

OTHER VOLUMES IN THE SERIES OF CAMBRIDGE
COMPANIONS:

- AQUINAS Edited by NORMAN KRETZMANN and
ELEANORE STUMP (*published*)
BACON Edited by MARKKU PELTONEN (*published*)
BERKELEY Edited by KENNETH WINKLER
DESCARTES Edited by JOHN COTTINGHAM
(*published*)
EARLY GREEK PHILOSOPHY Edited by
A. A. LONG
FICHTE Edited by GUENTER ZOELLER
FOUCAULT Edited by GARY GUTTING (*published*)
FREGE Edited by TOM RICKETTS
FREUD Edited by JEROME NEU (*published*)
GALILEO Edited by PETER MACHAMER
HABERMAS Edited by STEPHEN K. WHITE
(*published*)
HEGEL Edited by FREDERICK BEISER (*published*)
HEIDEGGER Edited by CHARLES GIGNON
(*published*)
HOBBES Edited by TOM SORRELL (*published*)
HUME Edited by DAVID FATE NORTON (*published*)
HUSSERL Edited by BARRY SMITH and
DAVID WOODRUFF SMITH (*published*)
WILLIAM JAMES Edited by RUTH ANNE PUTNAM
KANT Edited by PAUL GUYER (*published*)
KIERKEGAARD Edited by ALASTAIR HANNAY and
GORDON MARINO
LEIBNIZ Edited by NICHOLAS JOLLEY (*published*)
LOCKE Edited by VERE CHAPPELL (*published*)
MARX Edited by TERRELL CARVER (*published*)
MILL Edited by JOHN SKORUPSKI
NIETZSCHE Edited by BERND MAGNUS and
KATHLEEN HIGGINS (*published*)
OCKHAM Edited by PAUL VINCENT SPADE
PEIRCE Edited by CHRISTOPHER HOOKWAY
PLATO Edited by RICHARD KRAUT (*published*)
PLOTINUS Edited by LLOYD P. GERSON (*published*)
ROUSSEAU Edited by PATRICK RILEY
SARTRE Edited by CHRISTINA HOWELLS (*published*)
SPINOZA Edited by DON GARRETT (*published*)

The Cambridge Companion to
WITTGENSTEIN

Edited by Hans Sluga David G. Stern
University of California, Berkeley *University of California, Berkeley*



14 The availability of Wittgenstein's philosophy

I ought to be no more than a mirror, in which my reader can see his own thinking with all its deformities so that, helped in this way, he can put it right.

(CV, pp. 17-18. Source: MS 112, p. 225. 1931)

Nearly all of my writings are private conversations with myself.

Things that I say to myself *tête-à-tête*.

(CV, p. 77. Source: MS 137, p. 134. 26 December, 1948)

Whatever the reader can do too, leave to the reader.

(CV, p. 77. Source: MS 137, p. 134. 27 December, 1948)

Although Wittgenstein is widely regarded as one of the most important and influential philosophers of this century, there is very little agreement about the nature of his contribution. In fact, one of the most striking characteristics of the secondary literature on Wittgenstein is the overwhelming lack of agreement about what he believed and why. Over forty years after his death, despite the publication of over a dozen books from his *Nachlass* (the usual term for his unpublished papers), hundreds of books on his work, and thousands of scholarly articles, his philosophy remains unavailable to many of his readers. In part, that is because Wittgenstein's writing asks for a change in sensibility that many of his readers are unwilling or unable to accept. The continuing unavailability of Wittgenstein's philosophy is also due, in large part, to the expectations of those interpreters who disregard his way of writing, looking for an underlying theory they can attribute to him. Philosophers in search of Wittgenstein's theory of language or experience or practice focus on a relatively small number of

much-discussed remarks in which he appears to summarize his real reasons for accepting (or rejecting) a specific view, looking for "evidence" of his "underlying commitments" without giving sufficient consideration to the context from which those quotations are taken.¹ For such readers, Wittgenstein's writing is a mirror which reflects "their own thinking" so completely that his challenge to the "deformities" of systematic philosophy is regarded as incidental. Much of what passes for interpretation of Wittgenstein is really a discussion of other interpreters' readings, so that a forbidding and intricate secondary literature has taken on a life of its own.²

Stanley Cavell's "The Availability of Wittgenstein's Later Philosophy," a critical study of one of the first books on Wittgenstein's later philosophy, first published in 1962, is still one of the best discussions of how and why Wittgenstein has so frequently been misread by his philosophical expositors. In it, Cavell criticized David Pole, the author of *Wittgenstein's Later Philosophy*, for his failure to take Wittgenstein's characteristic and highly personal style seriously.³ Pole took for granted, and assumed Wittgenstein took for granted, that philosophy is the systematic study of a determinate and rule-bound structure, the structure of our language. Treating Wittgenstein's unsystematic and unconventional way of writing as nothing more than an idiosyncrasy, Pole construed some of the conflicting voices in Wittgenstein's writing as a partial exposition of a systematic and quite conventional set of philosophical views. Thus he took it to be unproblematically obvious that Wittgenstein believed that the rules of ordinary language can authoritatively resolve philosophical problems, and that language is always governed by a fully determinate set of rules. Most of Cavell's critical study consists of a careful critique of Pole's assumptions, in which Cavell shows that they are among the very views that are subjected to relentless criticism in Wittgenstein's later work. In the concluding pages, Cavell emphasizes the importance of Wittgenstein's style, pointing out the affinities of *Philosophical Investigations* to the genres of confession and dialogue. Cavell characterizes Wittgenstein's writing as a dialogue between "the voice of temptation," the voice that tempts the reader to theorize, and "the voice of correctness" which aims to return the reader to ordinary life. In pl, 107, Wittgenstein describes the "intolerable conflict" between

philosophical theorizing and ordinary life in the following terms: "We have got on to slippery ice where there is no friction and so in a certain sense the conditions are ideal, but also, just because of that, we are unable to walk: so we need *friction*. Back to the rough ground!" On Cavell's reading, neither the voice that tempts us onto the ice, nor the voice that returns us to the rough ground, sets out Wittgenstein's real views. Instead, he construes them as two opposing voices, opposing trains of argument, which form part of a larger dialogue in which they ultimately cancel each other out. On this reading, the aim of Wittgenstein's dialogues is not to lead his reader to any philosophical view, neither an idealized, frictionless, theory of language, nor a pragmatic theory of ordinary language, but rather to help us see through such ways of speaking and looking. While Wittgenstein's writing, just as Cavell's, contains arguments, ultimately it asks for a new sensibility, a change in the way one sees things:

There are questions, jokes, parables, and propositions so striking (the way lines are in poetry) that they stun mere belief. (Are we asked to believe that "if a lion could talk we could not understand him"? [PI, p. xii]) Belief is not enough. Either the suggestion penetrates past assessment and becomes part of the sensibility from which assessment proceeds, or it is philosophically useless.⁴

At the end of his review, Cavell recognized that such a style runs the risks of either uncritical acceptance ("the suggestion penetrates past assessment"¹) or uncritical rejection ("it is philosophically useless"). While Wittgenstein certainly has attracted both the disciples and debunkers that Cavell predicted, most of the secondary literature on the *Tractatus* and *Philosophical Investigations* consists of exegetical and critical discussion of the theories of language, mind, and culture that are supposedly found in those books. Most of his philosophical expositors find his "real views" in a small number of crucial passages which, taken out of context, can easily be made to provide support for almost any view one looks for. One reason for this state of affairs is the widespread conviction that the real interest in Wittgenstein's work lies in the particular arguments or ideas that he offered, rather than in his style of writing or conception of philosophy. This often leads to interpretations that provide their authors with an opportunity to find their own preconceptions at work in Wittgenstein's philosophy.

One way of countering such reductive readings is to stress the connections between Wittgenstein's arguments and his style, as Cavell does. Another is to emphasize the dangers of extracting any particular passage of Wittgenstein's writing from its context, without considering its role in the work from which it is taken. As we shall see, in view of the tangled history of the Wittgenstein papers, identifying the context of a given remark is more problematic than one might expect. However, despite the importance of the Wittgenstein *Nachlass* as a whole for an understanding of his work, the *Tractatus* and *Philosophical Investigations*, the pieces of writing that came closest to satisfying him, deserve a central place in any interpretation of his work, and cannot be treated on a par with the later posthumous publications. Interpreters have frequently defended their partial readings of particular passages from the *Tractatus* and *Philosophical Investigations* by selective citation of appropriate passages from the other publications. Cavell has gone to unusual lengths in opposing this approach, in a recent interview, he discussed how he avoided reading the remark in *On Certainty* about how knowledge is based on acknowledgement, a central theme in his own reading of the *Investigations*, until it was placed in front of him by a friend.⁵ After telling his interviewer that he was suspicious of those who preferred *On Certainty* to the *Investigations*, he explained his stance in the following terms: "The text of Wittgenstein's that I have mostly responded to — felt I could understand in its responses to itself — has been the *Investigations*. How it relates to other texts of Wittgenstein is for me as open a question as how it relates to the texts of other writers."⁶ Cavell is certainly right to stress the importance of the *Investigations*, a book that contains the most finished products of Wittgenstein's work from 1929 to 1949, especially when compared to a first-draft manuscript that never received the same attention and elaboration. But Cavell is wrong, I believe, to take the notion of a work of Wittgenstein's at face value, as he does in treating the *Investigations* and *On Certainty* as autonomous texts, sufficiently separate from the rest of his writing that it is an open question how they are related to it. Neither the *Investigations* nor *On Certainty* can best be understood in this way, for each is internally related to other Wittgenstein texts. Wittgenstein's "private conversations with himself" are often much clearer if one looks at his writing as a whole. In insisting on the need to see the

posthumously published works of Wittgenstein's as parts of a larger network of texts, I do not mean to suggest that either the books published after the *Investigations*, or the unpublished papers, contain the esoteric key to understanding his philosophy, or that much of his best work remains unpublished. But I do believe that both the *Investigations* and *On Certainty*, like Wittgenstein's other posthumously published works, are much more accessible if one approaches them as selections from a larger body of work. Looking at this larger body of work makes it easier to grasp the problems that occupied his attention.

