

One more Note on the Translation of Hegel's Science of Logic

On p. 705 of the translation, line 7 from the bottom, instead of

$x^{m-1} - 1$ divided by **1**

read

$x^{m-1} - 1$ divided by ***m***.

This is an especially unfortunate blunder because of the history behind this particular text. In my now corrected translation, the text reads in part: "The same [viz. that it develops analytically] applies to the solution of the equation $x^m - 1 = 0$ with the aid of the sine, and also to the immanent algebraic solution, famously discovered by Gauß, which takes into consideration as an aid the *residuum* of $x^{m-1} - 1$ divided by **m**."

Now, if one looks at A. V. Miller's translation of the text (p. 792, bottom), one finds that it has indeed the correct $x^{m-1} - 1$ divided by ***m***. However, instead of the preceding $x^m - 1 = 0$, it has $x^{m-1} = 0$. And this is an error which trivializes Hegel's illustration. At its origin is an unexplained emendation that Georg Lasson made in his 1923 edition of Hegel's works to the hitherto accepted correct text, without noting the fact. This emendation set the norm for subsequent editions of the Logic from 1923 until 1978, and also influenced all translations into non-German languages, Miller's included, the only exception being the Labarrière/Jarczyk translation into French of 1981. Finally, the 1981 Hogemann/Jaeschke's critical edition of the Subjective Logic set the text straight (GW 12.207.37-208.5). I followed this text in my translation but regretfully introduced a truly unexplainable new blunder.

For a detailed history of this text, and a discussion of Hegel's treatment of Gauss, see: Edward Beach, "Hegel's Misunderstood Treatment of Gauss in the *Science of the Logic*: Its Implications for his Philosophy of Mathematics", in *Idealistic Studies*, 36.3(2006) 191-218. ISSN0046-8541.

I am grateful to the author for pointing to my error.

Also, on p. 74 of the translation, last full paragraph, instead of “correctly,” read “abundantly.” I am grateful to Professor Brendan Boyle of St John’s College (Annapolis) for this correction.

More corrections provided by readers:

1. There is an important typographical error on page 339, in the introduction to the doctrine of essence. Instead of, "Essence is in the whole what **quality** was in the sphere of being," read "Essence is in the whole what **quantity** was in the sphere of being."

2. Also, on the very first page of Section I: Quality, in the second paragraph, read "Since it is **indeterminate**, it is being without quality," instead of "Since it is **immediate**, it is being without quality."

3. P. 485, first line of second paragraph (11.389, line 3): instead of “The relativity of real possibility. . . ,“ read “The relativity of real necessity. . . .”

4. Instead of "This proposition, as we know, is that the circle is equal to a right-angle triangle, one side of which enclosing the right angle equals the diameter of the circle and the other its circumference " (p. 261) read "radius", not "diameter."! The German is *Halbmesser*, which is the antiquated word for *Radius*.

George di Giovanni

McGill University, Montréal