

RESEARCH IN THE HISTORY OF
ECONOMIC THOUGHT AND
METHODOLOGY: INCLUDING
A SYMPOSIUM ON NEW
DIRECTIONS IN SRAFFA
SCHOLARSHIP

RESEARCH IN THE HISTORY OF ECONOMIC THOUGHT AND METHODOLOGY

Founding Editor: Warren J. Samuels (1933–2011)

Series Editors: Luca Fiorito, Scott Scheall, and
Carlos Eduardo Suprinyak

Recent Volumes:

- Volume 31A: Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: A Research Annual; Jeff E. Biddle, Ross B. Emmett; 2013
- Volume 31B: Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: Documents Related to John Maynard Keynes, Institutionalism at Chicago & Frank H. Knight; Ross B. Emmett; 2013
- Volume 32: Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: A Research Annual; Luca Fiorito; 2014
- Volume 33: Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: A Research Annual; Luca Fiorito, Scott Scheall, Carlos Eduardo Suprinyak; 2015
- Volume 34A: Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: Including a Symposium on Austrian Economics in the Postwar Era; Luca Fiorito, Scott Scheall, Carlos Eduardo Suprinyak; 2016
- Volume 34B: Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: Including a Symposium on Albert O. Hirschman; Luca Fiorito, Scott Scheall, Carlos Eduardo Suprinyak; 2016
- Volume 35A: Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: Including a Symposium on the Historical Epistemology of Economics; Luca Fiorito, Scott Scheall, Carlos Eduardo Suprinyak; 2017

RESEARCH IN THE HISTORY OF ECONOMIC THOUGHT
AND METHODOLOGY VOLUME 35B

**RESEARCH IN THE
HISTORY OF ECONOMIC
THOUGHT AND
METHODOLOGY:
INCLUDING A SYMPOSIUM
ON NEW DIRECTIONS IN
SRAFFA SCHOLARSHIP**

EDITED BY

LUCA FIORITO

University of Palermo, Palermo, Italy

SCOTT SCHEALL

Arizona State University Polytechnic Campus, Mesa, AZ, USA

CARLOS EDUARDO SUPRINYAK

Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil



United Kingdom – North America – Japan
India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2018

Copyright © 2018 Emerald Publishing Limited

Reprints and permissions service

Contact: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying issued in the UK by The Copyright Licensing Agency and in the USA by The Copyright Clearance Center. Any opinions expressed in the chapters are those of the authors. Whilst Emerald makes every effort to ensure the quality and accuracy of its content, Emerald makes no representation implied or otherwise, as to the chapters' suitability and application and disclaims any warranties, express or implied, to their use.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-78714-540-5 (Print)

ISBN: 978-1-78714-539-9 (Online)

ISBN: 978-1-78714-968-7 (Epub)

ISSN: 0743-4154 (Series)



ISOQAR certified
Management System,
awarded to Emerald
for adherence to
Environmental
standard
ISO 14001:2004.

Certificate Number 1985
ISO 14001



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

CONTENTS

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS	<i>ix</i>
EDITORIAL BOARD	<i>xi</i>
ABOUT THE EDITORS	<i>xiii</i>
VOLUME INTRODUCTION	<i>xv</i>

PART I A SYMPOSIUM ON NEW DIRECTIONS IN SRAFFA SCHOLARSHIP

SYMPOSIUM: NEW DIRECTIONS IN SRAFFA SCHOLARSHIP <i>Riccardo Bellofiore and Scott Carter</i>	<i>3</i>
DOCUMENTS ON PIERO SRAFFA AT THE ARCHIVIO CENTRALE DELLO STATO AND AT THE ARCHIVIO STORICO DIPLOMATICO <i>Eleonora Lattanzi and Nerio Naldi</i>	<i>61</i>
FRIENDSHIP AND INTELLECTUAL INTERCOURSE BETWEEN SRAFFA AND WITTGENSTEIN: A TIMELINE <i>Lucia Morra</i>	<i>101</i>
SRAFFA'S 1920s CRITIQUE AND ITS RELEVANCE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF MAINSTREAM MICROECONOMICS <i>Gabriel Brondino and Andres Lazzarini</i>	<i>131</i>
SRAFFA ON THE OPEN VERSUS "CLOSED SYSTEMS" DISTINCTION AND CAUSALITY <i>John B. Davis</i>	<i>153</i>

THE IMPROBABILITY OF RESWITCHING, THE
CERTAINTY OF WICKSELL-EFFECTS AND THE
POVERTY OF PRODUCTION FUNCTIONS: THE
CAMBRIDGE CRITIQUE OF CAPITAL TRANSFORMED
Bertram Schefold 171

SRAFFA, THE CONFIGURATION OF EXCHANGE, AND
VALUE/PRICE EXPRESSIONS OF LABOUR TIME IN
SURPLUS-PRODUCING TRIANGULAR TRADE
Scott Carter 195

**PART II
ESSAYS**

THE GREAT DEPRESSION AND MACROECONOMICS
RECONSIDERED: THE IMPACT OF POLICY AND
REAL-WORLD EVENTS ON ECONOMIC DOCTRINES
Masazumi Wakatabe 237

TWO-POPULATION SOCIAL CYCLE THEORIES
Gene Callahan and Andreas Hoffmann 303

**PART III
A COLLECTION OF REVIEWS OF THOMAS C. LEONARD'S
*ILLIBERAL REFORMERS: RACE, EUGENICS, AND
AMERICAN ECONOMICS IN THE PROGRESSIVE ERA***

NOT ALL IL-LIBERAL: ACADEMIC REFORM THOUGHT
IN THE LONG PROGRESSIVE ERA
Mary O. Furner 325

ILLIBERAL AMERICA: RETHINKING THE
PROGRESSIVE ERA IN THE AGE OF OBAMA AND
TRUMP
Matthew Frye Jacobson 345

REFLECTIONS ON THOMAS C. LEONARD'S *ILLIBERAL
REFORMERS*
Charles R. McCann, Jr. 357

FAITH AS POLITICAL EPISTEMOLOGY: A REVIEW OF
THOMAS C. LEONARD'S *ILLIBERAL REFORMERS*

Scott Scheall

375

A RESPONSE TO MY FRIENDLY CRITICS

Thomas C. Leonard

383

INDEX

397

This page intentionally left blank

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

<i>Riccardo Bellofiore</i>	University of Bergamo, Bergamo, Italy
<i>Gabriel Brondino</i>	Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET) and Universidad Nacional del Litoral, Santa Fe, Argentina
<i>Gene Callahan</i>	St. Joseph's College, Brooklyn, NY, USA
<i>Scott Carter</i>	The University of Tulsa, Tulsa, OK, USA
<i>John B. Davis</i>	Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, USA; University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
<i>Luca Fiorito</i>	University of Palermo, Palermo, Italy
<i>Mary O. Furner</i>	University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA, USA
<i>Andreas Hoffmann</i>	Leipzig University, Leipzig, Germany
<i>Matthew Frye Jacobson</i>	Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA
<i>Eleonora Lattanzi</i>	Sapienza University of Rome; Fondazione Istituto Gramsci, Rome, Italy
<i>Andres Lazzarini</i>	Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET) and Universidad Nacional de San Martín (UNSAM), Buenos Aires, Argentina
<i>Thomas C. Leonard</i>	Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA
<i>Charles R. McCann, Jr.</i>	University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA
<i>Lucia Morra</i>	University of Turin, Turin, Italy
<i>Nerio Naldi</i>	Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy
<i>Scott Scheall</i>	Arizona State University Polytechnic Campus, Mesa, AZ, USA

<i>Bertram Schefold</i>	Goethe University Frankfurt, Frankfurt am Main, Germany
<i>Carlos Eduardo Suprinyak</i>	Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil
<i>Masazumi Wakatabe</i>	Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan

EDITORIAL BOARD

Michele Alacevich
University of Bologna, Italy

Rebeca Gomez Betancourt
Université Lumière Lyon 2, France

John Davis
*Marquette University, USA;
University of Amsterdam, The
Netherlands*

Pedro Garcia Duarte
University of São Paulo, Brazil

Till Düppe
*Université du Québec à Montréal,
Canada*

Ross Emmett
Michigan State University, USA

Nicola Giocoli
University of Pisa, Italy

Kyu Sang Lee
Ajou University, South Korea

Steven Medema
University of Colorado Denver, USA

Tiago Mata
University College, London, UK

Maria Pia Paganelli
Trinity University, USA

This page intentionally left blank

ABOUT THE EDITORS

Luca Fiorito received his PhD in economics from the New School for Social Research in New York and is currently Associate Professor at the University of Palermo. His main area of interest is the history of American economic thought in the Progressive Era and the interwar years. He has published many works on the contributions of the institutionalists and on the relationship between economics and eugenics.

Scott Scheall is a Lecturer with Arizona State University's College of Integrative Sciences and Arts. He received his PhD in philosophy from Arizona State in 2012. Scott is a former Research Fellow with Duke University's Center for the History of Political Economy and a former Postdoctoral Fellow with the F.A. Hayek Program for Advanced Study in Philosophy, Politics, and Economics at George Mason University. He has published extensively on the history and methodology of the Austrian School of economics.