One of the principal reasons for the continuing unavailability of Wittgenstein's philosophy, despite all the attention it has received, is the conventional understanding of the posthumously published books as a number of separate texts, "works of Wittgenstein's," rather than as selections from the *Nachlass*. Although Wittgenstein devoted a great deal of time and effort to the editing and rearrangement of his work, and most of the posthumous books are based on fair copies that were given a more or less finished form, none of the material in the *Nachlass* has the finished form a publisher would expect. Because of the way he continually revised and rearranged what he had written, never reaching a final decision about the state of the text, nearly every book that has been published under Wittgenstein's name has called for extensive and far-reaching decisions about how to select and arrange the source material in order to produce a conventional text, decisions that were either left entirely unstated, or described in the broadest terms in a brief preface. Except for *Prototractatus*, an edition of an early version of the *Tractatus* that includes a facsimile of the source manuscript, and the forthcoming Vienna edition of Wittgenstein's writing from the 1929–33 period, none of the books published from the Wittgenstein *Nachlass* aims to provide a critical edition of the source texts.⁷ The editors' self-effacing methods have led most readers to take the notion of a "work," or "text," of Wittgenstein's at face value, unaware of the intricate relationship between the published books and the *Nachlass*. His editors' decisions about the presentation of his work, which apart from the *Tractatus* and a very short paper on logical form, he never saw to the press, have shaped our perceptions of his writing to an extent that is hard to appreciate until one looks at his alternative drafts and other arrangements of the published material.⁸

Both *Philosophical Investigations* and *On Certainty* are good examples of this. *On Certainty*, first published in 1969, is a selection of remarks from manuscripts Wittgenstein wrote during 1949–51, none of which reached the typescript stage. After learning he would die of prostate cancer in November 1948, he did very little further work on the *Investigations* or the other writing he had worked on previously, so there is a sense in which the 1949–51 manuscripts form a relatively self-contained epilogue to the Wittgenstein papers. The series of manuscripts on which *On Certainty* is based also includes extensive discussion of topics such as vision, color, mind and body, thought and expression, topics closely connected with the concerns of *On Certainty*. Nearly all of the remaining material has since been published in *Remarks on Colour* (1977), *Last Writings on the Philosophy of Psychology, Part II* (1992), and the last pages of *Culture and Value* (1977/1980/1994). While it is true, as the editors note, that the material that has been put in different books is separated by occasional lines across the page in the notebooks, there is no indication that Wittgenstein conceived of it as separate pieces of work, nor was he responsible for the titles of the separate works we now have. The published text of *On Certainty* is, therefore, not a work of Wittgenstein's, as the term is ordinarily understood: the title, the numbering of the sections, and the decision to print this material apart from the other writing in the source notebooks, were all editorial decisions. There is a good case for reprinting all the material from these manuscripts, in a single volume, arranged in the order in which it was written. While the other publications from this period have attracted a substantial literature, few readers of *On Certainty* have paid much attention to the connections between Wittgenstein's final writings. Nor have they seen that many of the leading themes in *On Certainty* were already anticipated in material Wittgenstein had written in 1937, shortly after he had assembled the first 188 sections of the *Investigations* ("Cause and Effect," PO, pp. 368 ff.). Instead, *On Certainty* has generally been read as a set of suggestive but inconclusive first drafts, or as a response to discussions of skepticism and G. E. Moore with Norman Malcolm.

The case of the *Investigations* is considerably more complex. In reading Wittgenstein, it is essential to keep in mind that his characteristic unit of writing was not the essay or the book, but the "remark" (*Bemerkung*). A remark is a unit of text that can be as short as

a single sentence or as long as a sequence of paragraphs covering a page or two. The beginning and end of a remark in his own writing—and in most of the published texts—is usually indicated by an extra blank line between paragraphs. The numbering of the remarks in Part I of *Investigations* is Wittgenstein's; however, in most of the other published texts, the numbering is the editors'. Throughout his life, his writing took the form of a large number of these relatively small units which he repeatedly revised and rearranged. In the preface to the *Investigations*, Wittgenstein describes his writing as composed of "remarks, short paragraphs, of which there is sometimes a fairly long chain about the same subject, while I sometimes make a sudden change, jumping from one topic to another." During the 1930s Wittgenstein experimented with a number of ways of organizing the material into a single coherent piece of writing, "in which the thoughts should proceed from one subject to another in a natural order and without breaks" (PI, p. vii), none of which entirely satisfied him. Eventually, he realized that he would never succeed, that "the best I could write would never be more than philosophical remarks" (PI, p. vii). The way of writing and thinking that Wittgenstein describes in his preface led him to continually rewrite and rearrange his work, with the result that it can be extremely difficult to separate one piece of writing from another.

In an editorial note to the *Investigations*, Anscombe and Rhees said that if "Wittgenstein had published his work himself, he would have suppressed a good deal of what is in the last thirty pages or so of Part I [PI, 525–693] and worked what is in Part II, with further material, into its place" (PI, p. vi). Von Wright has suggested that Wittgenstein may have planned to use the remarks published as *Zettel* as a way of "bridging the gap" between the present Part I and Part II of the *Investigations*.⁹ Wittgenstein's final preface, dated January 1945, was, in any case, written before Part II was even drafted, and nothing he wrote provides any support for the view that he regarded what we know as "Part II" as the second part of the *Investigations*. Unfortunately, the typescripts used to print the *Investigations* were lost shortly afterward, and there is no surviving typescript of Part II. There are, however, two surviving typescripts of the preface and what we now know as Part I, both of which Wittgenstein had revised extensively. Although neither corresponds precisely to the published text, the book almost always follows one typescript or the other; the published text

is apparently the result of collating the revisions from the two typescripts. However, there is no indication, either in Wittgenstein's hand or anyone else's, that the main text, which begins on the same page as the preface ends, is to be printed as "Part I."¹⁰ While the editors' inclusion of Part II is presumably based on Wittgenstein's oral request, the fact remains that it is only the last of a number of arrangements that he had settled on for the time being. But because he never carried out the revisions that he envisaged, "Part II" is a collection of material he might have used in revising Part I, not a sequel. Recently, Oliver Scholz has argued that Part II is best approached as a collection of material that Wittgenstein had typed up to show Norman Malcolm on his visit to Cornell in 1949, and that it had a much more provisional character than the first part of the book.¹¹

The source texts for the *Philosophical Investigations* span a twenty-year period and are, in large part, still unpublished. In addition to the published text, we have a number of earlier arrangements of the book, the source manuscripts and typescripts that were used in producing those drafts, other arrangements of that source material, much of it extensively and repeatedly revised and rewritten, and even a translation of the first half of an early version of the *Investigations* by Rhees with corrections in Wittgenstein's hand (TS, 226).¹² Wittgenstein's insistence in the preface to the *Investigations* that he was unable to write a book as a seamless whole, proceeding in an orderly way from topic to topic, has rarely been heeded. Considered as an isolated text, it can seem self-contained. But the published *Investigations* is only one of a number of possible arrangements Wittgenstein proposed, many of which extend, amplify, or cast light on the remarks in the published book. The *Nachlass* contains multiple drafts of previous versions of most of the remarks in the *Investigations* and includes several other attempts to put those remarks, and related ones, into a publishable format.

The dialogues that animate Wittgenstein's writing are often much clearer when one looks at his multiple and varying drafts, the different contexts in which he placed his remarks, and the words he later left out, than the compressed and polished formulations in the published work. Consider, for example, *Tractatus*, 5.6 ff. and PI, 398–410, which provide extremely compressed summaries of the results of Wittgenstein's work on solipsism and the self, a topic which received extensive attention in the pre-*Tractatus* and pre-*Investigations* note-

books. The changes and continuities in Wittgenstein's conception of solipsism are a central thread in the development of his philosophy. In both the *Tractatus* and *Investigations*, he dismisses solipsism, the view that only I exist, as nonsense. However, in his earlier work, he was drawn toward the idea of the solipsist as attempting to express an inexpressible insight, while by the time he assembled Part I of the *Investigations*, he had concluded that the only insight solipsism provides is insight into the nature of philosophical misunderstanding. Wittgenstein's later approach to solipsism emerged out of his critique of his transitional writings from the early 1930s. Most aspects of this critique can already be found, together with much more expository detail, in the second half of the *Blue Book*, which dates from 1934. However, it is easier to see the connections between the *Tractatus*, the *Blue Book*, and the *Investigations* on solipsism if one also looks at the extensive unpublished discussion of these issues in his manuscript volumes from the 1930s and the preparatory typescripts, culled from the manuscript volumes, that were the source material for PI, 398-410.¹³

The discussion of solipsism is a particularly clear example of a case of Wittgenstein's extended "conversations with himself" that lead up to a very compressed statement of his position in his principal writings. However, Wittgenstein's overall aim of getting the reader to use his work as mirror that would enable the reader to "see his own thinking with all its deformities so that, helped in this way, he can put it right" often made him leave out the track he had followed in arriving at his own views, so that the manuscript source material is more specific about what views Wittgenstein had once entertained and subsequently responded to.¹⁴ As he put it at one point, what was of value in his work were the "remedies" he had developed, not a diary of the particular problems he had suffered from.¹⁵

This attempt to separate the results of his work from the path he had taken has led to much controversy over the relationship between the "early Wittgenstein" and the "late Wittgenstein," the authors of the *Tractatus* and *Investigations*, very little of it based on acquaintance with the *Nachlass*. It is often taken for granted that early and late Wittgenstein held diametrically opposed philosophical positions, and much exegesis works on the principle of establishing a series of oppositions between their supposed views.

