



## The President and Fellows of Harvard College

---

DMYTRO ČYŽEVSKYJ, IN MEMORIAM (23 MARCH 1894 - 18 APRIL 1977)

Author(s): Omeljan Pritsak and Ihor Ševčenko

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (September 1977), pp. 379-406

Published by: [Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41035752>

Accessed: 30/09/2014 19:05

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and The President and Fellows of Harvard College are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Harvard Ukrainian Studies.*

<http://www.jstor.org>

## CHRONICLE

### DMYTRO ČYŽEVS'KYJ, *IN MEMORIAM*

(23 MARCH 1894-18 APRIL 1977)

Dmytro Čyževs'kyj (Tschizewskij), one of the last universal Slavic scholars and the leading authority on Ukrainian literature and philology, passed away in Heidelberg, Germany, on 18 April 1977. For several decades his towering personality had dominated all the major aspects of Slavic studies, especially in Germany, his adopted country.

#### I

Dmytro Čyževs'kyj was born on 23 March 1894, in the southern Ukrainian town of Oleksandrija (Kirovohrad oblast), once the Zaporozhian winter-quarters of Usivka. His was a new Ukrainian Cossack gentry family. Its founder, Petro Lazarevyč Čyževs'kyj, of humble origin, possessed the gift of a fine tenor voice. Along with other musically talented young Ukrainians (e.g., the Rozum-Rozumovs'kyjs), he was drafted into the Imperial choir in St. Petersburg during the relaxed reign of Elizabeth Petrovna (1741-1762). Petro soon became a renowned court singer (*pridvornyj tenorist*), and in 1743 was rewarded with hereditary nobility.

During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the Čyževs'kyj family had two branches—the Poltava and the Oleksandrija. The most interesting representative of the former was Pavlo Ivanovyč Čyževs'kyj (1860-1925), a follower of Myxajlo Drahomanov (1841-1895) and an uncle of Dmytro Čyževs'kyj. Together with his fellow student Volodymyr Vernads'kyj (1863-1945), who became the world famous scientist and philosopher, first president of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Kiev, and father of the historian George Vernadsky (1887-1973), Pavlo helped to smuggle illegal publications from Geneva into the Ukraine. Pavlo Čyževs'kyj was elected to the First Duma (1906) from the Poltava Government, and organized its Ukrainian faction. He was active during the Ukrainian Revolution, and in

1919 headed the Ukrainian trade mission to Switzerland, where he had once studied. His theoretical work *Osnovy ukrajins'koji deržavnosti* was published in Vienna in 1921.

Dmytro's father, Ivan Kostjantynovyč Čyževs'kyj, was born into the Oleksandrija branch of the family. In 1887, during the reactionary regime of Alexander III (1881-1894), Ivan's liberal views led to his arrest and a two-year imprisonment. Afterwards he was deported to northern Russia and, subsequently, confined to his estates in Oleksandrija. Like other noble families of the Ukraine, the Čyževs'kyjs of the Oleksandrija branch spent the "social season" in St. Petersburg. There Ivan Čyževs'kyj had met the Ukrainian noblewoman and painter Marija Jeršova, whom he married after his return from exile. Their son, Dmytro, was born on his father's estates.

Dmytro Čyževs'kyj was fond of saying that he inherited an interest in science and politics from his father and a love of literature, art, and music from his mother. Most of the unusually gifted boy's education took place at home, although he did attend the local primary school and, from 1904 to 1911, the classical gymnasium in Oleksandrija, which offered instruction in Latin and Greek. Dmytro later recalled that his teachers at the gymnasium did not stimulate his interests; instead, he relied extensively on his parents' library, which was rich in books on science, philosophy and literature.

The young boy was growing up during an exciting time—that of the first Russian Revolution (1905) and the aborted attempt to establish a constitutional regime in the empire. His father again became involved in politics, now as a member of the Russian Constitutional Democrat (Kadet) Party, and was elected mayor of Oleksandrija. Dmytro's own developing political interests led him to organize literary and political circles, legal and illegal, among his schoolmates. In 1912, according to his colleague, later the historian Panas Fedenko (b. 1893), Dmytro headed a successful intrigue against a Russifying priest.

\* \* \*

In the spring of 1911 Dmytro Čyževs'kyj passed his final school examinations (*attestat zrelosti*) with distinction. That fall he entered the university at St. Petersburg, where for the next two years (1911-1913) he studied mathematics, astronomy and, secondarily, philosophy. In 1912 he published the first of his scholarly articles on astronomy in the new journal *Izvestija Russkogo občestva ljubitelej*

*mirovedenija*. The young student's strongest interest, however, was captured by the lectures on metaphysics of his professor of philosophy, Nikolaj Onufrievič Losskij (1870-1965).

Having become convinced that although mathematics "knows," it is philology (*slovesnist'*) which really propels human life,<sup>1</sup> Čyževs'kyj decided that philosophy combined with literature should be his field of endeavor. Subsequently, he left St. Petersburg for Kiev, where the university was then one of the best in the empire. Here the eager young student could satisfy his manifold scholarly interests. He studied at Kiev University from 1913 until 1917, devoting himself mainly to philosophy and "Russian philology," and secondarily to Indo-European linguistics and Slavic philology.

In Kiev, two teachers of philosophy had a great influence on Dmytro. The first was Vasyl' Vasyl'ovyč Zin'kivs'kyj [Zen'kovskij, Zenkovsky] (1881-1962), a young docent with a Gogolian-like divided soul (Russian and Ukrainian) who was to remain Čyževs'kyj's friend for life.<sup>2</sup> When they met Zin'kivs'kyj had just published his first major work, *The Problem of Psychological Causality*, in which he, contrary to Durkheim and Freud, stressed the independence of religious experience. A follower of "the philosophy of heart" developed by the Ukrainian philosopher at Moscow University, Pamfil Danylovyč Jurkevyc (1827-1874), Zin'kivs'kyj introduced Dmytro Čyževs'kyj to the work of Jurkevyc, as well to that of Hryhorij Skovoroda (1722-1794), Mykola Hohol'/Nikolaj Gogol' (1809-1852), and Taras Ševčenko (1814-1861). The second philosopher to influence Dmytro was Oleksij Nykytyč Hiljarov [Giljarov] (1856-1938), the scholar of Plato and Fechner who developed a special sophiological system of synechology.

Heorhij Ivanovyč Čelpanov (1862-1936), psychologist, logician and author of the remarkable *Brain and Psyche*, taught at Kiev from 1892 until 1907, when he left for Moscow University. Although he did not work with him, Dmytro Čyževs'kyj nevertheless regarded himself as Čelpanov's student and maintained an interest in logic

<sup>1</sup> See the reminiscences of R. Pletner in *Novyj žurnal* (New York), 1977, no. 128, p. 268.

<sup>2</sup> In 1918 Zin'kivs'kyj served as minister of religious affairs in the cabinet of F. Lyzohub during the Hetmanate of Pavlo Skoropads'kyj. Later he became professor and rector of the Orthodox Theological Institute in Paris. Among his works was a standard, two-volume history of Russian philosophy (Eng. trans., New York and London, 1953).

throughout his life. During his student years in Kiev, Dmytro also studied the work of Hegel intensively and later became intrigued by the new current in West European philosophical thought, the phenomenology of Husserl.

In the field of "Russian" (i.e., Middle Russian and Middle Ukrainian) literature and philology, Kiev was then the empire's leading center. In the years 1903-1914, the relevant chair at Kiev University was held by Volodymyr Mykolajevyč Peretc (1870-1935), who in 1907 began conducting his famous literary seminar. Unfortunately for the avid young scholar who had just begun to study under him, by 1914 Peretc had already been elected member of the Imperial Academy and left for St. Petersburg. But five of his former students divided the field of their mentor and carried on his tradition. One of them, Oleksandr Adrijanovyč Nazarevs'kyj (b. 1887), wrote a monograph on Puškin and Goethe which apparently led Dmytro Čyževs'kyj to investigate the influence of Friedrich Schiller on Russian literature.

The popularity of West European literary topics in Kiev was largely due to the scholar of comparative German and Romance literature Mykola Pavlovyč Daškevyč (1852-1908), who taught in Kiev from 1877 to 1908. Slavic literature as a scholarly discipline was established there by two leading scholars in the field—Oleksandr Oleksandrovych Kotljarevs'kyj (1837-1881), from 1875, and Tymofij Dmytrovyč Floryns'kyj [Florinskij] (1854-1919), from 1882. Slavic philology was the domain of Mykola Kuz'myč Hruns'kyj (1872-1951), who became a professor of the field in 1910. Comparative Indo-European linguistics was taught by the Sanskritist Fedir Ivanovyč Knauer (1849-1918).

\* \* \*

Dmytro Čyževs'kyj passed his general examinations in Kiev in 1918. His candidate's dissertation on the philosophical development of Schiller was written in 1919; one section was later published in German (*Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie*, 1929, no. 6, pp. 1-42).

\* \* \*

During his student years Dmytro Čyževs'kyj took active part in the revolutionary movement. Like many young noblemen, he became a Marxist. His work in organizing workers and membership in the Russian Social Democratic Party (Mensheviks) led to imprisonment by the regime in 1916. He served his sentence until the March revolution of 1917, and for a year thereafter edited a Menshevik

newspaper. In 1919 he married a fellow party member, Lidija Israelovna Maršak [Marshak] of Kiev, who later became a physician.<sup>3</sup> During the Ukrainian Revolution he was a member of the Russian faction of the Central Rada's governing board (*Mala Rada*). As one of its four "minority" representatives, he made history, on 22 January 1918, by voting against the proclamation of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.<sup>4</sup>

Dmytro Čyževs'kyj's political affiliation with the Russian Social Democrats and, from 1921, with the German Social Democrats continued until 1924. In 1926 Čyževs'kyj set aside his commitment to politics for an involvement in the German Christian ecumenical movement, which continued to the end of his life.

