

FROM THE ARCHIVES

Christian Erbacher & Sophia Victoria Krebs

christian.erbacher@uib.no

svkrebs@gmx.de

The first nine months of editing Wittgenstein: Letters from G. E. M. Anscombe and Rush Rhees to G. H. von Wright

Introduction

The National Library of Finland (NLF) and the Von Wright and Wittgenstein Archives at the University of Helsinki (WWA) keep the collected correspondence of Georg Henrik von Wright, Wittgenstein's friend and successor at Cambridge and one of the three literary executors of Wittgenstein's *Nachlass*. Among von Wright's correspondence partners, Elizabeth Anscombe and Rush Rhees are of special interest to Wittgenstein scholars as they were the two other trustees of the Wittgenstein papers. Von Wright's correspondence with Anscombe spans from 1947 to 1999 and is in its entirety part of the von Wright Collection at the NLF; the correspondence with Rhees, spanning from 1951 to 1989, is stored partly at NLF and partly at WWA. Not only are both collections well ordered, but also fairly comprehensive because von Wright began to archive carbons of his own letters along the ones he received in 1952. Thus, those of von Wright's collections which are held in Finland promise to shed light on the context of decades of editorial work that made Wittgenstein's later philosophy available to all interested readers.

In the following, we present the letters which von Wright received from Anscombe and Rhees during the first nine months after Wittgenstein's death. Although there are no carbons of von Wright's letters from 1951 preserved in Finland, even one side of the correspondence shows how the three former students and friends of Wittgenstein began their work as literary executors. The overall important subject was, of course, the publication of Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations* (*PI*). It is well known that each of the appointed editors had read a version of the *PI* or parts of it during Wittgenstein's lifetime and that they were aware of Wittgenstein's wish to publish the book. Anscombe and Rhees had been given instructions for editing and translating. The letters contain further interesting details concerning the editorial history of the *PI*. A main topic in the correspondence of Anscombe and von Wright in 1951 is, for example, the choice of a publisher and their attempt to reprint the *Tractatus* (*TLP*) alongside the *PI*, an idea that Wittgenstein expressed in the preface to the *PI*. The publisher Kegan Paul held the copyright of the *TLP* at that time. As the correspondence shows, Kegan Paul had given Cambridge University Press (CUP) permission to reprint the *TLP* in 1944. However, neither CUP nor the publisher that was eventually chosen for printing the *PI*, Blackwell, could reach a similar agreement again. Thus, the *PI* had to appear without the *TLP*.

In addition to specific editorial information, the correspondence provides a vivid picture of the literary executors as persons and of their developing relationships. One can observe, for example, the growing friendship between Anscombe and von Wright when Anscombe began addressing von Wright with his first name, after he had lived in her house during a visit in June 1951. The purpose of this stay was to negotiate with Blackwell and to initiate an application for a fellowship that would facilitate Anscombe's work on the Wittgenstein papers. These are not only the first steps of cooperating for decades as literary executors of Wittgenstein's papers, but also the first steps of a philosophical friendship that would continue for 50 years, influencing to a considerable extent the directions of analytical philosophy in the second half of the 20th century.

In the letters from Rhees, von Wright is addressed without his academic title from June 1951 onwards. This too indicates a change in personal relation, as the last name was used by male academics when they were on friendly terms. However, the most striking feature in the exchange between Rhees and von Wright is the mutual professional and philosophical respect. The two men, although quite different in temperament, would develop a detailed exchange on the complexities of Wittgenstein's *Nachlass* during the subsequent decades. As the presented letters show, they first had to overcome some obstacles: when it turned out that Wittgenstein had made an agreement with Trinity College to the effect that his writings should belong to the College, Rhees' lawyers suggested preparing for a lawsuit concerning ownership. While Rhees was inclined to follow their advice, the issue was peacefully resolved through an informal conversation between von Wright and the Vice-Master of the College. As a consequence of this episode, Rhees felt that he would only hinder the progress of their inherited task and thus proposed to resign from taking any part in future editing. It was von Wright who generously persuaded him – in a letter unfortunately not preserved in Finland – to continue cooperating. Some months later, in December 1951, Rhees received a box filled with Wittgenstein's possessions from Trinity College. To his surprise it did not contain the books he had expected from Wittgenstein's library, which Rhees had inherited, but a great number of manuscripts in Wittgenstein's hand. This surprising Christmas present marks the beginning of Rhees' and von Wright's research into Wittgenstein's *Nachlass*.

The last letter in our current selection, dating from early 1952, can be read as rounding off and summing up the initial phase of the literary executors' work. The letter shows that there was explicit deliberation of specific editorial details, in this case about the question how to print Wittgenstein's numbering of his remarks in the *PI*. Moreover, the letter contains Anscombe's early views concerning publishing lecture notes and biographical materials. These questions exceeded the specific task of editing Wittgenstein's philosophical manuscripts, but from the very beginning the literary executors understood them as part of their responsibility. Last but

not least, Anscombe reports in this letter that The Rockefeller Foundation granted a fellowship and would provide additional money for dealing with the newly discovered manuscripts. Thus, by 1952 the literary executors had managed to clarify the copyright situation, they had reached an agreement with a publisher, they were swamped with a box full of additional manuscripts and The Rockefeller Foundation offered the means to work on them. In short, the literary executors were prepared to begin their journey into and with the Wittgenstein papers.

In sum, the letters of the first months of editing Wittgenstein are beautiful examples of what the whole correspondence has to offer; it depicts – besides facts of editing – the story of three philosophers, whose conversing voices unfold the human aspects of inheriting Wittgenstein's *Nachlass*. Their story does not only deal with editing the papers of an eminent philosopher, but with the attempt to do justice to the man they knew, to his philosophy and to his wishes for publication.

Editors' note

The original documents are stored at the NLF. The letters from Gertrude Elizabeth Margaret Anscombe are to be found at NLF, COLL. 714.11-12, those of Rush Rhees are to be found at NLF, COLL. 714.200-201. The quoted letter from Anscombe to Piero Sraffa is to be found in the Trinity College Library, SRAFFA C5.

As far as possible, the undated letters have been dated and arranged in chronological order. Every page break in the original letter is marked with a vertical bar (|). Every letter has a letterhead in which the document type, the sender, the addressee, the sender location, the weekday and the date is given. The document type is denoted with the characters T (originally sent typescript), t (copy of a typescript) or M (manuscript). Any included handwritten additions in T or t are set in italics. Deleted passages are crossed out, underlined passages are marked underlined. In some cases, details such as telegram, fragment or postcard are added to the characters T or M. Very few obvious errors in such areas as spelling and punctuation have been corrected; those errors are annotated only if they cause a change in the semantics of the language. The

corrections are then placed in chevrons (<>). Occasional comments appear in footnotes.

Part I: G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright, 1951

*M: G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright,
Oxford, 8 May 1951, Tuesday*

27 St John St
Oxford
May 8th 1951

Dear Professor v. Wright,

Rhees was here last Thursday and I told him of our conversation. He was a little inclined to wonder whether there would not be some special propriety in using the Cambridge press, but agreed that Braithwaite was a great objection. He agreed about everything else that we thought too, and we went & had a non-committal conversation at Blackwell's with the director Schollick. This man was very keen indeed on getting the book. We told him that there had been an earlier agreement on the part of the Cambridge press to publish it, though we thought there was no commitment on Wittgenstein's part, and also about the Kegan Paul-Tractatus question. He said if we offered them | the book he would write both to the C.U.P.¹ and to Kegan Paul and did not expect to encounter difficulty or cause annoyance if indeed there was no commitment. He further said that they had an agreement with a printer to give them priority, so that there would be no waiting in a queue, and that with prompt proof reading he thought he could get the book out seven or eight months after receiving it. He undertook to treat our enquiry as confidential and understood that we were not making any commitments with him.

