

Arie L. Molendijk

## The troubled Life of Heinrich Scholz<sup>1</sup>

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1515/znth-2022-00xx>

**Abstract:** The aim of this article is to present some of the fundamental aspects of Heinrich Scholz’s life and work to an international audience, providing archival sources and key publications about him. My intention is also to present sources – mainly letters – in an English translation for the first time. First, I discuss the autobiographical note that Scholz wrote around 1948; second, I provide a concise account of his intellectual trajectory; and third, I focus on some of the defining moral episodes in his personal life, which form the majority of this article. Successively, I deal with his role during the Nazi regime, his contacts with Polish and Dutch logicians (using unpublished correspondences), and several personal crises, which had a huge impact on his life and work.

**Keywords:** Heinrich Scholz, Jan Łukasiewicz, Adolf von Harnack, Evert W. Beth, Alfred Tarski, Mathematical Logic, Friendship, Nazism

The German scholar Heinrich Scholz (1884–1956) is an unusual figure in intellectual history. He carried out important work in theology, philosophy and mathematical logic, and gained wide recognition in all three fields. This is a remarkable achievement considering that he suffered from extremely poor health and was already in his late thirties when he embarked on his studies on physics and, foremostly, logic and mathematics. Scholz not only contributed text editions, books and articles, but also established contacts with major scholars in these disciplines and had a keen eye for the institutional framework of modern science. In 1943, he founded the first chair of mathematical logic in Germany.

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Niko Strobach, Monja Reinhart, Gabriela Besler, Jan Hertrich-Wolenski and Hetty Zock for their help in preparing this article. The following archives provided important materials (mainly letters): Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Harnack *Nachlass*, Berlin (Scholz); Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Münster (Scholz); Noord-Hollands Archief, Haarlem (Beth, Scholz, Schlick); Karl Barth Archive Basel (Barth, Charlotte von Kirschbaum, Scholz); and the Archive Centres, King’s College, Cambridge (Alan Turing, Scholz).

---

**Arie L. Molendijk:** Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies, University of Groningen, Oude Boteringestraat 38, 9712 GK Groningen, The Netherlands, E-Mail: [a.l.molendijk@rug.nl](mailto:a.l.molendijk@rug.nl)

This article wishes to present a series of fundamental aspects of Scholz's life and work to an international audience, as well as to provide archival sources and key publications about him. My intention is further to present these sources – mainly letters – in an English translation for the first time. I have not tried to render a literal, word-for-word version of Scholz's characteristic language style, but have instead aimed for a translation that makes the meaning of his words intelligible to present-day readers. Where I think it might be helpful, I will provide the original German text in a corresponding footnote. The structure of this article will be as follows: first, I will discuss the autobiographical note he wrote circa 1948; then, I will offer a concise account of his intellectual trajectory; and, finally, I will focus on a number of defining events in his personal life. This last objective will comprise the majority of the contribution. Successively, I will discuss his role during the Nazi regime, his contacts with Polish and Dutch logicians (using previously unpublished correspondences), and several personal crises that impacted greatly on his life and work.

Given his international renown, it may seem somewhat curious (at least from a present-day perspective) that Scholz never published in English or, for that matter, in any other foreign language.<sup>2</sup> He corresponded, as far as I can see, only in German.<sup>3</sup> None of his books or articles were translated into a foreign language during his lifetime. Nevertheless, he had many contacts in Europe and the United States. Although a few English encyclopedia entries exist, as well as some more specialised articles, which focus on his contacts with Polish and Dutch logicians such as Jan Łukasiewicz, Alfred Tarski and Evert W. Beth,<sup>4</sup> most of the secondary literature is written in German. This article is a first step

<sup>2</sup> With the exception of the translation in Greek of Scholz and Helmut Hasse, *Die Grundlagenkrisis der griechischen Mathematik*. Berlin: Pan-Bücherei, 1928. See the bibliography in Heinrich Scholz, *Mathesis universalis. Abhandlungen zur Philosophie als strenger Wissenschaft*, ed. Hans Hermes, Friedrich Kambartel, Joachim Ritter. Basel, Stuttgart: Benno Schwabe, 1961, 458 (85a).

<sup>3</sup> Most of his correspondents also wrote in German, which is not to say that Scholz did not understand English and French. He learned the Polish language to read the publications of Polish logicians, and he even took courses in Dutch in preparation for his visit to the Netherlands in 1923 (see below); Scholz to Schlick, 27 May 1923 – their correspondence is kept in the Noord-Hollands Archief. All translations from German texts are my own.

<sup>4</sup> Volker Peckhaus, "Moral integrity during a difficult period: Beth and Scholz." *Philosophia Scientiæ* 3/4 (1998–1999): 151–73; Hans-Christoph Schmidt am Busch, Kai F. Wehmeier, "On the relations between Heinrich Scholz and Jan Łukasiewicz." *History and Philosophy of Logic* 28/1 (2007): 67–81. The best-known introduction to Scholz in English is probably Volker Peckhaus' contribution to *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/scholz/>. Accessed 2 June 2022. This entry has been published in 2018 in open access, and focuses on Scholz's later work in mathematical logic and his contribution to the institutionalisation of the field in Germany.

in redressing this imbalance. Given the vastness of Scholz’s *Nachlass* (archive), which is kept at the University and Regional Library of Münster, my overview has a selective character.