\* \* \*

In 1920, the faculty of Mme. Žekulina's private women's institute in Kiev elected Dmytro Čyževs'kyj docent in general linguistics. The following year his alma mater, Kiev University, which had just become the Kiev Pedagogical Institute, invited him to become docent in philosophy. Before he could deliver his first lecture, however, Čyževs'kyj was arrested and sent to a detention camp. Miraculously, he escaped, in circumstances described by his first German student of philosophy, Dr. Wolfgang Berkefeld, in the Festschrift *Orbis Scriptus* (Munich [1966], p. 30). Having illegally crossed the Polish-Soviet border, he arrived in Heidelberg on 13 May 1921.

In leaving his country Dmytro Čyževs'kyj opted for Germany for reasons we will note later. The University of Heidelberg itself was not his choice as an academic affiliation: he went there only because it was the home of his brother-in-law, the sociologist Jacob Marshak (1899-1977), who had studied with Max Weber (1864-1920) and was later to work in the United States. Čyževs'kyj remained in Heidelberg only two semesters (spring 1921 - fall 1921/22), attending the lectures of the philosopher, psychologist, and founder of existentialism Karl Jaspers (1883-1969). His intent, however, was to go to Freiburg im Breisgau and study under Edmund Husserl (1859-1938), the founder of phenomenology whose philosophy had intrigued him as a student in Kiev. The plan was put into action in the spring of 1922:

<sup>3</sup> The Čyževs'kyjs had a daughter, Tatjana, raised by her mother, who is presently professor of Slavic languages at Wayne State University.

<sup>4</sup> It has not been established whether the action was based on his own decision or party directives.

Čyževs'kyj went to Freiburg and remained there until the winter of 1923-24.

During that time the little university town in southern Germany had a unique intellectual atmosphere, due to the leading philosophers and talented students who had flocked there to work with Husserl. In Freiburg Čyževs'kyj could study with not only Husserl, but Martin Heidegger (1889-1976), founder of the philosophy of the "meaning of being" who in 1928 became Husserl's successor; Jonas Cohn (1869-1947), representative of neo-Kantian perceptive-critical idealism and renowned authority on aesthetics; Richard Kroner (1884-1974), the neo-Hegelian who developed a new approach to German philosophy from Kant to Hegel; and Julius Ebbinghaus (b. 1885), a Hegelian who became a strict Kantian. Among Čyževs'kyj's fellow students were the German-Russian philosopher Fedor Stepun (1884-1965), who became his lifelong friend, and the Polish phenomenologist and theoretician of literature, Roman Ingarden (1893-1970).

Four semesters of philosophizing in the illustrious circle headed by Husserl was as much as the refugee could afford: Čyževs'kyj was then obliged to look for gainful employment. His doctoral thesis on Hegel in Russia, begun under the direction of Kroner in 1924, was not completed and defended until 5 July 1933, in Halle. His official new *Doktor-Vater* became Professor Adhémar Gelb (1887-1936), the Moscow-born *Gestaltpsychologe* of the Berlin School.<sup>5</sup> Čyževs'kyj's three obligatory fields of concentration were philosophy, Indo-European linguistics, and church history. He completed his studies *summa cum laude*.

\* \* \*

In the early 1920s, Ukrainian political émigrés who had settled in Prague established, with financial support from the Czechoslovak government, several private institutions of higher learning, among them the Ukrainian Free University (1920) and the Myxajlo Drachomanov Higher Pedagogical Institute (1923). The institute required a specialist in philosophy and, in 1924, invited Dmytro Čyževs'kyj

<sup>5</sup> The second reader of the dissertation was the professor of philosophy Paul Menzer (b. 1873). In the official *vita* added to his dissertation, Čyževs'kyj emphasized the help he received from Emil Utitz (1883-1956), the philosopher of culture who studied with F. Brentano and taught in Halle from 1925-1934. Another local scholar with whom Čyževs'kyj was in close academic and personal contact was Julius Stenzel (1883-1935), the eminent specialist on Plato.

to join the school's faculty. He did so as lecturer, soon becoming docent (1925) and professor (1926). Thereafter Čyževs'kyj completed his habilitation dissertation, "Hegel i francuz'ka revoljucija" [Hegel and the French Revolution], defending it at the Ukrainian Free University in 1929. This gave him the status of a "Privat-Dozent" at the university, with the right to teach without salary. In 1932 the university granted him a rank equivalent to associate professor.

In the interwar years Prague was intellectually an exciting city. As the capital of a newly established country—culturally the most advanced of Slavic nations and geographically in the heart of Europe, with a democratic government under the leadership of the scholar-philosopher T. G. Masaryk (1850-1937)—Prague became a haven for political refugees from Eastern Europe. To its two existing universities, Czech and German, were added many other schools, including the Ukrainian Free University and the Russian Populist University. The Ukrainian Historical-Philological Society and the Russian Philosophical Society were also active at the time. Dmytro Čyževs'kyj joined these societies, and his association stimulated him to write a history and a historiography of Ukrainian philosophy.<sup>6</sup>

In 1926 the Prague Linguistic Circle was created. The new society initiated original developments in information theory, especially in linguistics (structuralism) and literature (formalism). Among its founders and activists were Vilém Mathesius (1892-1945), Jan Mukařovský (1891-1975), Prince Nikolaj Sergeevič Trubetzkoy (1890-1938) and Roman Jakobson (b. 1896). The circle proved to be an excellent forum for mutual intellectual enrichment. The correspondence of its leader, Prince N. Trubetzkoy, shows that Čyževs'kyj was considered an authority in logic and the psychology of language.<sup>7</sup> For his part, Čyževs'kyj later declared that he learned much about linguistics and the theory of literature from fellow members Prince N. Trubetzkoy, R. Jakobson, and J. Mukařovský.

\* \* \*

<sup>6</sup> Čyževs'kyj maintained close ties with the Russian intellectuals who had emigrated to Prague, Paris, and Belgrade. Among them were such eminent figures as Fr. Sergej Nikolaevič Bulgakov (1871-1944), philosopher and dogmatist who had studied with Vladimir Solov'ev; Pëtr Bergardovič Struve (1871-1944), philosopher who became a brilliant political theorist; and Simon Ljudvigovič Frank (1877-1950), founder of the most profound philosophical system in Russian thought.

<sup>7</sup> *N. S. Trubetzkoy's Letters and Notes*, ed. by Roman Jakobson et al. (The Hague, 1975), pp. 153, 158, 213, 311, 401.



While working in Prague, Dmytro Čyževs'kyj maintained his ties with scholarly institutions and societies in Germany. He was elected member of two prestigious philosophical associations—the Hegelbund and the Kant Gesellschaft. He also became corresponding fellow, upon its establishment in 1926, of the Ukrainian Research Institute in Berlin. In 1927 Čyževs'kyj began contributing to the leading Slavic journal *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie*; subsequently, hardly an issue appeared without his work. A close fellowship developed between Čyževs'kyj and Max Vasmer (1886-1962), the journal's editor-in-chief. Čyževs'kyj later said that he benefited greatly from the erudition of this eminent philologist and Slavicist. Undoubtedly, this fellowship, along with his involvement in the Prague Linguistic Circle and subsequent lectureship in Russian, helped direct Čyževs'kyj's interests from philosophy to Slavic philology.

It was the deteriorating economic situation of émigré scholarly institutions which prompted Čyževs'kyj to accept an invitation from the University of Halle a. d. Saale to become lecturer in Russian. He returned to Germany in 1932. Within a year, however, his chances for advancement in that country were cut short as Hitler came to power. For Čyževs'kyj was not only a foreigner in Germany, but one married to a Jew (*jüdisch versippt*). Until the end of the Second World War, Čyževs'kyj remained a non-tenured lecturer who could be dismissed on a day's notice. From August 1941 to 1945 he was forbidden to leave the city of Halle without special permission from the German political police.

Nevertheless, by the war's end Čyževs'kyj had established himself as the leading Slavicist at Halle and at Jena, where he taught without stipend from 1935 to 1938. His courses encompassed all aspects of Slavic studies—languages, philology, literature, intellectual history, church history. Even though he lacked the status of a German *ordinarius* (full professor), Čyževs'kyj attracted gifted students interested in these fields. For their intellectual benefit he instituted two private circles, one of philosophy, active until 1941, and the other of Slavic studies,<sup>8</sup> which produced several leading Slavicists, including Dietrich Gerhardt and Ludolf Müller. Until 1939 Čyževs'kyj was able to continue his ties in Prague, with the German Charles University, as corresponding fellow of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für slavistische Forschung from 1931, and with the Czech Charles University, as

<sup>8</sup> The latter is vividly described by Wolfgang Berkefeld in *Orbis Scriptus*, pp. 27-33.

fellow of the Slovanský Ústav from 1932. In 1934 the Ukrainian Scientific Institute at the University of Warsaw published Čyževs'kyj's monograph, *Filosofija H.S. Skovorody*. Two years later, the work resulted in Čyževs'kyj's election as fellow of the most prestigious Ukrainian scholarly institution of the time—the Naukove tovarystvo im. Ševčenka in L'viv.

