

CULTURE AND VALUE

Philosophy and the Cultural Sciences

Papers of the 18th International Wittgenstein Symposium

13 - 20 August 1995

Kirchberg am Wechsel

Editors

Kjell S. Johannessen & Tore Nordenstam

Kirchberg am Wechsel 1995

The Austrian Ludwig Wittgenstein Society

David G. Stern

**New Evidence Concerning the Construction
// the Troubled History //
of Part I of the *Investigations***

My intention was that *some* day all this should be one book.
to make a book (out) of the
My intention was one day to make a book out of all this ~~these thoughts~~
to make a book out of them all
to make out of all of them a book¹

The copy-edited typescripts that were used in the publication of the *Philosophical Investigations* are not to be found in the surviving Wittgenstein papers. In the case of Part II, no copy of the typescript that was used to print it has survived. However, the catalogue of the Wittgenstein papers does include a typescript of Part I, under the name of typescript 227. A second copy of typescript 227 came to light in 1993, and was given to the Wren Library, in Cambridge, where most of the Wittgenstein papers are kept. In the summer of 1993 I compared the two typescripts with each other and the published text of Part I. Both typescripts are carbon copies of the same typed text; both typescripts contain extensive manuscript additions, variants, and deletions in several different hands; neither had been copy-edited. There are significant differences between all three texts. The main aim of this paper is to clarify the relationship between them, and to explain how the second typescript casts light on Wittgenstein's role in the production of Part I. However, we must first consider what was already known about the relationship between Part I and typescript 227.

To the best of my knowledge, there has been very little published discussion of the question of the relationship between typescript 227 and the published text of Part I. The principal sources of information on this topic are to be found in the work of von Wright. However, within von Wright's publications on the Wittgenstein papers, one can discern two very different answers to this question. His catalogue of the Wittgenstein papers and his paper on the origin and composition of the *Investigations* suggest that typescript 227 is the text of Part I, or that any differences are negligible. While the catalogue does not explicitly

¹ Wittgenstein *Nachlass*, MS 160, final page.

discuss the relationship between typescript 227 and the published text of Part I, the entries it contains for the typescripts of each part of the *Investigations* imply that only Part II has been lost:

227. Typescript of Part I of the final version of the *Investigations*. (1944)-45-(46). 324 pp.

234. Typescript of Part II of the final version of the *Investigations*. Probably dictated in 1949. (Missing.)²

Similarly, in von Wright's invaluable paper on "The Origin and Composition of the *Investigations*," typescript 227 is summarily described as "essentially the final version of Part I of the printed work" and the paper does not further discuss the relationship between typescript 227 and the published text.³

However, von Wright's research on the sources of the *Investigations*, much of it unpublished, has led him to very different conclusions. In a footnote that was added to the most recent version of his catalogue, he briefly describes his editorial work with Heikki Nyman on "a rather more critical edition of the *Investigations*"; the reader seeking further information is referred to the introduction to his *Wittgenstein* for further information.⁴ The meticulously edited "Helsinki edition" of the principal sources of the *Philosophical Investigations* reconstructs five successive stages in the construction of the *Philosophical Investigations*. Although the Helsinki edition, completed fourteen years ago, offers an invaluable overview of some of the principal stages in the composition of the *Investigations*, it remains unpublished. However, it has been deposited in research libraries in Bergen, Cambridge, Cornell, Helsinki, and Oxford, and has thus been made available to a number of researchers working on the Wittgenstein papers.

The texts Wittgenstein's literary executors have published do not usually show variant readings, changes in wording, deletions and the like. By contrast, the Helsinki edition aimed to show every significant difference between the text and the printed "final" text. The Helsinki edition of Typescript 227 is followed by 60 pages of closely typed apparatus, listing hundreds of differences between the typescript, the manuscript additions and deletions, and the published text. Most of them are minor differences in spelling and punctuation, but there are also many places where the typescript contains several variant readings and

² von Wright, 1982, p. 48.

³ von Wright, 1982, p. 115.

