

A BRIEF HISTORY OF WITTGENSTEIN EDITING

ANTHONY
KENNY

I. Wittgenstein's will

In his will, of 29 January 1951, Wittgenstein bequeathed to Rush Rhees, Elizabeth Anscombe and Georg Henrik von Wright “all the copyright in all my unpublished writings; and also the manuscripts and typescripts thereof to dispose of as they think best.” These heirs were to publish “as many of my unpublished writings as they think fit” and were to share the royalties and other profits equally between themselves.

During the decade following Wittgenstein's death the heirs, who acted as literary executors, did valuable service in publishing promptly serviceable editions and translations of the *Philosophical Investigations* and selections from other writings. Recent critical work has shown that the edition of what appears as *Philosophical Investigations*, Part I, was substantially sound. More controversial, however, was the decision to include, as Part II, MS 144, without any written warrant from Wittgenstein. The editors no doubt felt that it would be misleading, in the first publication of the philosopher's post-*Tractatus* thoughts, to conceal that after the completion of the *Investigations* (Part I) his thoughts on some crucial issues were taking a different turn before he died.

The *Untersuchungen* appeared with an *en face* translation by Elizabeth Anscombe. This has recently been subject to some criticism, but I must record my opinion that it was a very remarkable achievement. In substance it is extremely faithful to Wittgenstein's German: when a new *en face* edition was in preparation by Blackwell (3rd edition, 2001) I was invited to propose emendations, and could produce less than a score. It is true that it is not

A. Pichler, S. Säätelä (eds.), *Wittgenstein: The Philosopher and his Works*, pp. 382–396, Frankfurt a.M.: ontos verlag 2006, © ontos verlag, Anthony Kenny.

consistent in its translation of semi-technical terms, such as *Erklärung* and *Bezeichnung*, and it is also true that it often differs from the translations suggested by Wittgenstein himself in his notes on an earlier translation by Rush Rhees. But there are often good reasons for the inconsistencies, and Wittgenstein's own English suggestions are not those of a native speaker of the language. The Anscombe translation is fluent and readable and has been universally accepted as if it contained the *ipsissima verba* of Wittgenstein: I can think of no other English translation of a philosopher – not Jowett's Plato, nor Kemp Smith's Kant – that has achieved such canonical status in the philosophical world. The vivid lucidity of the translation is the more remarkable given that Anscombe's style, when she was writing in her own name, was often crabbed and opaque.

Von Wright was prevented by illness from taking part in the editing of the *Investigations*, and had no part in the controversial decision to include a second part. He was involved, however, in the subsequent publication of the *Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics*; something which, by 1969, appears to have slightly embarrassed him. Since this book consists of *selections* from Wittgenstein's writings, it occupies, he then wrote "a unique and perhaps not altogether happy, position" among the other publications from the *Nachlass*. These appeared at intervals during the fifties and sixties: *The Blue and Brown Books* (1958), *Notebooks 1914–16* (1961), *Philosophische Bemerkungen* (TS 209) (1965), and *Zettel* (1967).

In summer 1967 that part of the *Nachlass* which was known to exist in England was temporarily collected at Oxford and microfilmed for Cornell University, under the supervision of von Wright and Norman Malcolm. Later in the same year copies of papers in the Austrian part of the *Nachlass* were filmed at Cornell, in Ithaca New York. It then became possible to purchase copies of these microfilms and many universities throughout the world acquired them. However, the standard of photography was poor, the collection was incomplete, and parts of the manuscripts were omitted, in particular the coded passages of Wittgenstein's diaries.

After the Cornell microfilming, Wittgenstein's heirs gave all their originals of the Wittgenstein papers to Trinity College, Cambridge, to be kept in the Wren Library. By a deed of Trust of 5 May 1969 while the papers themselves were given to Trinity, the copyright in the papers was given to a new set of trustees. These trustees were to consist, initially of the original heirs,

henceforth to be called “the beneficiaries”. New trustees could be appointed by the beneficiaries, and the trustees were to hold the copyrights and royalties on trust for the beneficiaries while they survived, and after the death of the last of them on trust for Trinity College.