\* \* \*

Events at the war's end forced Dmytro Čyževs'kyj to leave Halle, where he had collected an enormous specialized library. His destination was Marburg/Lahn, where his friend Ernst Benz taught the history of Eastern churches. In November 1945, Čyževs'kyj was appointed *Lehrbeauftragter* for Slavic philology and acting director of the newly established Slavic Seminar at the University of Marburg.<sup>9</sup> The hoped-for invitation to the university's chair of Slavic studies did not materialize, so in 1949 Čyževs'kyj accepted an offer from Harvard to be visiting lecturer in that university's Slavic department. He remained at Harvard until 1956, teaching Slavic (including Ukrainian) subjects and associating with old colleagues, such as Roman Jakobson, Archpriest George Florovsky (b. 1893), and Alexander Gershenkron, and new ones, such as Horace G. Lunt, Wiktor Weintraub, and George Y. Shevelov.

Dmytro Čyževs'kyj was much too rooted in the German scholarly tradition, however, to adapt readily to the American milieu. In 1956 he returned to Germany to accept the Slavic chair at the University of Heidelberg, his first German alma mater. Six years later, in 1962, he was elected fellow of the Heidelberg Academy of Arts and Sciences and, some time later, fellow of the Croatian Academy in Zagreb.

It was Čyževs'kyj's tragic fate never to hold a position which carried financial security. Between 1938 and 1941, his candidacy was seriously considered by the universities of Brno, Vienna and Bratislava, but his political status foreclosed such opportunities. In 1939 Columbia University invited him to become a visiting professor, but

<sup>9</sup> After 1945, Čyževs'kyj renewed his association with Ukrainian scholarly and educational institutions in the diaspora, some of which had been transferred from Prague to Munich and others of which were created in Munich-Augsburg. He again became professor of philosophy at the Ukrainian Free University (1945-1949 and 1956-1963), and was appointed professor of philosophy and logic at the Pedagogical Academy of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (1946-1949). In 1945 Čyževs'kyj became a founding member of the Ukrainian Free Academy of Arts and Sciences in Augsburg.

the war intervened. After 1945, Čyževs'kyj was again the top candidate for chairs of Slavic studies at several German universities. Through misunderstandings and happenstance, however, he missed his chance at all of them, including the Marburg Chair of Slavistics.<sup>10</sup>

Unfortunately, at the time he joined the Heidelberg faculty (1956) Čyževs'kyj had already passed the age of 60, which precluded his appointment as full professor. His status remained that of a visiting professor, not entitled to retirement pay. As a result, after his retirement in 1964 until his death, financial need required Čyževs'kyj to accept temporary, part-time teaching appointments at the universities of Cologne (from 1968) and Heidelberg, as well as editorial obligations with the Wilhelm Fink Verlag of Munich.<sup>11</sup>

## II

In responding to the toast of his friend, Fedor Stepun, at the celebration of his seventieth birthday, Dmytro Čyževs'kyj observed: "When, on 13 May 1921, I first arrived in Heidelberg, I compiled a list of projects for my future work. Since then, nearly each project on the list has appeared in print, with one exception: a work on Schiller in Russia, of which I could publish only fragments ... the reason for this is the lack of the necessary sources in European libraries" (*Orbis Scriptus*, p. 25). This personal statement reveals Čyževs'kyj to be what he was—a tireless scholar who worked according to a precise schedule and maintained exacting discipline. Indeed, one would expect no less from the trained logician he had become.

In his lifetime, Čyževs'kyj's colleagues often marveled over the unusual breadth of his interests and the encyclopaedic character of his scholarship. The obituary of Čyževs'kyj by John Fizer went so far as to characterize him as a "renaissance man in a non-renaissance

<sup>10</sup> These circumstances did not, however, prevent Čyževs'kyj from attending scores of international and national (German, Czech, Polish, American) conferences of philosophers, Slavists, linguists and church historians, where he usually presented stimulating papers and took active part in discussions.

<sup>11</sup> From 1957 Čyževs'kyj was editor-in-chief or co-editor of several series in Slavic studies: *Musagetes Contributions to the History of Slavic Literatures and Culture* (The Hague, Mouton); *Apophoreta Slavica* (The Hague, Mouton); *Heidelberger Slavische Texte* (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz); *Slavistische Studienbücher* (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz); *Slavische Propyläen: Texte in Neu- und Nachdrucken* (Munich, Fink); *Forum Slavicum* (Munich, Fink).

age.”<sup>12</sup> Yet, one can question such a view, especially if one examines the underlying structure of Čyževs’kyj’s work.

As a young man, Čyževs’kyj’s major aim was to understand the contemporary intellectual milieu in his own state, the Russian Empire, and among his own people, the Ukrainians. The milieu reflected the secular thought which began to penetrate Eastern Europe in the sixteenth to eighteenth century, but took root only at the beginning of the nineteenth century, after the establishment of Western-type universities in the empire. Study of this secular civilization required knowledge of the material world (astronomy and other sciences) as well as of theoretical concepts (philosophy and theology), instruments of thought (logic and language), and the intellectual production of Western Europe, beginning with the Renaissance.

Čyževs’kyj devoted his first scholarly efforts to astronomy and mathematics (1912-1914) and then turned to philosophy, especially Greek and German transcendental idealism, and philology. From his early student years Čyževs’kyj was an exceptionally gifted bibliophile and bibliographer. Although he wrote several studies in theoretical fields such as logic, ethics, philosophy of language, philosophy of history and psychology of language—which led his teacher, V. Zin’kivs’kyj, to “sense” a system in these writings—Čyževs’kyj did not believe it necessary to develop his own philosophical system. For he considered the study of philosophy to be merely a prelude to his real area of endeavor, the *Geistesgeschichte* of Eastern Europe.

In Čyževs’kyj’s view, the intellectual make-up of the Ukraine and the Russian Empire had two basic roots, both German in origin: the German transcendental (idealistic) philosophy of the eighteenth to nineteenth century, and the German mysticism and pietism of the sixteenth to eighteenth century. French rationalism and the Enlightenment, especially Cartesianism as represented by Nicholas de Malebranche (1638-1715), played only a secondary role. Therefore, in 1921, when Čyževs’kyj had the opportunity to go to Paris (France was then the haven of émigrés from Imperial Russia, and the home of his mother-in-law), he opted instead for Germany, the source of his country’s intellectual roots.

These roots, German idealistic philosophy and German Romanticism, were typified by their respective exponents, figures who greatly

<sup>12</sup> *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* 13 (1977): 370.

influenced intellectual thought in the Russian Empire in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. They were the poet, dramatist and thinker Friedrich von Schiller (1759-1805), and the founder of the phenomenology of mind George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831). The work of Hegel and, to a lesser degree, Schiller was to occupy Čyževs'kyj throughout his scholarly career. The philosophy of Schiller, as we already know, was the topic of his first candidate's dissertation, and that of Hegel, of his other two academic dissertations—habilitation and Dr. Phil. The revision of the latter, published under the title *Hegel in Russland/Gegel v Rossii* [Hegel in Russia], became the *magnum opus* of Čyževs'kyj's scholarly production.

During Čyževs'kyj's *Lehrjahre* the most attractive philosophical theory in Germany was the phenomenology of Husserl. Čyževs'kyj had become interested in the theory while still a student in Kiev. However, after going to Freiburg, he chose as his academic adviser not Husserl, but Richard Kroner, an authority on German idealistic philosophy, particularly the theories of Hegel.

Another major immediate claimant to the Kantian succession was Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling (1775-1854), whose *Naturphilosophie* enjoyed great popularity in the Russian Empire during the first half of the nineteenth century, especially in the Ukraine, at the University of Xarkiv. Several studies by Čyževs'kyj dealt specifically with Schelling's influence. Moreover, the influence of German Romanticism on Puškin, Tjutčev, Gogol' and Dostoevskij were time and again the subjects of his studies and notes (*Lesefrüchte*), which appeared periodically in the *ZfslPh*.

Prior to the nineteenth century, the only great figure in East European philosophy was a Ukrainian, Hryhorij Skovoroda (1722-1794), whose philosophical system was disguised as literature. Skovoroda's writings, composed in the Baroque style, were permeated with the ideas of German mysticism and pietism. These same ideas were the major source of German idealistic philosophy.

German Protestant mysticism was the first form of mysticism known to Ukrainians and Russians. Čyževs'kyj discovered that Skovoroda was familiar with the work of the German mystic poets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, such as Valentin Weigel (1533-1588), Johann Arndt (1555-1621), Jakob Böhme (1575-1624) and Angelus Silesius (1624-1677), as well as with that of the German pietists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, especially Gottfried Arnold (1666-1714) and Friedrich Oetinger (1702-1782). Two

factors accounted for the appeal of German mysticism to the Orthodox of Eastern Europe. First, it was, at least externally, Protestant, not Catholic, in character. Secondly, and what is of greater importance here, it retained the presecular character of its sources: on the one hand, German medieval Catholic mysticism, as represented by Meister Eckhart (c. 1260-1328), Johann Tauler (c. 1300-1328) and Heinrich Seuse (c. 1296-1366); and, on the other, neoplatonism.

Whereas German mysticism reached Muscovy through the Ukrainian literature of Skovoroda, German pietism found its way to both the Ukraine and Muscovy independently. The pietists began journeying to Moscow in the mid-seventeenth century. Although such visits often ended tragically (e.g., Quirinus Kuhlmann [b. 1651] was killed in Moscow in 1689), the pietists nevertheless succeeded in establishing the first intellectual contacts between Muscovy and the West. The pietist educator August Hermann Francke (1663-1727) made his "rugged school" in Halle the center of pietist activities for the Slavic countries. Fortunately, the school, officially called "die Frankesche Stiftungen," maintained extensive archives and a rich library.