Carlos Eduardo Suprinyak is Associate Professor of Economics at the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), Brazil. He specializes in the history of economic thought and economic methodology, studying in particular the interplay between social, political, and economic ideas in early modern England, and the institutionalization of academic economics in Brazil during the postwar era. He has published several papers on these and other related themes in peer-reviewed scholarly journals, and is also the co-editor of *The Political Economy of Latin American Independence* (Routledge, 2017).

This page intentionally left blank

VOLUME INTRODUCTION

Our second volume of 2017 features a symposium guest-edited by Scott Carter and Riccardo Bellofiore on recent developments in the scholarly literature on the famous Cambridge economist, Piero Sraffa. The symposium includes contributions from several eminent methodologists and Sraffa scholars, including Bertram Schefold and John Davis.

In our general-research “Essays” section, Masazumi Wakatabe offers a penetrating new analysis of the significance for the subsequent development of macroeconomics of the events of the Great Depression and the various policy efforts to mitigate it. Gene Callahan and Andreas Hoffmann review and build a preliminary model of the common aspects of endogenous theories of various cyclical social phenomena.

Finally, we present a collection of reviews of Thomas C. Leonard’s (2015) *Illiberal Reformers: Race, Eugenics, and American Economics in the Progressive Era*, winner of the History of Economics Society’s 2017 Joseph J. Spengler Best Book Prize. Contributors include Mary O. Furner, Matthew Frye Jacobson, Charles R. McCann, Jr., and RHETM co-editor Scott Scheall. Professor Leonard was kind enough to write a response to his critics.

As usual, we close by thanking our team of editorial assistants at Emerald Publishing, Charlotte Maiorana and Fiona Mattison, for working to facilitate production of this important volume.

Luca Fiorito
Scott Scheall
Carlos Eduardo Suprinyak
Editors

This page intentionally left blank

PART I
A SYMPOSIUM ON NEW
DIRECTIONS IN SRAFFA
SCHOLARSHIP

This page intentionally left blank

SYMPOSIUM: NEW DIRECTIONS IN SRAFFA SCHOLARSHIP

Riccardo Bellofiore and Scott Carter

ABSTRACT

Resurgent interest in the life and work of the Italian Cambridge economist Piero Sraffa is leading to New Directions in Sraffa Scholarship. This chapter introduces readers to some of these developments. First and perhaps foremost is the fact that as of September 2016 Sraffa's archival material has been uploaded onto the website of the Wren Library, Trinity College, Cambridge University, as digital colour images; this chapter introduces readers to the history of these events. This history provides sharp relief on the extant debates over the role of the archival material in leading to the final publication of Production of Commodities by Means of Commodities, and readers are provided a brief sketch of these matters. The varied nature of Sraffa scholarship is demonstrated by the different aspects of Sraffa's intellectual legacy which are developed and discussed in the various entries of our Symposium. The conclusion is reached that we are on the cusp of an exciting phase change of tremendous potential in Sraffa scholarship.

Keywords: Sraffa; Sraffa archives

INTRODUCTION

The title of this Symposium is meant to indicate that the future of Sraffa scholarship is bright indeed – bright both in terms of depth of analysis as well as

Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: Including a Symposium
on New Directions in Sraffa Scholarship, Volume 35B, 3–59

Copyright © 2018 by Emerald Publishing Limited

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved

ISSN: 0743-4154/doi:10.1108/S0743-41542017000035B001

breadth of content. The former aspect of Piero Sraffa's inquiries – that of depth of analysis – has been recognised since he first made his way on the scene in the 1920s with a devastating critique of the Marshallian partial equilibrium framework (this being the subject of the Brondino & Lazzarini contribution below). John Maynard Keynes, among others, recognised the brilliance of this young Italian economist and it was because of this that he offered Sraffa an opportunity to come to Cambridge, partially as a way to add to the critical mass of scholars buzzing about the Cam River at that time who came to be known as the Circus,¹ and partially as a way for this friend of Antonio Gramsci to avoid persecution both overtly and subtly from Mussolini and the forces of fascism that swept Italy in the 1920s and 1930s (this being among the subjects of the Lattanzi & Naldi contribution below). Sraffa's intellectual depth exhibited influences outside of economics too: his well-known interactions with Ludwig Wittgenstein exerted tremendous influence on the philosopher's thinking (this being the subject of Morra's contribution below and is also touched upon by the contribution by Davis).

Upon moving to Cambridge in 1927, Sraffa postponed by a year lectures he was supposed to give in fall allowing him to formally commence lecturing duties at Trinity College in the Michaelmas Term 1928. These lectures lasted through 1931 and their fruit is preserved as *Lecture Notes on the Advanced Theory of Value*, archived according to the Wren Trinity (WT) convention as D2/4, the colour images of which are now available for consultation on the Wren Library, Trinity College, Cambridge, website (<https://janus.lib.cam.ac.uk/>). This manuscript consists of over 240 mostly handwritten pages and contains important insights into the development of Sraffa's thinking after publication of his 1925 (in Italian) and 1926 (in English) articles critiquing the Marshallian theory (see the Brondino & Lazzarini entry below). The manuscript is brilliant indeed and we are now fortunate to have complete online access to digital images of its entire content.²

The content in Sraffa's lectures was what he had made public – albeit to a small audience of students.³ We now know the thoughts and developments that Sraffa was making at the time away from anyone else's prying eyes. Such developments are contained in notes on his constructive activity, kept private throughout his lifetime, but now available for open study. Indeed, far from being idle in 1927, Sraffa made the most of the postponement of his lecturing duties with the writing of hundreds of pages of notes that expressed a different approach than what he would write in his lectures and present to his students. These notes are contained in five file folders⁴ and are available for consultation at the Wren Library and as digital images on their website. Also, when engaged in lecturing from 1928 to 1931 Sraffa found time to continue with his constructive activity as evidenced from three files which were penned at the time,⁵ often during the inter-session; these notes also comprise hundreds of handwritten pages. The article by Davis below discusses this period in Sraffa's intellectual

activity, focusing attention on notes written in 1931 entitled ‘Surplus Product’ that have received much attention in recent years.

The notes that Sraffa was writing in the late 1920s and early 1930s were the first efforts at grappling with economic theory on a different plane altogether. By the end of this time period Sraffa had been selected by the Royal Economics Society as Editor of the *Works and Correspondence of David Ricardo*.⁶ This allowed him to cease his lecturing duties which, given his reticence and disdain generally for lecturing, was quite a relief. Work on the Ricardo edition did, however, postpone Sraffa’s constructive activities for a decade until 1942 where for four years, until 1946, Sraffa engaged in an intense level of inquiry penning thousands of handwritten pages in 32 file folders available at the Wren archive. From 1946 through December 1954 Sraffa again put his constructive activity aside and spent those years finally finishing the Ricardo edition. Then from January 1955 to 1960 Sraffa would engage in his third and final stage of constructive activity, the fruits of which are contained in 58 file folders and thousands of handwritten pages; a significant file that begins this period is the Majorca draft of March 1955, archived according to WT as D3/12/52 of which more is spoken of in Carter’s essay below.⁷

In April of 1960 Sraffa finally published *Production of Commodities by Means of Commodities: Prelude to a Critique of Economic Theory* (PCMC). The earthshattering impact of this book was immediate and long-lived and indeed lasts to this day. Perhaps the most famous controversy that arose from its publication concerned the so-called Cambridge Capital Controversies, and in the contribution below by Schefold we have one of the participants in that debate from the 1970s revisiting this matter in light of recent theoretical and empirical evidence. Other positive dimensions and implications of Sraffa’s inquiries can be developed from grappling with the analysis in PCMC in light of archival evidence, and exploring some of these analytical aspects is the subject of Carter’s contribution below.

All of the above concerns the depth of Sraffa’s inquiries; that Sraffa was a deep thinker has always been acknowledged by proverbial friend-and-foe alike despite the paucity of his then-available written word. But deepness of thought notwithstanding, the relative dearth of publications over the years became a major criticism. Take for example the thoughts of one of Sraffa’s proverbial albeit respectful foes, namely Paul Anthony Samuelson, who in 2000 wrote an interesting essay that included a section entitled ‘Writer’s block’, referring to the notion that Sraffa remained relatively unproductive despite that what little he did write always had significant impact. On Sraffa’s supposed writer’s block, Professor Samuelson writes:

Several times I have heard the following sample of Keynes’ wit. When Maynard was told that a mysterious ailment of Nicky Kaldor’s was diagnosed as athlete’s foot, he is reported as saying ‘I don’t believe it. Next you’ll be telling me Piero suffers from writer’s cramp’.
(Samuelson, 2000, p. 26)

These sentiments of relative unproductivity are also echoed in the words of Gailbraith (1981, p. 74) where Sraffa is referred to as ‘one of the most leisured men who ever lived’.⁸

We now know the above attributions of Sraffa not being productive over the years to be untrue. And here we can turn to the breadth of content to match the depth of analysis as now, for the first time ever, interested readers can peruse the original content of much of Sraffa’s archival material. With the permission of Sraffa’s current literary executor Lord Eatwell, under the direction of Giancarlo de Vivo and Murray Milgate and with the assistance of Jonathan Smith, Hilary Moreton and James Kirwin of the Wren Library, as of September 2016 the process of uploading high-resolution digital images of the Sraffa Papers on the Wren’s website starting with the most important files, namely material related to notes, lectures and publications, finally began.

