

STUDIES  
IN THE  
HEGELIAN DIALECTIC

BY

JOHN McTAGGART ELLIS McTAGGART, M.A.  
FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE IN CAMBRIDGE.

CAMBRIDGE:  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

1896

*[All Rights reserved.]*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## CHAPTER I.

### THE GENERAL NATURE OF THE DIALECTIC.

	PAGE
1. The logical connection of categories . . . . .	1
2. The form of this connection is progressively modified . . . . .	2
3. The dialectic is a process of reconstruction . . . . .	3
4. Which takes place by alternate production and removal of contradictions . . . . .	4
5. An objection to this raised by Hartmann . . . . .	5
6. In what sense the dialectic may be said to be objective . . . . .	6
7. The imperfection of finite things does not involve, for Hegel, the objective reality of the dialectic as a process . . . . .	7
8. The dialectic does not violate the law of contradiction . . . . .	8
9. The importance of the idea of negation is only secondary . . . . .	10
10. The relation of the dialectic to ordinary thought . . . . .	11
11. Hartmann's criticisms of this relation . . . . .	12
12. The same continued . . . . .	14
13. The dialectic must prove its validity to the Understanding . . . . .	14
14. The relation of the dialectic to experience . . . . .	16
15. The relation of the dialectic to experience further defined . . . . .	17
16. The basis upon which the dialectic works is the nature of experience . . . . .	19
17. The postulate which it assumes is the validity of the category of Being . . . . .	20
18. And the denial of this postulate is contradictory . . . . .	21
19. The argument of the dialectic is transcendental . . . . .	21
20. The epistemological result of the dialectic . . . . .	22
21. The negative effects of this . . . . .	22 ✓
22. Its positive effects . . . . .	23
23. We are not entitled to consider pure thought as independent of experience . . . . .	24
24. The relation of Hegel's epistemology to Kant's . . . . .	25

	PAGE
25. The ontological result of the dialectic—ambiguity of the phrase	26
26. Hegel's deduction of Nature and Spirit from the Logic . . . . .	27
27. This deduction does not treat pure thought as independent of experience . . . . .	28
28. The importance of the ontological result of the dialectic . . . . .	29
29. Comparison of Hegel with his immediate predecessors in philosophy . . . . .	30

## CHAPTER II.

### DIFFERENT INTERPRETATIONS OF THE DIALECTIC.

30. Introductory . . . . .	32
<b>A.</b>	
31. Trendelenburg's view that the dialectic is <i>per se</i> sterile, and gains its advance by illegitimate appeals to experience . . . . .	32
32. The errors involved in this view . . . . .	33
33-43. Passages from the Encyclopaedia bearing on this view . . . . .	35
44. The true relation of the dialectic to experience is not made clear by Hegel . . . . .	48
45. Reasons for this . . . . .	49
46. Hegel's assertion that the dialectic is without presuppo- sition . . . . .	50
<b>B.</b>	
47. The relation of the Absolute Idea to experience . . . . .	51
48. The Absolute Idea transcends contingency, but not im- mediacy . . . . .	52
49. Hegel's definition of the Absolute Idea . . . . .	54
<b>C.</b>	
50. Professor Seth's view as to the ontological claims of the dialectic . . . . .	55
51. Hegel's description of the transition from Logic to Nature and Spirit . . . . .	55
52. The interpretation placed on this by Professor Seth . . . . .	57
53. Who confuses two charges—that Hegel tried to <i>synthetically</i> deduce Nature and Spirit from thought, and that he tried to deduce Existence from Essence . . . . .	58
54. But the first of these does not involve the second . . . . .	60
55. Hegel would have been wrong in trying to do the first . . . . .	61
56. But the arguments in support of the theory that he did try are untenable . . . . .	62

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

ix

	PAGE
57. And Hegel says himself that his deduction is of a different nature . . . . .	64
58. There <i>is</i> a deduction, but it is not purely synthetic . . .	65
59. The treatment of Contingency in the Logic as bearing on this question . . . . .	65
60. The second charge—deducing Existence from Essence. We cannot do this . . . . .	67
61. But if the deduction of Nature and Spirit is purely analytic, this second charge must fall to the ground . . . . .	68
62. The meaning of the phrase "absolute" as used by Hegel of his own philosophy . . . . .	69
63. Hegel's treatment of Kant's objections to the ontological argument . . . . .	69
64. It depends on the different definitions of God adopted by Hegel and Kant . . . . .	71
65. Professor Seth's assertion that Hegel depreciates the individual	72
66. And that his Absolute Spirit is a mere abstraction . . .	74

CHAPTER III.