## 1 Scholz’s Autobiographical Note

Scholz himself is inclined to retrospectively emphasise his later achievements. In an autobiographical statement that is likely to date from 1948, he listed the bare facts of his intellectual life as follows:

“Born on 17.12.1884 in Berlin as the son of the principal clergyman at the Marienkirche in Berlin. Attended the humanistic grammar school ‘zum Grauen Kloster’ in Berlin. 1903–1907. Studies in theology and philosophy at the University of Berlin under A. v. Harnack and A. Riehl. 1909 Lic. theol. Berlin. 1910 habilitation in Berlin for philosophy of religion and systematic theology. 1913 Dr. phil. Erlangen. 1917–1919 professor of philosophy of religion and systematic theology in Breslau. 1917 D. theol. h.c. [Berlin]. 1919–1928 professor of philosophy in Kiel. Since October 1928 in Münster i. W., first as full professor of philosophy, since 1936 with a teaching assignment for mathematical logic and foundational research, since 1943 as full professor of the first German chair for mathematical logic and foundational research (*Grundlagenforschung*)”.<sup>5</sup>

Scholz retired in 1952 and died on 30 December 1956.

His father Hermann Scholz, who was one of the most prominent Protestant ministers in Berlin,<sup>6</sup> and the famous church historian Adolf von Harnack (1851–1930), were arguably the most influential forces in his intellectual development as a student.<sup>7</sup> In his autobiographical note, Scholz writes that his intention was to specialise in philosophy, but he was disappointed by the logic courses taught by his teacher, Alois Riehl, and, therefore, turned to Harnack. After his habilitation in July 1910, Scholz became a *Privatdozent* (a private lecturer without much pay) for more than seven years. In an almost desperate letter to Harnack from 19 September 1917, he stated that it was extremely hard to be “without

---

<sup>5</sup> This autobiographical note was titled “Heinrich Scholz. Personalialia” and consists of four type-written pages, and is kept in the Barth Archive. A slightly different version is available in the Scholz *Nachlass*, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Münster, N. Scholz 2,012. The sketch presumably dates from 1948 – it refers to a “recently” (4) created extraordinariate for mathematical logic in Berlin, which was actually filled by Scholz’s student Karl Schröter in 1948.

<sup>6</sup> Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, “Scholz, Hermann.” In *Biographisches-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, ed. T. Bautz, Volume 9, Herzberg 1995, 687–747.

<sup>7</sup> Arie L. Molendijk, *Aus dem Dunklen ins Helle. Wissenschaft und Theologie im Denken von Heinrich Scholz*. Amsterdam, Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, 1991, 21–66, is the most extensive biography of Scholz.

responsibility” for such a long period. “As one of your most loyal and thankful, and perhaps also one of your most inspired students”, he begged his teacher “to cast the weight of his influence in the scales” to gain a meaningful academic position.<sup>8</sup>

In the autumn of 1917, Scholz succeeded the philosopher and phenomenologist of religion, Rudolf Otto (1869–1937), at Breslau and, exactly two years later he moved to Kiel, where he obtained the philosophy chair that had become vacant after the death of the prominent philosopher and Indologist, Paul Deussen (1845–1919).<sup>9</sup> His firm nationalistic stance during the First World War and his friendly relations with the classicist Werner Jaeger (1888–1961), who was a member of the university selection committee, and with the Orientalist and State Secretary of Education and the Arts, Carl Heinrich Becker (1876–1933), were no doubt conducive to this appointment. All three men were in favour of a new “humanistic synthesis” and pursued a reform of academic education.<sup>10</sup> To his own surprise, Scholz received a call to Münster in 1928. After a period of eight weeks of deliberation, he accepted the offer, considering the better possibilities in Münster to attract students.

The most consequential sentence in the autobiographical note is no doubt the statement that, after the publication (of the first edition) of his *Religionsphilosophie* in 1921, he “discovered in the library of Kiel through a stroke of good luck the ‘*Principia Mathematica*’”. He realized “immediately” that he had found what he had sought in vain for such a long time. There has been some speculation about his wording of this “discovery” as it is evident that, without prior knowledge of logic and mathematics, it is impossible to appreciate the importance of Alfred North Whitehead and Bertrand Russell’s ground-breaking book. Scholz further claimed that “the study of this work has been of decisive importance for the further course of my personal life”.<sup>11</sup> The autobiographical note states that, in the years 1922–1929, he attended lectures about mathematics and physics and himself started giving seminars on themes of mathematical logic, especially Boolean algebra.<sup>12</sup> His correspondence, however, shows that

<sup>8</sup> Scholz to Harnack, 19 September 1917. Scholz’s letters to Harnack are kept in the Harnack *Nachlass* of the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in Berlin (“*in der Stiftung preussischer Kulturbesitz*” [in the foundation of Prussian cultural heritage]). They are not mentioned in the national German Kalliope catalogue: <https://kalliope.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/de/index.html>.

<sup>9</sup> See Scholz’s obituary: “Paul Deussen †.” *Kant-Studien* 24 (1919): 304–317.

<sup>10</sup> Christian Tilitzki, *Die deutsche Universitätsphilosophie in der Weimarer Republik und im dritten Reich*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2002, Volume I, 92 f.

<sup>11</sup> Scholz, Autobiographical Note.