When, in 1931-1932, he had the option to be a lecturer at either Bonn or Halle, Čyževs'kyj opted for Halle because he wanted to do research in the pietists' archives. There his systematic work was rewarded with the greatest discovery of his life: in 1935 he happened upon the manuscript, lost one hundred and fifty years earlier, of the major opus of the Czech educational reformer, theologian and poet Jan Amos Komenský (Comenius, 1592-1670), who had stayed in Halle during his wanderings in religious exile. Called *De rerum humanarum emendatione consultatio catholica* (in abbreviation referred to as *Panaugia*) the work comprised three huge volumes. Together they present a compendium of philosophy which argues for the establishment of central places of learning devoted to all fields of knowledge.

In 1926, Čyževs'kyj's original plan—to study Ukrainian and Russian philosophy and *Geistesgeschichte*—was enlarged to encompass the history of philosophy among all other Slavic peoples, particularly the Czechs, Slovaks, and Croats.

Study of the sources of German idealism, analysis of the work of Skovoroda, and investigation of the work of Comenius tied Čyževs'kyj to the literary Baroque. His stay in Prague, especially the continuous creative dialogue on the theory of literature and on the stylistic and

linguistic analysis of literature among members of the Prague Linguistic Circle, prompted Čyževs'kyj to shift his work from philosophical analysis to literary criticism. The shift gave birth to his concept of Slavic comparative literature.

In 1952, as a visiting lecturer at Harvard, Čyževs'kyj formulated the principal tasks of comparative literary history as follows: "(a) To show the course of development, that is, the changes of literary style and in the content of literary works which occur from time to time; along with this, to divide literary history into the separate divisions, epochs, periods, that relate to it; these have a relatively uniform character and can be set off through common traits. (b) To characterize the intellectual history and the style, linguistic as well as literary, of these epochs: that is, to indicate the traits which are common to all the works and writers of the given period; these, if they are not all-inclusive, will be at least typical or representative of the epoch."<sup>13</sup>

Contrary to Roman Jakobson, Čyževs'kyj was very sceptical about the role of folklore, both in the literary development of the given pre-Romantic Slavic literature and as the common repository of a supposed "common-Slavic" pre-literary tradition. Actually, Čyževs'kyj had made a startling discovery which reinforced his scepticism: although parallel texts in the Slavic languages show that 75 to 80 percent of their lexical units have the same etymological roots, less than 20 percent of such common roots have the same meaning in all these languages. The result is that the lexical units which show the greatest degree of correspondence are not derivatives, but loan-words.

Although Čyževs'kyj became a leading scholar of literary history, he did not develop any particular theory for that scholarly discipline. To him, literature was just a province of *Geistesgeschichte*. In general, Čyževs'kyj's views coincided with the theories of the formalist school of German literature, as developed by Karl Vossler (1872-1949) in Munich, Oscar Walzel (1864-1944) in Bonn, and Fritz Strich (1882-1963) in Zurich. These maintained that the work of literature is primarily a work of art; hence, styles of literature must correspond to styles of art. As a literary historian, then, Čyževs'kyj concentrated on the stylistic analysis of individual works and writers, which resulted in his normative approach to literature. For him, this conceptualiza-

<sup>13</sup> Dmitry Čiževsky, *Outline of Comparative Slavic Literatures* (Boston, 1952), p. 3.

tion explained the unity of not only Slavic literary history, but of literary development throughout Europe. Čyževs'kyj also believed that the literary historian's duty was to examine how philosophical currents influence literary works and find expression in them, and to do formal analysis of literary work, especially lexicology, in order to study poetic language and formal devices (*tropoi*).

Almost from its inception, the study of Slavic philosophy was paired with the study of church history, especially of the spiritual currents in the Orthodox Church and of the relations between Eastern and Western Christianity. Čyževs'kyj believed that his own contribution to that field became dated after the appearance of Archpriest G. Florovsky's *Puti russkogo bogoslovija* (Paris, 1931).

In his literary analyses, Čyževs'kyj paid special attention to lexicology. From theoretical questions he went on to treat specific problems, such as Slavic terminology in philosophy and mysticism. Other topics of interest to him were the coining of new ideological terms, the enrichment of vocabulary through semantic transformations, and, following the ideas of Mukařovský, the poetic language of a given epoch and of specific poets.

Lexicological research led Čyževs'kyj to study linguistic theory, especially the dialectics of language (phonology and psychology), and structural questions, such as aspect, the case system, and the like. In this fashion he came full-circle to his scholarly starting point, that is, to the study of theoretical philosophy.

### III

Čyževs'kyj worked quickly and produced constantly. Five personal characteristics contributed to his success as an author and scholar: first, unusual memory (he often complained of an inability to forget the numbers of streetcar tickets); second, excellent knowledge of the cultural development and literary monuments of both Eastern and Western Europe (he had a special interest in bibliography and old prints); third, the capacity to orient himself immediately upon entering a library for the first time; fourth, an incredible capacity for work; and fifth, the keeping of a logically organized and continuously expanding filing system. Normally he slept only four or five hours a day. His pockets always bulged with blank cards, which he was apt to fill with notes on all occasions, even when talking to a visitor. There were, however, three kinds of circumstances in which the



totally devoted and no-nonsense scholar displayed warm friendship and a brilliant sense of humor: while preparing some exotic culinary dish; when browsing through local bookshops accompanied by colleagues or students; and, especially, over food and drink at the evening gatherings which took place religiously after the weekly meetings of his seminar in the tradition of German university *Gemütlichkeit*.

Although he was an intellectual and a philosopher, Čyževs'kyj, like Gogol', seriously believed in the devil, whom he once recognized in the person of a cab-driver. He also had a special affection for cats, both domesticated and homeless, liking to "converse" with them at length and to remark that they were better companions than humans were. Such were the brilliant man's idiosyncracies.

\* \* \*

The three bibliographies of Čyževs'kyj's work which have been published contain his scholarly production for the years 1912-1965.<sup>14</sup> A bibliography of publications for the years 1965-1977 and of unpublished manuscripts has yet to be compiled. The projected total is impressive, including no less than a thousand items.

Structurally, Čyževs'kyj's work can be divided into five groups: monographs, reviews, *Lese Früchte*, textbooks, and introductions and epilogues. From the scholarly viewpoint, Čyževs'kyj's most important contributions were his monographs, which appeared as books or lengthy articles in scholarly journals and collections. These always encompassed new theoretical findings and a wealth of new information. Deserving of special mention were his reviews, which were unvariably to the point, although often merciless.

Whenever he came across something of interest, Čyževs'kyj hastened to publicize his finding immediately, without any interposition, although he was always ready to make addenda and corrigenda. An ideal medium for such speedy publication was his famous *Literarische Lese Früchte*, of which there were three series: two were published in *ZfslPh* (1931-1955; nos. 1-105, and nos. 1-36) and the third in *Die*

<sup>14</sup> *A Bibliography of the Publications of Dr. Dmitry Čyževsky in the Fields of Literature, Language, Philosophy and Culture* (Cambridge, Mass., 1952); D. Gerhardt, "Schriftenverzeichnis von D. I. Čyževs'kyj (1912-1954)," in *Festschrift für Dmytro Čyževs'kyj zum 60. Geburtstag* (Berlin, 1954), pp. 1-34; Hans-Jürgen zum Winkel, "Schriftenverzeichnis von D. I. Tschizewskij (1954-1965)," in *Orbis Scriptus* (Munich, 1966), pp. 35-48.

*Welt der Slaven* (from 1968). When a fellow researcher, André Mazon of Paris, accused him of merely publishing his files, Čyževs'kyj replied that working in uncertain conditions had required him to pass along important data, however unrefined, to other scholars without delay.

Čyževs'kyj's textbooks and his introductions and epilogues to reprints and collections are of a mixed quality and nature. Some—e.g., those on philosophy in the Ukraine—are original and of pioneering value, whereas others were written simply for financial reasons. As Čyževs'kyj himself openly stated in the 1964 Festschrift, “that I published so much is hardly any merit. Rather, I was forced to do so, since my financial means was never secure” (*Orbis Scriptus*, p. 25). In the same Festschrift, Čyževs'kyj evaluated his contribution to scholarship in the following way: “When I look back upon my accomplishments, I believe that my works will retain interest longest among the Czechs: first, the discovery of the Comenius Manuscripts, then the studies on the Church Slavonic literature produced on Czech soil, perhaps the interpretation of Middle Czech songs, and my work on Czech Baroque literature. My Ukrainian countrymen, with a few exceptions, have no understanding for my work, so that I felt myself forced during the past year to resign from several Ukrainian cultural organizations. As far as my studies on Russian and Slovakian poets and thinkers are concerned, they are, because far removed from Marxian ideology, ignored, at best, in both countries” (*Orbis Scriptus*, p. 26).

#### IV

Although Čyževs'kyj had reason to question the willingness and capacity of his Ukrainian countrymen to appreciate his work, he will undoubtedly be remembered as one of the greatest Ukrainian scholars. In two fields of vital importance to Ukrainian scholarship—the intellectual history of the Russian Empire, and the area for which he himself coined the name “Slavo-Germanica”—Čyževs'kyj holds a place second to no one. The contributions of Dmytro Čyževs'kyj to Ukrainian studies were manifold and innovative. This is true of his books on general topics, such as *Fil'osofija na Ukrajinu* (Prague 1929), *Narysy z istoriji filosofiji na Ukrajinu* (Prague, 1931), and *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury vid počatkiv do doby realizmu* (New York,

1956);<sup>15</sup> and on specialized ones such as *Filosofija H. S. Skovorody* (Warsaw, 1934),<sup>16</sup> and *Ukrajins'kyj literaturnyj barok: Narysy*, 3 volumes (Prague, 1941-1944).