While the continuities and discontinuities between his earlier and his later work are complex, the broad outline of that relationship can be summarized as follows. On his return to full-time philosophical work in early 1929, Wittgenstein soon came to see that the logical atomism of the *Tractatus*, according to which ordinary language could be analyzed into logically independent "atomic propositions," had been a dogmatic requirement, one that could not be satisfied in practice, not even for his own examples in the *Tractatus*, such as the analysis of color discourse. The logical atomism of the *Tractatus* gave way, therefore, to a transitional "logical holism" on which each significant statement belonged to a specific whole – a whole he at first compared to a formal calculus, or a system of Cartesian coordinates, governed by formalizable rules. Analysis would lead to logically interrelated propositional systems and their grammar, not the atoms he had once postulated. The principal areas that occupied Wittgenstein's attention at that time had to do with various aspects of the grammar of visual experience and mathematics.¹⁶ For most of 1929, Wittgenstein conceived of a "phenomenological" language for immediate experience as "primary," as contrasted with "secondary" language, which included both ordinary language and scientific language. However, in October, he gave up the goal of such a "primary" language, maintaining that we must start with ordinary language. Despite his rejection of not only the logical atomism of the *Tractatus*, but the very idea of analyzing ordinary language into some other, supposedly primary language, he still thought of language as made up of a number of autonomous systems, each with its own grammar, and the task of philosophy as elucidating grammar. During this transitional period, he somewhat modified the *Tractatus* conception of a proposition as a picture of reality. Because the comparison of a proposition to a picture did not do justice to the role of the grammatical links between propositions, he now compared saying something to making a measurement with a measuring stick, which can give any one of a range of possible lengths. By the mid-1930s, he gave up the calculus model, and the measuring stick analogy, and came to think of language as a fluid and open-ended activity, more like a game than a calculus, and more like play than a game with precisely defined rules.¹⁷ In his later philosophy, Wittgenstein continually made use of what he called language-games, descriptions of

imagined or actual linguistic activities. The German "Spiel," usually translated as "game," also covers those more open-ended activities that would usually be thought of as "play" in English, and Wittgenstein did not restrict his use of the term to activities with clearly defined rules. His language-games, which are usually quite specific types of linguistic activity, an activity which includes not only the use of words but also the relevant context, serve a variety of different purposes: as illustrations, unexpected alternatives, and provocative points of departure for subsequent discussion. In PI, 130, Wittgenstein warned against taking them as intimations of a grand design: "Our clear and simple language-games are not preparatory studies for a future regularization of language — as it were first approximations, ignoring friction and air-resistance. The language-games are rather set up as *objects of comparison* which are meant to throw light on the facts of our language by way not only of similarities, but also of dissimilarities."

From 1929 to 1951 Wittgenstein wrote and rewrote, repeatedly rearranging and revising his remarks: his literary legacy is an intricate network of multiple rearrangements and revisions. The great majority of the unpublished manuscript writing takes the form of a series of bound volumes, and notebooks that were sources for the manuscript volumes. These "manuscript volumes" were substantial ruled ledgers of the kind a small business might use to keep its accounts. They contain a diary of Wittgenstein's work in progress, including both a regular record of the first draft material that he would consider using in subsequent revisions, and extensive revision and rearrangement of remarks in earlier manuscript volumes. The sheer size and scale of these volumes, and the way the material was written up on a regular basis, strongly suggest that Wittgenstein used them to write up and revise earlier drafts, contained in pocket notebooks he might have carried around.¹⁸ The thirty or so manuscript volumes, containing 8,000 pages of writing dating from 1929 to the late 1940s, can be regarded as a sequential record of his first drafts and his thoughts about how to revise them. Wittgenstein would often write on a number of different topics at once, sometimes dropping a topic for weeks, months, or even years, before returning to it. At times, Wittgenstein would select remarks from the manuscript volumes that he would dictate to a typist, producing several carbon copies of remarks that he would then revise and rearrange again.

Most of the manuscripts and typescripts contain extensive revisions or rewriting. Every manuscript contains variant wordings, alternatives that Wittgenstein was unwilling or unable to choose between, and these are often carried over verbatim into the subsequent typescripts. There are also a large number of deletions and additions, both above the line of the text and in the margin. As a result, there is a great deal of duplication and repetition in the *Nachlass*. Over forty typescripts record the repeated revisions and rearrangements that led from the manuscript volumes to his most polished work. Entries in the manuscript volumes show us Wittgenstein at work, raising questions, rejecting old ideas and developing new ones, the revisions and the typescripts show which parts he accepted and the uses he made of them. The manuscript volumes are a record of the inner dialogue that was the driving force in the development of his philosophical work; they contain lengthy exchanges that are the starting point for a protracted struggle between conflicting intuitions, in which the final result is a telegraphic recapitulation of his earlier train of thought. The Wittgenstein *Nachlass* is not a haphazard pile of working papers that happened to survive his death, nor is it a collection of works that only awaited publication. While it is both a carefully selected and highly structured record of his life's work, a collection of material that he deliberately assembled and left to posterity, it is also the record of a writer continually in flux, never entirely satisfied with anything he had written. As a result, although he devoted enormous attention to revising and refining his words, every publication from his *Nachlass* has required substantial editorial work.

During his lifetime, Wittgenstein published only one philosophical book, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, written while he was a soldier in the First World War and published shortly afterward. After publishing a short conference contribution in 1929, which he had repudiated by the time he was due to read it, none of his subsequent work satisfied him enough that he was willing to give it to the printer. In his will, he left his *Nachlass* — approximately twelve thousand pages of manuscript and eight thousand pages of typescript — to G. E. M. Anscombe, Rush Rhees, and G. H. von Wright.¹⁹ That will was entered in the District Probate Registry of the High Court of Justice at Camarthen on July 10, 1951. It consists of six numbered parts, preceded by an introduction that states that it disposes "of all

my estate except any money or other property situate or being in Austria which I own or to which I am entitled." The first part revokes all prior wills, and the second appoints Rhees as his executor. The third part reads as follows:²⁰

3. I GIVE to Mr. R. Rhees Miss G. E. M. Anscombe, and Professor G. H. von Wright of Trinity College Cambridge All the copyright in all my unpublished writings and also the manuscripts and typescripts thereof to dispose of as they think best but subject to any claim by anybody else to the custody of the manuscripts and typescripts

I intend and desire that Mr. Rhees Miss Anscombe and Professor von Wright shall publish as many of my unpublished writings as they think fit but I do not wish them to incur expenses in publication which they do not expect to recoup out of royalties or other profits

All royalties or other profits resulting from the publication after my death of my writings are to be shared equally between Mr. Rhees Miss Anscombe and Professor von Wright

If any of the three persons named in this clause shall die in my lifetime his or her share of the copyright and royalties and profits is to belong to the survivors or survivor

Until the discovery of a chest containing a large number of Wittgenstein's papers some time after his death, his literary heirs were unaware of the sheer quantity of material with which they had been entrusted. Additional typescripts and manuscripts have continued to turn up from time to time.²¹

Shortly after Wittgenstein's death, Anscombe and Rhees edited, and Anscombe translated, *Philosophical Investigations*, the book Wittgenstein had worked on from 1929 to 1949. Over the course of the next forty years, all three of Wittgenstein's original literary trustees edited for publication a number of substantial selections from his other writings, either accompanied or followed by an English translation. From his enormous literary legacy, they edited many of the most polished and carefully revised pieces of work in the *Nachlass*, mostly typescripts that were based on multiple previous drafts and rearrangements of earlier typescripts and manuscripts, but also some selections from his manuscripts. These texts include many of Wittgenstein's most thoroughly revised pieces of writing, but also include selections from work at every stage of revision.

The books that resulted from the editorial work of Wittgenstein's literary trustees can, for the most part, be arranged in a tidy se-

quence, based on the order in which they were written. Taken together, the published material provides a chronological record of the principal stages in the development of Wittgenstein's philosophical work. Two books provide much of the background to the composition of the *Tractatus*: the *Notebooks 1914-1916*, which contains selections from three of Wittgenstein's wartime notebooks, sources for the composition of the *Tractatus*, as well as notes dictated to Russell and Moore before the war; and *Prototractatus*, an early version of the *Tractatus*.²² Apart from personal correspondence, virtually nothing survives from the ten year period between the completion of the *Tractatus* in 1919 and his return to Cambridge in 1929. Three books date from the first half of the 1930s: *Philosophical Remarks*, a selection of remarks from 1929-30, the first year of Wittgenstein's post-*Tractatus* return to philosophical writing; *Philosophical Grammar*, a reconstruction of some of Wittgenstein's plans for revising the beginning of the Big Typescript, a book draft he put together during 1932-3, accompanied by some unrevised chapters from the end of the Big Typescript, on the philosophy of mathematics; *The Blue and Brown Books*, notes dictated (in English) to students in the 1933-4 and 1934-5 academic years.

