

Call for misprints in “Logic and Knowledge”

In his opening remarks to *Logic and Knowledge* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1956) Russell refers to my work editing the texts and says, "in regard to a considerable part of this volume he has undertaken the laborious work of collating versions which differed owing to difficulties arising from war-time censorship." I have been asked what this means. The reference is clearly to "The Philosophy of Logical Atomism" which was published in *The Monist* in a form which Russell did not completely approve. My task was to restore the original text, and Russell assisted me in this process, although as best I can recall over a period of 24 years, the changes were not extensive. My impression is that in one or two places the version in *Logic and Knowledge* is better described as a revision than a restoration, since Russell took this opportunity to clarify a phrase or two. One must recall that in 1918 when these lectures were given in London, Russell was under severe pressure because of his stand against the war, and a manuscript going overseas for publication may well have been subject to some mindless intervention, although it dealt with matters in no way related to the war effort.

Since *Logic and Knowledge* is very widely used as a text in courses in Russell's philosophy, a gratifying outcome I did not anticipate when work was begun in 1953, let me clarify my relationship to this book in the years since its publication. No one expected it to be much of a success, but Russell and his British publisher thought that these papers should be reprinted and cooperated fully with my efforts to collect them and establish accurate texts. I entered into an agreement in which, although I received a small royalty for a short period, I had no rights to the book after publication. The book belonged to Russell who went on to his later projects with the misunderstanding that I might still function as its editorial guardian. In fact, when a new printing

was needed in 1964, I was given no due notice, and there was no opportunity to correct typographical errors. I would have been delighted to clean up the slips in the American paperback edition which appeared in 1971, but, in fact, only became aware of the existence of this edition when one of my students brought a copy to class.

Recent correspondence has determined that neither Allen and Unwin nor the Russell Estate is in any way adverse to this book being re-issued in a version free of typographical errors. Thus I ask those who have been using this book as a text, and are undoubtedly aware of these needed corrections, to send them to Kenneth Blackwell at this journal to be forwarded to the publisher. Since I have been totally out of the picture with respect to this book for more than two decades, this responsibility clearly reverts to those who hold copyright to this volume.

Chicago, Ill.

Robert C. Marsh