<sup>12</sup> Scholz, Autobiographical Note: “Von 1922–1929 habe ich regelmässig mathematische Vor-

Scholz was already spending 10 hours a week attending these lectures in the summer of 1920.<sup>13</sup> During the winter semester of 1920/1921, he gave his first introductory course in logic, which was based on the German translation of the then already out-of-date handbook by William Stanley Jevons.<sup>14</sup>

At an early stage in his career, Scholz recognised the importance of the work of German philosopher, logician and mathematician, Gottlob Frege (1848–1925).<sup>15</sup> He succeeded in collecting Frege’s estate and prepared the publication of his manuscripts. The original texts have unfortunately been destroyed in the bombing of Münster during the Second World War but copies were made, making it possible to publish the texts at a later stage after Scholz’s death.<sup>16</sup> Frege’s analysis was aimed, in Scholz’s view, “at the methodological and subtle foundation of a ‘formal language of pure thinking’ [...]. Here it was not just

---

lesungen bei den Herren Toeplitz, Hasse and Steinitz gehört [...]. Ferner habe ich bei Herrn Kossel die theoretische Physik gehört”.

**13** Scholz to Fanny Kempner, 2 September 1920, quoted in Monja Reinhart, “Mathematische Logik und Grundlagenkrise. Autobiographisches Denken beim frühen Heinrich Scholz.” In *Revisiting History and Philosophy of Logic*, ed. Andrea Reichenberger, Anna-Sophie Heinemann, Elena Ficara (Festschrift Volker Peckhaus), in press. The article explores Scholz’s relationship with the Jewish banker’s wife Fanny Kempner (1862–1937); cf. Scholz to Harnack, 25/26 December 1920, about the fact that each Sunday he studied mathematics with the help of an unnamed young mathematician.

**14** Peter Rohs, “Philosophie.” In *Geschichte der Philosophischen Fakultät*, Geschichte der Christian-Albrechts-Universität Kiel, Volume 5, part 1. Neumünster: Karl Wachholtz Verlag, 1969: “Praktische Übungen zur Logik und Methodenlehre im Anschluß an Jevons Leitfaden der Logik” (WS 1920/21), 9–104, here 85. Niko Strobach, “Umbruch und Fortentwicklung. Heinrich Scholz als Zeitzeuge des Paradigmenwechsels in der Logik” (Leipzig manuscript), 2 f.

**15** An excellent contribution on Scholz’s view in relation to Frege (and Hilbert) is Göran Sundholm, “Heinrich Scholz between Frege and Hilbert.” In *Heinrich Scholz. Logiker, Philosoph, Theologe*, ed. Hans-Christoph Schmidt am Busch, Kai F. Wehmeier. Paderborn: Mentis, 2005, 103–117.

**16** Gottlob Frege, *Nachgelassene Schriften und Wissenschaftlicher Briefwechsel*, ed. Hans Hermes, Friedrich Kambartel, Friedrich Kaulbach, Volume 1, XXXIV–XLI, and Volume 2, IXX–XXVI. Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1969, 1976; cf. Kai Wehmeier, Hans-Christoph Schmidt am Busch, “Auf der Suche nach Freges Nachlass.” In *Gottlob Frege. Werk und Wirkung*, ed. Gottlieb Gabriel, Uwe Dathe. Paderborn: Mentis Verlag, 2000, 267–281; Wehmeier, Schmidt am Busch, “The Quest for Frege’s *Nachlass*.” (trans.) In *Critical Assessments of Leading Philosophers: Gottlob Frege*, ed. Michael Beany, Erick Reck, Volume I. London: Routledge, 2005, 54–67; Birgit Heitfeld-Rydzik, “Ver(w)irrende Logik. Sind die Nachlässe von Gottlob Frege und Ernst Schröder seit Ende des Zweiten Weltkriegs verschollen?”, [chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnpbpcjpcglclefindmkaj/https://repositorium.uni-muenster.de/document/midos/5abfdd12-e65b-403d-99a4-29a2897dc4d1/heitfeld-rydzik\\_2020\\_verwirrende-logik.pdf](chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnpbpcjpcglclefindmkaj/https://repositorium.uni-muenster.de/document/midos/5abfdd12-e65b-403d-99a4-29a2897dc4d1/heitfeld-rydzik_2020_verwirrende-logik.pdf). Accessed 2 November 2022. About Scholz’s attempts to publish Frege’s manuscripts, see Matthias Wille, Gottfried Gabriel, “Briefwechsel zwischen Heinrich Scholz und den Verlagen M. & H. Marcus, Hermann Pohle, Hermann Schroedel und Ferdinand Springer.” In *Fregische Variationen*, ed. Matthias Wille, Gottfried Gabriel. Paderborn: Mentis, 2020, 247–269.

meditating, as with Husserl, but showing how it had to be done if it was to be done well and thoroughly”.<sup>17</sup> In his quest to obtain Frege’s correspondence, Scholz had contacted Edmund Husserl, who was willing to donate his letters from Frege to him. In his letter to Scholz, Husserl noted that, at the time of their acquaintance, Frege was considered to be a clever eccentric, who neither as a philosopher nor as a mathematician bore much fruit.<sup>18</sup> Russell, who detected a fundamental contradiction in Frege’s 1893 work, *Grundgesetze der Arithmetik* (The Basic Laws of Arithmetic), had quite a different opinion of this German “grandmaster”, as Scholz called him.<sup>19</sup>

Scholz’s autobiographical note further mentions the good relationships between the “Münster School” (as he preferred to call his small group of mathematical logicians) and the School of Warsaw (especially his friend Jan Łukasiewicz) and the School of Princeton, which edited the *Journal of Symbolic Logic* to which Scholz contributed many reviews – all written in German. It is remarkable how strongly Scholz’s autobiographical note is focused on his later work at Münster.