Late in 1936, Wittgenstein drafted an early version of the first 188 sections of the *Philosophical Investigations*; he did very little work on the book after the end of 1948. In addition to the *Investigations* itself, five books have been published from this period of his work. *Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics* begins with Wittgenstein's most polished later writing on mathematics, a typescript written in 1937-8, that was intended as a sequel to the first part of the *Investigations*. Parts II to VII contain substantial excerpts from manuscripts on mathematics dating from the late 1930s and early 1940s. *Remarks on the Philosophy of Psychology, Volumes I and II* and *Last Writings on the Philosophy of Psychology, Volume I* are based on source material from the second half of the 1940s that was used in writing Part II of the *Investigations*. *Zettel* is a collection of cuttings from Wittgenstein's typescripts, spanning the years from 1931 to 1948, but mostly from the 1945-8 period.

Three books contain most of what Wittgenstein wrote during the last two years of his life, rearranged by the editors into three topical groupings: *On Certainty*, *Remarks on Colour*, and *Last Writings on the Philosophy of Psychology, Volume II*. Three other books span

the entire range of Wittgenstein's writing: *A Wittgenstein Reader* a selection of readings from the published work, which begins with an abridgment of the *Tractatus* and follows the chronological development of Wittgenstein's philosophical interests; *Culture and Value*, a selection of short "nonphilosophical" remarks culled from the entire *Nachlass*; and *Philosophical Occasions, 1912-1951*, an anthology that includes some minor pieces that Wittgenstein published during his lifetime, all of the previously published shorter excerpts from the *Nachlass*, and some new material.²³

The principal texts in the published corpus have been reprinted in the eight volume Suhrkamp edition of Wittgenstein's work, which includes indexes and editor's notes, and incorporates extensive corrections to the previous editions.²⁴ The published corpus contains approximately a million words of Wittgenstein's writing; the *Tractatus* and *Investigations* account for roughly an eighth of the total. Most of these texts are now also available in an electronic edition, in which each text is supplied in the language in which it was originally written.²⁵ The electronic edition makes it easy to trace connections between remarks, and facilitates different paths through Wittgenstein's writing. In view of the interrelated character of Wittgenstein's remarks and his elaboration of central terms in a wide variety of different contexts, often in a variety of different drafts, electronic searching is particularly valuable, as it makes it possible to compare and contrast Wittgenstein's use of key terms.

The sheer scale of the literary corpus created by the Wittgenstein trustees, the product of over thirty years of shared labor, has fostered the widespread impression that ample material has already been made available for a critical appraisal of Wittgenstein's philosophy. This view is endorsed by von Wright in the most recent version of his catalog of the Wittgenstein papers, where he states that the result of the trustees' work has been to "make the full body of Wittgenstein's philosophy accessible to the public" and that "all the works of major interest have, in my view, now been published (save for the Big Typescript, perhaps)" (PO, p. 504). But what is "the full body of Wittgenstein's philosophy" or a "work of major interest"? What are the appropriate editorial criteria for identifying a "work" of Wittgenstein's? What reasons are there for thinking that Wittgenstein's unpublished drafts of the *Investigations*, or the manuscript volumes that set out the journey that led

from his early to his late work, are not works of major interest? What should be included and what should be left out? The question of the extent of the Wittgenstein oeuvre, the question of what counts as a work of Wittgenstein's, or as Wittgenstein's philosophical writing, is rarely discussed at any length in the literature on Wittgenstein's work. In practice, few of Wittgenstein's interpreters make much use of the unpublished material, or discuss its significance. Most of what has been written about the Wittgenstein *Nachlass* has been written by experts for experts, and may actually have served to reinforce the expectation that the unpublished material is only of marginal interest.

Joachim Schulte, one of the participants in the first attempt to edit the *Nachlass*, and the editor of the current German edition of the Wittgenstein publications, has recently proposed that in order to count as "a finished work of Wittgenstein's," a piece of his writing should satisfy the following conditions:

- (1) the assessment by Wittgenstein himself that the text in question is an independent creation with a form suitable to its content; (2) a line of argument apparent to the reader, with theses, arguments, objections, underlying considerations, and examples, etc.; and (3) the formal stylistic polishing and formulation of the text which make it possible to call it "finished" and "complete."²⁶

Applying these standards to Wittgenstein's writings, Schulte eliminates all first draft writing, both in the notebooks and manuscript volumes, and selections from them that eliminate unwanted passages without rearranging the material into some more comprehensive order. However, Schulte acknowledges that "this clearly graduated picture is clouded somewhat by the fact that Wittgenstein was never quite satisfied with what he wrote"²⁷ and this leads him to propose that one regard Wittgenstein's writings as "experiments" rather than something "finished and complete." Schulte, unlike von Wright, explicitly states and defends his criteria; but they both take for granted that one must draw a line between the "finished" and the "unfinished," and that only the "finished" material is worthy of serious attention. While the result of the application of Schulte's criteria to the published Wittgenstein texts is certainly debatable, there can be no doubt that all those based on the editors' selections from the *Nachlass* would fail this test, as the texts are not independent cre-

ations of Wittgenstein's. (It is not so clear that the manuscript volumes do fail Schulte's test, provided one follows Wittgenstein's discussion of a particular topic, rather than reading every remark in sequence.) Although Schulte does not actually say so, the unpublished early versions of the *Investigations*, and the alternate arrangement of much of the material in Pl, 188–693 known as *Bemerkungen II* (TS, 230), which are in many ways as "finished" as the final version, surely qualify as "works" under his criteria.

In the opening pages of *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Michel Foucault argues that the traditional notion of "the author," the person responsible for a writer's work, and the correlative notion of "the work," or *oeuvre*, the collection of texts that the author put in a finished form, are fictions. Ordinarily, we conceive of the author as expressing him- or herself in the work, the work as giving us access to the author, and so turn the mass of records that a writer left behind into a coherent collection of finished texts on the one hand, and preparatory work, fragments, and notes, on the other. In defense of his claim, Foucault points out that what counts as a "work" by an author varies greatly from case to case: what might appear to be a simple distinction, turns out, on closer inspection, to vary in practice. Usually, one counts as an author's work those texts that the author had published, removing publications which do not count as "works," and adding works that were finished but remained unpublished. When one identifies an author's *oeuvre* in this way one imposes on it a unifying principle, according to Foucault, a principle concerning the variety of written records associated with a particular writer. In so doing, one tells a story that provides a rationale as to which pieces of writing are to count as the author's work: which pieces of writing are not sufficiently finished to count as works, which apparently insignificant pieces of writing should be included among the works. Foucault's remarks are particularly apposite when considering the work of a dead writer. Significantly, two of his examples are philosophers who left a substantial *Nachlass*: Nietzsche and Wittgenstein.²⁸ Both of them left a mass of writing that included plans for unpublished books, and notebooks that could not easily be separated into philosophical and nonphilosophical texts. However, in the case of the Nietzsche *Nachlass*, one can at least begin from the substantial number of texts that he did publish, while Wittgenstein published very little.

Apart from the *Tractatus*, Wittgenstein's works are the product of his trustees' decisions. Despite their differences, the author that Wittgenstein's editors have given us and the author that Schulte envisages, is one who attempted to write a series of works. Left out are not only the first drafts in the manuscript volumes but the process of rethinking and rewriting that links the published and unpublished texts. The published work is no substitute for a full publication of the *Wittgenstein Nachlass* as a whole, and has actually served, in certain respects, to obscure the nature of Wittgenstein's philosophical legacy. The assumption that Wittgenstein's principal works consist of his most polished writing, principally found in his typescripts, has led his trustees to adopt very different approaches to editing his typescripts and his manuscripts. While most of the posthumous publications that are based on typescripts make use of the entire source typescript, almost every publication from the manuscript sources has been heavily edited, often with little or no indication of the extent of the editorial intervention. Consider the example of the *Philosophical Grammar*, which is based on both typescript and manuscript sources. Part I of that book, an unfinished work on philosophy of language dating from the years 1930 to 1934, consists of Rhees's reconstruction of the first two of three sets of manuscript revisions that Wittgenstein made to the opening chapters of the Big Typescript. Although the text of Part I of the *Grammar* is a reconstruction that zigzags between a patchwork quilt of sources extracted from a group of source texts, the preface says next to nothing about how that trail was reconstructed.²⁹ Nor does the preface mention that several of the later chapters of the Big Typescript, on phenomenology, idealism, and philosophical method, were left out of the published book, even though the unrevised chapters on mathematics were published as Part II of the *Grammar*.³⁰ Rather than setting out his editorial decisions, so that a reader could see how the published text had been produced, Rhees took an almost authorial role in the production of the text, publishing his own synoptic table of contents to Part I alongside Wittgenstein's own table of contents for the chapters included in Part II. Although he appears to have followed Wittgenstein's plans for the production of Part I with great fidelity, there is no comparable basis for the choice of material included in Part II.³¹