This is a welcome and much-needed development indeed. Interested readers from all theoretical persuasions will now be able to explore for themselves the wonders that those of us who over the years trekked to the Wren have been able to glimpse. And ‘glimpse’ is a good way to put it, as up until 2016 any and all imaging of Sraffa’s archive was strictly forbidden.⁹ And it is this development that makes the future of Sraffa scholarship so bright, as the light now shines radiantly for all interested readers on the raw un-interpreted content of the archival material of this mighty thinker. Never before have Sraffa’s notes been made available for those who cannot make the trip to Cambridge, and never before was the material allowed to be imaged. This stands to be the fuel for a much-needed resurgence in interest in all things related to Sraffa. With the digital images and their release we expect scholarship to blossom in never-before conceived directions and avenues. As the material is already available online, the editors of this Symposium have decided that a useful contribution of this Introduction would be to provide readers with a brief history and account of the archival material as one finds it on the Wren website. This will help with the complex and cumbersome task of siphoning through the tens of thousands of pages of raw mostly handwritten text in order to help provide a sense of conceptual and structural cogency. One of us (Carter, 2017) goes so far as developing a complementary archival co-convention to facilitate this even more.

The remainder of this introduction is as follows. In the next section, a brief history of the Sraffa Papers is presented. This is followed by a section that introduces readers to the recent online presence of Sraffa’s archival material. With such access, the intellectual project of tracing the development of Sraffa’s Notes to that of PCMC can now be explored by a wider audience, and providing readers a brief sketch of this endeavour is the section that follows. The section after that introduces the contributions to this volume, and the final section briefly concludes.

HISTORY OF THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE SRAFFA PAPERS

Jonathan Smith, the Trinity Archivist who supervised the WT arrangement of Sraffa's Papers, indicates in a very instructive footnote that 'the history of attempts to catalogue Sraffa's papers is not particularly straightforward' (Smith, 2012, p. 1297). What we do know is that in 1974 Alessandro Roncaglia and John Eatwell gave a preliminary inventory of the material. Smith reports this was done in relation to the two scholars' translation into English of Sraffa's original 1925 Italian article critiquing Marshallian theory, this article being the precursor to the more truncated 1926 version that originally appeared in English in the *Economic Journal*. For purposes of this translation they had asked Sraffa permission to consult the preparatory material for the 1925 and 1926 articles and while being engaged in that endeavour realised how important it was to make an inventory of the content of the entire bulk material.¹⁰ Smith reports that they wrote to Sraffa on 8 August 1974 and that Sraffa returned the correspondence one month later. Roncaglia and Eatwell then sent a letter in January 1975 and Sraffa responded several months later in June, and during the interim in March 1975 we find papers catalogued by Roncaglia. Smith articulates three points related to the Roncaglia–Eatwell (RE) inventory and exchange with Sraffa:

First, that the catalogue of papers that date from this period (e.g. 1974–1975) are more a locations guide than a catalogue – sort of a preliminary draft that you would expect to be made before any attempt was made to order the papers. Second, that in their second letter Eatwell and Roncaglia make it evident that *any ordering of the papers was yet to take place*. Third, that Sraffa forbade any further cataloguing at that time. (Smith, 2012, p. 1297; emphasis added)

The second and third points especially are of tremendous importance. Here evidence emerges that the 'original order' in which we find Sraffa's papers has to be taken with a relative grain of salt. In the first instance many-a-hand was placed on the material even before Sraffa's death, as reported by Smith (2012) echoing a warning originally given by de Vivo (1998[2001]):

de Vivo (1998[2001])...sounds a warning with regard to the archive as a whole and reminds us that Alessandro Roncaglia, John Eatwell, Antonietta Campus and Pierangelo Garegnani all helped with his papers during his lifetime, and we should thus be cautious in coming to any conclusions based on the arrangement of the material. (Smith, 2012, p. 1296)

And Smith reports that Sraffa himself indicated that as of 1975 the order of the papers was yet to be determined, as seen in his (Sraffa's) reply dated June 1975 to the Roncaglia and Eatwell correspondence sent the previous January:

In his reply [Sraffa] explains that he feels that the questions raised are connected with the final destination of the papers and that any work on them should cease until he had made up his mind about their final place of deposit. (Smith, 2012, p. 1297)

Sraffa never made up his mind, and we can be reasonably certain that the papers in the order we find them in the archive including the presentation at the Wren Library website reflects the state at which Sraffa indicates in June 1975 – that is to say, the ‘final place of deposit’ remaining undetermined.

Sraffa died in September 1983, and in his will appointed Pierangelo Garegnani as his Literary Executor who with Krishna Bharadwaj began writing in autumn of that year an account of Sraffa’s archival material.¹¹ Professor Garegnani (2003) in an article first published in Italian in 1998¹² recounts the story in the following way:

In autumn of 1983, shortly after Sraffa’s death, and then in Spring 1984, Professor Krishna Bharadwaj of Nehru University, New Delhi and myself made a first reconnaissance and inventory of the manuscript material, not least to ensure nothing got mislaid when it was moved from Sraffa’s rooms in Trinity or in the Marshall-Library to a store-room of the College. In fact, only an index of the manuscripts a few pages long existed before then, drawn up by Professor Roncaglia, when helping Sraffa tidy up his papers in around 1974.

The inventory thus carried out immediately after Sraffa’s death was followed by a more detailed examination and systematic listing of the manuscripts as a preliminary to working on them (Trinity College, the owner of the papers, postponed a professional cataloguing of the papers; cataloguing was begun only after the papers were made available to the public, in early 1994¹³). The systematic examination and listing of the manuscripts was rather laborious because of their, for the most part, extremely fragmentary nature; for example, all the pages in the enormous mass of material had to be numbered. It was on this basis that the papers were microfilmed at the University Library in 1987. This job took up almost all the time that Professor Bharadwaj and I could devote to the manuscripts up to the summer of 1987. (Garegnani, 2003, p. 623)

Here we find that the original Bharadwaj–Garegnani (BG) arrangement underwent two stages. The first is the preliminary inventory accomplished immediately after Sraffa’s death ostensibly following the RE inventory of a decade earlier, and second ‘a more detailed examination and systematic listing of the manuscripts as a preliminary to working on them’. It is in the first preliminary inventory of 1983–1984 that we conjecture the meta-structure of files in the BG arrangement was set, following the same method as the RE inventory as in both RE and BG the different collections of files were identified according to the location they were found in Sraffa’s various quarters. We know this is the case for RE given Smith’s identification of it more as a ‘locations guide’, something made explicit in their letter to Sraffa dated 8 August 1974:

[W]e have already helped you to conduct a number of searches in your rooms and now we have a good idea of what papers there are, where they are, and what papers are, at the moment, missing. We have so far compiled two lists of materials, one relating to the cupboard left of the entrance door, the other the brown paper packet at present in your room at the Marshall Library. (Roncaglia and Eatwell to Sraffa, quoted in Smith, 2012, p. 1297).

Both Kurz (2009) and Smith (1998) tell us that the same ‘location method’ was used in the meta-file convention adopted in BG:

After [Sraffa's] death the late Krishna Bharadwaj and Pierangelo Garegnani produced a valuable inventory and numbering of the papers so that nothing should get lost in moving them from Sraffa's room in the College to the place of storage. The inventory was based on the locations where the papers had been found in Sraffa's rooms and the grouping he had given them. Bharadwaj and Garegnani also began to examine the manuscripts. Jonathan Smith, archivist, then produced the catalogue of the papers on behalf of Trinity College, which is the one now generally used. (Kurz, 2009, p. 266)

For his part Jonathan Smith characterises the BG arrangement as follows:

In a codicil to his will, Sraffa named Pierangelo Garegnani as his literary executor and it was to Garegnani that the task was left to bring together the physical remains of Sraffa's literary estate. Much important material was in Sraffa's room in Neville's Court, the second court of Trinity College, in bookcases, chests of drawers and suitcases...Although some papers were in good order, others were something of a jumble. Further material...was in the rooms that he had used as Librarian of the Marshall Library of Economics. In the early months of 1984, Garegnani and Krishna Bharadwaj prepared a rough inventory of the papers as they found them in two locations, before they were boxed and removed to library storage. From May 1985 to June 1986 Professor Bharadwaj worked on the papers under the supervision of Garegnani. In this time she was able to work her way through the papers, item by item, identifying and assessing the significance of each piece.

A more detailed catalogue was prepared and items were individually numbered and prepared for microfilming, which was undertaken by the Photography Department of Cambridge University Library. Although the Bharadwaj list is fundamentally flawed in archival terms, this intermediate catalogue is most important in helping to preserve the order of the papers as Sraffa left them (it is clear that Garegnani and Bharadwaj knew the importance of this). There is a map of the locations of papers as they were found in Sraffa's rooms, and what initially seems to be clumsy references to 'Green Chest, Bottom Drawer' or 'Horizontal piling' give useful clues to the arrangement of the papers while in use. (Smith, 1998, p. 44)

Clearly, the accounts of Garegnani, Kurz, and Smith resonate. In each we find the BG arrangement broken into two distinct phases; an initial inventory based on the RE 'location's guide' of the various piles in Sraffa's rooms, and a later more developed arrangement of the material, one that as we discover took conceptual content of the material into account. Note the role of Bharadwaj looms large throughout. The end of the BG endeavour can be marked as 1989, after which Bharadwaj began to experience health problems, which as Garegnani¹⁴ informs us, interfered with her continued work on the papers, precipitating her premature death in 1992 at the young age of 57.¹⁵ Around Mrs. Bharadwaj's death in the early 1990s the WT convention was completed and in 1993 the archive finally opened for scholarly study to those who travelled to the Wren Library.