## 2 Intellectual Trajectory

This section<sup>20</sup> will provide more information about Scholz’s career, in particular his work as a theologian and philosopher. The intention is also to assess his scholarly merits in general. In this respect, Scholz’s description of the renaming of his post as chair of philosophy into one of mathematical logic deserves our attention: “Through a series of planned steps, I finally succeeded in 1943 in my fight to obtain (*erkämpfen*) the first chair of mathematical logic and foundational research and thus at the same time the first recognised teaching pulpit for these things in the German area (*im deutschen Raum*)”.<sup>21</sup> The metaphor of fighting, the designation “*im deutschen Raum*” and, above all, his founding of this chair at

<sup>17</sup> Scholz, Autobiographical Note.

<sup>18</sup> Husserl to Scholz, 19 February 1936, published in Albert Veraart, “Geschichte des wissenschaftlichen Nachlasses Gottlob Freges und seiner Edition. Mit einem Katalog des ursprünglichen Bestands der nachgelassenen Schriften Freges.” In *Studien zu Frege, Volume 1: Logik und Philosophie der Mathematik*, ed. M. Schirn. Stuttgart, Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1976, 104.

<sup>19</sup> Bertrand Russell to Frege, 16 June 1902. In Gottlob Frege, *Wissenschaftlicher Briefwechsel*, Volume 2. Hamburg: Meiner, 1976, 211 f.

<sup>20</sup> This section is based on Arie L. Molendijk, “‘Ein standfester Mensch’. Bemerkungen zum Werdegang von Heinrich Scholz.” In *Heinrich Scholz*, ed. Schmidt am Busch, Wehmeier, 13–45.

<sup>21</sup> Scholz, Autobiographical Note, 4.

the height of the Second World War (*durch eine Folge von planmässigen Schritten*), are all revealing of Scholz's single-minded personality.

The foundation of this chair undoubtedly demonstrates Scholz's hard work and perseverance but, above all, it highlights his immense talent for skilful manoeuvring and networking. In his very last contribution – to the *Festschrift* of his old friend, the humanist philosopher and educator, Eduard Spranger (1882–1863) – Scholz wrote that his institute that was formally founded in July 1950 "was the only thing [he] left behind in Münster".<sup>22</sup> There is a certain amount of drama and resignation in this remark. As a mathematical logician, he had not been able to achieve what he had perhaps initially hoped for. It has been claimed that Scholz had "no primary talent" for mathematics,<sup>23</sup> and that he was only able to produce the more technical work in collaboration with students and colleagues.<sup>24</sup> However, he was a good organiser or – in today's terminology – an outstanding manager, and he recognised at a relatively early stage the great importance of the institutional frameworks for modern science.

It is worthwhile to take a brief look at Scholz's network in the German and international logical-mathematical intellectual landscape of the time. As is well known, he had close contacts with leading logicians such as Moritz Schlick, Rudolf Carnap, Otto Neurath, Jan Łukasiewicz, Alfred Tarski, Luitzen Egbertus Jan Brouwer, Evert W. Beth, Arend Heyting, Alonzo Church and Willard Van Orman Quine. He succeeded in getting Schlick a position at Kiel in 1921 and they taught a logic course together before Schlick moved to Vienna in 1922.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Heinrich Scholz, "Ich hatt' einen Kameraden." In *Eduard Spranger. Bildnis eines geistigen Menschen unserer Zeit, zum 75. Geburtstag dargebracht von Freunden und Weggenossen*, ed. Hans Wenke. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1957, 441–452, here 452. The title is the first line of Ludwig Uhland's poem "Der gute Kamerad" (The Good Comrade). On the foundation of the institute see Hans-Christoph Schmidt am Busch, Kai F. Wehmeier, "'Es ist die einzige Spur, die ich hinterlasse'. Dokumente zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Instituts für Mathematische Logik und Grundlagenforschung." In *Heinrich Scholz*, ed. Schmidt am Busch, Wehmeier, 93–101.

<sup>23</sup> Hans Hermes, "Heinrich Scholz. Die Persönlichkeit und sein Werk als Logiker." In *Heinrich Scholz, Drei Vorträge gehalten bei der Gedächtnisfeier der Math.-Naturw. Fakultät der Universität Münster am 20 Dezember 1957*, Schriften der Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Volume 41. Münster: Aschendorff, 1958, 25–45, here 35; Hans Hermes, "Logistik in Münster um die Mitte der dreissiger Jahren." In *Logik und Grundlagenforschung. Festkolloquium zum 100. Geburtstag von Heinrich Scholz*, Schriftenreihe der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität Münster, N. F., Volume 8. Münster: Aschendorff, 1986, 41–52, here 42.

<sup>24</sup> See Heinrich Scholz, Gisbert Hasenjaeger, *Grundzüge der mathematischen Logik*. Berlin, Göttingen, Heidelberg: Springer Verlag, 1961.