There is hardly a field in Ukrainian intellectual or cultural history to which Čyževs'kyj did not contribute an essential article or note. The number and variety of his topics were remarkable. They included the character of the Ukrainian people, the elements of Ukrainian culture, the literary and cultural problems of Kievan Rus' (texts such as *Pověst' vremennyx lět*, *Izbornik Svjatoslava 1076*, the *Igor' Tale*, the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, the *Sermons of Cyril of Turov*, the *Patericon* of the Caves Monastery, and topics such as Plato in Old Rus', mysticism in Old Rus', the stylistic devices of literary monuments, etc.), Ivan Vyšens'kyj, Socinianism in the Ukraine, Ukrainian physicians in the eighteenth century, Old Ukrainian prints, the poetics of T. Ševčenko, Ukrainian rhyme patterns, M. Hruševs'kyj as literary historian, the philosophies of P. Jurkevych and V. Vernads'kyj. Standing above all these are his numerous monographs and studies dealing with Gogol'; surely, of all such studies, the most penetrating are those by Dmytro Čyževs'kyj.

Although his junior by eighty-five years, Dmytro Čyževs'kyj, like Gogol', was a product of the Ukrainian genius which first appeared during the Cossack Baroque and then reappeared, essentially unchanged, among the Ukrainian gentry, the so-called *Malorossijskoe dvorjanstvo*, during the late eighteenth and the nineteenth century. Both Gogol' and Čyževs'kyj were men of tragic conflicts and paradoxes, "longing for movement, for change, for wandering, for adventure, for a tragic tension, indeed for catastrophe, for delight in clever combinations and unstable equilibrium ... [seeking] to excite man, thus to disquiet him, to shock him."<sup>17</sup>

Čyževs'kyj's merciless and devastating analysis of the philosophical work and literary criticism of Vissarion Belinskij (1811-1848) was nothing less than a "terrible vengeance" in the Gogolian style. In his *Gegel' v Rossii*—a book published in Russian, by Russians, and for the edification of Russians—Čyževs'kyj stripped the idol of the Russian intelligentsia of his glory. Step by step, he documented

<sup>15</sup> An English translation has appeared under the editorship of George S. N. Luckyj: *A History of Ukrainian Literature* (Littleton, Colorado, 1976).

<sup>16</sup> Its last edition was published in German as volume 17 of the Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies (Munich, 1973).

<sup>17</sup> Čyževsky, *Outline of Comparative Slavic Literature*, p. 58.

Belinskij's dependence on incomplete and inaccurate secondhand information. This was, to Čyževs'kyj, just retribution for Belinskij's scorn for the Ukrainian language and literature—that literary critic had once even urged Taras Ševčenko to better himself by writing in Russian.

In Dmytro Čyževs'kyj, contrary to Gogol', the Ukrainian soul emerged victorious, despite his Baroque grotesque. Nonetheless, instances of a Baroque, antithetic worldview were plentiful in his life. He was one of the few people to work before 1917 for a clear-cut division in Ukrainian versus Russian cultural relations, and he was also a social-democrat; yet, on 12 January 1918, as a descendent of the Imperial gentry, he voted against Ukrainian political independence. In Germany he became a typically systematic scholar who felt comfortable only in that country; yet he would not accept German citizenship, preferring to remain stateless after the loss of his Imperial citizenship, even at the risk of losing a retirement pension. Soon after leaving the Ukraine he separated from his wife; yet he would not divorce her, even though under the Hitler regime this relationship blocked his university career. Čyževs'kyj was a great formalist and aesthete; yet he was fascinated by the works of totally inept graphomaniacs, which he not only collected but exchanged with other "collectors" of the genre, such as Oswald Burghardt [Jurij Klen] (1891-1947).

His final changing of the German transcription of his surname, to "Tschizewskij," exemplifies the Baroque style in its calculation to be unexpected and paradoxical. In it the phonem /č/ is rendered as *tsh*, following the German orthography, but the second affricate, /ž/, is written according to the international Slavic transcription. For the vowel /y/ Čyževs'kyj used the sign *i*, although the /y/:*i*/ opposition is a typical differential between Ukrainian and Russian. Instead of placing *v* (or, for that matter, *f*) in postvocalic position (as one would expect in a Russian sound pattern) he opted for the (Middle and Modern) Ukrainian *w*. In this fashion he created a form of his surname which he believed to be early middle Ukrainian, just to irritate both his Ukrainian and Russian non-Baroque-minded contemporaries.

Omeljan Pritsak  
Ihor Ševčenko  
*Harvard University*

## ADDENDUM

*Professor Tatjana Číževska, daughter of the late Dmytro Čyževs'kyj, has kindly provided us with the following autobiographical material by her father. The undated text was evidently written in the fall of 1945, shortly after Čyževs'kyj arrived in Marburg to seek a university position. The author's statement on his scholarly achievement up to that time is rich in detail, containing data which supplement our knowledge of the great scholar and provide a comment on his times. It is published here without change.*

*The Editors*

## [I] Lebenslauf

Ich, Dmitrij Tschizewskij, bin als Sohn eines Edelmanns, Ivan Tsch. und seiner Ehefrau Maria, geb. Erschow, am 23/III. 1894 in Alexandria (Ukraine) geboren. Ich absolvierte das klassische Gymnasium in meiner Vaterstadt 1911 und studierte an der Univ. St. Petersburg 1911-13 Mathematik und Astronomie (auf diesem Gebiet habe ich einige Arbeiten veröffentlicht), dann an der Universität Kiev 1913-19 Philosophie und russische Philologie. Im Herbst 1919 habe ich die abschliessende Staatsprüfung abgelegt und das Diplom "ersten Grades" erhalten; meine Kandidatenarbeit (die ungefähr der deutschen Doktor-dissertation entspricht) behandelte die philosophische Entwicklung Schillers (ein Teil dieser Arbeit ist deutsch erschienen). 1920 wurde ich zum Dozenten der allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft an der Frauenhochschule Žekulins in Kiev gewählt, 1921 — zum Dozenten der Philosophie an dem „Pädagogischen Institut“ in Kiev, zu welchem die frühere Universität umgewandelt wurde. Ich habe allerdings meine Vorlesungen an diesen beiden Schulen nicht aufgenommen, sondern wanderte 1921 nach Deutschland aus, wo ich zunächst in Heidelberg (SS. 1921-WS. 1921-2) und Freiburg i.Br. (SS. 1922-WS. 1923-4) Philosophie studiert habe. Meine Lehrer in Deutschland waren: Prof. Husserl, Jaspers, Rickert, R. Kroner, J. Ebbinghaus, J. Cohn, M. Heidegger. Das deutsche Doktorat habe ich nachträglich 1933 in Halle a.d.S. gemacht, meine Doktor-dissertation behandelte „Hegel in Russland,“ Ergebnis der Prüfung war „summa cum laude.“ Im SS. 1924 wurde ich Lektor, 1925 Dozent, 1926 — Prof. der Philosophie an dem Ukrainischen Pädagogischen Institut in Prag, 1929 habe ich mich an der Ukr. Universität in Prag mit einer Arbeit über „Hegel und die französische Revolution“ habilitiert, wurde an dieser Hochschule 1932 ao. Prof. 1931 wurde ich gleichzeitig zum Lektor der Slavistik an den Universitäten Bonn und Halle vorgeschlagen, kam im SS. 1932 nach Halle, wo ich seitdem tätig war. 1935-8 habe ich ausserdem aushilfsweise slavische Sprachen an der Univ. Jena gelesen. — Meiner beabsichtigten Habilitation und meinem weiteren Fortkommen stand damals die jüdische Abstammung meiner Frau im Wege. So blieb es auch ohne Ergebnis, dass ich 1939 von der Phil. Fakultät der Univ. Wien als Kandidat auf den Lehrstuhl der Slavistik aufgestellt wurde. Ebenso, dass ich 1942 von der Philos. Fakultät der Univ. Pressburg (Slovakie)

auf den Lehrstuhl der Philosophie gewählt wurde. Auch die Verhandlungen mit der Columbia University in New York wegen Übernahme einer Gastprofessur 1939 kamen wegen dem Kriegsausbruch nicht zum Abschluss.

Ich konnte jedoch in Halle mit Erlaubnis der Fakultät neben meinen Sprachkursen (ausser Russisch habe ich auch Ukrainisch, aber auch Tschechisch, Slovakisch und Polnisch für Anfänger vorgetragen) Vorlesungen über mehrere Gebiete der Slavistik halten (neben der Einführung in das Studium der slavischen Sprachen, las ich auch das Kirchenslavische, die vergleichende Grammatik der slav. Sprachen, die russische, tschechische und ukrainische Literaturgeschichte, sowie die allgemeine slav. Literaturgeschichte, ebenso Vorlesungen über einzelne Perioden und Dichter, russische und polnische Kulturgeschichte, ostslavische Volkskunde, russische Geistes- und Philosophiegeschichte, Vorlesungen über die slavische Mystik, über die Geschichte des Protestantismus bei den Slaven, über die Geschichte der russ. Theologie usf.), Seminarübungen abhalten (im Seminar behandelte ich unt. and. die altrussischen Chroniken, die altrussischen Heiligenlegenden, die tschechische und polnische Dichtung des Mittelalters, der Renaissance, der Barockzeit und der Romantik, sowie die Dichter der Gegenwart) und Doktordissertationen annehmen, die ich z.T. als erster, z.T. als zweiter Rezensent begutachten durfte. Im Laufe der Zeit sind in Halle 6 slavistische Doktordissertationen entstanden, von welchen 4 im Druck erschienen sind (3 in Buchform). Ausserdem haben mehrere Schüler von mir etwa 20 wissenschaftliche Arbeiten veröffentlicht, die meist in der „Zeitschrift f. slav. Philologie“ und „Kyrios“ erschienen sind und die fast ausschliesslich in meinem Seminar entstanden sind.