In a supplement to *The Philosophical Review* in 1969 (Vol. 78: pp. 483–503) von Wright provided the first full description and catalogue of the *Nachlass*: henceforth the manuscripts and typescripts have been known by the numbers given them in that article. He announced the forthcoming publication of the Big Typescript (TS 213) and of *On Certainty*. “With the publication of these posthumous works”, he felt able to say, “the full body of Wittgenstein’s philosophy has been made accessible to the public.” (p. 503)

2. The seventies

It could, I think, fairly be said that at the end of the sixties an era in the reception of Wittgenstein came to an end. The main elements of his philosophy were available to the intellectual community, and if his philosophical insights were not to have the worldwide impact that they deserved, that was because of – hopefully ephemeral – changes in philosophical fashion, not because of the inaccessibility of the essential texts.

However, interest began to grow in Wittgenstein’s biography and his intellectual development, and gradually it was realised that the state of the *Nachlass* was not such that the early editions could be regarded as uncontroversial and unquestionable representations of his definitive thought. Matters were brought to a head with the publication of the Big Typescript by Rush Rhees, under the title *Philosophische Grammatik* in 1970. It was at this point that, for the first time, I myself became involved in the dissemination of the *Nachlass*: for I was commissioned to prepare the English translation of the *Grammatik*, which appeared in 1974, and that brought me into close contact with Rhees’s editing methods.

Rhees has been widely criticised; for instance Professor Hintikka, in his influential article on the *Nachlass* “An Impatient Man and his Papers” (*Synthese* 87: pp. 183–201, 1991) has this to say:

The only half-way conventional book Wittgenstein left behind is TS 213, the Big Typescript. Rhees was supposed to edit it, but he ended up doing something quite different ... Rhees assembled a medley of materi-

als, from different sources, which was never intended by Wittgenstein to go together, and which are sometimes lifted out of an important context.

This is a little unfair. Certainly, Rhees did not publish the Big Typescript. But Wittgenstein, as soon as he had finished it, began tinkering with it, adding, cutting, transposing. It is not sure that Wittgenstein never intended the passages chosen by Rhees to go together, but the text Rhees published, on the basis of a certain stage of Wittgenstein's revision, is only one of many possible orderings that could claim Wittgenstein's authority. The main objection is that Rhees's published text gives no indication at all of the amount of editorial activity that lay behind it. Cuts are made silently, and transpositions merely hinted at; important material in the typescript is simply omitted.

In the course of translating Rhees' text I drew up a full account of the editorial decisions he had made, with their justification, when there was one, in Wittgenstein's papers. I wished to put this as an introduction to the English version. But Rhees forbade this on the ground that it would "come between Wittgenstein and the reader". In my opinion, it would, on the contrary, have made clear just how much had already taken place between Wittgenstein and the reader, as a result of Rhees's editing. But of course I had to accept Rhees's decision.

Eventually I published my account as a separate piece, entitled "From the Big Typescript to the *Philosophical Grammar*" in a *Festschrift* for von Wright (*Acta Philosophica Fennica* 28, pp. 41–53, 1976). Relations between Rhees and myself were thereafter strained. I was sorry about that: he had been helpful to me when I was translating, and despite his unfortunate possessiveness and protectiveness in relation to the *Nachlass* he undoubtedly had a keen insight into Wittgenstein's ways of thought.

By the mid nineteen-seventies many felt that a complete and definitive text of the *Nachlass* should be considered. In 1965 von Wright had found in Vienna a hitherto unknown manuscript of the *Tractatus* which differed in several ways from the final published version. In 1971 he and a number of colleagues published it in facsimile, with a printed German text and an *en face* English translation, with a number of typographical devices to mark differences from the canonical text. The volume was handsome, and informative for scholars in the way that none of the previously published Wittgenstein

texts had been. But it gave an indication of how arduous and expensive a complete, conventional, critical edition of the *Nachlass* would be.