<sup>25</sup> See their correspondence which is kept in the Noord-Hollands Archief. The first letter from Scholz to Schlick is dated 19 April 1919. Niko Strobach, "Zusammenprall von Kulturen oder geteiltes Paradigma? Heinrich Scholz für und gegen den Wiener Kreis" (manuscript). Scholz corresponded

Already in the first volume of the *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, Quine discussed a German-language essay by Scholz.<sup>26</sup> To give another example, Scholz was one of the two people who asked Alan Turing for an offprint of his paper “On Computable Numbers” in 1937.<sup>27</sup> On 19 October 1937, Turing wrote from Princeton to his mother: “Scholz of Münster sent me a photolithoprinted reprint the other day, containing the gist of my paper in the L.M.S. [Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society], apparently as ‘*vorgetragen*’ [vorgetragen] in Münster. It was most delightfully done, with most excellent translations into the German of the expressions I had used. I must write him a card to thank him.”<sup>28</sup> This suggests that the first seminar on theoretical computer science took place in Münster.<sup>29</sup> It was remarked that “a breath of the world of great scholars surrounded him”, and not without reason.<sup>30</sup>

The question arises whether Scholz’s published work is merely of historical significance. This could arguably be true of his strictly mathematical-logical

---

with Albert Einstein to get his support for the nomination of Schlick. Einstein was very much impressed not only by Schlick’s “profound knowledge of mathematical physics”, but also by the “extraordinary lucidity and autonomy with which he is able to treat epistemological problems”. Further, he remembers with pleasure his walk and the conversations with Scholz during the Kiel Week for the Arts and the Sciences around 15 September 1920; Einstein to Scholz, 13 March 1921, in Albert Einstein, *Collected Papers*, Volume 12, “The Berlin Years: Correspondence, January-December 1921” (English translation supplement), 139 f. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009, <https://einsteinpapers.press.princeton.edu/vol12-trans/102>. Accessed 2 November 2022. In later letters that year they discussed the philosophical importance of relativity theory.

**26** Willard Van Orman Quine, [Review] “Heinrich Scholz, Die klassische und die moderne Logik, Blätter für Deutsche Philosophie 10 (1936): 254–281.” *Journal of Symbolic Logic* (1936): 113. Scholz’s publications were systematically discussed in the journal.

**27** Andrew Hodges, *Alan Turing. The Enigma*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983, 124: “But only two people asked for offprints: Richard Braithwaite back at King’s and Heinrich Scholz, [...] who wrote back saying that he had given a seminar on it at Münster, and begged almost plaintively for two copies of any future papers, explaining how difficult it was for him to keep abreast of developments otherwise”. Cf. Scholz’s postcard to Turing, 11 February 1937, <https://turingarchive.kings.cam.ac.uk/correspondence-amtd/amt-d-5>. Accessed 29 June 2022.

**28** Letter from Turing to his mother, 19 October, 1937, <https://turingarchive.kings.cam.ac.uk/material-given-kings-college-cambridge-1960-amtk/amt-k-1-62>. Accessed 29 June 2022.

**29** Scholz’s postcard to Turing, 15 March 1937: “Die Methode, die Sie verwendet haben, um die Unlösbarkeit des Entscheidungsproblems schon für den Hilbertschen Prädikatenkalkül der ersten Stufe zu zeigen, ist so fein und originell, dass ich mir vorgenommen habe, über Ihre Arbeit in unserer logistischen Arbeitsgemeinschaft vortragen zu lassen”. <https://turingarchive.kings.cam.ac.uk/correspondence-amtd/amt-d-5>. Accessed 29 June 2022.

**30** Heinrich Behnke, *Semesterberichte. Ein Leben an deutschen Universitäten im Wandel der Zeit*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978, 107.

works, as Scholz was not able to publish much in this field.<sup>31</sup> According to Hans Hermes, his student and successor of the chair of mathematical logic at Münster, Scholz's more important achievements lie in the intermediate field of philosophy on the one hand and mathematics and logic on the other.<sup>32</sup> In my own estimation, it is especially his work on the history of mathematical logic that has been influential and is still occasionally cited. In the ten volumes of the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Scholz is referred to four times.<sup>33</sup> His *Geschichte der Logik* (1931), which has been reprinted several times, is the most frequently mentioned work here, probably because it was translated into English in 1961.<sup>34</sup> His writings on the history of philosophy and theology are also still known today.

Scholz's editorial work is also worthy of note. His edition of Friedrich Schleiermacher's theological encyclopaedia has seen many new editions has been in print for a long time<sup>35</sup> and, in 1988, an English translation of his edition of the main texts about the pantheism controversy was also published.<sup>36</sup> Scholz produced these and other editions while still a private lecturer (*Privatdozent*).

Further, it should not be forgotten that Scholz wrote highly esteemed philosophical essays and books in his time.<sup>37</sup> Apart from the booklet *Metaphysik als strenge Wissenschaft* (Metaphysics as a Strict Science), his *Religionsphilosophie* is the only work of systematic philosophy that has been republished after his

**31** Still Scholz put much work into the handbook that he wrote together with Gisbert Hasenjaeger and that would be published after his death: *Grundzüge der mathematischen Logik*, 1961.

**32** Hermes, "Heinrich Scholz. Die Persönlichkeit", 38.

**33** *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <https://www.rep.routledge.com/>, Volume 4, 279; Volume 5, 722; Volume 7, 499, Volume 8, 520.

**34** Heinrich Scholz, *Concise History of Logic*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1961.

**35** Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums zum Behuf einleitender Vorlesungen, 1811/1830* (Leipzig 1910), ed. Heinrich Scholz. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982.