THE VALIDITY OF THE DIALECTIC.

67. Introductory . . . . .	76
<b>A.</b>	
68. Mr Balfour's criticism of transcendental arguments . . .	77
69. Which rests on a confusion of the different senses in which we may be said to be conscious of an element in experience	78
70. The same subject continued . . . . .	80
71. The justification of the Reason to the Understanding. The longing for the Absolute is not merely ethical or emotional	80
72. The Understanding demands a complete explanation of the universe . . . . .	82
73. Which it cannot itself supply . . . . .	83
74. Since many of its categories lead to contradictions . . .	84
75. And this must lead to scepticism; not, as Hartmann suggests, to separation between thought and being . . . . .	85
76. The Reason can supply such an explanation . . . . .	86
77. Which the Understanding must therefore accept . . . . .	87
78. The Understanding and the Reason are not separate and unconnected faculties . . . . .	88
<b>B.</b>	
79. We are justified in assuming the validity of the category of Being as a starting-point . . . . .	90

	PAGE
80. As to the process—first from a synthesis to the new thesis	91
81. The process from thesis to antithesis. Neither sterile nor empirical . . . . .	91
82. The consideration of the categories in detail is impossible here . . . . .	93
83. The process from thesis and antithesis to synthesis . . .	94
84. Hartmann's objection to the possibility of this . . . .	94
85. Trendelenburg's objection that the dialectic is merely a history of subjective knowledge . . . . .	96
86. But, although it only retraces abstractions, it gives new knowledge . . . . .	97
87. And reverses the order of explanation current in science .	98
88. Nor is it merely a process of subjective thought . . .	99
89. The dialectic does not displace the finite sciences, but does not depend on them . . . . .	100
90. Though an advanced state of the finite sciences may be an aid in <i>discovering</i> the dialectic . . . . .	102
91. The idea of Motion—according to Trendelenburg introduced empirically in the category of Becoming . . . . .	103
92. But in reality it is deducible by pure thought . . . .	104
93. Nor does Becoming specially involve time or space . . .	106
94. Nor is it, if taken correctly, much more concrete than Being . . . . .	108
<b>C.</b>	
95. The ontological validity of the dialectic. The denial of the thing-in-itself is justifiable . . . . .	108
96. Mr Schiller's objection that thought may be inadequate to reality . . . . .	110
97. Unjustifiable, since reality itself can only be known to us by thought. . . . .	111
98. Transition from Logic to Nature and Spirit . . . . .	113
99. Thought can never be self-subsistent, but must have a given <i>datum</i> . . . . .	114
100. The transition might have been made differently. Importance of this . . . . .	115
101. Lotze's criticism of "the identity of Thought and Being." Ambiguity of this phrase . . . . .	116
102. Lotze seems to take it as meaning that Being is identical with what is thought about Being . . . . .	117
103. In this sense Hegel did not hold the doctrine . . . . .	118
104. He held it in the sense that Being is identical with what it thinks :—perhaps he was mistaken . . . . .	118
105. The essence of Idealism is the assertion that Being is rational, not that it is Thought . . . . .	119

CHAPTER IV.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE METHOD

	PAGE
106. Introductory . . . . .	121
<b>A.</b>	
107. Hegel's own expressions on this subject . . . . .	121
108. As the process continues the categories become less stable and self-contained . . . . .	123
109. And the antithesis marks an advance from the thesis . . . . .	124
110. This second change is connected with the first . . . . .	125
111. The first is explicitly mentioned by Hegel. The second is not . . . . .	126
112. The change seems to be continuous from category to category . . . . .	127
113. Such a change in the method of the dialectic is antecedently probable . . . . .	129
114. And it is antecedently probable that it will be continuous . . . . .	131
115. The change consists in combining the search for complete- ness and the search for harmony, which were originally separate stages . . . . .	131
116. Hence the change does not destroy the validity of the process . . . . .	133
117. The subordinate importance of negation in the dialectic is thus made still clearer than before . . . . .	134
<b>B.</b>	
118. Hegel asserts that the dialectic process is an adequate analysis of the Absolute Idea . . . . .	135
119. But this we now see reasons to doubt . . . . .	136
120. Hegel's own premises lead us, on this point, to reject his conclusion . . . . .	137
121. The dialectic thus becomes, in a sense, subjective . . . . .	139
122. Owing to an inevitable characteristic of our thought . . . . .	140
123. It does not give a fully adequate account of its own nature . . . . .	141
124. This does not diminish its power of demonstrating that the Absolute Idea alone is completely valid of reality . . . . .	143
125. Nor of determining the relative truth of the different categories . . . . .	144
126. Nor are we left ignorant of the nature of the Absolute Idea . . . . .	145
127. The essential and unessential elements in the process . . . . .	146
128. The dialectic process may be looked on as primarily continuous. This is confirmed by the inequality of the subdivisions of the Logic . . . . .	147