Ich habe selbst 1921-45 450 wissenschaftl. Arbeiten und Besprechungen veröffentlicht, von denen die wichtigsten die beiliegende Liste aufzählt. Drei Bücher und mehrere kleinere Arbeiten wurden während der Besatzungszeit von der deutschen Zensur in Prag nicht zum Druck zugelassen und werden z.T. dort jetzt erscheinen können.

[II] Ergänzung zu *A. Personenbeschreibung — Promotion, Habilitation, Ausbildung*

Ich studierte an dem klassischen Gymnasium in Alexandria (Russland), dann an der Univ. St. Petersburg (1911-13) Mathematik und Astronomie, zum Teil auch Philosophie, dann an der Univ. Kiev (1913-17) Philosophie und russische Philologie, ebenfalls Indogermanistik und slav. Philologie. 1919 habe ich die russ. Staatsprüfung abgelegt, die ungefähr dem deutschen Doktorat entspricht (Fächer : Philosophie und russ. Philologie). 1920 wurde ich zum Dozenten der allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft an einer Frauenhochschule in Kiev (Hochschule von A. Žekulina), 1921 zum Dozenten der Philosophie an dem Pädagogischen Institut in Kiev (in welches die frühere Universität umgewandelt wurde). 1921 reiste ich ins Ausland und studierte Philosophie in Heidelberg (1921-2) und Freiburg i.Br. (1922-4). 1924 ging ich als Dozent der Philosophie nach Prag, an das Ukrainische Pädagogische Institut. In Prag habe ich mich 1929 an der Ukrainischen Universität für Philosophie habilitiert. 1932 ging ich als Lektor der Slavistik nach Halle und da es wünschenswert schien, ein deutsches Doktorat zu erwerben, habe ich 1933 (bei dem später

entlassenen „jüdischen“ Professor A. Gelb) an der Univ. Halle promoviert (Dr. phil., Fächer : Philosophie, Indogermanistik und Kirchengeschichte).

### *Lebensbeschreibung*

Ich bin in einer kleinen Stadt, Alexandria, in der Ukraine am 23.3.1894 als Sohn eines früheren Offiziers und Gutsbesitzers, der aber 1887 wegen seiner liberalen Gesinnung verhaftet wurde, 2 Jahre lang in der Festung gefangen gehalten wurde, dann nach Nordrussland verbannt wurde und später auf sein Gut ausgewiesen, und seiner Frau, die eine Künstlerin war, geboren. Die geistigen Interessen meiner Eltern haben von vorn herein meine eigene Einstellung bestimmt. Die Schule dagegen (1904-1911) hatte in meiner Entwicklung nur eine nebensächliche Bedeutung, höchstens nur insofern, inwiefern ich zum Organisator der (in Russland illegalen) Bildungsvereine unter meinen Schulkamaraden war, die sich meist mit Literaturgeschichte, später auch mit Politik befassten. Mein Vater konnte nach der ersten russischen Revolution 1905 politisch tätig sein (er gehörte der russ. liberalen Partei, den „Konstitutionalisten-Demokraten“ an), was auch auf meine Interessen nicht ohne Einfluss geblieben ist : in meinen Studienjahren an der Universität fand ich Zeit neben meinen wissenschaftlichen Studien (ich habe schon seit 1912 wissenschaftliche Studien, zunächst auf dem Gebiete der Astronomie, veröffentlicht) Anschluss an die politische Studenten- und Arbeiter-Bewegung zu finden; ich war Sozialdemokrat und wurde schliesslich 1916 von der zaristischen Polizei verhaftet. Die Revolution 1917 hat mich befreit. Die ersten Monate der Revolution arbeitete ich sehr viel an den Arbeiterorganisationen in Kiev, kehrte aber 1918 und in den folgenden Jahren zu meiner wissenschaftlichen Tätigkeit zurück, ohne die Verbindung mit der Arbeiterbewegung zu lösen. Die Politik der Kommunisten, die zu einer Diktatur der Partei über dem russischen Volk geführt hat, hat mich sehr enttäuscht und ich entschloss mich, meine Studien zunächst im Auslande fortzusetzen. Schon in Russland habe ich mich für die sog. „Phänomenologie“ Husserls und seiner Schule besonders begeistert, so ging ich nach Deutschland, wo ich bald 1922 ein Schüler Husserls werden durfte. Meine Ausbildung schloss ich 1924 ab und begann meine Laufbahn als Dozent. Von den rein philosophiegeschichtlichen Studien wurde ich aber zu etwas weiteren „geistesgeschichtlichen“ Themen getrieben und zwar dann, als ich mich mit der Philosophiegeschichte der slavischen Völker zu beschäftigen begann. Schon damals entschloss ich mich (etwa 1926) mein Leben einem Werk über die Geschichte der Philosophie auf dem slavischen Boden zu widmen,—dieser Plan wurde durch einen weiteren Plan einer vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte der slavischen Literaturen ergänzt. Meine gesamte wissenschaftliche Arbeit (1923-1945 über 100 Bücher und Aufsätze, abgesehen von 350 zum Teil grösseren Besprechungen) ist eine Verwirklichung dieser beiden Pläne.

Die wichtigste Rolle in meiner geistigen Entwicklung spielten neben dem Elternhause verschiedene Kreise der Freunde, die ich mir an verschiedenen wechselnden Stätten meiner Wirksamkeit geschaffen habe : zunächst waren das meine zu den Bildungsvereinen zusammengeschlossenen Schulkamaraden und Kamaradinnen, dann die Kollegen an der Univ. Kiev, die zum grossen Teil

auch meine politischen Ansichten teilten, später meine Dozenten an der Univ. Freiburg (von denen für mich persönlich neben Husserl einige weitere eine entscheidende Rolle gespielt haben) und eine kleinere Gruppe meiner Kameraden an dieser Universität, eine Gruppe, die bis jetzt besteht (keiner der Mitglieder dieser Gruppe ist Nationalsozialist geworden, vielmehr haben mehrere einen entschiedenen Kampf gegen den Nazismus seit seiner Entstehung geführt), später ein engerer Kreis russischer Philosophen in Prag und eine Gruppe tschechischer Sprachwissenschaftler in derselben Stadt, die als „Prager linguistischer Zirkel“ in der Entwicklung der europäischen Wissenschaft eine bedeutende Rolle gespielt hat und noch spielt (vom Prager Zirkel abhängige Gruppen gibt es jetzt in Genf, Kopenhagen und anderswo, einer der leitenden Köpfe der Gruppe, mein Freund, Roman Jakobson, ist Prof. an der Columbia University in New York), in Halle waren das vor allem zwei kleinere Kreise, die ich geleitet habe,—ein philosophischer und ein slavistischer, und ein kleiner Kreis antifaschistischer Intellektueller, mit dem ich seit 1938 in enger Beziehung gestanden habe. Die Freundschaften der letzten Jahre haben mich zur Erkenntnis geführt, dass einer der wichtigsten Kulturfaktoren eine persönliche Verbindung der Menschen—vor allem über die Grenzen der in Europa so engen Nationen hinaus—ist. Die kulturellen Verbindungen der Völker halte ich für noch wichtiger als die politischen und meine Absicht ist es, der Pflege dieser internationalen kulturellen Beziehungen meine Kräfte in der Zukunft zu widmen, ganz egal, welche Lebensstellung ich einnehmen werde.

Damit ist meine persönliche Entwicklung bis jetzt abgeschlossen. Politisch war ich ausserhalb Russlands nicht mehr tätig, wenn ich einige Jahre auch noch weiter zur sozialdemokratischen (russischen, später deutschen) Organisation gehört habe (bis 1924). Dagegen trat ich seit 1926 in eine nähere Beziehung zur Kirche—und zwar nicht nur zu meiner eigenen griechisch-orthodoxen Kirche, sondern zu den beiden grossen Konfessionen des Westens, indem ich meine wissenschaftliche, schriftstellerische und pädagogische Arbeit zum Teil religiösen Fragen widmete. Zu den grossen Persönlichkeiten des kirchlichen Lebens gehören auch die „geschichtlichen Persönlichkeiten,“ die für mich die grössten Leuchten der Menschheit gewesen sind, wie manche russischen Heiligen, der hlg. Franziscus, der Bischof der tschechischen Kirche J. A. Comenius (17. Jht.) und andere.

Von den im Fragebogen angedeuteten Faktoren, spielten in meiner Entwicklung das Heer (ich habe nie gedient), die Zeitungen (obwohl ich selbst 1917-18 in Kiev an der Redigierung einer sozialdemokratischen Zeitung beteiligt war), Rundfunk und Kino keine Rolle. Dagegen bedeuteten für mich Theater und besonders Musik immer sehr viel, ohne dass ihre Einflüsse in meiner Lebensarbeit irgendwelche nennenswerte Rolle gespielt haben.

Zur Zeit erwarte ich eine Möglichkeit, meine Kräfte den Aufgaben zu widmen, die mir als meine persönlichen Aufgaben erscheinen—dem Abschluss meines wissenschaftlichen Lebenswerkes und dem Dienst der Annäherung er europäischen Völker untereinander.

