSS 27, Box [#], Folder [#], Open Court Publishing Company records, Special Collections Research Center, Southern Illinois University–Carbondale.

SIU [box #.folder #. LPB copy #] An LPB copy of a typescript letter from SIU Special Collections. The LPB copy number is found in the top-right corner of the document.

TS Typescript


**De Gruyter publication considerations**

In addition to the editorial conventions described in this chapter, this edition also complies with De Gruyter publication conventions that require certain elements of the text to be standardized or otherwise modified for optimal layout. Paragraph indentation and line breaks have occasionally been modified to avoid problematic textual spacing and page breaks. Some diagrams are presented between paragraphs instead of wrapped by surrounding text as shown in the source text to improve readability. Large numbers without commas are spaced out every three orders of magnitude for improved readability, and similarly monetary symbols are
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