completed only the first chapter (see EP2:11–26). Later in the year, Peirce submitted How to Reason to another textbook publisher, the American Book Company. Although we have not found an actual rejection letter, it is clear the manuscript was not accepted.

In March of the following year, 1895, Peirce seems to have given up on the idea of publishing How to Reason. In a letter to his brother Jem he wrote, “I had a great ambition to some day write a Popular Logic for the Million—But I must be upon my guard against things I have an inclination for.” However, by August, Peirce was clearly back in the running, writing Russell that his logic “has been completed & largely rewritten.” It is unclear whether he submitted the manuscript at this point, but he may have tried to strike a deal by combining it with his geometry textbook, an extensively revised republication of his father’s Elementary Treatise on Geometry. Whatever happened, by November, part of the manuscript ended up in the hands of Russell in Chicago, who kept it until June 1896. At the end of September, Peirce asked Russell about the possibility of publishing How to Reason with the Open Court, adding that the chapter on quantitative logic, which he had sent to Russell earlier, needed serious revision, requiring a “few months more of terribly hard work.”

About two years later, in 1898, D.C. Heath & Co. invited Peirce, on the recommendation of Josiah Royce, to write a small logic manual. Peirce optimistically replied by sending a proposal for three small volumes, in which he probably sought to include the material from How to Reason. Peirce’s proposal was more than the editors of Heath & Co. had bargained for. On top of that, they thought Peirce’s logic was terribly outdated. They answered, “From your description of your work it is evidently scholastic and belongs to a period of thought which rather antedates the present marked interest in science.” This seems to mark the end of Peirce’s attempts to get the book published.

The Manuscript Material

The surviving manuscript material is remarkably complete with only a few pages missing here and there. The most significant gap is that the first chapter starts at page sixteen with §16. It might be that the missing fifteen pages were superseded by the current eighty-three-page introduction on the association of ideas, of which we have two versions. That this introduction was written at a later date is suggested by the fact that two isolated sheets are pulled from a draft of chapter 6.

It is not yet entirely clear how much rewriting Peirce did after first submitting the manuscript in 1894. The chapters were obviously reshuffled, as Peirce changed several of the chapter numbers. The correspondence suggests that after its initial submission, Peirce did not work much on the manuscript until the spring of 1896, and that he planned to revise the chapter on quantitative logic. No substantial alternative draft of this chapter (chapter 23) has so far been identified. However, there are substantial revisions found for chapter 8, one of the most technical chapters in the book. Moreover, there are two versions of chapter 6.

The surviving manuscript also appears to be set up as a three-volume work, in conformity with Peirce’s proposal to D.C. Heath & Co. Each of the three books into which the table of contents is divided starts at page 1. If this is correct, it might indicate that the long introduction on the association of ideas was actually dropped in favor of the now missing (or possibly later recycled) fifteen-page introduction, thereby reversing the above hypothesis concerning these missing pages.

This short account of Peirce’s How to Reason must conclude with a disclaimer. There are still many uncertainties regarding the precise compositional sequence of the documents, which we hope to clear up further as we work to publish this important book, for the first time, in 2004, well over a century after Peirce first submitted it.

Cornelis de Waal