Meine literarische Produktion ist schon deshalb recht unübersichtlich, da ich meine Arbeiten in acht verschiedenen Sprachen veröffentlicht habe (von den Büchern und Aufsätzen sind 88 deutsch geschrieben, darunter 4 grössere Bücher, 2 französisch, 22 russisch, 19 ukrainisch (russisch—1 Buch, ukr.—7),



15 tschechisch, 5 slovakisch, darunter 1 Buch, 1 kroatisch, 1 polnisch). Ausserdem muss ich zugeben, dass ich vielfach Arbeiten, die noch nicht ganz abgeschlossen waren, herausgebracht habe (der franz. Slavist Mazon hat mir in einer Besprechung vorgeworfen, dass ich den Leser mit dem Inhalt meiner Kartothek bekannt mache), — das erklärt sich allerdings aus den Bedingungen, in welchen ich gearbeitet und veröffentlicht habe: ich war in Prag in einer schlecht bezahlten Stellung, die immer aufgehoben werden konnte, in Halle bin ich nach den ersten 8 Monaten ins „dritte Reich“ geraten, wo ich 11 Jahre lang meine Absetzung (wegen der „jüdischen Versippung“) bzw. Verhaftung durch Gestapo erwartet habe. So *musste* ich die Arbeiten im Zustande herausbringen, der die Veröffentlichung zuließ; mein Schicksal in den letzten Wochen hat mir, wie es scheint, recht gegeben — der Verlust eines Teils meiner unveröffentlichten Arbeiten wäre viel schwerer, hätte ich nicht den grössten Teil meiner Arbeiten schon in „nicht ganz fertiger“ Form herausgebracht. Ausserdem habe ich doch im Laufe der Jahre mehrere grössere Themen ganz abschliessend bearbeitet: Geschichte der ukr. Philosophie, Hegel in Russland, die philos. Ansichten des ukr. Mystikers Skovoroda, des slovakischen Hegelianers L. Štúr, die Weltanschauung des tschechischen Romantikers K. I. Mácha, die ukr. Barockdichtung, die altrussische Literatur des 11-13 Jhts.

Die mannigfaltigen Arbeiten, die ich veröffentlicht habe, behandeln keine zufälligen Themen, vielmehr liegt fast allen ein gewisser Plan zugrunde. Ich will meine Hauptthemen hier nennen:

1. Mein erstes grosses Thema, an dessen Bearbeitung ich nach dem Abschluss meiner philosophischen Studien herangetreten bin, war *Geschichte der Philosophie bei den slav. Völkern* (als ein dreibändiges Werk für das Vasmer-Trautmannsche „Handbuch der slav. Philologie“). Völlig fertig ist die Geschichte der Phil. bei den Ostslaven (Russen und Ukrainer), weit fortgeschritten ist die Vorbereitung der Teile über die Tschechen und die Slovaken. Eine Reihe Spezialarbeiten sind z.T. veröffentlicht, z.T. druckfertig (ich nenne besonders Comenius; hier gelang mir seine philosophische Hauptschrift in der Handschrift auszufinden, die ich zum Druck vorbereitet habe, ausserdem etwa 10 unbekannte Schriften und Drucke von ihm), den ukr. Mystiker des 18. Jhts., Skovoroda, den Russen Strachov, Jurkevič, Dostojevskij (die alle der gleichen Zeit angehören und miteinander z.T. auch genetisch verbunden sind), den deutschen Idealismus in Russland, die Geschichte der ukr. Philosophie, einige Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie bei den Slovaken im 19. Jht. — das Buch über Štúr ist erschienen, eine grössere Arbeit über Kellner-Hostinský ist in Vorbereitung (hier habe ich auch den handschriftlichen Nachlass beider durchgearbeitet). Vorbereitet ist eine Arbeit über den Kroaten Bosković (18. Jht.).

2. In Verbindung mit dem ersten Thema steht das zweite, das ich im Laufe der Zeit ebenfalls bearbeitet habe — *die vergleichende slav. Literaturgeschichte*, die mich zunächst durch den philos. Gehalt der slavischen literarischen Werke herangezogen hat, nachher aber auch durch ihre dichterische Eigenschaften mich zur Bearbeitung der stilistischen, kunstwissenschaftlichen und literarischen Probleme geführt hat. Ein Gerüst der vergleichenden slav. Literaturgeschichte ist schon fertig (Vorlesungen darüber habe ich schon 2 Mal gehalten). Einzelne Teilthemen sind auch schon völlig fertig, — darunter: Geschichte der altruss.

Literatur (11.-13. Jht.). Ukr. Literaturgeschichte (16. Jht. - 1860), kirchenslavische Literatur auf dem tschechoslovakischen Boden (9.-11. Jht.), Literaturgeschichte des tschechischen Mittelalters, tschechische Barockliteratur, einzelne Dichter : Russen — Puškin, Gogol', Tjutčev, Dostojevskij, Leskov, Andrej Belyj, Majakovskij, Tschechen — Bridel, Comenius (17. Jht.), Mácha (19. Jht.), K. Čapek (20. Jht.), Barock in den slavischen Literaturen ist mit Benutzung der handschriftlichen Materialien und mehreren von mir aufgefundenen (tschechischen) unbekanntem Drucke bearbeitet, vorbereitet ist eine Arbeit über die slavischen Dichter als Zeichner und Maler.

Die beiden Themen bilden eine wesentliche Einheit, indem die Gesamtheit der sie behandelnden Arbeiten einen Überblick über mehrere wesentliche Gebiete der slavischen Geistesgeschichte bieten wird. Damit sind auch die methodologischen Eigentümlichkeiten meiner Arbeit verbunden, — in den die Geschichte der Philosophie betreffenden Arbeiten behandle ich neben den Fachphilosophen auch Dichter, Politiker und Theologen, in den literaturgeschichtlichen sind die ideologischen Motive (neben den wichtigen ästhetischen, denn ich habe sehr viel bei den russischen „Formalisten“ und der „Prager Schule“ der „strukturellen Linguistik“ gelernt) besonders eingehend behandelt.

3. Aus der Beschäftigung mit diesen beiden Fragenkomplexen ist im Laufe der Zeit eine Gruppe meiner Arbeiten emporgewachsen, die ich als „*germanoslavische*“ bezeichnen kann. Es handelt sich um die deutschen Einflüsse im slavischen Geistesleben. Leider musste ich die Veröffentlichung der Arbeiten zu den germanoslavischen Fragen im „dritten Reiche“ einstellen, da der deutsche Einfluss als Begründung der *politischen* Ansprüche des Hitler-Deutschland galt.

Germanoslavica unter meiner Arbeiten betreffen u.a. — die deutsche Mystik bei den Slaven (u.a. Skovoroda, Comenius), den Pietismus bei den Slaven (hier habe ich zahlreiche handschriftliche Quellen im Archiv des Franckeschen Waisenhauses entdeckt und bearbeitet, die die Verbindung des Franckeschen Kreises mit den Ostslaven, Tschechen, Polen, Slovenen, Wenden beleuchten), die deutsche Romantik bei den Slaven (Arbeiten über Puškin, Tjutčev, Gogol', Hoffmann und Dostojevskij — in Vorbereitung). Zusammenfassend habe ich den Einfluss Hegels in Russland behandelt, die zweite Ausgabe der einschlägigen Arbeit (neue russische Bearbeitung), behandelt neben dem Einfluss Hegels auch die Einflüsse des deutschen Idealismus überhaupt, in Vorbereitung befinden sich weitere Arbeiten über die deutsche Philosophie bei den Slovaken (an Hand des handschriftlichen Materials, als Buch ist die Arbeit über die Philosophie L. Štúrs erschienen).

4. In Verbindung mit der Geistesgeschichte stehen nur z.T. veröffentlichte Arbeiten über die slavische *Lexik* : zunächst handelt es sich um die philosophische und mystische Terminologie (Skovoroda), dann um den weltanschaulichen Wortschatz und seine Bereicherung durch eine neue Sinngebung der alten Wörter. Ich behandelte kurz manche Fragen der altrussischen Lexik (das Igorlied), die Komposita in der russ. Literatursprache, die Ukrainismen Gogol's, die romantische Sprache (Puškin, Lermontov, Tjutčev), die philosophische Terminologie der russ. Hegelschen Schule, die neue Sinngebung der alten Worte (Puškin), die theoretischen Probleme der Lexik (an den Beispielen Leskovs und And. Belyjs — unveröffentlicht). Gesondert steht eine Arbeit über die deutsche phil. Terminologie („Übermensch“, „übermenschlich“).

5. In Verbindung mit der Mitarbeit an der Prager sprachwissenschaftlichen Schule stehen einige Arbeiten, die sich mir der *Philosophie der Sprache* befassen. Es handelt sich hier um die Begründung der Phonologie („Phonologie und Psychologie“), um einige Referate im Prager linguistischen Zirkel und um eine mit Roman Jakobson, einem der Begründer und Leiter der Prager Schule, vorbereitete Arbeit über „Dialektik der Sprache.“

Besondere Aufmerksamkeit widmete ich dem slav. Zeitwort (in Vorbereitung eine Arbeit über die Aktionsarten), der Deklination (im Druck in „Acta linguistica“ eine Arbeit über das ukr. Kasus-System). Aus der Arbeit an der Theorie der Uebersetzung ist u.a. eine Hallische Dr. Dissertation über A. Mejs Uebersetzungen entstanden. Von Mukařovský sind meine Arbeiten über die dichterische Sprache beeinflusst (Alliterationen in der Nestorchronik, die dichterische Sprache Skovorodas, die Entwicklung des ukr. Reimes bei Skovoroda, in der ukr. Barockdichtung und bei Ševčenko).