**36** *The Spinoza Conversations Between Lessing and Jacobi. Text with excerpts from the ensuing controversy*, ed. Gerard Vallée, trans. G. Vallée, J. B. Lawson, and C. G. Chapple. Lanham: University Press of America: 1988 [translated excerpts from: *Die Hauptschriften zum Pantheismusstreit zwischen Jacobi und Mendelssohn*, ed. Scholz. Berlin: Reuther and Reichard, 1916].

**37** For an incomplete bibliography see Scholz, *Mathesis universalis*, 453–470. In the years 1920–1921 Scholz published no less than five books: *Der Unsterblichkeitsgedanke als philosophisches Problem*. Berlin 1920, second new edition, Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1922; *Zum „Untergang“ des Abendlandes. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Oswald Spengler*. Berlin 1920, second new edition, Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1921; *Die Bedeutung der Hegelschen Philosophie für das philosophische Denken der Gegenwart*. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1921; *Religionsphilosophie*. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1921, second new edition, Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1921; *Die Religionsphilosophie des Als-ob. Eine Nachprüfung Kants und des idealistischen Positivismus*. Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1921.

death. His philosophy of religion and his contributions to the discussion on the scientific character of theology have arguably been most influential in a systematic-theological respect,<sup>38</sup> but his concept of metaphysics has also been studied. Until the turn of the century, it was mostly theologians who carried out scholarly work on Scholz; since 1965 seven monographs focusing exclusively on Scholz have been published. At present, there is a renewed interest in his later work, with a team of scholars (working in the field of philosophy and mathematical logic) recently being awarded a grant to study and digitise Scholz’s extensive *Nachlass*, which is kept at University and Regional Library of Münster.<sup>39</sup>

Unfortunately, this collection does not contain much material from his early career. As a student and lecturer in Berlin, Scholz was primarily interested in systematic theology but nevertheless regarded the church historian Harnack as his main teacher. At Scholz’s request, Harnack covered Augustine’s *De civitate Dei* in his seminar in 1909 – the subject of Scholz’s habilitation thesis. Scholz hoped that “systematics did not intrude anywhere in the historical investigation in a disturbing way”.<sup>40</sup> Even at the start of his career, it is difficult to define Scholz’s work and interests in a disciplinary manner. He often found himself between different disciplines and mediated between his various interests in a unique way. This diversity is already apparent early on. His remark at the end of his life that logic was the “unredeemed province of my earliest days”<sup>41</sup> is not to be understood exclusively as an expression of a retrospective harmonious self-understanding. Already in his dissertation and post-doctoral thesis, there are hints of an early mathematical and logical interest.<sup>42</sup> Nevertheless, I am rather sceptical about the various scholarly attempts to make Scholz’s intellectual career comprehensible from one particular point of view or leading question.<sup>43</sup>

**38** For the reception of Scholz’s work, see Eberhard Stock, *Die Konzeption einer Metaphysik im Denken von Heinrich Scholz*, Theologische Bibliothek Töpelmann, Volume 44. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter 1987, 7–16.

**39** The so-called *Findliste* (the inventory) can be found at [ogy.de/jttd](http://ogy.de/jttd). Accessed 2 November 2022.

**40** Heinrich Scholz, *Glaube und Unglaube in der Weltgeschichte. Ein Kommentar zu Augustins De Civitate Dei, mit einem Exkurs: Fruitio Dei, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Mystik*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1911, V.

**41** Scholz, “Ich hatte einen Kameraden”, 451 f.; Molendijk, *Aus dem Dunklen ins Helle*, 43 f.

**42** Heinrich Scholz, *Christentum und Wissenschaft in Schleiermachers Glaubenslehre. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Schleiermacherschen Theologie*. Berlin: Glaue, 1909, Leipzig <sup>2</sup>1911, 31 f., note 4; and Scholz, *Glaube und Unglaube in der Weltgeschichte*, 29, note 1 (a reference to Georg Cantor, *Zur Lehre des Transfiniten*, 1887).

**43** Volker Peckhaus, “Heinrich Scholz als Metaphysiker.” In Heinrich Scholz, *Logiker, Philosoph, Theologe*, eds. Schmidt am Busch, Wehmeier, 69–83; Arie L. Molendijk, “Heinrich Scholz’ Principia Metaphysica” (a discussion of Eberhard Stock, *Die Konzeption einer Metaphysik im Denken von Heinrich Scholz*. Berlin, New York 1987).” *Tijdschrift voor Filosofie* 51 (1989): 330–337.

In various respects, it is difficult to grasp Scholz's position precisely. Initially he was inclined towards liberal theology, but he later developed a friendship with Karl Barth (1886–1968), who taught from 1925–1930 at Münster. Barth was the leader of so-called dialectical theology, which is at least partly responsible for the decline and bad reputation of liberal theology. The reappraisal of Scholz within the history of theology, then, may be also understood as being part of a positive reception of the legacy of liberal theology, which seeks to bring religion and culture into a productive and not merely antagonistic relationship.<sup>44</sup> At the end of his life, however, Scholz himself spoke of the "religious bankruptcy" of Harnack's theology.<sup>45</sup> He described the change in effect as a paradigm shift:

"Just as Kronecker in the eighties of the 19th century, through his criticism of Weierstrass's constitution of irrational numbers, affected the foundation of analysis and thus at the same time the foundation of Weierstrass's mathematics in the most sensitive way, so in the second decade of the 20th century Karl Barth, through his criticism of Harnack's humanism, affected an essential existential condition of every humanist theology and thus at the same time of Harnack's theology in the sharpest way."<sup>46</sup>

