


Postcard
Postmarked Boston 1905 Sep 21
Professor Royce
103 Irving Street
Cambridge, Mass

Yours rec'd. I shall not read it at once, because I should be sure to lose time owing to being too interested in it. I see I blundered as to finite systems. My study of your paper had to be done in walking, and so I was led to assume that () in your principle might be thought of as a collection of 3 elements. I have put my interpretation of the O relation into strictly demonstrative form. Your notion that a disquarance can be composed exclusively from equiparances & for which you argue by a weaker variation of Kempe's argument Math. Form, §69 is absurd & the fallacy is a strange one to come from you trained as you are. Also you say nothing about that weakened the distinction between dyadic & triadic relations. Look at my original definition ([off to the side:] In connection with my matric O which also [illegible] him this subject.) of a disquarance O & my noting that a cousin of a friend is such (because cousin & friend are composed ([off to the side:] as they are also aggregated. It was this last point that I insisted on] of disquarances). Also consider my existential graphs. C. S. Peirce