Rhees told me that he had heard that the Blue and Brown books were being photostated and I have heard this too. I heard today from Blackwell's who sent me a letter from a man called Anthony Flew, a lecturer at Aberdeen, offering them the Blue Book, the Brown Book,

¹ Cambridge University Press.

and something called ‘Lectures on Mathematics’² for publication; he wished to be ‘given the job’ of preparing an edition of these things. Blackwell’s say they expect to ~~hear~~ get more letters of that sort. I think we may have to make some sort of announcement via a letter to the Times or Mind, both saying that | Wittgenstein left instructions to publish (for the excuse of these people is that he wished to withhold his work from the world), and giving a warning about copyright. Flew is too young to make a shady proposal sound anything but shady, but some more cunning person may try it on with some other publisher. – In their letter Blackwell’s also said that they would be willing for a contract either for royalties or half profits, and recommended the latter. (We had not mentioned this question on Thursday.)

Rhees thinks he can come to Cambridge ~~next~~ the week-end of May 18th and we can discuss all these things together then.

We have got to give an estimate of the value of Wittgenstein’s MSS for probate.

Rhees wondered whether you could approach the Trinity Librarian to find out whether Wittgenstein made some agreement with them for ultimate custody of some of his MSS, or whether a formal letter would | be better.

I’ll bring the Blackwell·Flew correspondence with me when I come.

I hope your knee³ is not hurting you too much.

Yours ever

Elizabeth Anscombe

*M: G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright,
Oxford, 23 May 1951, Wednesday*

27 St. John St
Oxford
May 23rd 1951.

Dear Professor v. Wright,

² These are likely to be notes by Richard Guy Bosanquet. Another alternative is that they are notes by Norman Malcom.

³ Von Wright had an operation in the beginning of May 1951; he had to stay at the nursing home for two weeks, cf. von Wright, G. H. (2001). *Mitt liv som jag minns det*. Helsingfors: Söderström, 151f.

Thank you for your message about the letter. I will certainly do as you say.

Perhaps Rhees will have written to tell you of our conversation with Prof. Moore. It emerged that the date of the arrangement⁴ that Trinity should look after the MSS was about 1935. Moore has the exact date and will give it you.

I hope very much that your knee is making good progress.

Yours Elizabeth Anscombe

*M: G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright,
Oxford, 28 May 1951, Monday*

27 St. John St.
Oxford
May 28th 1951

Dear Professor von Wright,

I am sending off a letter to Rhees at the same time as this one, containing the same information. I have also sent him the letter to *Mind*⁵ and you should be getting it from him. It occurred to us after we were with you that we ought to shew it to Blackwell's as it uses information that they gave us; I did this and Schollick (the director with whom we are in touch) said he'd very much rather we altered the first sentence. I did this, but had | the letter typed and have sent it with my signature on it to Rhees, so that if you and he approve it as it now stands we should save time and further correspondence about it.

I told Schollick that we had decided to ask Blackwell's to do the book. I did not after all tell him about the possible snag⁶ about Trinity: I thought I could not mention it without going into all the details, that there is very likely nothing in it, but if there is, this will appear soon enough, and that there was no harm in his going ahead with writing to

⁴ Wittgenstein had made an agreement with Trinity College to the effect that his writings should be given to the college, cf. letters from Rush Rhees to Georg Henrik von Wright below, esp. letter from May 30th and June 2nd 1951.

⁵ The letter was published in *Mind* in autumn 1951: Anscombe, G. E. M., R. Rhees and G. H. von Wright (1951). "Note." *Mind* 60: 584. Available online: <http://mind.oxfordjournals.org/content/LX/240/584.full.pdf+html>, accessed September 9 2014.

⁶ Because of Wittgenstein's agreement with Trinity College from 1935, Rhees lawyers prepared for a law suit concerning ownership claims, but these suspicions proved unwarranted after von Wright had an interview with the College's Vice-Master, cf. letters from Rhees to von Wright below, esp. letter from June 5th 1951.

Kegan Paul. He wrote asking them to confirm the permission they gave in '44, with the results that you see in the copies I enclose. I hope it will not turn out that they would have had to | react differently to the Cambridge Press; but it is clear that there was nothing binding about the permission they gave in '44, as it was not a contract and there was no fee; and Cambridge would have had to get confirmation after so long an interval.

I imagine that you & Rhees won't feel inclined to let them have the book, any more than I do!

I suppose we might see if Cambridge would have any better luck with them: but it seems too unlikely to be worth considering.

It seems to me that there may be just a chance of getting them to climb down by threatening them with publicity. A lawyer would know how to frame a letter a) making it clear that this wasn't going to | get them the book b) indicating that all the facts would be published if they persisted in their refusal, and c) pointing out that they have little to lose, as their sales of the book are mostly in the English-speaking world and won't be damaged there.

About (b), I think Ryle would publish an article, to appear about the time the book does, the main business of which would be to give a list of mistranslations of the Tractatus; but this could be prefaced with a denial of Ogden's statement that Wittgenstein revised the translation and an account of Kegan Paul's dealings. This would be to the point, because Wittgenstein speaks in the preface to the Untersuchungen | of printing the Tractatus with them, and some explanation why this is not being done (if it isn't) will be needed. Of course such an article would have to be vetted for libel, but it should be possible to state the facts; and some of them (at least that K. P. gave the permission in '44 and withdrew it in '51) could be stated in a footnote to that place in Wittgenstein's preface.

I hope you are up & about now. Have you yet been able to look at the Trinity Council minutes for 1935?

Do come here as soon as you can. I hope so much not to be locked up when you do. I am expecting Kreisel on Thursday; he | is coming to go over as much of the translation as I have done.

All good wishes

Yours ever

Elizabeth Anscombe.

P.S. I have a letter from Peel, the solicitor who drew up Wittgenstein's will, recommending Messrs. Field Roscoe & Co. of 52 Bedford

Square, London W.C.1. as a firm of solicitors who would be good for dealing with copyright business, publishers' contracts, etc.

I am returning the copies of letters from the Cambridge Press that you sent me.

*M: G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright,
Oxford, 5 June 1951, Tuesday*

27 St John St
Oxford
June 5th

Dear Professor von Wright,

I am afraid it is necessary for me to leave for the hospital (Radcliffe Maternity Home): this involves a breakdown in hospitality for which I am very sorry.

If it were at all possible to see you after you have seen Schollick, to hear your conclusions, & also whether you have any new opinions on what we have been discussing, I should be extremely glad. If this is a nuisance to you, do not consider it; but otherwise there is a possibility that you could come and see me, say about or towards 12 tomorrow morning – if you applied for help to Dr. Vaughan, the Principal of Somerville and one of the governors of these hospitals and therefore a powerful person there. I have written her a note which I enclose; the only difficulty is that it may I believe be necessary to give it to her by nine o'clock or so; otherwise she is likely to have vanished from the college to her laboratory. So if this is really too much, don't bother about it; except that I should be very grateful if you could get the note delivered at some point today, as it refers to other matters too. And I have written a note to Mrs. Smythies too; naturally, this has caught me ill-prepared, and I am asking her to do some things for me – among others, to telephone a pupil who will otherwise be coming to be taught today.