In April 1977 a symposium was held in Tübingen, attended by philosophers, linguists and computer experts from Germany, England, Italy, France, Finland and Canada, as well as the publishers, Blackwell of Oxford and Suhrkamp Verlag of Frankfurt.

The conference made those attending it aware that Wittgenstein's texts presented problems almost without parallel among 20th century writers. Apart from the ten years after world war I when he had abandoned philosophy, Wittgenstein wrote incessantly, corrected and amended constantly, dictated to pupils and friends, destroyed, restored, rearranged, repeated himself, crossed out, crossed out the crossings out. He wrote paragraphs and remarks, often seemingly unconnected, because he felt that his thoughts became crippled if he tried to force them in any single direction against their natural inclination. He left behind blocks of thoughts and insights that he failed, after repeated attempts, to assemble into a complete philosophical edifice.

The problems were well illustrated by the Big Typescript, as I had discovered when following in the footsteps of Rhees. It had its origin in a series of small notebooks, which were revised in the form of volumes of manuscripts, further revised in the form of a typescript, which was cut up and rearranged and then further revised several times. The text thus exists on six or more separate levels, and any full critical edition would have to discriminate between each textual level and show how the thought evolved.

The symposium marked the beginning of a new phase in Wittgenstein studies, by defining the extent of the problem and by the realisation that the appropriate first step to a complete edition must be the establishment of a computerised database (the word was still so unfamiliar to the general public as to appear in inverted commas in the early reports of the symposium).

3. The eighties

The creation of the database had been entrusted, since 1975, to a team under the direction of Dr Michael Nedo and Professor H.J. Heringer of Tübingen, Brian McGuinness and Joachim Schulte, both then at Oxford, and Marino Rosso and Michele Ranchetti of Florence. Financial support came, initially, from the Fritz Thyssen Foundation. The project began with high hopes. "By the mid 1980s it is hoped that the philosopher who once

said that the only response to certain philosophical problems was silence will be represented by some fourteen volumes of 500 pages each, which will contain every word of philosophy he ever committed to paper. Perhaps only then will it be possible to assess his contribution to philosophy justly and in full,” I wrote at the time, to the TLS.

Sadly, the project proved abortive. Though about half the *Nachlass* was transcribed into a computer, not one volume of text was published during the lifetime of the project. The collaborators quarrelled, and the Tübingen Wittgenstein archive was dissolved. In his final report Heringer said that Nedo “was incapable of directing such a project in an organizationally serious or personally responsible manner.” After the dissolution of the Tübingen project, Professor Heringer handed over a substantial amount of material to a new venture in Norway, the Norwegian Wittgenstein Project. Nedo moved from Tübingen to Cambridge. He and Ms Isabelle Weiss began a new project for a complete transcription of the posthumous writings into a database.

In 1981 the three trustees applied to the Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung (FWF), an Austrian government research foundation, for support for the Nedo project. The FWF in 1982 funded a twelve month pilot program. Application was made for further support, for the computing expenses, to the British Academy. The philosophy section of the Academy (of which I was then chairman) refused support on the grounds that it did not wish to take part in the quarrel between the former Tübingen partners.

Despite renewal of funding for two further years, Nedo did not produce any publishable text. Von Wright began to have serious doubts about his capacity to produce a *Gesamtausgabe*. Anscombe continued to support applications to the FWF and it is possible that her recommendations were taken to represent the unanimous opinion of the trustees until in 1987 von Wright wrote to dissociate himself. Eventually, in 1989, a substantial grant was made by the FWF, at the request of all the trustees, on the basis of a transcript of MSS 105–6 which was produced for their inspection in 1988.