	PAGE
129. And by the possibility of discovering direct dialectic connection between divisions which are not the lowest . . . . .	148
130. The effect of this with regard to any error in the detail of the dialectic . . . . .	149
C.	
131. The triad of Logic, Nature, and Spirit . . . . .	150
132. This transition is made by a triad of the Notion-type . . . . .	151
133. But it could be made by a triad of the Being-type . . . . .	152
134. This confirms the view taken above of the change of method . . . . .	154
135. The alternative adopted by Hegel was on the whole the best . . . . .	154
136. But the other has some advantages . . . . .	155
137. Which Hegel's does not share . . . . .	156
138. The same continued . . . . .	157
139. Conclusion . . . . .	158

## CHAPTER V.

### THE RELATION OF THE DIALECTIC TO TIME.

A.	
140. Difficulties in the way of taking the development of the dialectic in time as ultimately real . . . . .	159 -
141. Such a process in time must be finite in length . . . . .	160 -
142. And the question would arise: Why did it begin where it did? . . . . .	161 -
143. Which cannot be avoided by referring it to a timeless basis . . . . .	163
144. Nor by the suggestion that time only begins when change begins. . . . .	164
145. Nor by arguing that the idea of finite time cannot be contradictory, since that of infinite time is impossible . . . . .	165
146. We must rather suppose that the idea of time is not ultimate . . . . .	166
147. The lower stages of the dialectic cannot exist by themselves, since they are contradictory . . . . .	167
148. And we saw above that the dialectic must be a process of reconstruction . . . . .	168
149. Hegel's own language is against the theory of development in time . . . . .	169
B.	
150. But the rejection of this theory involves that the universe is now perfect . . . . .	172
151. Which involves us again in serious difficulties . . . . .	173
152. Hegel's answer that evil is a delusion is unsatisfactory . . . . .	173

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xiii

	PAGE
153. Since on his theory a delusion could never be completely rational . . . . .	175
154. The suggestion that the universe is perfect <i>sub specie aeternitatis</i> . . . . .	175
155. It is more effective than Hegel's own answer . . . . .	177
156. And must not be confounded with the theory that imperfections of the parts disappear in the whole . . . . .	177
157. But it was not Hegel's own view—nor will it solve the difficulty . . . . .	179
158. Which seems to be insoluble . . . . .	180
159. And naturally so, since it is, in fact, the problem of the origin of evil . . . . .	181

O.

160. Can any other theory extricate us from the difficulties which are involved in the assertion that the universe is eternally perfect? . . . . .	182
161. Not the theory that it is fundamentally irrational . . . . .	184
162. An absolute dualism is impossible . . . . .	184
163. And, if possible, would not solve the difficulty, supposing one side predominated . . . . .	186
164. Or supposing both were exactly balanced . . . . .	187
165. We should succeed no better with the theory that reality is totally indifferent to reason . . . . .	188
166. Or indifferent to the higher categories . . . . .	188
167. And to take refuge in scepticism proves equally impossible . . . . .	189
168. Our difficulty does not arise from a <i>reductio ad absurdum</i> . . . . .	190
169. And we have no more right to reject the dialectic than we have to reject the arguments against it . . . . .	191
170. We may hope for a synthesis of the opposed positions . . . . .	192
171. Since they are opposed as contraries, not as contradictories . . . . .	193
172. But we do not know of what nature such a synthesis could be, nor have we any positive evidence for its existence . . . . .	195
173. We should have such evidence if we knew that the detail of the dialectic were correct throughout . . . . .	195-
174. Conclusion . . . . .	196
175-178. Note on Mr Schiller's paper "The Metaphysics of the Time-Process" . . . . .	197