It is now 3.30, and I believe that this business will be over before many hours.

If you feel like it, do make yourself some coffee and help yourself to such food as there is. A pint of milk on the front-door step is mine & at your disposal.

I'm so sorry.

Yours

Elizabeth.

*M: G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright,
between 5 and 11 June 1951*

Dear Georg Henryk,

Thank you very much for your note – it was cheering to get it on returning to the ward. I don't know if you will get this. It would only be through Dr. Vaughan that you could conceivably get in here!

I'd like to hear something – if there is anything to hear – of your interview with Schollick.

I'd be grateful if when | you get back to Cambridge you could 'phone Peter for me, tell him I am well, but not to reckon on coming here this week-end, because of the plan with Kreisel I mentioned to you, which I'd like to carry out if possible.

Thank you very much for the oranges.

I hope you have good luck in all you are involved in.

Yours ever

Elizabeth.

P.S. On 2nd thoughts – there is that letter to Mind to send off. It is I believe on a table in my room, ~~and if you could send a wire to Kreisel at Reading University~~ but no I'll write to him.

*M: G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright,
Oxford, 11 June 1951, Monday*

27 St. John St.
Oxford
June 11th

Dear Georg Henrik,

Thank you very much for your letter. I agree fully with all that you say in it:

a) I think you should write to Ogden and tell him K. P. won't get the book, by Wittgenstein's instructions. (unless you like to pull his leg by asking 'what about $\frac{3}{4}$ profits?')

b) It is quite right, I feel, to delete the sentence about Wittgenstein's character in the letter, and to leave 'without authority' and 'unauthorized' in. (What does Ryle mean by wanting to change 'works' into 'notes'? The Blue & Brown Books aren't notes.) I think Ryle's alteration of the | last sentence is a possible one and not weak,

though it does not use any strong expressions; I think everything is implied in it, and if you feel doubtful about using any expression which implies we have the copyright, I do not think ‘cannot be entertained’ can be altered into anything equally strong, that does not carry that implication. I am returning you the letter with the last sentence of paragraph two crossed out, but have not done anything to the last sentence of all; it seems to me a matter of the alternatives I have mentioned and on the whole I am inclined to accept Ryle’s suggestion.

c) I quite agree with what you say about the Cambridge Press. I hope it is legally possible for them to reprint the *Tractatus*.

d) At the moment I have no special feeling for or against publishing the letter in the *T.L.S.*⁷, unless doing so would make Ryle say there was no point in reprinting it in *Mind*. I agree it should in any case appear in *Mind*, and do not know that ~~they~~ the delay is important. I should agree to whatever you and Rhee thought.

Rhee has sent me copies⁸ of his two | letters to you – the one after my ‘phone call, when he was offended, and the one withdrawing from things. I wish I had asked you to do that ‘phoning; I am clumsy and it is my fault. I do not believe his decision can or ought to be final, as this is just a stupid legal business and doesn’t shew anything about working together on the MSS. I am dreadfully sorry to have hurt his feelings but feel they are too easily hurt.

I escaped from the hospital on Saturday and am happy about it. Kreisel is angelic, and also we have already been able to do quite a bit of work. I am perfectly well and so is the baby.

My heart sank down to hear you were in fact going to the Vice Chancellor – though I expected it and believe you are probably right.

All good wishes

Yours ever

Elizabeth.

⁷ *Times Literary Supplement*.

⁸ Cf. letters from Rhee to von Wright below, esp. letters from June 2nd and June 5th 1951.

*M: G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright,
mid of June 1951*

Dear Georg Henrik

Here is part of a letter I have just had from Rhees in answer to one I wrote him the other day. I'm sending it in case you have not yet made any reply to him. I'd like it back.

I had a sad letter from Peter about your resigning⁹; and Kreisel finds it shattering.

I never congratulated you on your successful conduct of the Trinity business. It was excellent news.

You are probably in a great rush of business. Good luck. Please remember me most warmly to your wife – Yours ever. Elizabeth.

*M (postcard): G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright,
Summer 1951*

Dear Georg Henrik,

Could you send me that draft prospectus if you still have it?
I hope <seven unreadable words>

P.S. Thank you for your letter: it will be fine to see you next week-end.
– Could you go and talk with the graveyard custodian about what sort of foundation is necessary? Pink¹⁰ says a bed of gravel won't be adequate.

Forgive haste – E.

⁹ Von Wright had decided to resign from his chair at Cambridge, cf. von Wright (2001), p. 138-157.

¹⁰ Barry Pink engraved the stone for Wittgenstein's grave.

*M: G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright,
Oxford, Summer 1951*

27 St John St
Oxford

Dear Georg Henrik,

I sent off a hasty p.c.¹¹ to you yesterday as I had no time to write properly. Today I had the enclosed letters from Mr. Medley, which I'd like to turn over to you to deal with. It sounds as if there were some difficulty in finding a legal phrase to formulate the bankruptcy condition while excluding the others. You might consider travelling here via London & making an appointment to see Medley on the way. I have written to Rhees telling him all the points involved, & saying I am sending you the letter to deal with, and asking him to write to you before the end of the week if there is any idea he has about it. For the rest, I am content to leave the decision to you, whether you decide to leave the matter as it stands or to get Medley to draft a further clause.

Mr. D'Arms¹² and Dr. Vaughan got on well, it seems, and are working out a scheme for Rockefeller¹³ to | give Somerville money to give me a research fellowship of a generous kind for the next three years. Of course it has to go through many committees etc. on both sides so remains confidential. Lucky for me you were here! I'm most grateful to you for your various good offices.

I've pressed Rhees to join us here next week-end as it would be by far best if we were all three together for a discussion on policy. And you & he have read the stuff, which I haven't.

Yours ever

Elizabeth.

¹¹ p.c. = postcard.

¹² Mr. D'Arms, a representative of the Rockefeller Foundation.

¹³ In 1950, The Rockefeller Foundation wanted to grant Wittgenstein a stipend which Wittgenstein rejected, cf. Wittgenstein, L. (2012). *Wittgenstein in Cambridge. Letters and Documents 1911-1951*. Edited by Brian McGuinness. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, letters from Wittgenstein to Norman Malcolm, February 17th 1950 (WIC 422), May 7th (WIC 424), January 12 1951 (WIC 432).

*M: G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright,
Cambridge, 27 August 1951, Monday*

19 FitzWilliam St¹⁴
Cambridge
August 27th.

Dear Georg Henrik,

Thank you for your letter. I'm returning the C.U.P. letters. Rhees has seen them and agrees about going to Blackwell's and so do I – assuming they abide by their offer. Will you write to them?

The letter will be appearing in *Mind* in October and also in the *Philosophical Review*.

I didn't manage to get to London & see Medley as I was not well when I wanted to go. I have written to him (a short time ago) but haven't an answer yet as he is having his | holiday. In my letter, I also raised the question of putting pressure on Kegan Paul.

Peter has got a job in Birmingham so we shall be leaving Cambridge in a few weeks. An awful job to clear out of this house, and I shall in a way be sorry not to have a foot in Cambridge any more.

I've done 225 pages of the translation and about half of it is typed. It is not very satisfactory.

Peter sends his love. Please give our good wishes to Mrs. von Wright.

Yours ever
Elizabeth.