In 1989 Rhees died. For some time the trustees had been giving thought to the future of the *Nachlass* after their death, and each had privately nominated a successor: Anscombe nominated Anselm Müller of Trier, Rhees nominated Peter Winch, and von Wright nominated myself, though these

nominations were not for some time communicated to the persons involved. Soon after Rhees's death, Peter Winch became a Trustee, and in Spring 1990, I was invited to join the Trust, von Wright having decided that he would wish me to do so before he had ceased to be a member of the board. From this point, the proceedings of the trustees became more formal, with roughly annual meetings minuted by a secretary, who from 1991 until his death was Winch.

The responsibilities of the trustees had recently been affected by a change in English law. Hitherto, copyright in unpublished materials had been perpetual. An Act of 1988 limited its duration to fifty years from the author's death. With respect to those who had died before the implementation of the act, including Wittgenstein, copyright was extended to fifty years from 1 August 1989.

One of my first duties as a Trustee was to join the other three, on 4 May 1990, in a meeting with representatives of Blackwell's to discuss the possibility of a new edition of all Wittgenstein's philosophical writings. The minutes read as follows:

Those present agreed that such an edition was, in principle, desirable. The material involved, if published in its entirety, would result in circa 30 substantial printed volumes. There was some discussion about whether these volumes should encompass the quite considerable overlap and duplication between discrete notes and texts or whether they should be reduced to circa 15 more selective volumes. The tendency of the meeting was to prefer the latter option, suggested by Professor Kenny.

Issues discussed were: should the edition be German only, or bilingual *en face*? How were royalties to be divided? Should subsidies be sought? It was proposed that the trustees should form an overarching supervisory board, to which there should report an executive board with a central scholar at its head, possibly Joachim Schulte.

The item discussed at greatest length was the relationship of the proposed edition to the work already being done by Michael Nedo. The minutes read:

The first volume of his transcription was discussed in some detail and analysed by editorial and production experts at Blackwell. At issue were:

(i) the format of the existing Nedo project which Blackwell feels too large to be conveniently published in book form and which Nedo feels adamant could not be changed.

(ii) the working structure of any such edition and the levels of responsibility and command in such a system.

(iii) deadline and incentives for completion. It was felt that the benefits of collaborating with Nedo were considerable in terms of taking advantage of very sophisticated and, as far as the meeting was able to gauge, intellectually sound work. The disadvantages were administrative and, to some extent, political.

The suggestion of collaboration between Blackwell and Nedo was taken no further. After this meeting Blackwell's production staff expressed great reservations about being able to work in the manner proposed by Nedo. Accordingly the trustees had to decide, separately, on the Blackwell plan for a complete edition and on the publication of the work done by Nedo.

After the meeting the trustees sent Nedo an ultimatum. They agreed to continue his permission to work on the Wittgenstein MSS and to continue their support for his grant (from the FWF) on conditions which included the following:

Within one year (i.e. before 4th May 1991) you are to produce, in a form ready for publication, volumes 107, 108, 208 and 210 according to the numbering in the von Wright catalogue. If those volumes have not been produced in satisfactory form by that time you will take no further part in the production of the *Gesamtausgabe* of Wittgenstein's works.

Given the constant failure to produce camera-ready copy, some of the trustees began to doubt whether, as Nedo claimed, substantial transcription had actually taken place. On their behalf, early in 1991 I inspected his office in Trinity College, Cambridge, and saw the 10,000 or more pages of computer print-out. So far as I could tell on brief inspection the transcriptions were of high quality. However, in spite of repeated questioning of Nedo, both in private and later before the other trustees, I 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 pub-

lished according to his own taste. When he had started working, in 1977, desk-top publishing was in the future; but by 1990 it appeared to me that there were many commercially available packages that would enable a novice to produce camera-ready copy as satisfactory, from either the aesthetic or the scholarly point of view, as Nedo's output.

May 1991 came and went and no volumes appeared. The trustees severed all communication with Nedo as editor of a possible *Gesamtausgabe* but agreed that they would support publication of the two volumes Nedo had prepared in 1987/8 (MSS 105–6 *Philosophische Bemerkungen*) and inquire whether Springer Verlag would undertake publication. They also agreed to support such further transcribed material as he would have ready in publishable form by the end of 1991. At that date Nedo must return all material to the Wren Library and must give up his office in Trinity. He did so, but once again no volumes were presented before the predefined date.