⁴ von Wright, 1993, p. 504, n. 19. The footnote refers the reader to von Wright, 1982, pp. 7-10 and pp. 111-136 (the introduction and the essay on the origin and composition of the *Investigations*.)

none of them is deleted, or where different words or phrases are chosen in each text. In the preface to their edition of typescript 227, von Wright and Nyman observe that they found no manuscript alterations or corrections by Wittgenstein in the final quarter of the text. These pages, a later addition to a typescript which Wittgenstein had revised in his own hand, contain numerous revisions in other hands. At the end of this painstaking editorial work, von Wright was in no doubt that the typescript which had been used in printing the book had been lost. The preface to *Wittgenstein* contains a compressed summary of the four stages in the revision of Part I that are included in the Helsinki edition. The description of Typescript 227 reads as follows:

(4) TS 227. Later in the year 1945 Wittgenstein expanded the then existing intermediate version with some 400 remarks the manuscript sources of which are in his writings from almost the entire period after his return in 1929 to Cambridge. In a letter to Rush Rhees of June 1945 he still refers to this as "my first volume." As already said, this is the typescript of what the editors (Anscombe and Rhees) called "Part I" of the book as printed. The copy of the typescript from which the printing took place is, regrettably, lost. The edited typescript with comments produced by us in Helsinki is made from the only surviving copy of 227. In editing we encountered some problems arising from the fact that many of the corrections and additions to it were not inserted into this copy by Wittgenstein himself but later transferred from the printer's copy.⁵

In 1992, in an article on "The Troubled History of Part II of the *Investigations*", von Wright returned to the question of the relationship between Typescript 227 and the published text. This time he presented the view that the printer's typescript had been lost in somewhat more qualified terms, implying that his construal of the evidence had been challenged but that he remained convinced of its correctness:

The preserved TS 227 is, for all I can understand, *not* identical with the copy from which the printing of the book took place. It has numerous insertions which are not in Wittgenstein's handwriting. They are presumably copied from the printing typescript which seems to have been the only complete copy at the time of Wittgenstein's death. If I am right, the "original" typescript of Part I thus is lost.

⁵ von Wright, 1982, p. 9.

This regrettable fact also remains something of a mystery. I have been told that checking matters sometime in the 1970s with the publisher, Basil Blackwell, had revealed the entire typescript of the book had been returned by registered mail to one of the editors. Professor Anscombe, however, cannot remember having received it. I myself have not been able to confirm the information about its return after printing.⁶

While I share von Wright's conviction that the copy from which the printing of the book took place has been lost, the only textual reason he gives is not convincing. The book could just as easily have been printed from a copy that had insertions that were not in Wittgenstein's hand. My principal reason for agreeing with von Wright can be stated very simply: there are far too many many discrepancies, both large and small, between the text of typescript 227 and the published text. While typescript 227 has been extensively revised, in several different hands and inks, there are no signs of copy-editing in the typescript, and there are hundreds of differences, both large and small, not only in spelling and punctuation, but also in choice of words, between the text of the published book and the text of typescript 227. Most of the changes are minor, but there are many places where a choice of wording is left open in the typescript, or where one variant is deleted in the typescript yet used in the published text. Another text, in which those changes had been made, presumably another heavily annotated carbon copy of the typed part of typescript 227, must have been used by the printer. However, as we shall see, the second copy of typescript 227 cannot be that text either, for it, like the first copy, frequently diverges from the published text.

At first sight, the second copy of typescript 227 is strikingly similar to the first. Both consist of a carbon copy of the same typescript, which has been substantially modified in a variety of hands. Each of them contains many additions and corrections in Wittgenstein's hand which are usually copied over into the other typescript in another's hand; the changes in Wittgenstein's hand are almost always followed in the published text. Wittgenstein's handwriting, mainly in pencil or black ink, is usually recognizable in the manuscript, but as many of the changes are a matter of deleting variants in the typescript by putting a line through them, one cannot tell by inspection whether they are in his hand or not; this could probably be resolved by an analysis of the ink. However, it is clear that the second typescript greatly reduces the number of cases where there is a

⁶ von Wright, 1992, p. 182.

New Evidence Concerning the Construction...

significant discrepancy between the published text and the revisions in Wittgenstein's hand.