¹⁴ The Cambridge address was Elizabeth Anscombe and Peter Geach's principal address before she became principal tenant of 27 st John's Street by 1950. As Geach was getting occasional lecturing and tutoring work in Cambridge he remained resident in FitzWilliam Street. Anscombe and Geach were helped in paying the rent by subletting rooms in the Cambridge house.

*M: G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright,
Oxford, probably October 1951*

27 St John St
Oxford

Dear Georg Henrik,

Thank you for your letter. Either of the times that you suggest would be perfectly possible for me, and I will leave you to choose, though I think if anything I'd rather you came at the week-end. Both because you would be able to stay longer, and because I have to lecture on Thursday morning and am likely to be rather occupied with this as I have not yet had time to prepare this course. On the other hand Peter and possibly Kreisel are likely to be | here too. This presents no difficulties as far as putting you up is concerned since I have two spare rooms; and you will very likely like to see them. But there is the possibility that you will not want to be bothered with extra faces.

Schollick has asked me to prepare some remarks – a sort of blurb – to be printed in a prospectus leaflet announcing the appearance of the Untersuchungen, with an order form, which he wants to get out soon. I have drafted something not very happy – Rhees has seen the part up to the last paragraph – and I am sending it to you in the hope that you can either improve it or do a different one (which is what I'd like best.)

Rhees was here last week and we got the German typescript ready; | I have a few more things to do with it and shall then take it to Schollick. The printers will start on it early in November.

I gather that the trouble over the Philosophical Library was to do with the Philosophical Dictionary issued by them. When a revised issue came out, the contributors did not 'toe the time-line' with their revisions and Runes¹⁵ annoyed them very much by doing the revisions himself, which their contracts allowed him to do. If you do not have strong feelings in the matter, I am rather inclined not to take this as an objection, since there is no reason to suppose he would want to monkey with this book and Blackwell's would see to it that he was firmly tied to merely issuing the English edition; and | what Schollick says about his competence in selling philosophical literature is impressive. However, we can talk about this when you come.

I have got your copies of the Blue and Brown books ready for you.

¹⁵ Dagobert D. Runes, founder of The Wisdom series at The Philosophical Library.

Please forgive this smudgy letter.

Yours ever

Elizabeth. |

P.S. I nearly forgot an important thing, that Medley suggested, as a last throw with Kegan Paul, getting such a person as Bertrand Russell to write to them. I should think that Professor Broad might be a good idea too; and that you would be the right person to approach them. I will try Ryle if I can get hold of him. – Medley thought that nothing intimating a threat however delicately (which had been my idea) would do anything but get their hackles up.

E.

*M: G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright,
Oxford, September or October 1951*

27 St. John St
Oxford

Dear Georg Henrik,

Thank you for your letter. We were very sorry to hear that things have been beastly for you. I hope your leg at least is better.

About copyrights. Medley said that there was a clear copyright in the Blue Book, and almost certainly in the Brown, but not in lecture notes since Wittgenstein's lectures were not delivered from a MS. which he retained.

The contract. Medley has done a new draft of which I enclose a copy. I haven't seen Schollick yet, but shall do so very soon.

The letter will appear in *Mind* and | in the *Philosophical Review*, and at Schollick's request I shall try to get it added to it that ~~the~~ the book will be published by Blackwell's.

We have accomplished the move but not the tidying up necessary in consequence and I hardly know where I am.

Please remember me to your wife.

I hope to see you soon.

Yours ever

Elizabeth.

*M (postcard): G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright,
October 1951*

Much looking forward to seeing you on Friday. Kreisel won't be here. But I heard from Richards that he would come for the night on Friday on his way from Hull to London. Ryle has promised to look in on Friday night: I saw him today for a moment and told him that there was a matter in which he might be able to help us if he would. Unluckily there is a dinner I am supposed to go to on ~~Friday~~ Saturday night in Somerville. – I do hope you are feeling better.

– Elizabeth.

*M: G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright,
Oxford, 20 November 1951, Tuesday*

Oxford
Nov. 20th

Dear Georg Henrik,

I am sending you the next batch of translation, with the corresponding German text.

I suppose you haven't yet heard from K.P. – I am very curious about the result. I met Ryle the other day, and he told me Russell was approaching them.

Please give my good wishes to your wife. I hope to see you – and if possible her – soon.

Elizabeth.

*M: G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright,
Oxford, 26 November 1951, Monday*

27 St John St
Oxford
November 26th 1951

Dear Georg Henrik,

Thank you for your letter. I shall look forward to your coming on the day you mention, and to Mrs. von Wright's coming – I do hope she will; certainly there's no question of any difficulty about putting you up. The only pity is, that it doesn't sound as if you would be able to come on Saturday – Sunday trains are so bad. If it should turn out to | be possible, come then instead – (and stay, of course, till Monday).

Have you looked into the business of the box in Trinity¹⁶?

Though I think it right to make every effort to carry out Wittgenstein's wishes, I shall not actually be upset if the *Tractatus* can not be printed with the *Untersuchungen*. Largely because the book will look a bit odd, starting with a solid German text and then going into German-cum-English; and the *Tractatus* will certainly be available to anyone wanting to read the *Untersuchungen*. And the *Untersuchungen* is going to be a massive enough book as it is and expensive enough. | I have just finished going through my draft of the translation of the first part (i.e. all but the Dublin MSS) with Kreisel. He is very savage about it all.

It sounds from your letter as if you were less clear about the order of further publications than when we met. Perhaps something will come of discussing it with Kreisel. I hope so, because I am so utterly unqualified to help in coming to any decision about the mathematical work.

I don't know if it would be useful; but I think I could get the Moore volume typed here perfectly well, and at much less expense than by the U.T.O.¹⁷ If you have not already given it to them, you might consider it. |

You know that Wittgenstein left me some money; it has just arrived. I am wondering if a loan of £ 500 could conceivably be of any

¹⁶ Cf. letters from Rhees to von Wright below, esp. letters from December 2nd and December 16th 1951.

¹⁷ University Typing Office.

use to you if your present situation¹⁸ is still difficult. It could be of indefinite duration – e.g. possibly to be repaid out of the proceeds of Wittgenstein publications. – I hope that you are not at present too harassed, but fear it is an empty hope.

With all my good wishes, to you and to Mrs. von Wright

Yours

Elizabeth.

Part II: R. Rhees to G. H. von Wright, 1951

*T: R. Rhees to G. H. von Wright,
Swansea, 30 May 1951, Wednesday*

96, Bryn Road,
Swansea, Glam.,
May 30th, 1951

Dear Professor von Wright,

I am enclosing a copy of a letter I am sending to Miss Anscombe. Perhaps you know more about this situation than I do, and perhaps you can guess – as I cannot – what Trinity College would like to do.

I am also enclosing the letter to Mind¹⁹, which Miss Anscombe sent to me for signature. I think this must be held up for the time being, but I thought it might as well be signed in case it should turn out that we are in a position to send it.

I am sorry I have not thanked you for sending on the communication from BOWEN & Bowes about the books. Wittgenstein had very few books, and he would have been amused at a reference to his “library”, – unless that were his collection of detective story magazines. He left two books in particular to Richards, and he left the remainder to me. I don’t suppose there are more than about a

¹⁸ In the period of moving to Finland, von Wright suddenly found himself in financial difficulties, as he had built a house in Cambridge which could not be sold again before he re-settled in Finland.