4. The nineties

During the eighties, another abortive project had been proceeding simultaneously. In 1981, as recorded, material from Tübingen had been moved to Norway. In 1981 a number of Norwegian scholars banded together to establish a Norwegian Wittgenstein project, to put together a computer-readable text of the *Nachlass*. This project transcribed about 3000 pages, with funding from Norwegian universities, councils, and foundations. However, those responsible failed to apply for copyright clearance from the trustees, believing that it was not necessary for publication in machine-readable form. When belatedly approached, the trustees refused their support, and the project came to a halt in 1987.

However, at long last the story took a hopeful turn. In 1989 Claus Huitfeldt drew up plans for a Wittgenstein Archives at the University of Bergen. This too was to have as its goal a complete machine-readable version of the *Nachlass*. But the new project was punctilious in its relation with the trustees (who now included Peter Winch and myself). In June 1990 the University of Bergen gave financial support to the Archives for a trial period of three and a half years.

At their meeting of May 1991 the trustees agreed in principle to permit Huitfeldt to produce a facsimile CD-ROM of the *Nachlass*. In March 1992 an agreement was signed between the trustees and the University of Bergen.

The university was given permission to copy and make machine-readable transcripts of the *Nachlass* and to make these available to scholars in Bergen. It was also given exclusive permission to distribute and sell machine-readable transcripts and machine-readable facsimiles of the *Nachlass*, including the diaries and the coded passages, under three conditions. First, satisfactory financing of the project was to be assured; second, the parties were to reach agreement on the sharing of royalties; third, the parties were to agree on a publisher for the machine-readable texts. The trustees were also favourably impressed by the sample transcripts Huitfeldt submitted, and wrote to him “that they are hopeful that the work at Bergen may eventually serve as a basis for the preparation of a printed *Gesamtausgabe*.”

The conditions laid down by the trustees did not take long to fulfil. After a favourable report from an independent evaluation committee, the University of Bergen agreed to continue funding the project until 1997. The trustees agreed that they would not charge royalties on the first 200 copies of the CD-ROM. Oxford University Press was chosen as publisher, and in 1993 a contract was signed between OUP and Bergen, with the approval of the trustees, for the publication of a CD-ROM facsimile, to contain the entire *Nachlass*, including the coded passages. It was hoped that the facsimile would be published late in 1995.

Meanwhile, in December 1992 this complicated story took an unexpected twist. Nedo presented the trustees with six volumes of text 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 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.

In 1993 the trustees authorised a contract between Nedo and Springer Verlag of Vienna for the publication of Wittgenstein MSS 105–114 and TSS 208–213, that is to say, that manuscripts and typescripts from 1929 up to and including the Big Typescript of 1933. Rights of electronic publication were explicitly excluded, and the trustees minuted that Nedo’s work should not be regarded “as constituting part of any possible future Collected Edition of the Wittgenstein *Nachlass*.” The trustees resolved that the FWF should be told that any further support they might wish to give to the editing of Witt-

genstein's papers should usefully be applied to the Bergen project. (Despite this collective resolution of the trustees, Professor Anscombe shortly afterwards supported a further application from Nedo to the FWF.)

Since then several volumes have appeared of the *Wiener Ausgabe*. After an introductory volume written by Nedo, the two volumes that had been essentially ready since 1978 appeared in 1994, and four further volumes by 1998. Most recently, in 2000 there appeared the volume containing the Big Typescript. Unlike Rhees, Nedo has published the typescript exactly as produced, without taking account of the annotations and emendations. Two further volumes are promised which will take account of the reworking of the Big Typescript. These will be volumes 12 and 13 of the *Wiener Ausgabe*. When they have appeared (plus volumes 6, 7, 9 and 10 which have been held up), the trustees' permission to Nedo to publish Wittgenstein texts will come to an end. Publishers' blurbs say "an extension of the edition is intended." Such an extension, however, has not been agreed with the trustees, and any such agreement would have to wait on an eventual decision about a possible hard-copy *Gesamtausgabe* founded on the Bergen database.