While the books based on Wittgenstein's typescripts usually provide the entire source text, save only for information about variant

readings, corrections, deletions, that one would only expect to find in a critical edition, a number of the publications that are based on manuscript sources have been much more heavily edited, usually without specifying the location or extent of the breaks in the text. In the case of Parts II–VII of the *Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics*, and Rhees's edition of the "Notes for Lectures on 'Sense Data' and 'Private Experience,'" the editors judged that although the manuscript contained material of great interest, it was too long to publish in full. The prefaces to the published texts do state that cuts were made, but give no indication of their location, and so make it impossible to follow Wittgenstein's train of thought. The cuts are not a matter of dropping a few poorly chosen phrases, or of leaving out passages that are irrelevant to the main line of discussion, but rather involve extensive elimination of supposedly inferior writing, yielding a patchwork composed of a large number of relatively short selections from the source text. For instance, Part II, §§1–40 of the *Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics*, was assembled from pages 9–17, 21–9, 31–3, 42–3, 52–7, 59–67, 71–88, 90–7, 99–118, 121–3, 128–9, 131, 135–40, 143–7 and 149–50 of MS 122. After I became aware of the extent to which the "Notes for Lectures" had been edited, I produced a new edition of that text in which the missing passages were restored, that edition has recently been published, together with an appendix that specifies the principal differences between the two editions, as part of *Philosophical Occasions*. Readers who wish to study the sources of the *Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics* or the *Philosophical Grammar* will find that Alois Pichler's source catalog of the published texts provides an extremely valuable guide to the manuscript and typescript sources of each publication based on the Wittgenstein *Nachlass*.³² Even those who have no intention of actually looking at those sources would be well advised to take a look at the catalog, which provides an excellent overview of the *Nachlass* and its complex relationship to Wittgenstein's posthumous works. Some indication of the complexity of the relationship between sources and published texts is provided by the fact that the tables which summarize the sources of the *Philosophical Grammar* and the *Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics* occupy ten pages each. The editors of *Notebooks 1914–1916* gave no indication that the book only reproduces part of the source manuscripts. The omitted material, which consists of diary entries and personal reflections,

was for the most part written in a simple letter-substitution code, presumably designed to conceal their contents from a casual reader. This became public knowledge when the missing passages were published by Wilhelm Baum in a Spanish journal in 1985, without the permission of the trustees; the decoded German text is now available in book form, under the title *Geheime Tagebücher* (secret diaries).³³ These omissions, coupled with the fact that the coded material was covered up in the 1967 Cornell microfilm edition of the papers, have led to farfetched speculation about the motivations for these decisions. Wittgenstein's literary heirs were students and friends of his who discovered that they had inherited the unexpected responsibility of deciding how to make his work available; it would be entirely inappropriate to judge them by the standards of a definitive scholarly edition. It is understandable that they should have chosen to keep his more personal writing, which included references to people who were still alive, out of the public domain in the years immediately following his death. Fortunately, they have decided that the coded material, much of which is of considerable interest, both biographically and philosophically, will be included in the forthcoming Bergen and Vienna editions of the *Nachlass*. Substantial selections from it have already been included in *Culture and Value*, and the Monk and McGuinness biographies.

Another striking example of a published text that involves a substantial editorial contribution is Wittgenstein's *Zettel*. Peter Geach's arrangement of a collection of remarks that Wittgenstein had cut out of a number of typescripts and placed in a box file. The collection of cuttings is apparently connected with Wittgenstein's work on what we now know as Part II of the *Investigations*. Most of the remarks are taken from the source typescripts for Part II, but a substantial minority have sources dating from 1929 to 1945, and belong to the group of remarks that Wittgenstein had considered using in the final arrangement of Part I. Although the published book gives no indication of where one cutting starts and another stops, and no sources for the cuttings, the preface does explain that the arrangement was Geach's responsibility. While the collection clearly falls Schulte's criteria, and is disappointing if one reads it looking for the kind of arrangement one finds in the *Investigations*, it is much more valuable if one looks at it as a collection of cuttings that Wittgenstein had considered using in his book. Thanks

to the work of André Maury, who has published a full list of the manuscript and typescript sources of each of the remarks in both *Zettel* and the *Investigations*, one can reconstruct Wittgenstein's cuttings from Geach's continuous text.³⁴ The third edition of *Culture and Value* includes a similar list of sources for each passage included in that collection.³⁵ Those with access to a copy of the *Nachlass* can read these lists as pointers to the contexts from which those remarks are taken, a starting point for exploring the typescript and manuscript sources of Wittgenstein's work on the *Investigations*.

On the approach to Wittgenstein's writing advocated here, all of Wittgenstein's *Nachlass* should be included in his *oeuvre*. In other words, we should consider his surviving papers as a family of works, connected by the constant process of reworking and rewriting that links the notebooks, manuscript volumes, manuscript rearrangements, typed selections from the manuscripts, and the subsequent typescripts. This is not simply because of the vast number of revisions, deletions, alternative wordings and the like, to be found on most pages of the *Nachlass*, but also because so many passages have a complex genealogy, having been copied and revised from one text to another. The Wittgenstein *Nachlass* is in certain respects poorly served by the linear arrangement of remarks of a traditional printed text. The intertextual links between his remarks are either left out altogether, or provided in the form of a lengthy list of correlations that would take days or weeks of research to follow. Because the Wittgenstein *Nachlass* is the result of such an extensive act of rewriting, it is less a collection of texts than a hypertext, an interconnected network of remarks. The forthcoming electronic edition of the Wittgenstein papers, currently in preparation by the Wittgenstein Archives at the University of Bergen, could make the paths through the unpublished papers that are described here as accessible as the published works. But before looking at what can be expected from the projected edition of the *Nachlass*, we need to consider its history and the resources that already exist for reading the *Nachlass*.

In May 1969, Wittgenstein's literary heirs signed a deed of trust with Trinity College, Cambridge, giving the Wittgenstein papers in their possession to Trinity's Wren Library; a few exceptions, which were not part of the legacy, are now kept in the Austrian National

Library, Vienna; the Brenner Archive, Innsbruck; the Bodleian Library, Oxford; and the Bertrand Russell Archive, Hamilton, Ontario. Under the terms of the agreement with Trinity, the heirs would continue to receive royalties and copyright on publications from the *Nachlass*, which would pass to Trinity when the last one died. The deed of trust instituted two committees: a board of trustees, which administered the copyright, and a board of editors. Until Rhees died in 1989, both committees were composed of the three heirs; shortly afterward, Anscombe and von Wright invited Anthony Kenny and Peter Winch to join both committees. Around the time the papers were given to Trinity, von Wright published the first catalog of the Wittgenstein *Nachlass*, which has become established as the point of departure for work on the unpublished papers. It has been updated as further texts have come to light and presently lists eighty-two manuscript items, forty-five typescript items, and eleven dictations (PO, pp. 480–506). The catalog provides a reference system which allows one to refer unambiguously to any given item in the collection. Each physical entity, whether it is a notebook, a sequence of typed pages, or a bound volume, is assigned to one of the three categories mentioned above; within each category, the items are assigned to a numbered series, arranged in the order in which they were composed. Sometimes several items that are closely related were grouped under the same number and are distinguished by an additional letter. In addition to this comprehensive list of the contents of the *Nachlass*, the catalog also provides a classification and description of the papers as a whole, and includes considerable information about such matters as the title of the item, its chronology, and its relationship to other items.

Most of the material in the *Nachlass* is available in the form of a microfilm edition, produced at Cornell in 1967. Copies, either on microfilm or in the form of dozens of bound volumes, have been sold to researchers and university libraries. In principle, this has made most of Wittgenstein's surviving writing accessible to scholars, if not to the general public, but in practice there have been major limitations. Even the best facsimiles cannot be a substitute for an edition of the text, and these facsimiles had serious shortcomings. The quality of the photography was poor, some pages were illegible or omitted, and some manuscripts were left out altogether. The microfilm of the typescripts is, for the most part, quite

legible, but the extensive handwritten revisions to many of the typescripts, and the manuscripts themselves, often written with a blunt pencil, are less easy to follow. While it is possible to become familiar with Wittgenstein's handwriting, the overall limitations of the format, coupled with the lack of an index, make it almost impossible to use the Cornell edition to track the development of Wittgenstein's thought from one text to another.³⁶

In October 1974, the Wittgenstein trustees signed an agreement establishing the *Wittgenstein-Archiv Tübingen*, a research team at the University of Tübingen that aimed to edit a complete edition of Wittgenstein's writings, led by Mr. Michael Nedo and Professor H. J. Heringer. Much of the funding was provided by the Fritz Thyssen Foundation. Over the next five or six years, more than half of the *Nachlass* was transcribed into a computer database, a search program was developed, and the question of how best to edit a published complete works was discussed. However, the team members quarreled, and work on the project came to an end around 1980-1; none of the transcriptions have ever been published. In the final report, Professor Heringer stated that Mr. Nedo was "incapable of directing such a project in an organizationally serious or personally responsible manner" and that "there arose with all the collaborators considerable doubts concerning Mr. Nedo's scholarly competence."³⁷