As chance would have it, Scholz and Barth met for the first time in Harnack's seminar (I have written about the development of their complex relationship in another article).<sup>47</sup> Here, I will give a characteristic quotation that describes the friendship from Barth's perspective, taken from Barth's letter of condolence to Scholz's wife, Erna Koch:

"You know that we too were very fond of him – for almost 30 years, during which our fellowship with him proved itself again and again. For me, at least, the acquaintance goes back to much earlier times: I can still remember how I saw him in the winter of 1906/7 in Berlin as a senior in Harnack's seminar – he had something flashing at that time – among us smaller spirits. That we then became friends in Münster was a small miracle when one considers what different creatures of God we both were, how far he had moved away from theology into areas where I could not even follow him one step and how I, for my part, had worked myself into a kind of theology which, one might think, could only make him shake his head. Yes, and then everything turned out so beautifully: a relationship – he would now say: 'of a

<sup>44</sup> Georg Pfeleiderer, *Theologie als Wirklichkeitswissenschaft. Studien zum Religionsbegriff bei Georg Wobbermin, Rudolf Otto, Heinrich Scholz und Max Scheler*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, Volume 82. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.

<sup>45</sup> Heinrich Scholz, "Offene Fragen." *Evangelische Theologie* 12 (1952/1953): 572–583, here 581.

<sup>46</sup> Heinrich Scholz, "[Review] Agnes von Zahn-Harnack, *Adolf von Harnack*. Berlin: Hans Böttcher Verlag, 1936." *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 57 (1936): 821–831, here 830; cf. Heinrich Scholz, "Der Gottesgedanke in der Mathematik." (1934) In Idem, *Mathesis universalis*, 293–311, here 295 f.

<sup>47</sup> Arie L. Molendijk, "Eine 'rätselhafte' Freundschaft. Die Korrespondenz zwischen Heinrich Scholz und Karl Barth." *Zeitschrift für dialektische Theologie* 8/1 (1992): 75–98.

magnitude that can only be compared with itself'. Oh yes, how I will miss never hearing his whole artificial language again, from which one always heard his moved and good heart [...]. We will never forget this man who was so animated and at the same time so firm, so rich and so faithful in everything and what he meant in our lives."<sup>48</sup>

Scholz was a steadfast and loyal man. These were important values for him and thus they appear in his series of aphorisms that deal with many such moral concepts. In his view, the steadfast person is "loyal to what must not fall".<sup>49</sup> Crucial for him were his loyalties to mathematical logic, his Christian faith and the principles for which he stood. His moral orientation and stance will be further explored in the rest of this article.

### 3 Scholz and the Nazi Regime

Politically speaking, Scholz was a conservative Prussian nationalist.<sup>50</sup> During the First World War he published pamphlets that adopted a denigratory stance towards the French and the British. It is a somewhat embarrassing experience to read these texts. He saw the German *Zusammenbruch* (collapse) in 1918 as the result of a violent imperialism that turned "against the German spirit, with which we had been brought up".<sup>51</sup> The ensuing Treaty of Versailles, which stipulated huge so-called reparations to the victorious Entente states, was in his view a defamation of Germany. "We did not deserve this",<sup>52</sup> Scholz wrote in 1956, the "disgrace, ignominy and shame of the armistice" and the "intrigues of the Kaiser's overthrow", as it was still called in 1918.<sup>53</sup> In Scholz's opinion, the new freedom was that of a nation of "helots". The "so-called government in Weimar" ruled "the masses" according to the principle: "I am their leader, therefore I must follow them".

As he wrote to Harnack in 1919, he had taken up the cause of the *Deutsch-Nationalen* (nationalist-conservative party):

---

**48** Barth an Erna Scholz, 6 January 1957, copy, Karl Barth *Nachlass*, Basel. German original is quoted in Molendijk, "Ein standfester Mensch", 17.

**49** Heinrich Scholz, *Von grossen Menschen und Dingen*. Berlin: Habel, 1946, 35.

**50** In this section and the next sections I use materials from Molendijk, *Aus dem Dunklen ins Helle*, chapter 2.

**51** Scholz, "Ich hatt' einen Kameraden", 448 f.

**52** Scholz, "Ich hatt' einen Kameraden", 449.

**53** Scholz to Harnack, 22 November 1918.

“May God at least save us from the hellish spook of Bolshevism, if he cannot accept us into heaven because of our debts! For how can he, since we are ruled by men who deride Christianity and the great metaphysical sentiments which we hold sacred to others as [vain?] mummery and throw us the dog bones of the class struggle and Marxist ideology as surrogates for it!”<sup>54</sup>

The Weimar Republic could not count on Scholz’s sympathy. As late as 1932, he had to justify himself to Barth because of his alleged “German-folk fanaticism”:

“As long as I can remember, I have never attended a political meeting, never belonged to a political party as a member, and I am now more determined than ever not to do so in the future. But I feel for a youth that does not want to allow the victims of war to be even close to people for whom the penal code was invented. It is possible that I am wrong with this youth. It is certainly not proven. Consequently, dialectical theology is also not justified in pushing us down to demonised human beings, i. e. second- and third-order human beings.”<sup>55</sup>