THE DIGITAL SRAFFA

Beginning in autumn of 2016 and with the endorsement of Piero Sraffa's current literary executor Lord Eatwell, the Wren Library began releasing on its website colour digital images of the most important files from the Sraffa

Papers. The effort is directed by Giancarlo de Vivo and Murray Milgate and is made possible by Jonathan Smith, Archivist and Modern Manuscript Cataloguer, and Hilary Moreton and James Kirwin, all of the Wren Library, Trinity College, University of Cambridge. This is a very welcome development as now all interested scholars and lay-people alike are able to enjoy deep unfettered study of the non-interpreted raw material from which to base their own ideas, opinions and developments regarding Sraffa's very much unfinished intellectual project. With this development matters are quickly moving from famine to feast and in the coming months and years we will likely become inundated with material as images of Sraffa's handwritten notes start to populate the worldwide web. And as economics remains in search of its soul we are fortunate indeed to now have the breadth to finally complement the depth of Mr. Sraffa's ideas and developments on matters of great interest and importance to the science.

The Wren Trinity or WT catalogue developed by Smith constitutes the presentation of the archive to the public, including the presentation of the digital images on the Wren Library website. It is therefore crucial to understand the architecture of the convention to make sense of the material. In its totality, WT accords to the following conceptual structure of macro-sections ([Table 1](#)).

The amount of material in the various sections is often quite voluminous and always very interesting. Most of the recent literature on Sraffa's archive consults (D.) Notes, Lectures, and Publications, and to a lesser extent (C.) Correspondence, (E.) Diaries, and (I.) Items removed from printed books. Section D is the most complex and itself divides into three subjections, D1. – Notes, D2. – Lectures, and D3. – Publications. A partial breakdown of this section is given in [Table 2](#).

An Appendix to this Special Issue contains the entirety of the entries of the content of the Sraffa Papers as it appears on the Wren Library website, including all 115 files archived under D3/12 Notes on PCMC.

Table 1. Macro-Sections of the Wren Trinity Convention.

A. Personal and family papers
B. Academic career
C. Correspondence
D. Notes, lectures, and publications
E. Diaries
F. Memoirs of colleagues
G. Publications by others
H. Bibliographical and manuscript interests
I. Items removed from printed books
J. Miscellaneous

Table 2. Breakdown of Section D of the Wren Trinity Arrangement of the Sraffa Archive.

D1: Notes (1923–1963) (92 sub-groupings)
D1/1
...
D1/91: Black Notebook (1943)
D1/92
D2: Lectures (1927–1943) (eight sub-groupings)
D2/1: Lecture notes on economic theory (n.d.)
D2/2: ‘The corporative state’, given to ‘Keynes Club’ (1927)
D2/3: ‘Revalorization of the lira’, given to Emmanuel Economic Society (3 Nov 1927)
D2/4: <i>Lecture Notes on the Advanced Theory of Value</i> (1928–1931)
D2/5: Lectures on continental banking (1929)
D2/6: ‘I banchieri fiorentini’ (14 May 1929)
D2/7: Two lectures on Italian problems...(1941–1943)
D2/8: Lectures on Industry (1941–43)
D3: Publications (1920–1973) (14 sub-groupings)
D3/1: L’inflazione monetaria in Italia durante e dopo la Guerra (n.d)
D3/2: ‘The Bank Crisis in Italy’, <i>Economic Journal (EJ)</i> (1922)
D3/3: Untitled article on the economics of fascism (1923)
D3/4: Obituary of Maffeo Pantaleoni (1924)
D3/5: Sulla relazione fra costo e quantita prodotta (1925)
D3/6: The laws of returns under competitive conditions, <i>EJ</i> (1926)
D3/7: ‘Increasing returns and the representative firm: a symposium’, <i>EJ</i> (1930)
D3/8: ‘An alleged correction of Ricardo’. <i>QJE</i> (1930)
D3/9: ‘Dr Hayek on money and capital’, <i>EJ</i> (1932)
D3/10: ‘Money and capital: a rejoinder’, <i>EJ</i> (1932)
D3/11: <i>The Works and Correspondence of David Ricardo</i> (1930–1973)
D3/12: <i>Production of commodities by means of commodities</i> (1927–1967)
D3/12/1
...
D3/12/115
D3/13: ‘ <i>Production of commodities by means of commodities: A Comment</i> ’, <i>EJ</i> (1962–1967)
D3/14: ‘Produzione congiunta di merci a mezzo di merci. Risposta a Manara’ (14 May 1929)

Sraffa's archival material can also be found on the academic webpage of one of the editors of this volume (readers are invited to go to Carter's *Heretical Sraffa* website at www.sraffaarchive.org). The manner of presentation of the material as it appears there follows a complementary archival co-convention which takes the fact that the same material was subject to two distinct archival cataloguing schemas – WT and BG – as the starting point for development a robust archival co-convention resultant from the organically combining the two.¹⁶

A SKETCH OF THE DEBATE ON THE PATH FROM THE ARCHIVAL NOTES TO PCMC

The papers collected here must be set against the rich debate on-going since the opening of the archive around the meaning of the Sraffa papers in the reconstruction of Sraffa's path to PCMC. What follows in a very compact way, and also in a very personal way for the most senior of the present writers, provides hints on the discussion so far. We clarify in advance agreement with Alessandro Roncaglia that 'any interpretation of Sraffa's economics must conform to the published texts' (Roncaglia, 2017). This does not diminish, however, the role of the Archival research on Sraffa in grasping individual points, in reconstructing the non-linear 'making' of *Production of Commodities*, in interpreting its results and in understanding where to go from here.

We may begin from Porta (2015),¹⁷ whose reading of the Sraffa papers is informed by two principles: (i) that Sraffa was a Marxist, bending his analytical conclusion to his ideology, and reading Ricardo through Marx; (ii) that Sraffa was one of the great Cambridge economists (like Marshall or Keynes) who criticised the static nature of Neoclassicism, rediscovering the links between Scottish and Italian Enlightenment. The first principle cannot be accepted (and here we would agree with some criticisms by Kurz): there was no ideological distortion in Sraffa; here, by the way, Porta shares the standard, but faulty, Neoricardian reading according to which the debate has conclusively shown the unsoundness of some Marxian propositions, beginning with the labour theory of value. But the Marxian inspiration is evident in the Sraffa Papers. More than that, we would argue that from certain points of view Sraffa became more Marxian along the way, especially after re-reading *Capital*, Volume 1, in 1940. This is peculiarly relevant because many readings (from Steedman to Kurz) (partially) correspond to the 1927–1931 Sraffa, not to the later one. The second principle stated by Porta is intriguing, but vague and not substantiated by the Archive.

An alternative authoritative position is the one by Kurz and Salvadori (2005, 2010) where it is argued that Sraffa began from Marshall, thinking that it could be made compatible with Marx. But in late 1927 came the abrupt turning point on which Garegnani (2005) insists. In this interpretation, the game is mostly played in 1927–1931: (i) the surplus approach, based on the view of production as circular flow, is the foundation of the perspective of classical

economics in its entirety; (ii) this classical economics perspective provides the means for a criticism of marginalism and the positive proposition of a sound alternative economic theory; (iii) these developments imply, however, a break with the labour theory of value, which in this reading is perceived as a corruption of Petty and the Physiocrats, who underscored ‘physical real costs’ and the ‘true absolute costs of commodities’. Note that in this interpretation Marx’s value theory is read as a dualist and non-monetary theory of individual pricing (and not, as it is, a single-system monetary labour theory of value). Sraffa’s alternative shows that the labour theory of value must be understood as the only analytical tool at the disposal of Ricardo and Marx: but that tool is no longer adequate and does not correspond to the complexity of Ricardo’s and Marx’s highly sophisticated and empirically rich concepts. Labour values are of no importance in the analysis: what is the key is an ‘objectivist’ – mostly ‘physicalist’ – program, a ‘naturalist’ point of view, a ‘science of things’. This Sraffa is a follower of James Mill, when he (Mill) argued that the agents of production are the commodities themselves.¹⁸

Indeed, this looks very much like the perspective that the same Sraffa, after 1941–1942, considered to be tarred by commodity fetishism. We may observe that in Kurz’s papers published up until 2002, the wealth of the theory that we find in the Sraffa papers in the other two phases (1941–1945 and 1956–1959) went unexplored. For a thorough, and sometimes enlightening account of the second phase we had to wait for the works of Kurz and co-authors published after 2005.¹⁹ After considering the subsequent development of Sraffa in the 1940s and 1950s, however, Kurz and Salvadori (2010) still insist that Steedman’s interpretation is fully corroborated by Sraffa’s hitherto unpublished papers.²⁰ To maintain this view, they have to reverse the direction of time, and recognise but sterilise the positions of the second and third phase of Sraffa’s journey, so that these are made compatible with the arguments of the 1927–1931 period (especially at the beginning).

