

From Mike  
Key to Hegel's translation  
Wallace  
Dec. 10, 1986

Dear Raya:

I have been trying to trace the divergence between the German text of para. 76 of the Encyclopedia and the Wallace translation. It has been puzzling and frustrating. Let me tell you what I've found.

First, I examined all of Hegel's texts for that paragraph. Of course, it did not exist at all in this form in the 1817 edition. It first appears in the 1827 edition, and there is no important change between the text of paragraph 76 in 1827 and 1830. The only change at all is that Hegel removed the last part of the last sentence of his footnote to the paragraph (the one beginning with the quotation from Descartes' Principia Philosophica).

Second, the text that Wallace used for his translation is the 1840 text, which was edited by Leopold Von Henning. This is the one which first brought in large additions of Zusatze. However, that is not the source of Wallace's divergence either, since the Von Henning text of paragraph 76 does not differ at all from the 1830 edition. By the way, his Zusatze are clearly marked (for example, there is one at the end of paragraph 74); and there is none for para. 76.

Third, the text in your German edition is perfectly good, and is nearly the most current representative of the whole movement of publishing critical editions of Hegel's works that began with Lasson at the turn of the 20th century. Kauffmann (enclosed) has a useful discussion of the textual problems of the Encyclopedia in Ch. 52 of his book. He shows how the Zusatze additions were inserted without regard to the year of Hegel's formulating them, and calls into question Wallace's editing of them. None of this, however, gets to the point of Wallace's translation problems as such, and none of it directly concerns the attitudes to objectivity. Kaufmann does say, in the Preface (where he also attacks Findlay), that Wallace's translation is, in his opinion, "inadequate", and elsewhere he calls it "very free". Others, including Findlay, refer to it as a "free" translation-- this whether they are praising or criticising it.

So the heart of the problem is that Wallace has taken the Von Henning text (which differs not at all from either Hegel's 1827 or 1830 text insofar as para. 76 is concerned), and translated it in a way that made it more "accessible" (my phrase) to readers. Take that very first part of para. 76. ~~the part before the elaboration of the~~ (the part before the elaboration of the

11270

three points Hegel says Descartes and the modern followers have in common)

In Hegel, it is one sentence-- one very difficult, complicated sentence.

In Wallace, it becomes three sentences. Wallace uses the word "Jacobi" twice here; in the Hegel text (original), Jacobi's name does not appear.

NOTE: This insertion of Jacobi's name by Wallace is not limited to para. 76 alone. Wallace also adds it to the first sentence of para. 63. And he adds it to the penultimate section of para. 63-- the very sentence you were asking me about the other day: "The Christian faith comprises in it an authority of the Church, but the faith of Jacobi's philosophy has no other authority than that of personal revelation". Jacobi's name is added also to the ~~second~~ third sentence of para. 77 in Wallace.

Raya, I don't know that any of these additions change the meaning. That is, when Hegel uses a more "inclusive" word, like "modern times," or "modern standpoint", he clearly is pointing to the Intuitionists. But perhaps Hegel didn't want to tie it so tightly to Jacobi that future readers wouldn't see the category in another appearance (?).

\* Of more concern to me is the rest of the paragraph (76), especially the fact that there is no direct relation between Wallace's use of the word "reactionary", and the German text, at least as far as I can see. As I said, it isn't a one-to-one translation anyway; the thrust is there. And Hegel surely was saying that Jacobi's doctrine was a "reversion" to the Cartesian school. But the formulation that Wallace presents as "reactionary nature of the school of Jacobi" is not there in the text.

None of this, I don't think, has ~~any~~ any direct bearing on the letter you wrote to Kelley, with its entirely new breakthrough on philosophy's dialectic and organization's dialectic. But it does seem wrong that we have had no new translation of the smaller Logic since 1892, if Wallace was more concerned with "popularization" than exactness.

I have enclosed my xeroxes of all the editions with respect to that paragraph, as well as Kaufmann's comments. You know, Raya, you seem to be a very rare bird indeed in your interest in the three attitudes to objectivity. It is a most neglected subject even among Hegel scholars.

Yours,  
Mike

11271