¹⁹ The letter was published in *Mind* in autumn 1951: Anscombe, G. E. M., R. Rhees and G. H. von Wright (1951). “Note.” *Mind* 60: 584, available online: <http://mind.oxfordjournals.org/content/LX/240/584.full.pdf+html>, accessed September 9 2014.

dozen in all. (He had more books before 1914, but he left those with Russell at that time.)

I hope your knee may be getting better.

Yours sincerely,
R. Rhees

*T: R. Rhees to G. H. von Wright,
Swansea, 1 June 1951, Friday*

96, Bryn Road,
Swansea, Glam.
June 1st, 1951

Dear Professor von Wright,

You must have wondered why I said nothing of your letter of the 28th when I last wrote you. I have only just had it. I had not been over to the college; lectures had stopped, and examinations are beginning. And since term is officially still on, letters are not forwarded. I am sorry.

The lawyer could not see me today. This is exasperating, and I very much hope I can see him tomorrow. I will let you know as soon as I learn anything.

I am growing rather pessimistic. I have an idea that the College can claim the papers if they want to, and they appear to want to. What I cannot guess is what they have in mind to do then. Make them available to the general public? Publish some of them themselves?

Yours sincerely,
R. Rhees

*T: R. Rhees to G. H. von Wright,
Swansea, 2 June 1951, Saturday*

96, Bryn Road,
Swansea, Glam.,
June 2nd, 1951.

Dear Professor von Wright,

I have been talking with my lawyer about Trinity's claim to possession of the manuscripts. He thinks the case is not in all ways clear. But it looks as though Wittgenstein did make a contract to give the manuscripts to Trinity, and the contract was completed by his handing them over in 1940. It might possibly (though it is a disputable point) be argued that the completion of the contract did not refer to those manuscripts which were not handed over to Trinity, – although there is a clause in the agreement which refers also to “such future manuscripts as I may write”.

Wittgenstein had evidently forgotten the terms of this agreement at the time when he drew up his will. And if the Oxford solicitors had seen a copy of it, they would certainly not have let the disposition of the manuscripts (whereby they are left to us) stand as it does there.

It is important, too, that the agreement gives Trinity the entire discretion of in the disposition of the manuscripts after his death, and all copyright in them.

The precise definition of the legal position of the manuscripts (there were too many words in “ion” there), and of their possession, had best be left to the Inland Revenue Authorities, when the will is sent to them for the assessment of estate duty. We propose not to include the manuscripts in the list of the estate – in view of the fact they may not have been his property at the time of his death – but to ~~include~~ attach a copy of the correspondence with Trinity College regarding them. The Inland Revenue Authorities will then raise the matter, and there will be a three cornered correspondence between them, Trinity and ourselves.

But for various reasons it seems better not to let everything wait for that. In the first place, it would probably take about three months before that matter was settled; and if there is any chance of our getting on with the publication, that is a long delay. In the second place, I think we do not want to fall out with Trinity College over the business. So it would be better if one of us could see the authorities - I suppose it would be the Senior Bursar – in Trinity and talk it over. Could you do that? |

I know you are busy at present, and that you are going away soon. If you cannot manage to see them, I will try to go to Cambridge myself. But in every way it would be better if you would do it.

I suppose the first point to be made clear would be the curious position arising from Wittgenstein's will; that will at least show what his wishes were at the time. (I am only writing my own suggestions here, so that you may know what I think. It is not because I am not content to leave the matter to your judgment.) And I suppose we should want to emphasize that our concern and interest is in the selecting and arranging of the material for publication. I take it that any question of royalties is entirely incidental, and we need not even mention it. The question, which I at least should want to know, is the course which Trinity would want to take in exercising its apparent right to "the entire disposition" of the manuscripts. But you may probably think of other matters.

My lawyer has emphasized that any agreement which you and Trinity might reach about the manuscripts will not settle the matter of the legal possession of them. That must wait on the discussions with the Inland Revenue. And the question of copyright depends entirely upon that.

If you could attend to the matter fairly quickly, or could let me know if you are unable to, I should be extremely grateful. I am very sorry to rush you like this. But obviously any arrangements with a publisher will have to wait until we know what can be done and who can do it.

Yours sincerely,
R. Rhees
(R. Rhees)

I am sending a copy of this to Miss Anscombe.

*T (telegram): R. Rhees to G. H. von Wright,
Swansea, 2 June 1951, Saturday*

PROFF G. H. VON WRIGHT TRINITY COLLEGE
CAMBRIDGE =

HAVE SEEN LAWYER CAN YOU DISCUSS MATTERS
INFORMALLY WITH TRINITY TO DISCOVER WISHES
LETTER POSTED = RHEES +

*T: R. Rhees to G. H. von Wright,
Swansea, 5 June 1951, Tuesday*

96, Bryn Road,
Swansea, Glam.
June 5th, 1951

Dear Professor von Wright,

Thank you for your letter of June 4th. I am sorry that my earlier ~~telegram~~ letter and my telegram were both out of date when they were sent. You had written me the day before; but I had not received your letter then, and I did not receive it until the following Monday.

My lawyers wrote to Trinity College today, enclosing a copy of the will, and asking whether the College wished to make any claim concerning copyright in the manuscripts. They added also that the College might refer to you for the discussion of particular difficulties. I hope this last point may fit with your wishes.

I have not been in every way satisfied with the way in which my lawyers have handled the matter. But neither do I think they have been as stupid as you and Miss Anscombe seem to suppose. From the letter which the Senior Bursar first sent them (which I quoted to Miss Anscombe in a writing of which I sent you a copy) the most natural assumption was that Trinity intended to lay claim to the manuscripts. I would refer you especially to the first sentence and to the last sentence of the passage I quoted. To assume anything else, – to assume anything like what you have now reported to have been the case, – would have been contrary to the plainest evidence that they had. The lawyers therefore asked themselves what sort of case Trinity would probably try to make in support of their claim. They admitted from

the beginning that Wittgenstein's document did not have everything to make it obviously valid as a contract. But they thought that if it came to a dispute, then Trinity's counsel would probably try to argue that it was a contract; and that they might be successful. Assuming that we did not want to fall out with Trinity, they thought it was best that we should not at the outset state claims ourselves on points in which Trinity was evidently determined to assert its own rights, but rather to let these questions be settled by the Inland Revenue. As soon as they learned of your meeting with the Vice-Master, and of the attitude which the College apparently was showing, they changed their opinion about this. Their action in all this may have been mistaken. I do not think it was just stupid. As I say, it rested first of all upon the impression which they thought, – and which I thought and still think, – the Senior Bursar's letter gave. If you see nothing in this, then I do not know that there is anything I can say.

Yours sincerely, R. Rhees

*T: R. Rhees to G. H. von Wright,
Swansea, 10 June 1951, Sunday*

96, Bryn Road,
Swansea, Glam.
June 10th, 1951.

Dear Professor von Wright,

I humbly and sincerely apologize for the offence of my last letter.

I cannot say how much of this came from viciousness and how much from stupidity. Stupidity accounts for some, at least, and especially for the last sentence. (I had a sinus headache, which had been some days with me, and words would not come. I could not find the sentences I wanted, and what I wrote was bound to suggest something other than what I had in mind.) But I do not say this to excuse it. And certainly it does not make me less sorry.

I think it would be better if I were to retire from anything to do with the manuscripts and their publication. I am sorry, because if I thought I could help in any way, I should have wanted to. But I think that I should hinder. And I shall do more to further the publication by retiring. I will write to Miss Anscombe in this sense. This means, of course, that I give up any sort of claim in connexion with the manuscripts.