According to de Vivo (1998[2001]), (2000) the reference to the Petty’s and Physiocrats’ physicalism of the ‘loaf of bread’, ‘was only a brief and very early mood, perhaps a sort of reaction to Marshall’. The merit of the reconstruction by de Vivo (2003) together with Gilibert (2003), whatever the criticisms which have been addressed to them, is in considering in some detail the second period (1942–1945) of Sraffa’s writing of his book. Contrary to Garegnani, there is no ‘turning point’, and contrary to Kurz the starting point of the path towards PCMC was Marx. In 1927 Sraffa had the occasion to read (in French) *Theories of Surplus Value*. His ‘equations’ were built from Marx’s schemes of reproduction. In the early 1940s, and especially in 1942–1943, Sraffa developed a ‘Value’ Hypothesis, which could also be labelled as the Statistical Hypothesis: at the time, the Italian economist thought that this would have confirmed Marx, so much so that the book he was writing ‘is nothing but Old Moor’ (‘Crosscap’, D3/12/16/17.2).²¹ From this perspective, the path to PCMC is rather a path to rediscover Marx. In 1943 this ‘heroic’ attempt to confirm Marx died with the collapse of the

model built on the Hypo. It is interesting, however, that, while on the one hand this ‘failure’ led Sraffa to the Standard System and the Standard Commodity, on the other hand it never led him back to his previous 1927–1931 criticism of Marx’s theory of value.

A very different perspective from Kurz & Salvadori is presented by Ginzburg (2015). According to this interpreter, it is wrong to equate Sraffa’s ‘objectivism’ to physicalism as a form of metaphysical naturalism like we find in Otto Neurath, according to which only physical things exist. Sraffa moved away at the end of the first phase from any positivist materialism and any scientism: the terms ‘objective’ and ‘subjective’ are always used in a relational, culturally ‘situated’ sense (Ginzburg, 2015, pp. 58–59). Ginzburg refers to Garegnani (2005), according to which ‘the Marshallian interpretation of the classics could already have achieved the ‘objectivist’ goal with no need for further investigation’. It is a promising line of research: unfortunately for Ginzburg also the game is only limited to the 1927–1931 period: like Kurz & Salvadori (2005), and like Garegnani (2005), he does not devote too much attention to the second and third phase.

Another interpretation, which we may only name here very cursorily, is that by Pasinetti (1981, 2005b, 2012); according to which *Production of Commodities* is a pre-institutional, purely logical inquiry of a ‘capitalistic’, that is, industrial society: “‘primary and natural’ features of an economic system have to be studied independently of a particular institutional set-up’ (Garbellini & Wirkierman, 2010, p. 9). Likely, in this view, ‘capitalistic’ may refer to a society without Marx’s ‘capital relation’, so that we may wonder whether or not this definition includes Socialist societies. For Pasinetti (2005a), Sraffa is an ‘enigma’: the camp base for a much larger dynamic and structural theoretical endeavour. Here again Ginzburg’s position is worth remembering. According to Ginzburg (2015, p. 76), whereas Kurz ‘flattened’ Sraffa on a reductive conception of materialism (akin to Bukharin’s reading of Marx), Pasinetti’s alternative is an idealism of generic abstractions. Sraffa, like Gramsci, tried to overcome these alternatives.

There are then authors who, in very different ways one from the other,²² find in the Sraffa papers arguments to construct a novel positive relationship of Sraffa with Marx. An incomplete list of these interpreters may refer to Gattei and Gozzi (2010), Perri (2010, 2014), Preti (2014) and the two editors of this collection of essays. The novelty of these interpretative lines (plural) is the distance from the old traditional Marxism of Dobb and Meek in arguing for a continuity between Sraffa and Marx.²³ They all ground their positions about the (at least partial) continuity of Sraffa with Marx on the normalisation by Sraffa in §10 and §12, such that the money value of the national income monetarily exhibits the direct labour expended.²⁴

Even though he did not actually work on the Archival material, a last interpretation is worth remembering, as being paradoxically closer to the Sraffa of the Sraffa papers than most of the debate which occurred so far, after the ‘opening’ of the Wren Library. We refer to the position held since 1975 by Alessandro Roncaglia (English translation by Roncaglia, 1978). According to this

author, Sraffa rejected the idea of a general theory, and his book must be seen as a specific piece of analysis where prices of production correspond to a 'photograph' of the system at a given moment in time, with given methods of production and productive consumption (given technical inputs and given output levels). This outlook, of course, cannot but be critical of the interpretation of prices of production as long period positions (which is not supported either by a reading of Sraffa's book or of the Sraffa papers). In our view, this 'language game' may well be compatible with a Marxian theory of the *constitution* of the data of price determination: and this theory is represented by the theory of value as the theory of the *form determination* of labour, production, and accumulation.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PRESENT VOLUME

It is apt for a volume that points to new directions in Sraffa scholarship to be eclectic in terms of content and subject matter. New ways to think about the intellectual legacy of this brilliant yet enigmatic scholar now can be buttressed with the open availability of Sraffa's archival material. There has already been a resurgence in Sraffa scholarship from the perspective of his political economy, much but not all of the material developing ideas out of the archive. And as the life and work of Piero Sraffa become more widely known – an inevitable result of the unleashing of his archival material – much more will be known about his sympathies politically as well as his contributions to fields outside of economics such as philosophy.

And these matters outside the sphere of economic theorising are the subject of the first two contributions to this volume. The opening chapter by Eleonora Lattanzi & Nerio Naldi presents archival material from two Italian sources, the *Archivio Centrale dello Stato* and the *Archivio Storico Diplomatico*. They present results of archival research of the last decade including recent findings which point interested readers in new and interesting directions. The archival material begins with the final years of Sraffa's military service in the Great War and his refusal to accept a military award. Other documents uncovered concern the scrutiny of the Italian political police who viewed him as a possible communist or subversive, including evidence of efforts of Mussolini himself to force Sraffa to retract certain content of an article published in the English press in 1922. Evidence is also presented on Sraffa's academic career, his *libera docenza*, his appointment at Cagliari and the leave which allowed him to move to Cambridge in 1927. Here emerge different views among the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Italian Embassy in London regarding granting Sraffa permission to remain abroad and to teach in England. Documents pertaining to Sraffa's personal connections are also uncovered, including efforts by his uncle Mariano D'Amelio, president of the Italian Supreme Court, who used his influence to obtain the requisite permissions. Other documents evidence surveillance of Sraffa's activities by the Italian

political police including the very interesting discovery of a file containing documents dated 1931 and 1951 originated from British sources. All of this enriches our understanding of Sraffa's complex and very interesting life.

This look into Sraffa's life continues with the entry by Lucia Morra. Her work concerns the intellectual intercourse and friendship Sraffa had with the philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein in Cambridge beginning in the late 1920s. Morra's work consults both Sraffa's and Wittgenstein's Cambridge Pocket Diaries (CPD) as well as their correspondence and biography to construct a timeline of meetings, broken down into five phases: (i) their first meeting in 1929 through June 1930, (ii) October 1930 through June 1933 when their weekly conversations ran uninterrupted, (iii) the period from October 1933–July 1936 when there was a falling out between the two and the continuity of their previous meetings broken, (iv) the decade after July 1936 in which their meetings were at times intense and others nearly non-existent, culminating with Sraffa's decision to put an end to their conversations and (v) the years immediately prior to Wittgenstein's death. Morra's work evidences that the two met no less than 240 times from their first meeting in 1929 until 1951. The work concludes with an appendix that documents the meetings between Sraffa and Wittgenstein for the period in question based on study of the CPDs from both Cambridge scholars.

Turning to the contributions on economics in this volume, we begin with the entry by Gabriel Brondino & Andres Lazzarini which focuses on the Sraffa's critique of Marshallian theory in the mid-1920s. The authors utilise resources now available for open consultation at the Wren archive thereby uncovering new dimensions to this old story. Their essay re-examines Sraffa's critique of Marshall's supply curve developed in the former's 1925 (Italian) and 1926 (English) articles which demonstrated logical and theoretical problems both in the short and long run as regards neoclassical supply schedules derived from non-proportional returns. The meaning of the notion of equilibrium for both short and long run is examined as it appears in Marshall and also in Sraffa's original contributions, and specially considered are notions related to limitations in the growth of the firm. Regarding the short run, Marshallian theory assumes the number of firms is fixed thereby engendering serious problems regarding competition and the purported competitive behaviour of the individual firm. Regarding the long run, the source of increasing costs in Marshallian theory is seen to emanate from matters related to management and control, an idea which Sraffa demonstrates as untenable on logical and empirical grounds. In addition to the two published articles from the 1920s, Brondino & Lazzarini also analyse in detail Sraffa's *Lectures on Advanced Theory of Value* delivered in 1928–1931 at Trinity College, Cambridge University; the latter are archived as D2/4 and are now publicly available online at the Wren Library's website. The authors conclude that contemporary mainstream microeconomic treatment of costs and supply under perfectly competitive conditions still present several problems in the marginalist supply and demand approach to the

theory of value and distribution, and thereby openly questions the continued stranglehold of this flawed approach in the current state of the science.