During the nineties, therefore, there were two projects engaged in the dissemination of Wittgenstein's unpublished papers. Rather confusingly, each of the projects, one based in Bergen and one in Cambridge, called itself "the Wittgenstein Archive". The Cambridge papers, from 1994, were located in a concrete-and-glass house designed and owned by Colin St John Wilson, architect of the new British Library, a student and admirer of Wittgenstein's architectural work. But of course the originals of Wittgenstein's manuscripts and typescripts are elsewhere, principally in Trinity College Cambridge, the Bodleian Library in Oxford and the Austrian National Library in Vienna.

The Bergen project modified and developed during the last years of the century. Initial difficulties with permissions from the three libraries took some time to overcome, and OUP encountered technical difficulties by 1995. It was then hoped to publish the facsimile CD-ROM in 1997; but by the time 1997 came it had been decided not to publish the facsimile separately, but to publish it in four volumes each consisting of one or more disks containing facsimile, diplomatic transcript, and normalised transcript. Publication was complete by 2000, and the edition has sold widely.

The death of Peter Winch in 1997 was a great blow to the trustees: he had served them as a devoted secretary, and had been skilful in conducting the difficult tripartite negotiations both with Nedo and Springer, and with Bergen and OUP. One of his last acts was to prepare a second edition of *Culture and Value*, the English version of *Vermischte Bemerkungen*. This included the publication of Wittgenstein's only known poem. At the same time as it appeared, Haymon Verlag, by permission of the trustees, published Wittgenstein's diaries of 1930/2 and 1936/7 (*Denkbewegungen*, 1997).

These diaries were the property of Herr Johannes Koder, and along with them von Wright discovered the earliest version of Part I of the *Philosophische Untersuchungen*. This has very recently been published, along with four other stages of composition of that work, in a *Kritisch-genetische Edition* by Joachim Schulte, assisted by Eike von Savigny, building on earlier work by von Wright and Heikki Nyman (Suhrkamp 2001). The book also gives a definitive history of the genesis and status of the material published in 1951 as Part II of the *Investigations*.

5. The situation today

In 1996 Elizabeth Anscombe was involved in a serious car accident and suffered injuries to the head. In succeeding years she suffered occasional periods of disorientation, and this sometimes made it difficult to conduct the business of the Wittgenstein Trust, to such a point that in the two years before her death in 2001 no meeting of the Trust was held. This was doubly sad in view of the enormous contribution she had made during her lifetime to the reception and understanding of Wittgenstein's philosophy. The surviving trustees were G.H. von Wright, plus Nicholas Denyer, Peter Hacker, Joachim Schulte and myself. That group continued to hold the copyrights on trust for G.H. von Wright, the sole surviving heir, until his own death in 2003 after a lifetime of service to Wittgenstein scholarship. The copyrights have since then reverted to Trinity College Cambridge, in accordance with the Trust Deed of 1969. Denyer, Hacker, Schulte and Anselm Müller now form an advisory committee to guide Trinity College on publications from the *Nachlass*.

Now, fifty years after Wittgenstein's death, everything that he has written is available to scholars. Only ten years ago the learned world had virtually despaired of this. In 1991 Hintikka wrote: "There is a veritable scholarly

industry of books and papers on Wittgenstein going on unremittingly, oblivious to the critical importance of the notebooks and other unpublished materials for the interpretation of Wittgenstein, which will be subject to a sharp re-evaluation in the light of the literary remains.” (p. 198) Moreover, as long as the coded passages were excluded from publication, great importance was attached to them by those more interested in Wittgenstein’s sexuality than in his philosophy – though Ray Monk, in his 1993 biography, by publishing all the passages with a sexual content demonstrated the wildly exaggerated nature of this curiosity.