I cannot give up my position as executor of the will, because – for some reason which I do not understand – Wittgenstein entrusted²⁰ that to me especially, and I must try to complete it. For this reason I cannot dissociate myself entirely from the question regarding the possible claims of Trinity College to the ownership of the manuscripts, because the administration of the will is concerned with that. But when that has been settled, I will not disturb you further. I will arrange to return the typescripts which I have borrowed when next I travel that way; I imagine it would be better not to send them by post.

Yours sincerely,
R. Rhees
(R. Rhees)

P.S. I have had no letter from you. I mention this lest one be under way and this of mine be read as an answer to it.

*M: R. Rhees to G. H. von Wright,
Swansea, 13 June 1951, Wednesday*

96, Bryn Road,
Swansea, Glam.
June 13th, 1951

Dear von Wright,

Thank you for your letter of the 11th. You are extremely generous. I still think, or feel that I may bring more trouble than can be balanced by any work I may do. And it was this which made me think the matter serious enough to disregard Wittgenstein's requests. But I should do that reluctantly. And I shall be very glad to give what help I can, – in the hope that, well, we'll see. Anyway, you are more patient than I expected or deserved. And I am grateful.

I imagine that the other two of us can consult the London lawyers about the question of copyright in the Blue Book & | Brown book. And we will ask about lecture notes. If there are questions of policy arising out of this, we can get in touch with you or hold them over.

²⁰ Cf. Wittgenstein's will § 2: "I APPOINT my friend MR. R. RHEES of 96 Bryn Road Swansea to be the EXECUTOR of this my will *and I hope that he will accept £50 for his personal Expenses in discharging this trust(?)*" (transcript in italics = handwritten addition; quoted from copy of the will stored at WWA).

I was interested in what you said about your conversation with the Cambridge Press, and I shall be interested to know what you learn. I agree that, *ceteris paribus*, there is a strong reason for going to a publisher who is able to print the German text of the *Tractatus*. I wonder if they will be able to give you any estimate of the time it is likely to take.

I've seen a copy of the letter which Trinity College sent, and also the reply of my lawyers. I am very glad that has been settled in the way it has. And I think we have you to thank, especially. I had not seen the letter of my lawyers in reply, before it was sent. I do not much like it. But maybe it does not matter much.

Thank you again,
RRhees

*T: R. Rhees to G. H. von Wright,
Swansea, 15 June 1951, Friday*

96, Bryn Road,
Swansea, Glam.
June 15th, 1951.

Dear von Wright,

This may never reach you; but there will be no great loss if it doesn't, and I ~~would~~ should like to take the chance.

I am very surprised to learn that you are going to resign your chair²¹. And for a great many reasons I am very sorry. I can understand how anyone might find it impossible to go on in Cambridge. And I hope you have found something that will be more congenial. But I can't help feeling sorry, all the same.

I will write to Drury and to Richards about the question of the tomb stone²². And I will discuss it with ~~Miss A~~ Elizabeth Anscombe and Smythies. I had thought of the question earlier, but it had slipped my mind latterly. Thank you for bringing it up.

I hope you may be leaving your address with Elizabeth Anscombe, so that we may communicate with you if anything important does have to be decided, – e.g. about a publisher.

I hope your summer goes well.

²¹ cf. von Wright (2001), p. 138-157.

²² cf. von Wright (2001), p. 152.

Yours sincerely,
R. Rhees

*T: R. Rhees to G. H. von Wright,
Swansea, 25 October 1951, Thursday*

96, Bryn Road,
Swansea, Glam.
October 25th, 1951.

Dear von Wright,

This is a hurried acknowledgement of your letter *which arrived today*. I have a full day with students today, and I shall not be able to post the manuscripts to you until tomorrow. But I hope to do it then.

Yes, you had told me that you were leaving at the end of this term. But I think I am even more sorry about it now than I was when you first told me.

Yours sincerely,

R. Rhees
R. Rhees

*T: R. Rhees to G. H. von Wright,
Swansea, 26 October 1951, Friday*

96, Bryn Road,
Swansea, Glam.
October 26th, 1951.

Dear von Wright,

I posted two parcels of Wittgenstein manuscripts to you today.

The smaller of them is the manuscript belonging to Professor Moore. This is in a black covered note book²³.

The larger parcel consists of one big manuscript²⁴, another shorter one, and some fragments²⁵. The portion devoted to the ~~philoso~~

²³ Ts 209 which the literary executors subsequently called the “Moore-Volume”.

foundations of mathematics begins on page 529 of the big manuscript. I have placed the shorter manuscript and the fragments in between pages 528 and 529. So you can find the chapter on the foundations of mathematics at once, by looking to see which pages have paper clips on the top of them. The chapter on the foundations of mathematics comes immediately after those, as I have arranged them. The manuscript was in a very disordered state when it came into my hands. I have put it in better order than it was, but I have not done as much as I intended.

One reason for separating the section on the foundations of mathematics from the rest, as I have done, is that Wittgenstein had separated them. He had included the part on the foundations of mathematics in his main file, whereas he had taken out the part (the 528 pages) which comes before that. But I am sending the earlier part as well, in order that you may get an ~~inde~~ *idea* of the general position from which the mathematical philosophy was written. You will see that it is a position that has been thoroughly superseded and altered in the later work.

The same is true of the Moore manuscript. If you are familiar with the paper which Wittgenstein published in the supplementary volume of the Aristotelian Society's Proceedings²⁶, in 1929, you will see that this manuscript belongs to the time just after that. This manuscript is also partly identical with the shorter manuscript which I have included in the larger parcel. (You can identify it by the size of type, which is the same as that of the volume of Moore's; although it is black, not blue.) But it is differently arranged.

If you are willing to send them back to me when you have finished with them, I should be glad. I mention this on the assumption that Elizabeth Anscombe will not want them yet. If she does, then of course I should want them to be sent to her. On the other hand, you may think they ought to be sent to her in any case. And then I accept your judgment. |

I ought to have taken steps to get copies made of them. There is no typist here who could copy them, and that is one reason why I did not. I suppose the simplest and the quickest way would be to have them photographed. But it would come very expensive. I should like very much to have copies myself. And if you would also, then it might be worth while getting some estimate of the price. I think I know the

²⁴ Ts 213 which is known as "The Big Typescript".

²⁵ It is uncertain which manuscripts are meant here.

²⁶ Wittgenstein, L. (1929). "Some Remarks on Logical Form". *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society Supplementary*, Volume 9, 162-171.

address of one London firm that makes photostatic copies; they did some work for me once which was quite satisfactory. But there are probably others.

Yours sincerely,
R. Rhees
R. Rhees

*T: R. Rhees to G. H. von Wright,
Swansea, 26 November 1951, Monday*

96, Bryn Road,
Swansea, Glam.
November 26th, 1951.

Dear von Wright,

I am very sorry to learn that you have not been well. It would be bad in any case; and when you are in the middle of the thousand things that have to be done in moving, it is worse. I hope you may feel a little more vigorous soon.

It is a pity that the business of the Wittgenstein manuscripts should have come on you just at this time as well. I think all four of the steps you have taken to get things duplicated are very good. I could hardly have found anyone here to type copies of them, and if they can do it in the University Printing Office, that is fine. I certainly think the Moore typescript ought to be copied too, and I shall be glad to check and collate the copies and send one to you. I have an idea that we ought to return the original typescript to Moore when that is done.