The entry by John Davis continues with the line of reasoning in an earlier article (Davis, 2012) concerning the five-page handwritten manuscript entitled 'Surplus Product' that Sraffa penned in 1931 which has much to offer regarding the question of Sraffa's objectivism (archived as D3/12/7:161.1-5). The essay explores the relationship between the open system of distribution in relation to the closed 'economic field' of commodity values. Davis argues that this open–closed distinction allowed Sraffa to deal with issues raised in objectivistic interpretations of surplus producing systems, and he (Davis) looks to other sciences in developing this thesis. Specifically explored is the analogy between Sraffa's methodology and that of the Austrian biologist Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1901–1972) regarding the latter's own notion of the open–closed distinction in regard to differences in physical versus life sciences. Bertalanffy's general systems theory understanding of open and closed systems was developed around the same time as Sraffa was writing his Surplus Product manuscript to address the specific nature of economics. The chapter compares two related interpretations of Sraffa's thinking in regard to the open–closed distinction developed by Arena (2015) and Ginzburg (2015), and also addresses Sraffa's thinking in relation to similar thinking by Wittgenstein and Gramsci. The chapter concludes by contrasting the causal reasoning in Sraffa with that of mainstream economics, thereby echoing a theme also raised in the Brondino & Lazzarini entry around the lack of efficacy of the *ceteris paribus* condition. Davis argues that Sraffa ultimately retained the objectivist, sufficient cause principle to explain the 'closed system' of the 'economic field' of commodity values, but also supposed it to be operated upon as-a-whole by causes that lay outside of it; this yields a modified objectivism by allowing for different types of causal factors associated respectively with production and distribution that are in 'communication' with one another.

Bertram Schefold's contribution continues with his recent work which revisits issues surrounding the Cambridge capital controversies regarding questions of reswitching and reverse capital deepening. The essay argues that empirical evidence from recent years (e.g., Han & Schefold, 2006) has led to a necessary re-evaluation and reorientation of the research programme within the school of thought that emerged from Sraffa's 1960 book. This reorientation arises from the theoretical discovery that wage curves (wage–profit schedules) tend to get linear in random systems the larger they are, which explains the fact that empirical wage curves do not deviate a great deal from linearity. Moreover, based on recent evidence (uncovered in Schefold, 2013, 2016), the essay argues that reverse capital deepening and reswitching (the latter a special case of the former) are so improbable as to be insignificant. These results seem to invalidate Sraffa's critique, but it can be revived. The paper shows that although reswitching becomes less likely in larger systems, Wicksell effects will surely arise and will be manifested when the Standard commodity is not selected as the

numéraire. The paper considers different scenarios of ‘pro-’ and ‘anti-neoclassical’ cases of Wicksell effects when prices are expressed in terms of the net product. It also turns out that far fewer efficient techniques appear on the envelope than expected. The entry concludes by showing that the elasticity of substitution is likely to be small in actual systems so that a policy to lower real wages will not easily generate much additional employment in a closed economy, and it is from this basis that a new perspective on employment policies is called for.

Finally, Scott Carter’s paper develops Sraffa’s model of triangular trade and discerns two important characteristics from that framework: (i) that exchange value in fact represents a configuration amongst all exchangeable commodities, including in the surplus case living labour, and (ii) that this living labour can have three related but distinct value or price expressions, namely (a) labour’s productivity, (b) its remuneration, and (c) its extraction. This latter especially speaks to the general approach of using the foundations of Sraffa’s theoretical advances in contributing to the development of the Marxian theory of wage-labour and exploitation (as e.g., in Carter, 2014a). Also addressed in this essay is an adaptation of Sraffa’s normalisation of $\$10 = \12 in terms of the price and/or value expressions of labour–time as related to, but conceptually distinct from, the monetary expression of labour–time found in the New Interpretation literature; this leads Carter to conclude that consideration of the money-relation along such lines is a promising line of inquiry, especially in relation to Sraffa’s development of the Standard commodity as revealed in the now widely available archival evidence. One feature of the approach in Carter’s essay is the adoption of the same method of exposition and inquiry as Sraffa, namely that of given quantities and simple algebra. This is important because it allows for an easy transfer to the arguments originally made by Sraffa both in PCMC as well as his archival notes.

CONCLUSION

We are at the cusp of tremendous change in Sraffa scholarship. The online availability of the archival material in its raw form is a very significant development indeed. Scholars from all walks and theoretical persuasions as well as informed lay-people alike can now study deeply the profound theoretical developments and insights of this mighty thinker. Unfettered, open and un-interpreted access to his archive is vital for a much-needed resurgence of interest in the theoretical and archival legacy of Piero Sraffa. In 2014 we published our first co-edited book that explored ‘surprises’ in the Sraffa archive.²⁵ In the Introduction to that work we informed interested readers of the excitement with which we – among others – felt as we sat at the Reader’s Table of the Wren Library for hours on end pouring over Sraffa’s fascinating archival material:

Among those regularly visiting the Cambridge archive were also many of us contributing to this volume, including the two authors of this Introduction. We, as others, were first curious as to what could be found in the archive, then somehow surprised by the documents we read: not only by the sheer amount of papers extant in contrast to the relatively few publications in his life, but also and especially by their content. The Sraffa Papers reveal a complex intellectual journey that has remained, it seems, mostly hidden to his friends, colleagues, and followers. We met an ‘other’ Sraffa, one different from the one usually transmitted by the literature certainly before his death but also left unchallenged for at least 15 years after his death; an ‘other’ Sraffa not in contrast with what he published, to be sure, but rather a Sraffa that could shine a different light on his printed articles and books. The opportunity to read the papers of this ‘other’ Sraffa was not one to be missed. (Bellofiore & Carter, 2014, p. 2)

It is certainly true that when we wrote these words we had no expectation that a few short years later Sraffa’s archival material would be available in the guise of professional grade high-quality colour digital images! We look forward now to all interested readers of the archive being able to finally understand the sentiments from our 2014 Introduction penned above as they work through the raw material themselves.

Sraffa’s book of less than 100 pages is subtitled *Prelude to a Critique of Economic Theory*. Note, however, that in the subtitle to the Italian version Sraffa did not employ the term *Preludio*, but opted instead for *Premesse* [*ad una critica della teoria economica*]. The Italian ‘premesse’ corresponds to the English *premises*. If we follow the *Oxford English Dictionary* the meaning is clear: a series of assertions or propositions which forms the *basis* for a work, a theory. This interpretation of the term *Prelude* is confirmed by the Preface, at p. vi, where Sraffa writes. ‘it is, however, a peculiar feature of the set of propositions now published that, although they do not enter into any discussion of the marginal theory of distribution, they have nevertheless been designed to serve as the basis for the critique of that theory. If the foundation holds, the critique may be attempted later, either by the writer or by someone younger and better equipped for the task.’

NOTES

1. The five members of John Maynard Keynes’s (1883–1946) Circus were Joan Robinson (1903–1983), Richard F. Kahn (1905–1989), E. Austin G. Robinson (1897–1993), Piero Sraffa (1898–1983) and James E. Meade (1907–1995).

2. See Signorino (2005) and Marcuzzo (2005) for the history of Sraffa’s 1928–1931 Lectures. *Lecture Notes on the Advanced Theory of Value* is archived as D2/4 and the file can be found on the Wren Library website. In Carter (2017) the Trinity 2.0 convention is introduced, and an alternative online presence of Sraffa’s archival material is made available at Carter’s academic website Heretical Sraffa (<http://www.sraffaarchive.org/>). Included there are Google slideshow presentation files which contains the images of text in tandem with a complete electronic transcription.

3. Including, as Marcuzzo (2005) writes, the ‘two special pupils’ Joan Robinson and Richard Kahn.

4. Archived according to Wren Trinity convention as D3/12/3, D3/12/5, D3/12/6, D3/12/10 and D3/12/11.

5. These folders are archived according to Wren Trinity as D3/12/7, D3/12/8 and D3/12/9.

6. For an interesting account of this period in Sraffa's life including references see Gehrke & Kurz (2002).

7. The Majorca draft is a fascinating 31-page handwritten manuscript which constitutes an advanced working draft of Part I of Sraffa's book (Single Product Industries). In this manuscript Sraffa restates and reformulates much of the material that he had been working on in the second period of scientific activity in the early 1940s. It is archived as D3/12/52; images of this file can be found on the Wren Library webpage http://trin-sites-pub.trin.cam.ac.uk/manuscripts/Sraffa_D3_12_52/manuscript.php?fullpage=1&startingpage=1, and Carter's Trinity 2.0 arrangement can be found on the Heretical Sraffa website (<http://www.sraffaarchive.org/>).

8. Stanfield (2001, pp. 8–9) recounts the story as follows:

About the same time [i.e. after Germany's surrender in the Second World War], in England, Galbraith arranged American military transportation for Piero Sraffa to return to his native Italy. Sraffa was convinced a revolution was imminent and, having convictions favouring such political action, he did not want to miss it. Had such a revolution occurred and Sraffa's role been prominent, Galbraith no doubt would have had some explaining to do. But knowing Sraffa, he concluded there was no cause to worry, for '[Sraffa] was one of the most leisured men who ever lived; a Communist revolution led by him would have shown no perceptible movement.' (1891, p. 74)

9. Although one of us (Carter) did with permission from Sraffa's literary executor procure in early 2013 a digital copy of the 115 files that comprise D3/12 *Notes on Production of Commodities*. These images are downloadable with the Trinity 2.0 arrangement at www.sraffaarchive.org; slides there link to the images on the Wren website and the interface between the various conventions is made meticulous and clear.

