

Philosophy 190E: Hegel's Logic

Short Writing Assignment 7

Due Tues., Nov. 29

Instructions

Note: this assignment is for students in Group IV *only*.

Please respond to the following in two pages or less (double spaced). (Needless to say this should be your own original work.)

(a) Consider the a syllogism of the third figure, of the form:

$$\begin{array}{r} \text{S is not P} \\ \text{but S is U} \\ \hline \text{therefore, U is not P} \end{array}$$

Where S, P, and U stand for singular, particular, and universal, respectively. Explain how *purposive activity* (§208; see also §204) is a syllogism of this kind. Hints: (1) Why is the subjective content of a purpose, and also the presupposed material for it, particular (that is: neither singular nor universal)? (2) Why is purpose as such, regarded as *power*, universal? (3) Why is the activity itself by which the purpose is executed, as well as the means by which it is executed, singular? (4) Why is the second premise true, for the Hegelian (concrete) universal? (5) In what sense(s) do the singular and universal terms *negate* the particular one (in the first premise and the conclusion), and why does this depend on the identification between singular and universal in the second premise?

(b) A classic problem of theodicy runs as follows. No finite activity is possible unless God concurs with it (since nothing can act if God does not allow it to). But some finite activities aim at evil purposes, and so God concurs in evil. If divine power, according to Hegel, is “the immediate might of the concept,” how does the above analysis address this problem? (Compare what Hegel says about purpose as self-preserving in the *Zusatz* to §209.)