You say this latter job will be sent to me, since you will have left the country by then. I imagine they will send the account to me as well? That would seem to be the most sensible thing. It will cost less than the job for which you say you are paying; and we shall have to get payments straightened out later.

I will see to having copies made of the other mathematical fragments.

The photographing job is to be finished before you leave, I take it. If you pay for this – and the longer job – now, will it be possible for us to send you money later? I have an idea that one can send money to Finland from here; you will know. But if you would rather have a sum to cover it before you leave, please say so.

I am sorry also that I could not see you in Oxford. It is just conceivable that I might manage it if you go there again in the next few weeks. I am not sure. But if you could send me a card or a wire telling me when it is, I should be grateful.

This is in a great hurry, – to catch the post. Thank you again for all the trouble you are taking.

Yours
RRhees

T: R. Rhees to G. H. von Wright,
Swansea, 2 December 1951, Sunday

96, Bryn Road,
Swansea, Glam.
December 2nd, 1951.

Dear von Wright,

Thank you for sending the typescript parcel (which I ought to have acknowledged before now), and thank you for your letter of the 30th.

The box of books in Trinity is one of the many things to which I have been meaning to attend for months. I am as embarrassed as I am grateful that you should have taken the trouble to inquire about it. I don't like to ask you to take any further trouble about it. I will write to the Junior Bursar (I hope he is the right person to approach) now and post it together with this letter. If you should happen to be seeing him about other matters in the next day or so, and should think to ask him about this, then of course I should be grateful. But I am writing him now anyway; so please do not think it is something more that you have to do, and please do not make any special calls to inquire about it. As it is, I am very glad indeed to know what you have told me about it.

I am enclosing two specimen pages which Blackwell's have shown to Elizabeth Anscombe. I am also enclosing her letter to me, in which she discusses them; and a copy of my letter to her in reply.

I will try to get to Oxford for the 9th. I am not perfectly sure yet whether I can, but I will let you know. I think it should be possible; I hope so, anyway.

Yours sincerely,
RRhees

*T: R. Rhees to G. H. von Wright,
Swansea, 16 December 1951, Sunday*

96, Bryn Road,
Swansea, Glam., Great Britain.
December 16th, 1951

Dear von Wright,

I have been trying to find out your address, because I wanted to thank you, first for your Christmas card, and more especially for having the copy of Burckhardt's "Briefe" sent to me. I am glad to have these, – more glad than you could imagine easily. I have wanted to get hold of them for a long time, and there aren't many things that would be as welcome. Perhaps my feeling about them is stronger now, because I realise what an extra effort it must have been for you to go in to Bowes & Bowes to get them in all the confusion of your leaving. I don't know how to thank you for that, but please believe that I shall not soon forget it.

But Bowes and Bowes did not send an invoice, and I am a bit puzzled to know what to do. I wonder whether you paid for them at the time. If you did, may I send a cheque to your account right away? I know we have other matters to settle eventually, but I would rather not let this get mixed up with them. I do not know where your account is, and I should be glad if you would tell me.

The box of Wittgenstein's books came the day before yesterday. (I hope you may not have had more bother about that; I am sorry you have been troubled with it as you have. I doubt if it would have come here at all if it had not been for your help.) I have been swamped with examinations here, and I have not been able to sort the things out much. But Elizabeth was right in thinking there might be manuscripts there. There are quite a lot. They are all manuscript books and note books²⁷, and some folded papers. There is no typescript at all, except for about three or four pages pasted into one of the large manuscript books. There are small note books, and larger "ledgers". He used to carry the smaller ones in his pocket; and some, at least, of the notes he made in them were copied – or revisions of them were written – into the larger note books. Some of the note books have dates, but unfortunately many of them – of the smaller ones, at least, – have not. And the smaller ones will need some careful study to see which of them go together and which follows on which. The earliest date I have

²⁷ It is uncertain which manuscripts are meant here; they may include Ms 125-127.

noticed is in 1932, and the latest is in 1947. Some of this material has been used for the typescripts which Elizabeth had. For instance, there seems to be the manuscript of a good part of the typescript of the mathematical part of the earlier draft of the *Untersuchungen*, which you are having photographed. But there is some material which is not in typescript at all. Some of it is in the form of very rough notes, and some of it is material that he | had rejected. But there is other material that is important. You remember I said that he was working on logic and mathematics during 1942 and 1943. Well, there are two smaller note books of this material, *one dated 1942 and one 1943 both dealing with mathematics and logic*, written in more carefully than most of the pocket note books were. And there is a larger note book of 1947, which seems to be mainly about proof, and which is at least partly a revision of material from these smaller note books of 1942-43. There is also a note book dated 1939, – of the time when he was giving the lectures on the foundations of mathematics which we heard and this may have some important stuff in it.

All this will have to be studied fairly carefully before we can even begin to have any ideas of what use could be made of it. I may try typing some of it, and if I do, I will make copies for you and Elizabeth. (But I had better not make grand promises until I have actually done something.) I am not sure how far a professional typist could copy these manuscripts. She should do the more careful of them. But many of them are overwritten with alternative readings and marginal notes. Well, we'll see. The chief difficulty, I think, will be in knowing how to put together any of the material which we do decide to use. But perhaps we ~~have~~ *shall* get some ideas about this when we have studied it. In the small note book dated 1942, and headed "Handelt von Mathematik und Logik", the different entries are dated. And sometimes one day's entry is connected with what was written the previous day; but sometimes it has no direct connexion. It is possible that they have all been worked together more in the larger 19467 book. I have not looked at it closely yet.

I will hold this over until tomorrow, on the off chance that I may have your address from Elizabeth by then. I have written to her for it. I wonder if you are recovering from the exhaustion of your journey yet. I hope so. And I hope the climate there may bring both you and Mrs. von Wright to better health than you seemed to have latterly here.

Yours,
R. Rhees

By the way, except for the note books there were practically no philosophical books in the box. There is a copy of Ramsey's "Foundations of Mathematics", inscribed by Mrs. Ramsey, but otherwise without any marks, and an English translation of Mach's "Analysis of Sensations"; but I think that is all. There is a lot of detective stories. And there are a good many works of German literature which I am extremely glad to have.

Part III: The first letter from G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright in 1952

*M: G. E. M. Anscombe to G. H. von Wright,
Oxford, probably January 1952*

27 St John St
Oxford

Dear Georg Henrik,

Forgive me for being so long in writing. The main reason was that I have been wretchedly ill this month; but I am better now. – You were right in supposing that what I wanted to know²⁸ in my telegram

²⁸ Anscombe contacted Piero Sraffa, famous economist and Wittgenstein's friend, concerning the question 16 January 1952:

Dear Mr. Sraffa,

I am enclosing two specimen pages for Wittgenstein's book. If I may, I should like to ask you to give your opinion on which would be better. The decision rests between people who don't quite agree as between these two. The only difference there is meant to be between them is the placing of the numbers and in consequence the equal or unequal indentation of the opening and subsequent paragraphs of a numbered section.

One of us feels that having the numbers on the margin is right because the numbers have an unusual role, and this accords most with Wittgenstein's own placing of them in the typescript | he always insisted on their being in the margin; this can't be done in print without adding heavily to the cost (and it's not clear if it would have the same effect in print); also that the different paragraphs of the section ought to be equally indented.