10. In an email exchange to Carter in 2015, Professor Roncaglia related his account of this as follows:

[W]hat I did in 1974–1975, with some help from John [Eatwell], was not a catalogue or an inventory, but simply a rough list of material in Sraffa's Trinity room, mainly with the aim of helping him to find things around and with the benefit, on my side, to talk with him on his manuscripts. Most of my time in Cambridge in that period (in all, a few weeks) was spent in preparing together with John [(and discussing with Sraffa)] an English translation of Sraffa's 1925 article. (Roncaglia to Carter, December 9, 2015; reproduced with permission)

11. A typed account of the Bharadwaj–Garegnani Catalogue can be found at Sraffa Papers J/14.

12. 'Sui manoscritti di Piero Sraffa', *Rivista Italiana degli Economisti*, April 1998.

13. Professor Garegnani is off a year on this date as the archive was open beginning in 1993.

14. After 1987...deterioration in Professor Bharadwaj's health hindered her work increasingly until her premature death in 1992, shortly before she had planned a visit to Italy, so we could resume work on the Sraffa manuscripts. (Garegnani, 2003, p. 624)

15. Geoff Harcourt's (1993–1994) memoir of Mrs. Bharadwaj in the *JPKE* recounts the trying time she had while engaged in this arrangement: 'The last time I saw Krishna for any length of time was when she came to Trinity in the middle and late 1980s to put some order into Piero Sraffa's papers; Piero had died in September 1983 and Pierangelo Garegnani, his literary executor, asked Krishna to help with this mammoth but vital

task. It was a time of great tension for Krishna for her love of Sraffa himself and her belief in the importance of his contributions obliged her, she thought, to take on this daunting task; yet she also felt keenly the sacrifice of time she would otherwise have spent working in India on pressing Indian problems. This created an insoluble dilemma for her, a sense of ambivalence and doubt as to whether she had done the right thing, made the correct choice, and I fear that the psychological trauma all this undoubtedly caused her was a significant factor leading to her final illness. Certainly I had never before seen her so agitated and unhappy, working – effectively as ever and for as long hours as ever, but without the usual resilience and *joie de vivre* that went with her sense of purpose and drive. It was desperately worrisome for her friends to see her health deteriorating under the strain; we could offer support but not really relieve her of the essential burden and pressure. I was glad to learn the other day (January 1993) that the papers are in order and catalogued, although not yet opened, for this is another vindication of Krishna's devotion and work – but at what a cost (Harcourt, 1993-1994, p. 308).

16. See this spelled out in Carter (2017). The Trinity 2.0 arrangement of the material is independent of the Wren Library's uploading of the material and the moniker 'Trinity 2.0' is not an indication of any formal connection therein. Rather the name was chosen to recognise the important work accomplished with the Wren Trinity arrangement as well as extending and developing the archival architecture from the foundations laid down by Smith in the early 1990s as interfaced with the inner-file arrangement of literally the two most capable economists to have engaged in that endeavour in Mrs. Bharadwaj and Professor Garegnani. A feature of Trinity 2.0 is the presentation of the colour digital image in a Google docs slideshow format containing a complete electronic transcription presented tandem to the image. Not only does this facilitate study, readers will also be able to conduct in-text searches and cut-and-paste for purpose of citation, etc. Note this is an on-going task and as of the date of publication of this Symposium around 10 per cent of the archive in D3/12 has been transcribed.

17. Pier Luigi Porta passed away in January 2016 from a long illness. His 2015 paper presented at the ASSA was among the last of his professional endeavours. Though one may disagree with some, or even many, points of his interpretation, he made a commendable battle for the openness of the Sraffa Archive. Another Sraffa scholar pressing for an open archive that we also lost in 2016 was Giorgio Gilibert who made significant contributions early-on with groundbreaking analyses of archival material (Gilibert, 2003, 2006).

18. The role of James Mill for this interpretation is first elaborated in Kurz (2006). In 1932 Sraffa wrote a 15-page continuous document of notes entitled 'Notes from James Mill' on a small notebook paper (approximately 3 × 5 inches in area); see D3/12/9:106-118.

19. In the special issue on Sraffa of the *Cambridge Journal of Economics* in 2012, one of the authors of the present Introduction observed that Kurz in his writings until 2002 downplayed the novelties coming from the Archive (Bellofiore, 2012). In his response in that issue, Kurz complains of a 'lack of evidence': but the smoking gun here is not something which was written, but rather something which was *not* written, namely the absence of any acknowledgement of the troubled path to the 1960s book. In the same period, other authors (e.g., de Vivo, 1998[2001], Bellofiore, 2001, Bellofiore-Potier, 1998 and afterwards Giorgio Gilibert, to name just a few) were already giving news about unexpected 'surprises' from the Archive. It is not true, as Kurz (2012) says, that the critique in Bellofiore (2008) was mostly based on his (Kurz's) work with Salvadori or Gehrke. Although it is true that Kurz gave full recognition to the importance of those papers published since 2005, Bellofiore's papers cited above already show things to be different; the same work of Bellofiore (2008) was based on a presentation Bellofiore gave in 2004 at the conference organised by Chiodi & Ditta where he labels Kurz a 'fundamentalist

Marxist': in fact, this is not quite right if one looks to the contemporary debate on Marx.

20. For a different (and more interesting) perspective, see Kurz's (1979) first reaction to Steedman in *Australian Economic Papers*.

21. 'Crosscap' is a two-page document Sraffa penned in 1942, archived as D3/12/16:17.1–17.2; it is written in Italian and the English translation can be found at Bellofiore (2008, note 18, pp. 89–90).

22. Some of these authors contributed to Bellofiore & Carter (2014) which includes a pluralism of perspectives that cannot be unified into a single position. The inability to distinguish among the different contributions of that book is a serious weakness of De Vivo's (2015) critical review in *Contributions to Political Economy*.

23. Dobb's position was based on an untenable distinction of 'stages of approximation' between values and prices, a distinction which has been actually destroyed by the Sraffa-based tradition. Meek (1967) (and later on, Eatwell, 1974, 1975) based the continuity argument on an even more disputable – at least for one of the editors of this collection of essays (see Bellofiore, 1989 for a criticism of Meek) – reference to the Standard commodity as the means to rescue the labour theory of value. Here again de Vivo (2015) seems not to grasp the difference between the authors he is criticising and the representatives of traditional Marxism. In his later years, another representative of traditional Marxism was much more willing to self-criticism: namely Paul Sweezy.

24. Here De Vivo (2015) commits a misattribution. He quotes our introduction to Bellofiore-Carter as saying: 'Some of their points on the labour theory of value must however be rejected outright, for example, the claim that the normalisation in §10 and §12 of Sraffa's book [the definitions of total labour employed as the unit amount of labour, and of the value of the net product as the unit amount of value] can be interpreted as an *explicit* endorsement of the labour theory of value' (De Vivo, 2015; 126; emphasis added). This phrase is nowhere to be found in our introduction. In the text quoted we rather say that normalisation in §10 and §12 can be interpreted as an *implicit* endorsement of the labour theory of value: which is a completely different statement. One of the authors of this introduction to this collection, however, finds some merit in de Vivo's quarrel just after the quote: 'It [the normalisation] certainly cannot (provide in itself an endorsement of the labour theory of value). A choice of units cannot represent an endorsement of any theory'. In fact, Bellofiore's (2014) chapter in Bellofiore and Carter (2014) argues precisely that it is not just that normalisation in itself that matters, but rather the fact that normalisation seems to follow quite naturally from Sraffa's 1940 note *On the use of the notion of surplus value* (archived as D3/12/46:57–63). Only through connecting the normalisation in PCMC to that Note (and other documents in the Archive) we can justify Sraffa's answers to Napoleoni and to John Eaton where he insists in using the language of *exploitation* in a Marxian fashion (the Eaton exchange is in a massive file of over 500 pages that contains correspondence after the publication of PCMC and is archived as D3/12/111:115-135; see also Carter & Lazzarini, 2013, pp. 190–191, and Bellofiore, 2014, pp. 1396–1398). De Vivo is however right when he writes: 'it is asserted (by Bellofiore) that income distribution may be influenced by price, but of course Sraffa shows that prices are influenced by distribution, not the other way around'. It is clearly a slip.

25. Readers are encouraged to consult the contribution by Jonathan Smith to that volume (Smith, 2014), as there he speaks as an archivist on the possibilities offered to scholars by 'surprises' from an archive as rich as Sraffa's.