While the Tübingen project was running into trouble, much of the groundwork for tracing the relations between Wittgenstein's drafts and revisions was being done by von Wright and two of his colleagues at the University of Helsinki, Heikki Nyman and André Maury. After he published the catalog of the Wittgenstein papers in 1969, von Wright continued his research into the process of revision that led to the production of the *Tractatus* and *Investigations*. The results of this research are summarized in his highly informative studies of the origins of those books, reprinted in his *Wittgenstein*.³⁸ The meticulously edited "Helsinki edition" of the principal sources of the *Philosophical Investigations* reconstructs five successive stages in the construction of the *Philosophical Investigations*, showing not just the result of Wittgenstein's revisions to the typescript, but also where revisions were inserted, variant readings, deletions and the like and every significant difference between their text and the printed "final" text. This research on the origins of the *Philosophical Investigations* led to the production of thousands of pages of carefully edited type-

scripts of the surviving drafts of the book. Although the Helsinki edition, completed fifteen years ago, offers an invaluable overview of some of the principal stages in the composition of the *Investigations*, it remains unpublished. Copies are, however, available in Helsinki, Bergen, Oxford, Cambridge, and Cornell.³⁹ The early, intermediate, and final versions of the *Investigations*, as von Wright calls them, were constructed circa 1936-9, 1942-4, and 1945-9, respectively. The early version is divided into two parts: the first, which was composed in late 1936, is closely related to §§1-188 of the final version, although it contains a number of remarks that were either substantially changed or dropped from later versions of the book. Part II of the early version of the *Investigations* is the basis for the published Part I of the *Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics*. The intermediate version consists of a slight revision and rearrangement of the material in the first part of the early version, followed by roughly half of the material in Pl, 189-425. Part I of the late version was constructed circa 1945, primarily by adding remarks from *Bemerkungen I* (TS, 228), a typescript containing a large number of remarks selected from his previous work; Part II was composed in 1946-8 and probably reached its final form in 1949. Von Wright and Nyman also edited manuscript volume XII (MS 116), a collection of remarks from earlier work, written up in 1937 and 1945, many of which were incorporated into the final version of Part I. The edited typescripts consist of a main text accompanied by an editorial apparatus which gives variant readings and the closest typescript and manuscript sources of the remarks. This apparatus, together with a copy of the relevant parts of the *Nachlass*, makes it possible to explore some of the successive formulations and rearrangements of Wittgenstein's remarks in the *Investigations*, although it does not attempt to trace the full generality of each remark.

In October 1981, the Wittgenstein trustees applied to the principal Austrian national research foundation, the *Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlich Forschung*, for support for a new editing project, under Nedo's direction. The project was to aim at the complete transcription of Wittgenstein's posthumous writings into a database and the development of appropriate computer programs; the aim was to produce a complete edition of Wittgenstein's works by 1989. The proposal did not mention the previous project or the fact that Nedo had been denied access to those transcriptions, so that much of the

work would repeat what had already been done. In September 1982 the *Fonds* agreed to support a one year pilot project, and IBM offered to donate computer time. According to Hintikka, the only person who has so far published an account of these events, "the subsequent history of the project is not easy to chronicle, one reason being Mr. Nedo's failure to keep his own sponsors apprised of what he had done and what he had not."⁴⁰ Apparently, Nedo's reports were approved by Professor Anscombe on behalf of the other trustees, and as a result the funding was renewed for the next few years. However, the project did not proceed according to plan. Nedo had promised to produce a transcript of the first four manuscript volumes that Wittgenstein had written in 1929-30 and the first typescript that was based on it, by October 1984. In September 1987, Professor Anscombe once again approved another renewal application on behalf of the trustees. However, in November of that year Professor von Wright wrote to the *Fonds* to say that he still had not seen the promised material, and that he was therefore withdrawing his support, with the result that the application was not approved. Early in 1988, Nedo produced a transcript of the first two manuscripts, but they were still not in publishable form. In 1990, a year after the projected completion date, the situation remained essentially unchanged. Shortly after joining the trustees, Kenny inspected Nedo's office in Trinity College, Cambridge, and saw 10,000 or more pages of computer printout. However, Kenny reports that he "was unable to obtain from him a satisfactory account of the reasons for delay. So far as I could ascertain, he had spent his time designing software for formatting the pages to be published according to his own taste."⁴¹ As a result, the trustees established two further deadlines, in May and December 1991, for the production of material ready for publication. After these ultimata produced no results, the trustees severed all connections with Nedo as editor of the Wittgenstein papers, and decided to move ahead with an electronic edition in collaboration with the Wittgenstein Archives at the University of Bergen. However, in December 1992, Nedo produces six volumes ready for the printer. "This placed the Trustees in a difficult position. In the light of past experience, they did not wish to co-operate further with Nedo in the production of a *Gesamtausgabe*; on the other hand, it seemed to them harsh to forbid the publication of the result of such long periods of work. In the event, they decided that while they would take no initiative in publishing these texts, they

would not stand in the way of their publication. Nedo was given permission to make arrangements of his own with a publisher, but not as part of an authorised edition of the collected works. In summer 1993 the trustees authorised a contract . . . for the manuscripts and typescripts from 1929 . . . to 1933. Rights of electronic publication were explicitly excluded."⁴²

Despite this long and troubled history, the Wittgenstein papers should soon be available in several different formats. While the Nedo edition will only cover a small fraction of the *Nachlass*, the entire *Nachlass* should soon be available in a CD-ROM edition, produced by the Wittgenstein Archives at the University of Bergen, in the form of photographic images of each page of the papers and an extraordinarily thorough transcription of the text. The first edition, due to be published in the spring of 1997, will contain a complete set of photographs, and a transcription of a little less than half the total; the remainder should be available not long afterward.⁴³ The electronic edition of the Wittgenstein papers will contain both black and white and color photographs of each page of the papers and a comprehensive transcription of the text. The black and white images will offer rapid reference to any part of the *Nachlass*, while the more detailed color images will facilitate close examination when needed. The transcript has been recorded in a specially developed language, which will allow the accompanying software to display the text in a number of formats, each representing a different set of editorial choices. For instance, when studying a heavily revised typescript, one could move between editions which would show the unrevised typescript, the text as finally revised, and a fully comprehensive "diplomatically" edited text which shows every semantically significant mark on the page, including all revisions, deletions, and variant wordings. While the electronic edition will not include a printed edition of the text, it will be possible to produce a printout of particular pages in whatever format one prefers.

The electronic edition of the Wittgenstein papers will make it possible to look at his writing as an interconnected whole, rather than as a discrete number of self-contained texts. The solid physical boundaries of a printed volume that separate one text from another in the traditional library become just one way of organizing information within the fluid world of hypertext. In hypertext, each paragraph or screenful of text can be multiply interlinked with many

other paragraphs of text, connected not only by the numerical sequence of published pages in a particular edition, but also with different editions of the same text, variant drafts and footnotes inserted by the author on a number of occasions, editorial information, previous drafts of the sentences in question, a translation into another language, relevant passages in other parts of the corpus, glossaries, dictionaries, a concordance for every term in the text, references to the collection of the most relevant secondary literature, pictures of illustrations or problematic passages in the original manuscript draft, and so forth. While the links that animate hypertext are familiar, and can, at least in principle, already be followed by a sufficiently skilled reader, in practice, it promises to change our understanding both of Wittgenstein's way of writing and his philosophy. Readers of the electronic edition will be able to compare different stages of Wittgenstein's revisions, systematically review his use of key terms, or search customized concordances. Questions that could not have been answered before will be answered in less time than it takes to ask them. Readers will approach Wittgenstein's writing in new ways, exploring connections and relationships that have received little attention in the past.

Perhaps one of the most important morals that the later Wittgenstein drew from his critique of his own earlier work is that there is a great danger in philosophy of taking a particular way of seeing things as though it were the only way of looking at them. In this chapter, I have argued that there is a comparable danger in treating Wittgenstein's posthumously published works at face value, as though they correspond to the books that he would have published. One reason for the overview I have provided of Wittgenstein's literary remains, and of his editors' decisions as to how to publish them, is to indicate some of the main connections between the published works and his *Nachlass*: connections that provide strong reasons for not taking his published works at face value, and for expecting that in the future readings of his work will increasingly be informed by a reading of the *Nachlass* as a whole. However, for most readers of this essay, there will be no need to consult the unpublished parts of the *Nachlass*. For those who are beginning to read Wittgenstein, or who wish to concentrate on the writing that comes closest to satisfying Schulte's criteria for being a "finished work of Wittgenstein's," the essential texts – the *Tractatus*, Part I

of the *Investigations*, and Part I of the *Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics* – have long been in print. For those who are interested in reading those works in the context of Wittgenstein's other writing, the published corpus of his writing already includes a substantial fraction of his surviving writings, including not only much of his most polished writing, but also texts from every stage of revision. It is these readers, for whom the published Wittgenstein is Wittgenstein enough, who are most in need of an outline of the relationship between Wittgenstein's published and unpublished writings, and it is for them that this chapter was written.

