

Equiparance

1895-6 [c.] | That Categorical and Hypothetical Propositions are one in essence, with some connected matters | CP 1.567

The logical and hemilogical relations belong to the old class of relations of reason, while relations *in re* are alogical. But there are a few not unimportant relations of reason which are likewise alogical. In my paper of 1867, I committed the error of identifying those relations constituted by non-relative characters with relations of equiparance, that is, with necessarily mutual relations, and the dynamical relations with relations of disquiparance, or possibly non-mutual relations. Subsequently, falling out of one error into another, I identified the two classes respectively with relations of reason and relations *in re*.

The "paper of 1867" is 'On a New List of Categories'

1901-1902 [c.] | Definitions for Baldwin's Dictionary [R] | MS [R] 1147

An *equiparance* is a fact about a set of objects irrespective of their order, such as *being together, being alike, being unlike...*

1906 | The Basis of Pragmaticism | EP 2:381

...an *equiparance*; that is, the relation of *B* to *A* is essentially the same as that of *A* to *B*, so far as the duality of the pair is concerned. But no equiparance whatever, with the exception of the very few that are necessary, such as *identity, coexistence, etc.*, is a *logically simple relation*.

1906-7 | PAP [ed.] | NEM 4:325

Which is the more primitive (or fundamental, or simple) form of relation, that of an Equiparance (i.e. a reciprocal relation), or that of a Disquiparance? I say that it is the Disquiparance, or rather, it is the *Opponency*, or relation of which a specialization may be a Disquiparance.