

### Editorial

Owing to the Editor's absence from England between April and October 1981 this issue of the Bulletin has been put into final shape for publication by Professor W.H. Walsh and the Editor's wife, Mrs. Denise Pelczynski. The Editor is most grateful to them for their help, and accepts responsibility for any imperfections caused by this arrangement.

### Announcements and Reports

#### Joint Conference of the Hegel Society of Great Britain and the Hegel Society of America, 1981

As members will know already, the Hegel Society of Great Britain is to hold a joint conference with the Hegel Society of America in Merton College, Oxford, starting after lunch on 1 September 1981 and ending with lunch on 4 September. The general subject of the conference is HEGEL'S PHILOSOPHY OF ACTION - INDIVIDUAL, CULTURE AND SOCIETY. Among those who have promised to give papers are: L. Siep (Duisberg, West Germany), Guy Planty-Bonjour (Poitiers), M.J. Petry (Rotterdam), H.S. Harris (Toronto), R. Plant (Southampton), Errol Harris (Northwestern), Murray Greene (New York), Charles Taylor (Oxford/McGill), A. Walton (Open University), L. Stepelevich (Villanova). A detailed programme will be circulated later.

All participants will be asked to pay a conference fee of £5. The charge for full board and accommodation for the three days in Merton College will be around £55 (an application to have the conference exempted from VAT unfortunately failed). It will be possible for those not staying in the college to take individual meals there. Further information can be obtained from the chairman of the organising committee, Professor W.H. Walsh, 352 Banbury Road, Oxford OX2 7PP, telephone Oxford 59328.

#### Hegel Society of America: 1982 Convention: Call for Papers

The Hegel Society of America will hold its 7th session at Clemson University, 7-9 October 1982. The topic is Hegel's Philosophy of History. Papers for the session should not exceed 40 minutes reading time and each will be subject to and refereed by the Programme Committee. Longer papers should be shortened before submission. Papers which do not fit into the programme as planned will be returned. It is further assumed that the papers submitted will be in final form and ready for editing into the Proceedings. Please submit four copies.

Papers should be sent to the Programme Chairman, Professor Robert L. Perkins, Department of Philosophy, University of South Alabama, Mobile, Alabama 36688. Due Date: 30 January 1982.

### Articles

#### T.M. Knox: His Life and Scholarship

##### Part II

There is no precise record when and why T.M. Knox decided to translate Hegel's Philosophie des Rechts. In the corpus of the writings of the British Idealists (with which Knox was familiar) the work had not featured very much. Although the Idealists developed a distinct social philosophy based on Hegel's thought they drew their inspiration from his fundamental metaphysical and religious ideas rather than directly from Hegel's most important philosophical work dealing with social reality. According to his correspondence he discussed publication of a translation with a representative of the London firm of Methuen in 1935 so he must have started work soon after returning to Oxford. Whenever it was, the translation only flourished in the more tranquil atmosphere of St. Andrews. On 16 April 1938 Knox wrote to the Clarendon Press - the academic branch of the Oxford University Press - offering them the translation almost ready for publication. He justified it by the need to make Hegel's work accessible to English readers, especially undergraduates, at a time when there were signs of a revival of interest in Hegel's thought (he mentioned Sidney Hook's and M.B. Foster's recent books in this connection), and when ignorance and prejudice clouded people's judgement. Knox pointed out that the only complete English translation of the work by the Canadian professor S.W. Dyde (1896) was defective, without notes and long out of print. The response of the Clarendon Press was somewhat lukewarm. There was doubt whether the work merited retranslation and whether there was really a market for it. The Oxford dons (not Hegel specialists) who read the translation for the Press criticised it (somewhat contradictorily) for being too free and too diffuse and at the same time not idiomatic enough, and Gans' Zusätze, which