The other feels that the numbers on the margin are an ~~an~~ irritation, that they obscure the opening of a new paragraph, that one doesn't take them in, strains to overlook them, and would wish to chip them off with a chisel.

was which you preferred. It was in fact the one that I was inclined to; but Rhees had a very clear and ~~decisive~~ strong objection to it; I therefore consulted a few people; among them Kreisel and Sraffa, and these, with some others, very definitely agreed with Rhees. As, therefore, I had felt my preference with some doubts, and as you were still more faint-hearted about it, I thought these opinions weighty enough to decide, and accordingly sent to Schollick that specimen which had the numbers | indented, and the sub-paragraphs beginning in line with the numbers.

Sraffa, when I was speaking to him about this by telephone, said that he would be glad to do as you asked him, when I come to Cambridge next month.

Good news about Rockefeller; they have arranged to give me money through Somerville for the next three years. This includes £100 a year expenses. I remarked to Dr. Vaughan that this would be particularly useful, as the discovery of a further box of MSS.²⁹ would involve us in a lot of photostating, etc. She at once said “But it won’t be enough!” and sent them a cable and a letter, suggesting they should set aside £500 for such purposes. I had mentioned to her our plan for a meeting in Austria in the summer; she mentioned it to them in her letter. They replied saying that they had arranged the endowment for me, but the cable & letter came too late to be dealt with at the same time, but they thought they could deal with it separately. They – that is D’Arms who was writing, added that of course his letter wasn’t a commitment; but just an enquiry to get the arrangements proposed | clear. Would Somerville undertake the administration of a fund of £500 for duplicating purposes? And what about the expenses of Prof. von Wright & Mr. Rhees in travelling to Austria? – Well, it’s not filed

On the role of the numbers: They aren’t just ~~punct~~ reference, but also punctuation, almost rhetorical in purpose in many places.

We’re now trying to find out which of us is more private and fanciful in his ideas and are collecting other people’s opinions.

I have promised to give the publishers the decision tomorrow, and have thought of you as a person to consult at the last moment, if I have the luck to reach you. I will telephone King’s at 12.45 tomorrow afternoon (Thursday). | I am sorry the pages are so full of horrors that they are difficult to read.

Yours sincerely

GEM. Anscombe.

²⁹ Cf. letters from Rush Rhees to Georg Henrik von Wright above.

yet, but she is saying Somerville would be prepared to administer grants for these purposes (she said to me that ‘foundations’ like giving money to institutions rather than individuals) and suggesting £500, as at first, and £200 for your & Rhees’ travelling expenses over the 3 year period. – I will let you know as soon as it goes through. It removes the difficulty about having the MSS. with us; I will start getting them photostated – I have a man to do it – as soon as possible. And one of Rhees’ difficulties was about money ~~will~~ and this makes it more likely he will be able to come. – I take it you have no objection to the money coming through Somerville? (They will of course have to work it out about your getting dollars.)

When Wittgenstein gave me a photograph of himself about a year ago, he said ‘Don’t publish it!’ – I do not think this was anything to do with that particular photograph. I therefore feel | a kind of personal interdict, as far as concerns being responsible for the publication of any photograph.

Thank you very much for the article on Lichtenberg, who interests me extremely.

A man just came to see me with copies which he had got from Russell of a) early work, towards the Tractatus and b) letters to Russell, some philosophical, some personal, 1912–1921. The letters are a joy to read; full of fury excitement about logic; the personal ones so recognisable, younger, naiver, I suppose; but the same person completely. This man kindly said he would like to present us with further copies of these papers. I underline Russell (who in this kind of thing has always been very open & generous, so far as I have ever known anything about him) has no objection.

Dr. Ludwig Hänsel
Alseggerstraße 38
Wien XVIII

Thank you for the typescripts you sent. I am enclosing the first half of the lectures on mathematics³⁰. I | find myself badly irritated by the

³⁰ These are most likely notes taken and by R. G. Bosanquet. Bosanquet took notes in shorthand and then wrote up his notes turning what Wittgenstein said in proper sentences. Cf. Wittgenstein, L. (1979). *Wittgenstein’s Lectures on the Foundations of Mathematics, Cambridge, 1939*, edited by Cora Diamond, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

occurrence of ‘Wittgenstein’ instead of ‘T’. It makes it read queer and unpleasant, though I understand it would be natural to ~~say~~ take notes like that. I feel extremely doubtful about publication, ever. More than about the Blue & Brown Books – much more. I shall be surprised if we can’t publish ~~the~~ writings which take all the value from these notes. And I believe they give an idea of Wittgenstein’s lecturing style only to someone who heard him. If you have heard him, they remind you. That his lectures were so vigorous, so meaty, & contained so many impromptu coherent sentences (the man has left out the false starts & broken sentences) is impressive. But you don’t need all that lot to learn that – The ‘phrasing’ in paragraphs is good: particularly as my typist has done it, without my telling her to, with a gap between them.

Kegan Paul’s wrote first a refusal to Blackwell’s letter ~~askin~~ about printing the Tractatus in a separate German edition. I saw | Schollick’s letter afterwards, and thought it the wrong letter to have written; I am sure I should have thought so before the event too! Franklin was away; on his return he said it could be done, but demanded a royalty. It seemed to me that that was that; one could not argue with them that they were going back on their original licence, and they have a right to demand a royalty.

I think I have reported everything to you that I should!

Please remember me to your wife.

Yours ever, affectionately,
Elizabeth

Acknowledgements

The copyright of the letters by G. E. M. Anscombe belongs to Mrs M. C. Gormally (Dr Mary Geach) who has given permission for publication. The letters by Rush Rhees are reproduced with permission of Professor Volker Munz who represents the copyright holders of Rhees’ letters in this case. Thanks are due to NLF, WWA, Wren library and Trinity College Library for granting access to their holdings. We thank Mrs M. C. and Professor Luke Gormally for their comments on historical facts and their kind help in deciphering G. E. M. Ancombe’s handwriting. We thank Professor Cora Diamond, Professor James Klagge and Dr Joachim Schulte for their help in identifying Wittgenstein’s manuscripts and typescripts mentioned in the correspondence. We thank Professor Luke Gormally and Tina

Schirmer for valuable language corrections. The department of philosophy at the University of Bergen, the Wittgenstein Archives at the University of Bergen and the department of philosophy at the University of Helsinki generously contributed infrastructural and scientific support.

This work has been funded by the Research Council of Norway as part of the research project “Shaping a domain of knowledge by editorial processing: the case of Wittgenstein’s work” (NFR 213080). This research project collects archival materials and conducts interviews on the editorial history of Wittgenstein’s *Nachlass*. Using these sources, a comprehensive account of the history of editing Wittgenstein’s writings is in preparation.

Biographical Notes

Christian Erbacher was born in Marburg (Germany) in 1979. He received his diploma in psychology from the University of Regensburg (Germany) in 2006 and his PhD in philosophy from the University of Bergen (Norway) in 2010. He has conducted the postdoctoral project “Shaping a domain of knowledge by editorial processing: the case of Wittgenstein’s work” (NFR 213080) at the University of Bergen (Norway). Currently he is preparing a comprehensive account of the social and intellectual history of editing Wittgenstein’s writings.

Sophia Victoria Krebs, born 1989, is currently reading for a PhD in German Literature at the Saarland University. Beforehand, she studied Philosophy, German literature/language and Scholarly Editing and Documentology at the universities of Düsseldorf, Marburg and Wuppertal. Her scientific interests include the topics of Enlightenment, Intellectual History and digital and analogue editing.