While most of the manuscript corrections in each copy of typescript 227 correspond, both with each other and the published text of Part I, there are also many differences between the published text and one or both copies of typescript 227. Thanks to the the Helsinki edition of the first copy of typescript 227, which lists each departure from the published text, it is not so difficult to identify each point at which the two texts disagree, either with each other, or with the published text. The differences between the two typescripts and the published text can be divided into two main categories. The first consists of those cases where the published text agrees with neither of the surviving typescripts. These differences can be attributed to changes that were introduced at a later stage in the editorial process: the vast majority are very minor changes in spelling and punctuation, presumably made by the copy-editor, that do not affect the sense.

Once one puts the editorial differences between the published text and both typescripts to one side, one finds that the published text almost always follows the text of at least one of the two surviving typescripts. However, there are many places where the revisions to the first and the second copy of TS 227 do not agree, and there does not seem to be any clear pattern as to *which* of the surviving typescripts the published text follows. Given that Rhees and Anscombe jointly worked on editing the printed text, it seems likely that the two surviving typescripts of 227 are the two working copies that they used, and that they are responsible for most of the copying of Wittgenstein's alterations from one text to another. It is very likely that they used a third copy of typescript 227, and that the corrections which are in a hand other than Wittgenstein's in both surviving copies were copied over from his work on the third copy. It is possible that Wittgenstein himself collated the two surviving typescripts, writing up the result in a third copy of the typescript. It is also possible that the editors were responsible for all of the work of producing the printing text. Without further information from Professor Anscombe, or the publishers, some of the final stages of the production of the book will remain a mystery. But the new evidence provided by the second copy of typescript 227 makes it clear that the vast majority of editorial decisions as to the wording of the text were Wittgenstein's. In particular, it turns out that Wittgenstein did edit the text of the last quarter of typescript 227, but only in the second copy of the typescript.

The most striking discrepancy between the second copy of typescript 227 and the published text, is one that it shares with the first copy of typescript 227:

neither contains the published title of "Part I" at any point.⁷ 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 pages 11 and 14 explicitly state that they should be inserted at the end of sections 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 "1" next to the words "On page 60", and one finds a corresponding "1", in the same hand, at the end of section 70, on page 60 of the typescript. In both copies of the typescript, the end of the penultimate sentence in section 142 has a superscripted "1" connecting it with the *Randbemerkung* printed at the bottom of that page. Several *Randbemerkungen* are attached to section 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. Without the printer's copy of the text, the reason for these discrepancies will remain a mystery; but in view of the very small number of other significant differences between the two typescripts and the printed text, one cannot rule out the possibility that last-minute mistakes were made.

Perhaps the most significant information provided by the second copy of the typescript is that there are very few places where Wittgenstein did not choose between the variant wordings he had written down. Wittgenstein often included alternate wordings in his work: he repeatedly copied variant wordings from his manuscripts, and the broken underlining he used to indicate that he was not quite happy with his choice of words, into subsequent typescripts, continually rewriting and revising. The mass of variants recorded in the two copies of typescript 227 is actually much more characteristic of his writing as a whole than the published text.⁸

References

Stern, D. G. 1995 *Wittgenstein on mind and language*, New York: Oxford University Press.

⁷ Cf. von Wright (1992).

⁸ For further discussion of these issues, see Stern (1995) and (1996).

New Evidence Concerning the Construction...

Stern, D. G.: 1996 "The availability of Wittgenstein's writing," in Sluga, H. and Stern, D. G.: *The Cambridge Companion to Wittgenstein*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

von Wright, G. H. 1982 *Wittgenstein*, Oxford: Blackwell.

von Wright, G. H. 1992, "The Troubled History of Part II of the *Investigations*", *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 42 181-192.

von Wright, G. H. 1993 "The Wittgenstein Papers", in Wittgenstein, L. 1993 *Philosophical Occasions, 1912-1951* 480-510, J. Klagge & A. Nordmann (eds.) Indianapolis, IN: Hackett. Originally published in the *Philosophical Review* 78 (1969) 483-503.

David G. Stern
Department of Rhetoric
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley CA 94720-2670
USA