

'Corollarial Reasoning' (pub. 06.01.13-14:54). Quote in M. Bergman & S. Paavola (Eds.), *The Commens Dictionary: Peirce's Terms in His Own Words. New Edition*. Retrieved from <http://www.commens.org/dictionary/entry/quote-neglected-argument-reality-god-o>.

---

**Term:** Corollarial Reasoning

**Quote:** Deduction has two parts. [—] Explication is followed by Demonstration, or Deductive Argumentation. [—] It invariably requires something of the nature of a diagram; that is, an "Icon," or Sign that represents its Object in resembling it. It usually, too, needs "Indices," or Signs that represent their Objects by being actually connected with them. But it is mainly composed of "Symbols," or Signs that represent their Objects essentially because they will be so interpreted. Demonstration should be *Corollarial* when it can. An accurate definition of Corollarial Demonstration would require a long explanation; but it will suffice to say that it limits itself to considerations already introduced or else involved in the Explication of its conclusion; while *Theorematic* Demonstration resorts to a more complicated process of thought.

**Source:** Peirce, C. S. (1908). *A Neglected Argument for the Reality of God (O)*. MS [R] 841.

**References:** EP 2:441-442; CP 6.471

**Date of** 1908

**Quote:**

**URL:** <http://www.commens.org/dictionary/entry/quote-neglected-argument-reality-god-o>