REFERENCES

- Arena, R. (2015). Order, process and morphology: Sraffa and Wittgenstein. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 39, 1087–1108.
- Bellofiore, R. (1989). A monetary labor theory of value. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 21(1–2), 1–25.
- Bellofiore, R. (2001). Monetary analyses in Sraffa's writings: A comment on Panico. In T. Cozzi & R. Marchionatti (Eds.), *Piero Sraffa's political economy. A centenary estimate* (pp. 362–376). London: Routledge.
- Bellofiore, R. (2008). Sraffa after Marx: An open issue. In G. Chiodi & L. Ditta (Eds.), *Sraffa or an alternative economics* (pp. 68–92). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bellofiore, R. (2012). The “tiresome objector” and Old Moor: A renewal of the debate of Marx and Sraffa based on the unpublished material at the Wren Library. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 36(6), 1385–1399.
- Bellofiore, R. (2014). The loneliness of the long distance thinker: Sraffa, Marx, and the critique of economic theory. In R. Bellofiore & S. Carter (Eds.), *Towards a new understanding of Sraffa: Insights from archival research* (pp. 198–240). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bellofiore, R., & Carter, S. (2014). Introduction. In R. Bellofiore & S. Carter (Eds.), *Towards a new understanding of Sraffa: Insights from archival research* (pp. 1–8). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bellofiore, R., & Potier, J. P. (1998). Piero Sraffa: Nuovi elementi sulla biografia e sulla ricezione di *Produzione di merci* in Italia. *Il pensiero economico italiano*, VI(1), 7–55.
- Carter, S. (2014a). Sraffa and the standard commodity. In R. Bellofiore & S. Carter (Eds.), *Towards a new understanding of Sraffa: Insights from archival research* (pp. 47–68). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Carter, S. (2017). The Trinity 2.0 Arrangement of Sraffa Papers Section D3/12 Notes on Production of Commodities by Means of Commodities. Unpublished Manuscript. Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B39UtqpVdpxuY1F4cHRVX3o4ZGc>
- Carter, S., & Lazzarini, A. (2013). Sraffa, the general rate of profit, and the theory of the firm: A conjectural approach. In J. Moudud, C. Bina, & P. Mason (Eds.), *Alternative theories of competition: Challenges to the orthodoxy* (pp. 174–200). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Davis, J. (2012). The change in Sraffa's philosophical thinking. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 36, 1341–1356.
- de Vivo, G. (1998[2001]). Some notes on the Sraffa papers. In T. Cozzi & R. Marchionatti (Eds.), *Piero Sraffa's political economy. A centenary estimate* (pp. 157–164). London: Routledge. Originally published as (1998). Piero Sraffa. Torino: Presso la Fondazione Luigi Einaudi di Torino.
- de Vivo, G. (2000). *Produzione di merci a mezzo di merci*: Note sul percorso intellettuale di Sraffa. In M. Pivetti (a cura di), *Piero Sraffa. Contributi per una biografia intellettuale* (pp. 265–295). Roma: Carocci.
- de Vivo, G. (2003). Sraffa's path to *Production of Commodities by Means of Commodities*. An interpretation. *Contributions to Political Economy*, 22(1), 41–62.
- de Vivo, G. (2015). Review of towards a new understanding of Sraffa. Insights from archival research. R. Bellofiore & S. Carter (Eds.), (2014). *Towards a new understanding of Sraffa. Insights from archival research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. *Contributions to Political Economy* 34(1), 125–129.
- Eatwell, J. (1974). Theories of surplus value: Old and new. *Science and Society*, 38(3), 281–303.
- Eatwell, J. (1975). Mr. Sraffa's standard commodity and the rate of exploitation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 89(4), 543–555.
- Gailbraith, J. K. (1981). *Life in our times*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Garbellini, N., & Wirkierman, A. (2010). Pasinetti's structural change and economic growth: A conceptual excursus. *Universit' a Cattolica del Sacro Cuore*, Gruppo PRIN 2007.

- Garegnani, P. (2003). On Piero Sraffa's manuscripts, English translation of an edited version of a paper published in April 1998 in *Rivista italiana degli economisti*, the Journal of the Società Italiana degli Economisti. In H. Kurz & N. Salvadori (Eds.), *The legacy of Piero Sraffa*, two vols. In *Intellectual legacies in modern economics* (pp. 623–625). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Garegnani, P. (2005). On a turning point in Sraffa's theoretical and interpretative position in the late 1920's. *European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 12(3), 453–492.
- Gattei, G., & Gozzi, G. (2010). Sraffa come economista classico: Una congettura possibile? *Il Pensiero Economico Italiano*, 27, 75–88.
- Gehrke, C., & Kurz, H. D. (2002). Keynes and Sraffa's 'difficulties with J. H. Hollander. *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 9(4), 644–671.
- Gilibert, G. (2003). The equations unveiled: Sraffa's price equations in the making. *Contributions to Political Economy*, 22, 27–40.
- Gilibert, G. (2006). The "Man from the Moon": Sraffa's upside-down approach to the theory of value. *Contributions to Political Economy*, 25, 35–48.
- Ginzburg, A. (2015). Two Translators: Gramsci and Sraffa. *Contributions to Political Economy*, 34, 31–76.
- Han, Z., & Schefold, B. (2006). An empirical investigation of paradoxes: Reswitching and reverse capital deepening in capital theory. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 30(5), 737–765.
- Harcourt, G. (1993-4). Krishna Bharadwaj, August 21, 1935–March 9, 1992: A memoir. *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, 6(2), 299–311.
- Kurz, H. (1979). Sraffa after Marx. *Australian Economic Papers*, 18(32), 52–70.
- Kurz, H. (2006). The agents of production are the commodities themselves. On the classical theory of production, distribution and value. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 17, 1–26.
- Kurz, H. (2009). Preparing the edition of Piero Sraffa's unpublished papers and correspondence. *Cahiers d'économie Politique/Papers in Political Economy*, 2(57), 261–278.
- Kurz, H. (2012). Don't treat too ill my Piero: Interpreting Sraffa's papers. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 36, 1535–1569.
- Kurz, H. D., & Salvadori, N. (2005). Representing the production and circulation of commodities in material terms: On Sraffa's objectivism. *Review of Political Economy*, 17(3), 413–441.
- Kurz, H. D., & Salvadori, N. (2010). Sraffa and the labour theory of value. In J. Vint, J. S. Metcalfe, H. Kurz, N. Salvadori, & S. Samuelson (Eds.), *Economic theory and economic thought: Essays in honour of Ian Steedman* (pp. 187–213). London: Routledge.
- Marcuzzo, M. C. (2005). Piero Sraffa at the University of Cambridge. *European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 12(3), 425–452.
- Meek, R. (1967). *Economics and ideology and other essays: Studies in the development of economic thought*. London: Chapman and Hall.
- Pasinetti, L. L. (1981). *Structural change and economic growth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pasinetti, L. L. (2005a). The Sraffa enigma. *European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 12(3), 373–378.
- Pasinetti, L. L. (2005b). The Cambridge School of Keynesian economics. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 29, 837–848.
- Pasinetti, L. L. (2012). Piero Sraffa and the future of economics. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 36(6), 1303–1314.
- Perri, S. (2010). From "the loaf of bread" to "commodity fetishism": A 'New Interpretation' of the Marx–Sraffa connection. *History of Economic Ideas*, 18, 55–81.
- Perri, S. (2014). The standard system and the tendency of the (maximum) rate of profit to fall – Marx and Sraffa: There and back. In R. Bellofiore & S. Carter (Eds.), *Towards a new understanding of Sraffa: Insights from archival research* (pp. 94–120). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Porta, P. L. (2015). *The formative stages of Piero Sraffa's Research Program*. Paper presented at the Allied Social Science Association Annual (ASSA) Conference, San Francisco.

- Preti, D. (2014). On the Neocardian criticism of irrelevance. In R. Bellofiore & S. Carter (Eds.), *Towards a new understanding of Sraffa: Insights from archival research* (pp. 25–46). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Roncaglia, A. (1978). *Sraffa and the theory of prices*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Roncaglia, A. (2017). Review of Ajit Sinha (2016). *Revolution in Economic Theory: The Economics of Piero Sraffa. Contributions to Political Economy* (forthcoming).
- Samuelson, P. A. (2000). Revisionist findings on Sraffa. In H. Kurz (Ed.), *Critical essays on Piero Sraffa's legacy in economics* (pp. 25–44). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schefold, B. (2013). Only a few techniques matter! On the number of curves on the wage frontier. In E. Levrero, A. Palumbo, & A. Stirati (Eds.), *Sraffa and the reconstruction of economic theory: Volume one, theories of value and distribution* (pp. 46–69). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schefold, B. (2016). *Marx, the Production Function and the Old Neoclassical Equilibrium: Workable under the Same Assumptions?* With an Appendix on the Likelihood of Reswitching and of Wicksell Effects. Centro Sraffa Working Papers, n. 18, March 2016, 57 pp., online as Centro Sraffa working papers, ISSN: 2284–2845.
- Signorino, R. (2005). Piero Sraffa's *Lectures on the Advanced Theory of Value, 1928-31* and the rediscovery of the Classical approach. *Review of Political Economy*, 17, 359–380.
- Smith, J. (1998). An archivist's apology: The papers of Piero Sraffa at Trinity College Cambridge. *Il Pensiero Economico Italiano*, 6, 36–54.
- Smith, J. (2012). Circuitous processes, jigsaw puzzles, and indisputable results: Making the best use of the manuscripts of Sraffa's Production of Commodities by Means of Commodities. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 36(6), 1291–1301.
- Smith, J. (2014). Surprise in the archive: Reactions to Sraffa's papers. In R. Bellofiore & S. Carter (Eds.), *Towards a new understanding of Sraffa: Insights from archival research* (pp. 9–21). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stanfield, J. R. (2001). The useful economist. In M. Keaney (Ed.), *Economist with a public purpose: Essays in honour of John Kenneth Galbraith* (pp. 7–24). London: Routledge.