## CHAPTER VI.

## THE FINAL RESULT OF THE DIALECTIC.

## A.

	PAGE
179. Hegel makes the highest stage in the nature of Spirit to be Philosophy . . . . .	203
180. His account of this . . . . .	204
181. Philosophy must be considered to be merely a state of knowledge . . . . .	205
182. Philosophy, as we have it at present, is clearly not adequate for this position. . . . .	206
183. And Hegel never attempted to deduce facts from the nature of pure thought . . . . .	207
184. Nor will it suffice to make philosophy end by proving the necessity of philosophy . . . . .	208
185. Taking a wider meaning of philosophy—we shall never be able to dispense with immediate data . . . . .	209
186. But a perfect system of knowledge is conceivable, in which contingency vanishes. . . . .	210
187. Such an ideal is remote, but not contradictory . . . . .	212
188. It would leave no question unanswered, except Why is the universe as a whole what it is?—which is an unmeaning question . . . . .	213

## B.

189. Even such knowledge, however, is not a complete expression of Spirit . . . . .	214
190. For volition is not reducible to knowledge . . . . .	215
191. Though both of them may perhaps be synthesised in a higher unity . . . . .	216
192. Nor are pleasure and pain reducible to knowledge . . . . .	217
193. Though, like volition, they are inseparable from it . . . . .	217
194. But can knowledge, as such, be even <i>part</i> of the true nature of Spirit? . . . . .	218
195. It postulates complete unity and differentiation between subject and object . . . . .	218
196. The <i>This</i> in knowledge . . . . .	219
197. Which is essential to knowledge, and which knowledge must always regard as alien . . . . .	221
198. The <i>This</i> prevents knowledge reaching complete unity and differentiation . . . . .	222

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

XV

	PAGE
199. Thus knowledge can never express quite adequately the harmony of the universe . . . . .	223
200. Nor does the possibility of self-knowledge get over the difficulty . . . . .	223
201. This defect is the reason why we cannot cease to ask, Why is the universe as a whole what it is?—though we know the question to be unmeaning . . . . .	224
202. We find some support for this view in the Logic . . . . .	226
203. Since philosophy there comes under the subordinate category of Cognition . . . . .	227
204. Hegel's treatment of the last stages of the Philosophy of Spirit is imperfect . . . . .	228
205. Philosophy should rather be part of the antithesis—not the synthesis . . . . .	229
206. Conclusion . . . . .	231

CHAPTER VII.

THE APPLICATION OF THE DIALECTIC.

207. Introductory . . . . .	233
208. The application of the dialectic to determine the nature of ultimate reality . . . . .	234
209. The practical importance of this . . . . .	235
210. The application of the dialectic to the interpretation of the facts round us . . . . .	236
211. This is the part of Hegel's system which is now most generally received . . . . .	238
212. But it seems doubtful if it is valid . . . . .	238
213. <i>The first difficulty</i> —we cannot recognise theses, antitheses, or syntheses, except in relation to one another . . . . .	239
214. Thus we shall require points independently fixed to begin from or end at. We have such in the Logic . . . . .	240
215. But not in the applications of the Logic . . . . .	241
216. The terms of which, till seen in relation to each other, only differ quantitatively . . . . .	241
217. The initial point of the Philosophy of Nature, and the final point of the Philosophy of Spirit, are exceptions . . . . .	242
218. Attempts to fix the extreme points in the Philosophies of Nature, Spirit, and Religion, . . . . .	243
219. in the History of Philosophy and the Philosophy of Law . . . . .	244
220. and in the Philosophy of History. A criticism by Lotze . . . . .	245
221. The reason of the exceptions mentioned in Section 217 . . . . .	246

	PAGE
222. <i>The second difficulty.</i> In Religion, History, Law, and Philosophy, the dialectic process is affected by external influences . . . . .	248
223. And, in another manner, in Nature and Spirit . . . . .	249
224. We know that there is a dialectic process in facts, but are unable to trace it . . . . .	250
225. <i>The third difficulty.</i> The extent and intricacy of the subject-matter . . . . .	251
226. These difficulties can be avoided by taking abstract qualities, rather than actual facts, as the terms of our dialectic . . . . .	252
227. As in Hegel's treatment of Innocence, Sin, and Virtue . . . . .	254
228. Or of the conception of Dying to live . . . . .	255
229. But the main practical interest of philosophy lies in upholding the abstract assertion that reality is rational and righteous . . . . .	255
230. For this cannot be done at all, except by philosophy . . . . .	256
231. Nor is this view unduly abstract . . . . .	258