NOTES

- 1 Leading examples include Pl, 43, 199, 242, 258.
- 2 For some further elaboration of these claims, see Stern, "Recent Work on Wittgenstein," *Synthese* 98 (1990), pp. 415–58.
- 3 Stanley Cavell, "The Availability of Wittgenstein's Later Philosophy," in Wittgenstein: *The Philosophical Investigations*, ed. G. Pitcher (New York: Doubleday, 1966).
- 4 Cavell, "The Availability of Wittgenstein's Later Philosophy," p. 184.
- 5 Stanley Cavell, *Philosophical Passages: Wittgenstein, Emerson, Austin, Derrida* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), p. 96.
- 6 *Ibid.*, p. 96.
- 7 Only the introduction to the Vienna edition, dated 1993, had reached me when this was written. Although the third volume had just been printed when this book went to press in September 1995, and I had an opportunity to look at the first three volumes at a book display this summer, they had not reached the Berkeley library. The "Plan of the Edition" states that "Between two and five volumes will appear annually. . . . Fifteen volumes of edited text are initially envisaged, containing the writings from 1929 to 1933. These will be thoroughly indexed by an accompanying series of concordance volumes. An extension of the edition is intended" (M. Nedo, ed., *Vienna Edition. Introduction* [Vienna: Springer, 1993], p. 127). Volumes 1–5 will contain the ten manuscript volumes from this period (MSS, 105–14). According to the Introduction, volumes 6–13 will consist of the Big Typescript and the typescripts that led up to it (TSS, 208, 210–18). Finally, a set of manuscript notebooks dating from 1931–2, which contain rough drafts for MSS 110–14, will be published in volumes 14–15. However, the prospectus for the edition circulated by Springer in 1995 divides the same texts into eleven volumes, and promises six additional concordance volumes, which will be

updated every two years or so as the edition progresses. While the Vienna edition will find a home in a number of research libraries, this small selection from the *Nachlass* will cost far more than the entire electronic edition, cannot easily be revised to ensure editorial consistency or to correct mistakes as they are discovered, and will contain far less information.

8 Those who have challenged the editors' decision have for the most part questioned particular inclusions or exclusions, rather than the construction of the *oeuvre* as a whole, and there has been little recognition of the extent to which their decisions have shaped the reception of Wittgenstein's philosophy. What discussion there has been of the problems in editing the *Nachlass* has, for the most part, occurred either in the popular press or relatively obscure scholarly journals, and has had little impact on most of his readers.

9 G. H. von Wright, *Wittgenstein* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1982), p. 136.

10 For further discussion of the publication history of the *Investigations* see G. H. von Wright, "The Troubled History of Part II of the *Investigations*," *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 42 (1992), pp. 181–92, O. Scholz, "Zum Status von Teil II der *Philosophische Untersuchungen*," in E. von Savigny and O. Scholz, eds., *Wittgenstein über die Seele* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1995), pp. 24–40, and Stern, "New Evidence Concerning the Construction // the Troubled History // of Part I of the *Investigations*," *Papers of the Eighteenth International Wittgenstein Symposium* (Kirchberg, Austria: The Austrian Ludwig Wittgenstein Society, 1995), pp. 789–95.

While there are relatively few discrepancies between the published text of Part I of the *Investigations* and the two surviving typescripts, the typescripts should provide the basis for a thoroughly revised critical edition of the text of Part I. A comparison of the two typescripts and the published text which I carried out in the summer of 1993 made it clear that the published text contains some errors which should be corrected. For instance, in §85, line 3, the published text reads "Also kann ich sagen, der Wegweiser lässt doch keinen Zweifel offen" (therefore I can say, the signpost leaves no doubt open), which does correspond to the typed text of the source typescript. On checking the source typescripts, one finds that in both typescripts, Wittgenstein changed "Keinen" (no) to "einen" (a), a much more readily intelligible reading, but the editors later decided to keep the original wording. (This passage was brought to my attention by Elke von Savigny.)

Another significant divergence between the typescripts and the published text concerns the so-called *Randbemerkungen* or marginal remarks. These slips contained additional remarks that were attached to

particular places in the typescript; most of them include instructions as to where they should be inserted in the main text. In most cases, those instructions were not followed, and the material in question was published at the bottom of the page, separated from the main text by a line. For instance, both copies of the *Randbemerkungen* that are printed on pp. 11 and 14 explicitly state that they should be inserted at the end of Pl, 22 and 28 respectively. Other *Randbemerkungen* may have been footnotes: in the second copy of typescript 227, the *Randbemerkung* on page 33 of the published text has a "r" next to the words "On page 60," and one finds a corresponding "r" in the same hand, at the end of Pl, 70, on page 60 of the typescript. In both copies of the typescript, the end of the penultimate sentence in Pl, 142 has a superscripted "r" connecting it with the *Randbemerkung* printed at the bottom of that page. Several *Randbemerkungen* are attached to Pl, 138; one is printed at the bottom of that page, two more on the next page, and two others on page 147; there is no evidence in either typescript to explain why this decision was made. It is likely that these discrepancies were the result of last-minute misunderstandings between the editors and publisher.

11 Scholz, "Zum Status von Teil II der *Philosophische Untersuchungen*."

12 Those who read the *Investigations* in the English translation should be warned that the present translation is not entirely reliable and was apparently constructed without consulting Wittgenstein's comments on Rhees's translation. While Wittgenstein's writing is extremely difficult to translate well, a more accurate and faithful translation is certainly possible. Although the translation was substantially improved in the second edition of the book, it still contains a number of egregious errors, such as the omission of an entire clause in the translation of Pl, 412, and the translation of *Sprache*, language, in Pl, 116 as language-game. The English translation of §116 has seemed to many readers to provide strong textual grounds for conflating language-games, Wittgenstein's term for quite specific uses of language (see his introduction of the term in Pl, 23), with language as a whole. More generally, the use of a variety of English words for important German expressions makes it impossible for the English reader to see connections which are manifest in the German text. For instance, *übersichtlich* and *übersehen*, which are adjectival and verb forms of the same root, are translated as "perspicuous" and "to command a clear view" respectively in Pl, 122, where the central importance of this expression is emphasized; elsewhere "surveyable" and "to survey" are also used. The translation of a family of related German terms by a single English word has been equally misleading. For instance, the translation of *Gebrauch* (custom), *Verpflogenheit* (an institu-

tionalized practice), *Verwendung* (use), and *Anwendung* (application) by the English word "use" has helped to create the mistaken impression that Wittgenstein accepted what has become known as a "use theory of meaning." There is further discussion of specific problems with the translation of the *Investigations* in Baker and Hacker's commentary on the *Investigations*.

The Ogden translation of the *Tractatus* was reviewed by Wittgenstein, who made a number of suggestions for changes, and can be regarded as having received his considered approval. The correspondence is documented in *Letters to Ogden*, which includes facsimiles of Wittgenstein's comments written on the proofs. While the Pears and McGuinness translation is somewhat more colloquial and accessible than the Ogden version, it sometimes sacrifices consistency in the interest of a fluid translation. For instance *sich zeigen*, which literally means "to show itself," is closely related to *zeigen*, "to show," yet Pears and McGuinness depart from the Ogden translation, instead using the expression "makes itself manifest."

- 13 For further discussion of the development of Wittgenstein's treatment of solipsism, see: Stern, *Wittgenstein on Mind and Language* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Hacker, *Insight and Illusion* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986); Pears, *The False Prison* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987, 1988); Hallett's *A Companion to Wittgenstein's Philosophical Investigations* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), p. 439 ff. provides a large number of cross-references to passages in both the published and unpublished writings, and includes a number of quotations from the *Nachlass*.
- 14 The preparatory work for the *Investigations* contains many more references to the authors Wittgenstein had read than the published texts. In some cases, this even takes the form of an explicit reference to the author Wittgenstein had in mind in a particular remark (e.g., early versions of PI, 122 contain a parenthetical reference to Spengler in connection with the use of the term *Weltanschauung*). There are numerous references, both explicit and implicit, to Köhler's *Gestalt Psychology* and William James's *Principles of Psychology* in the *Remarks on the Philosophy of Psychology* and Part II of the *Investigations*. Although Wittgenstein liked to give the impression that he had read very little, this was far from the truth. In a remark in *Culture and Value*, written in 1931, he even described himself as a "reproductive thinker," someone who had never discovered a train of thought but had only made use of others' for his "work of clarification," which involved the discovery of "new similes." He initially listed "Frege, Russell, Spengler, Staffa" as his influences, but later expanded the list so that it read "Boltzmann Hertz Schopenhauer Frege, Russell, Kraus, Loos Weininger

- Spengler, Staffa." In view of Wittgenstein's biography, and the care he took over the order, it is very likely that the authors are arranged in chronological sequence. While Hallett's appendix to his *Companion to Wittgenstein's Philosophical Investigations*, an extensive list of authors and books that Wittgenstein read, has some gaps, in it is a valuable indication of the range and character of Wittgenstein's literary tastes.
- 15 Wittgenstein, quoted by Rhees, in "Correspondence and Comment," *The Human World* 15-16 (1974), p. 153. Rhees does not give a precise reference, simply stating that the quotation is taken from a manuscript written in 1948. The passage is cited in full in Stern, *Wittgenstein on Mind and Language*, pp. 6, 193.
- 16 There is a programmatic outline of this transitional metaphysics of experience in "Some Remarks on Logical Form" (PO, pp. 28-35) and parts of it, despite his change of mind in October 1929, can be found in the *Philosophical Remarks*, assembled in the spring of 1930. But the best record of this phase of Wittgenstein's work is to be found in Wittgenstein's manuscript volumes from 1929, which are now available in the first two volumes of the Vienna edition of his work.
- 17 For further discussion, see Stern, *Wittgenstein on Mind and Language*, pp. 98-104, 125-7, 186-92.
- 18 There is also some anecdotal evidence that he intentionally destroyed other papers. In an interview in the *Daily Telegraph*, Mrs. David Ennals described her friendship with Wittgenstein and told the reporter that "when the philosopher died, she took three rucksacks of his papers and, alone, burnt them in Wales, Austria and Norway as he had wished."
- 19 The number of pages in the Wittgenstein *Nachlass* has recently become a matter of some controversy. If one follows the convention that von Wright adopts in his catalog, of counting each side of a sheet of paper with writing or type on it as a "page," one arrives at a result of approximately 20,000 pages, roughly 12,000 manuscript pages and 8,000 typed pages (many with manuscript revisions), the figure cited by the Wittgenstein Archives at the University of Bergen. Nedo's figure of 30,000 manuscript pages is hard to understand, and no reasons are given (Vienna edition *Introduction*, pp. 51, 52.)
- Huttedt and Rossvaer, the editors of *The Norwegian Wittgenstein Project Report 1988* (Bergen: Norwegian Computing Center for the Humanities, 1989), estimated that their electronic complete works would occupy about 40 megabytes, or well over 5 million words. While a substantial fraction of this would consist of drafts of published remarks and the coding needed to represent every variant draft, erasure, and rearrangement, there is at least as much material that does not fall into these categories.