6. Reiner *Philosophie* sind wenige Arbeiten von mir gewidmet, neben einer Vorlesung über Logik, handelt es sich um die Geschichte der Philosophie (Hegel und seine Schule, Hegel und Nietzsche, romantische Philosophie— „Nachtproblem in der Romantik“—meine Arbeiten über Tjutčev und eine Dissertation meines Schülers, St. Grzonka über das Nachtproblem in der polnischen Romantik), weit fortgeschritten ist ein Buch über den Formalismus in der Ethik, als Vorstudien zu welchem auch einige meiner Dostojevskij-Aufsätze zu betrachten sind.

7. Einzelne Arbeiten und zahlreiche Besprechungen betreffen auch *Kirchengeschichte*: die deutsche Mystik, Protestantismus bei den Slaven (Vorlesung), Geschichte der russischen Theologie (Vorlesung, die Veröffentlichungen meiner Arbeiten sind nach dem Erscheinen des betreffenden Buches von Florovskij entbehrlich geworden), die russ. Heiligenlegenden (Vorlesung), einzelne Beiträge zur russ. und deutschen Kirchengeschichte, vielfach an hand der Handschriften (manche Arbeiten betreffen die Hallische Lokalgeschichte).

8. Die *slavische Kulturgeschichte* war zum Teil Gegenstand meiner Beschäftigung: eine Vorlesung über die polnische Kulturgeschichte habe ich wiederholt gehalten, zur ukr. Kulturgeschichte habe ich umfangreichen Stoff gesammelt.

Ohne die Bedeutung meiner Arbeiten zu überschätzen, muss ich feststellen, dass es mir gelungen ist auf verschiedenen Gebieten manches Neues zu sagen, was im Einzelnen von der Kritik und Forschung anerkannt ist (z.B. von den Tschechen haben meine einzelne Einsichten die „Formalisten“— Mukařovský und Vilikovský, die Katholiken—Vařica, Kalista, Králik, die Positivisten—Hendrich—angenommen).\* Daneben muss ich meine Berichterstattung her-

\* Z.B. Entdeckung der Quellen—etwa der altukr. Kirchenlieder, der Epigrammen der ukr. Dichters des XVII. Jhts. Velyčkovs'kyj (J. Owen), die Beziehungen zwischen der Romantik und Tjutčev, der Einfluss Schillers auf Dostojevskij (eine diesbezügliche Arbeit des sovjet-russ. Forschers Glebov ist nur ein Plagiat aus meinem Aufsatz), der Einfluss der Mystik auf Skovoroda, die Quelle der Legende des hlg. Isaakij in der Legende von Valens, die Quelle der philosophischen Ansichten Dostojevskijs in den Schriften N. N. Strachovs, die Quellen des Labyrinths der Welt des Comenius; ich hoffe, dass die Veröffentlichung der von mir aufgefundenen Comenius-Handschriften weitere konkrete Entdeckungen bringen wird, usf.

vorheben, z.B. über die neueste tschechische Forschung, über die Sovjet-Russ. Literaturgeschichte,—diese Berichterstattung (Berichte und Besprechungen) zeichnet sich—was von vielen Seiten anerkannt wurde—durch eine gewisse Objektivität und bringt nach meinem besten Wissen gewisse Bereicherung des Stoffes, von dem ich zu berichten habe. Ich muss auch betonen, dass ich schon einige Schüler ausgebildet habe, die eine selbständige Stelle in der Slavistik durch ihre zahlreiche Veröffentlichungen sich erwerben konnten, so besonders Dr. D. Gerhardt und Dr. A. Mietschke.

### [III] Antwort auf die Frage

**B.3. Welche Gebiete Ihres Faches haben Sie seit 1930 gelesen :**

Einführung in die slavische Philologie, vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen, Sprachkurse in Russisch, Ukrainisch, Polnisch, Tschechisch, Slovakisch, Russische, Ukrainische und Tschechische Literaturgeschichte, Polnische Kulturgeschichte, Protestantismus bei den Slaven; im Seminar dieselben Gebiete behandelt.

**B.4. Beschreiben Sie Ihre akademische, bzw. amtliche Laufbahn seit 1930 :**

Bis April 1932 habe ich an dem Ukrainischen Pädagogischen Institut in Prag und an der Ukr. Universität dortselbst Vorlesungen aus dem Gebiete der Philosophie abgehalten (als Prof. der Philosophie). Ende 1931 wurde ich gleichzeitig zum Lektor der slav. Sprachen in Bonn und Halle gewählt und von dem (damals noch demokratischen) Ministerium in Berlin nach Halle berufen, wo meine Habilitation demnächst bevorstand, als die Nationalsozialisten die Macht ergriffen und ich mit meiner Entlassung rechnen musste (wegen der „jüdischen“ Abstammung meiner Frau). Doch hat der Hallische Kurator mich weiter im Dienst behalten, da ich als Nicht-Deutscher kein Beamter, sondern nur Angestellter war.

Vom 1935-8 habe ich (ohne Gehalt) vertretungsweise slavische Sprachen auch in Jena gelesen.

1938 war mir eine Berufung nach Brno (Tschechoslowakei) in Aussicht gestellt, die aber nicht zustande kam; 1939 habe ich Verhandlungen mit der Columbia University (New York, Prof. Heuser) wegen der Uebernahme einer Gastprofessur geführt; etwas später stand ich auf der Kandidatenliste der Wiener Universität; 1940-1 wurde ich zum Prof. der Phil. an der Univ. Pressburg (Slovakie) vorgeschlagen. Ich konnte aber natürlich in den von den Nationalsozialismus beherrschten Ländern auf kein Fortkommen rechnen.

**B.5. Die Liste meiner wichtigsten Veröffentlichungen seit 1930 liegt bei.**

**B.7. Sind Sie gegen den Nationalsozialismus tätig gewesen? In welcher Art und Weise? (Nennen Sie zwei Zeugen dafür).**

Seit 1935 bis 1941 habe ich in Halle einen Kreis von jüngeren Dozenten, Assistenten und besseren Studenten geleitet, der sich mit Philosophie befasste und in welchem gelegentlich auch politische Fragen zur Sprache kamen,—dass ich dabei immer den ganzen Widersinn der nationalsozialistischen Weltanschauung dargelegt habe, können die Teilnehmer des Kreises bestätigen (z.B. Prof. Dr. H. Kleinknecht, Prof. an der Univ. Rostock, z. Zt. Ellwangen/Württemberg, bei Herzog; Buchhändler H. Hoffmann, Halle a.d.S., Buchhandlung Lippert-Niemeyer—der letztere verbrachte 9 Monate im Nazi-Gefängnis; die

Lektorin M. L. Giebelhausen an der Univ. Greifswald). — Fast genau so offen sprach ich meine Ansichten in meinem slavistischen Kreis aus, den ich seit 1935 leitete (und an welchem übrigens mehrere „unerwünschte“ Ausländer, vor allem Tschechen und zwei „Halbjüdinen“ teilgenommen haben), bestätigen können das die Mitglieder des Kreises (Pfarrer K. H. Anbau, Petersberg bei Halle a. d. S., Pfarrhaus, Frau Prof. S. Windisch, Halle a. d. S., Mühlweg, 11). — Dass ich auch in Kreisen meiner Bekannten in einer ähnlichen Weise und noch offener wirkte, können weitere Zeugen bestätigen, z. B. Dr. W. Hennemann, Halle a. d. S., Mozartstr. 20, Peter Brückner, Halle a. d. S., Fuchsbergstr. 5 uff. — Falls die Zeugen in Halle schwer erreichbar sind, möchte ich meine Schweizer Kollegen nennen: Prof. Dr. Fritz Lieb, Univ. Basel; Lektor an der Univ. Basel, Dr. Paul Zumthor. — Ich darf vielleicht auch meine materielle Hilfe einigen tschechoslovakischen Juden (Zeugin dafür Frl. T. Hovsijeva, Prag, II, Hopfenštokova, 4), den die Zwangsarbeit in Deutschland ausübenden Tschechen (Zeuge Prof. Dr. J. Vašica, Praha. XIX, ul. Národní Obrany, 21), Polen (Zeuge Prof. Dr. S. Hessen, Warszawa, Wsztechnica Polska), Franzosen (Zeuge Prof. Dr. D. Stremoukhoff, Strasbourg, Université) als eine anti-nationalsozialistische Tätigkeit bezeichnen. Durch einen Dresdner Kreis habe ich verschiedene Gegenstände und Bücher an die russischen und polnischen Kriegsgefangenen geliefert (Zeuge Prof. Dr. F. Stepun, z. Zt. Oberbayern, Tegernsee, „Sonnenhof“). Gelegentlich habe ich auch die illegale antinationalsozialistische Literatur verbreitet (etwa kommunistische — Zeuge — Baumeister Erich Kaestner, Halle).

Ich möchte diese Tätigkeiten keinesfalls als einen besonderen Verdienst von mir bezeichnen, ich will aber die Frage der Militärregierung eingehend beantworten.

*B.9.* Sind Sie seit 1930 in anderer Hinsicht wegen Ihrer politischen Gesinnung benachteiligt worden? Bevorzugt worden?

Dass ich vielfach nicht fortkommen konnte habe ich schon erwähnt. Seit August 1941 durfte ich das Stadtgebiet von Halle nicht verlassen (nur eine einzige zweitägige Reise wegen eines Vortrags an der Lutherhalle in Wittenberg wurde mir erlaubt). Einige Arbeiten (tschechische und ukrainische) von mir wurden von der deutschen Zensur in Prag (Tschechoslowakei) zum Druck nicht zugelassen (Zeuge Prof. Dr. J. Vašica, Praha. XIX. ul. Národní Obrany, 21).