The learned world has had a long wait for the complete publication of Wittgenstein’s work. The most disquieting part of the story I have told is the gap of some seventeen years between Nedo’s original involvement with the *Gesamtausgabe* project and the appearance of the first volumes of the *Wiener Ausgabe*. To the extent that the trustees supported Nedo’s funding applications, and gave him a virtual monopoly of editorial access to the texts, they must share the responsibility for this delay. I do not know enough about events in Tübingen in the latter half of the seventies to assign responsibility for the breakdown of the project. By 1987, however, when Nedo had spent a further five unproductive years in charge of a second publishing project, it was surely time – as von Wright saw – for the trustees to break off relations with him. That they did not was of course principally the responsibility of Professor Anscombe, who continued to retain confidence in him, and frequently presented her fellow-trustees with a *fait accompli*. When I myself became a Trustee one of my main concerns was to try – with only partial success – to bring about a clean break between the Trust and Nedo. Shortly before her death Anscombe wrote to me that the trustees’ decision to continue with Nedo had been vindicated by the eventual publication of the *Wiener Ausgabe* volumes. I do not believe that is correct. The volumes that have been published have, indeed, contained accurate transcriptions and appropriate critical annotation: to this extent the doubts expressed at Tübingen about Nedo’s scholarly competence have proved unfounded. But still no reason has been given why it should have taken so long, and cost such enormous sums of money, to bring this scholarly output to production. The page layout, on which Nedo spent so much time and to which he attaches almost mystical significance, seems to me no more conducive to the study of Wittgenstein than others which could have been produced at a fraction of the

cost. The lack of running heads makes the text difficult to consult, and the unwieldy size of the volumes makes them unsuitable for desk use: they would be more at home on a coffee table or a gospel lectern.

The Schulte critical-genetic edition of the *Untersuchungen* is, to my mind, a far superior example of how a critical Wittgenstein should appear in hard copy. It is aesthetically as attractive as Nedo's volumes, and was far less expensive to produce and is far easier to consult. If there is to be a full critical edition of the *Nachlass*, that and not the *Wiener Ausgabe* is the model to be followed.

But now that Bergen and Oxford University Press have produced on CD-ROM the entire *Nachlass* in facsimile and two kinds of transcription, is there really a case for an authorised *Gesamtausgabe* in hard copy? The repetitive nature of Wittgenstein's manuscripts, with so many texts existing in multiple drafts, makes them, in my own view, more suitable for study in electronic form than in hard copy. The existing CD-ROMs are indeed not perfect, and it would be good to have an electronic edition not tied to a particular search engine. But in my view an improved electronic edition is a more realistic goal than a multi-volume hard-copy edition. (The two English publishers most likely to be interested in such a project have, in the past, considered and rejected such an option).

However, there may be others who think differently. Hintikka, in his 1991 paper, argued for the superiority of "a decent critical text" to the convenience promised by the greater searchability of machine-readable versions. It is possible that his view commands majority support among Wittgenstein scholars, but I beg leave to doubt it.

I conclude with a final word about translations. Wittgenstein's works have now been translated, with the approval of the trustees, into many different languages, including Chinese. From time to time proposals have been made to the trustees for complete translations into other languages of the entire *Nachlass* as exhibited. Hitherto they have refused permission, and in my view rightly. The study of Wittgenstein at a level which demands the kinds of comparison between variants and revisions which only the entire *Nachlass* permits cannot be profitably undertaken except by scholars who understand German. The production of entire-*Nachlass* translations into many languages could only divert Wittgenstein studies into an amateur scholasticism.

A related objection can be made to the proliferation of different translations in the same language (e.g. English). We are fortunate in that most of the English translations of Wittgenstein's works are of a high standard. When errors are found in them, it is better that they should be remedied in a second edition of the existing translation, rather than in the production of entirely new translations. Otherwise, readers ignorant of German may take differences between translators' styles for evidence of variation or development in Wittgenstein's own thought.