20 Parts 4–6 give away the remainder of his estate. Part 4 contains the following gifts:

To Dr. Benedict Richards my French Travelling Clock my Fur Coat my complete edition of Grimm's Fairy Tales and my book "Hernach" by W. Busch

To Dr. Ludwig Hänsel in Austria my volume of Lessing's Religious Writings

To Mr. R. Rhees the rest of my books and what I call my Collection of Nonsense which will be found in a file

To Miss Anscombe all my furniture

21 A lost typescript of the first part of the *Investigations* and two manuscript notebooks were rediscovered in 1993 and given to the Wren Library. In the same year, a number of Wittgenstein's papers, including the missing "Gmunnden" typescript of the *Tractatus* and the manuscript of the early version of the *Investigations*, together with a previously unknown notebook from the 1930s, were found in the *Nachlass* of Rudolf and Elisabeth Koder and given to the Brenner Archive in Innsbruck. The notebook, which contains extremely interesting diary entries and personal reflections, dating from 1930–2 and 1936–7, has already been edited and will be published as *Ludwig Wittgenstein. Tagebuch 1930–1937*, ed. Ilse Somavilla. (Innsbruck: Hayman Verlag, 1996.)

22 The best printed index to all three books is to be found in the one-volume Suhrkamp edition, the *Tractatus and Notebooks 1914–1916* are included in the *The Published Works of Ludwig Wittgenstein* (Clayton, Ga: Intelext, 1993), but not *Prototractatus*.

23 In addition to these books, all based on the Wittgenstein *Nachlass*, much of his correspondence, and notes of his lectures and conversations, have also been published; these are included in the list of primary sources in the bibliography.

24 Wittgenstein, *Werkausgabe*, 8 vols., ed. Joachim Schulte (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1984).

25 *The Published Work of Ludwig Wittgenstein*.

26 J. Schulte, *Wittgenstein: An Introduction* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1992), p. 34.

27 *Ibid.*

28 Foucault uses the expression "the author of the *Tractatus* [Wittgenstein]" to remind us of the peculiarly problematic status of posthumous authorship. Cf. H. Sluga, "Thinking as Writing," *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 33/34 (1989), pp. 115–141, and Derrida on Nietzsche's "I have forgotten my umbrella" in *Spurs: Nietzsche's Styles* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), pp. 122–43.

29 For instance, the first nineteen sections of the *Philosophical Grammar*

are based on the following sources: pp. 1–4, 12, 4–5, 25–6, 25, 5–13, 14, 13, and 14 of MS 140, pp. 28–32, 31, 32–3, 93, 52, 33–7, 179 of MS 114, part II, p. 26 of the Big Typescript.

30 The "Philosophy" chapter, which includes versions of many of the most well-known remarks on philosophical method in the *Investigations*, was published as a journal article in 1989, and can be found in *Philosophical Occasions*. The chapters on "Phenomenology" and "Idealism, etc." remain unpublished.

31 Kenny, the translator of the *Philosophical Grammar*, wrote a judicious and extremely informative discussion of how that book was edited, under the title "From the Big Typescript to the *Philosophical Grammar*," reprinted in his *The Legacy of Wittgenstein* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1984).

32 A. Pichler, "A Source Catalog of the Published Texts," in M. Biggs and A. Pichler, eds, *Wittgenstein: Two Source Catalogues and a Bibliography* (Bergen: Working Papers from the Wittgenstein Archives at the University of Bergen, no. 7, 1993). The book, like all the publications of the Wittgenstein Archives at Bergen, can be obtained from the Archives by writing to them at Harald Hårtagens gt 31, N-5007 Bergen, Norway, or by E-mail at wab@hd.uib.no.

33 Wittgenstein, *Geheime Tagebücher*, ed. W. Baum (Vienna: Turia and Kant, 1991).

34 A. Maury, "Sources of the Remarks in Wittgenstein's *Zettel*," *Philosophical Investigations* 4 (1981), pp. 57–74 and "Sources of the Remarks in Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations*," *Synthese* 90 (1994), pp. 349–78.

35 *Vermischte Bemerkungen*, 3rd ed. (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1994). A new edition of the English translation, *Culture and Value*, is currently being prepared by Peter Winch.

36 For a brief review of the work that has been done on the *Nachlass*, see Stern, "Recent Work on Wittgenstein," Part III.

37 J. Hintikka, "An Impatient Man and His Papers," *Synthese* 87 (1991), p. 192.

38 Von Wright, "The Wittgenstein Papers," PO, p. 504, n19. The footnote refers the reader to von Wright, *Wittgenstein*, pp. 7–10 and pp. 111–36 (the introduction and the essay on the origin and composition of the *Investigations*).

39 This work on a number of carefully edited typescripts of successive versions of the *Philosophical Investigations* is outlined in the preface to von Wright's *Wittgenstein* (1982, pp. 6–10). The sources include TSS 220, 221, 225, 227, 239, all of which are drafts for Part I, together with a similarly edited typescript of MS 144, the only surviving draft of the

published Part II (the typescript on which the published book was based is lost).

40 Hintikka, "An Impatient Man and His Papers," pp. 193-4.

41 A. Kenny, "Wittgenstein's Troubled Legacy," *Times Higher Education Supplement*, August 26, 1994.

42 *Ibid.*

43 The Wittgenstein Archives at the University of Bergen, *The Collected Manuscripts of Ludwig Wittgenstein on Facsimile CD-ROM* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

The Norwegian Wittgenstein Project aimed at a complete electronic version of the Wittgenstein papers, but was discontinued in 1987; it is described in more detail in Huitfeldt and Rossvaer, *The Norwegian Wittgenstein Project Report 1988*. The work is being continued by the Wittgenstein Archives at Bergen, which was restarted in 1990 with the approval of the Wittgenstein trustees. Further discussion of the work of the Wittgenstein Archives at Bergen can be found in Claus Huitfeldt, "Computerizing Wittgenstein. The Wittgenstein Archives at the University of Bergen," in K. Johannessen et al., eds., *Wittgenstein and Norway* (Oslo: Solum Forlag, 1994), pp. 275-94, and "Multi-Dimensional Texts in a One-Dimensional Medium," in P. Henry and A. Utraker, eds., *Wittgenstein and Contemporary Theories of Language* (Bergen: Working Papers from the Wittgenstein Archives at the University of Bergen, no. 5, 1992), pp. 142-61.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

FURTHER READING

The literature on Wittgenstein's life and work is extensive. The bibliography by Shanker and Shanker, which is already ten years out of date, contains over 6000 items; a more selective bibliography, by Frongia and McGuinness, which includes short summaries of many of the principal entries, still lists well over 1000 items. Our bibliography makes no claim to comprehensiveness, but does offer a representative selection of work on Wittgenstein, and especially recent material that will not be found in the standard reference works. Readers who would like easy access to a wide range of secondary literature on Wittgenstein's philosophy might like to consult the five-volume anthology edited by Shanker, or the fifteen-volume anthology edited by Camfield. The anthology edited by Pitcher contains a number of papers which have had a considerable influence on the secondary literature.

The best general introductions to Wittgenstein's philosophy are Kenny's *Wittgenstein*, which stresses the chronological development and continues in his thought, Pears's *Ludwig Wittgenstein*, which outlines some of the central problems that preoccupied him, Fogelin's *Wittgenstein*, which concentrates on the argument of the *Investigations*; and Schulte's *Wittgenstein: An Introduction*. Kripke's *Wittgenstein on Rules and Private Language* provides a clear and provocative interpretation of Wittgenstein's conception of rule-following which has generated an enormous amount of critical discussion. Hacker's *Insight and Illusion*, Hintikka and Hintikka's *Investigating Wittgenstein*, Pears's *The False Prison*, and Stern's *Wittgenstein on Mind and Language* offer conflicting but complementary accounts of the development of Wittgenstein's philosophy. Those engaging in a close study of the *Philosophical Investigations* will want to consult the commentaries by Baker and Hacker, Hallett, and von Savigny, each of which provides a very different style of commentary and interpretation of the text. Books that contain information about the primary literature and its relationship to the Wittgenstein