Despite his nationalism, from the very beginning Scholz seems to have been critical of national socialism. As a Prussian, Scholz feared belonging to the group that the Nazis hated most. The movement was perhaps also too plebeian for him. He wrote to Barth on 14 June 1933 that the census service, to which he was forced, and other *Gleichschaltungsaktionen* (Nazi Party total coordination actions) consumed an enormous amount of time. His letters to Barth suggest that an important reason for his rejection of national socialism lies in his Christian belief. He spoke of the “iron” that had gotten into his own Protestantism and the necessity to descend “into the catacombs”.<sup>56</sup>

---

54 Scholz to Harnack, 28 March 1919: “Möge Gott uns wenigstens vor dem Höllenspuk des Bolschewismus retten, wenn er uns schon, wegen unserer Schulden, nicht in den Himmel aufnehmen kann! Denn wie kann er das, seit wir von Männern regiert werden, die das Christentum und die grossen metaphysischen Gesinnungen, die wir andern für heilige Dinge halten, als [eitlen?] Mummenschanz verhöhnen und uns dafür die Hundeknochen des Klassenkampfes und der Marxistischen Ideologie als Surrogate hinwerfen!”. The word in the square bracket I am not completely sure about.

55 Scholz, “Weiteres zu Karl Barth. Der Fall Dehn und die dialektische Theologie”, 27 February 1932, 5 pages; Charlotte von Kirschbaum Estate, Karl Barth *Nachlass*, Basel: “Ich habe, so lange ich denken kann, nie eine politische Versammlung besucht, nie einer politischen Partei als Mitglied angehört und bin jetzt fester denn je entschlossen, dies auch in Zukunft nicht zu tun. Aber ich fühle mit einer Jugend, die nicht zulassen will, dass die Opfer des Krieges auch nur in die Nähe von Menschen gerückt werden, für welche das Strafgesetzbuch erfunden ist. Es ist möglich, dass ich mit dieser Jugend irre. Nachgewiesen ist es ganz sicher nicht. Folglich ist auch die dialektische Theologie nicht berechtigt, uns zu den dämonisierten Menschen, also den Menschen zweiter und dritter Ordnung herunterzudrücken.”

56 Scholz to Barth, 30 December 1933; Scholz to Barth, 23 December 1934.

Barth would have liked to hear Scholz speak “without *sordino*” (because of the Nazi censorship): “One thing is comfortingly clear to us: whoever and however many in church and world may bend their knees before Baal in this strange time and take upon themselves the mark of the beast, of which it is written Apoc. 13 – a Heinrich Scholz who is in some palpable sense *gleichgeschaltet* is one of those things whose existence cannot even be thought of”.<sup>57</sup> During the *Kirchenkampf* (church struggle) Scholz regained a steadfast Christianity that contributed to his rejection of national socialism. This is the picture that emerges from the correspondence with Barth. Others, like his colleague and friend Heinrich Behnke in Münster, found Scholz’s Prussian nationalism arrogant and pointed to instances where he, apparently, showed an uncomfortable degree of conformism.<sup>58</sup>

Is there more to be said about Scholz’s manoeuvring in this era? In 1943 he succeeded in changing his chair in philosophy to one of mathematical logic. And there are other questions to be asked. Scholz was involved in the publication of the journal *Deutsche Mathematik* (German Mathematics), which advocated a kind of *völkisch* (popular) mathematics. Students spoke out here with quotes from the Führer in order to refute “Jewish-liberalist” theses and advocated an applied German mathematics. In addition, Scholz published in the weekly *Das Reich*, which was founded by Joseph Goebbels, the propaganda minister of Nazi Germany. Although there is nothing seriously objectionable about Scholz’s own contributions, Beth nevertheless called his friend Scholz to account.<sup>59</sup> Scholz replied that he had “never belonged to the party or any of its branches”. He had had to associate himself with *Das Reich* “in order (1) to save our foundational research, (2) to be able to help our suffering Polish friends in the way I did”.<sup>60</sup> Scholz emphasised that his logical-mathematical work had been threatened by accusations from German-Swiss mathematician Max Steck, who spoke of the “decadence” of the mathematical mind:

---

**57** Barth to Scholz, 24 May 1933: “Eines ist uns tröstlich klar: wer und wie viele immer in Kirche und Welt in dieser seltsamen Zeit ihre Kniee beugen mögen vor Baal und das Zeichen des Tieres, von dem geschrieben steht Apoc. 13, auf sich nehmen – ein in irgend einem angebbaren Sinn ‘gleichgeschalteter’ Heinrich Scholz gehört zu den Dingen, deren Existenz auch nicht einmal gedacht werden kann.”

**58** Behnke, *Semesterberichte*, 108 and 116.

**59** Beth to Scholz, 28 July 1946; see Peckhaus, “Moral Integrity during a difficult period: Beth and Scholz”, 159, for the English translation of part of this beautiful letter, which makes a clear distinction between the evil elements (“*verbrecherischen Elemente*”) in the German population and the trustworthy German personalities (“*vertrauenswürdige Deutsche Persönlichkeiten*”), with whom normal relations have to be reestablished in the not too distant future. The correspondence between Scholz and Beth is kept in het Noord-Hollands Archief.

**60** Scholz to Beth, 24 August 1946.

“I will not have to tell you what we had to fear for ourselves from certain quarters on the basis of this book [Steck’s *Das Hauptproblem der Mathematik* (1942)]. I had to risk a countermove or I was also responsible for our research going to ruin; because at that time we still had to reckon with the possibility that the war would turn out in such a way that the system would remain in place. This is what the connection with *Das Reich* has done, and in such a way that I have reason to believe that I would repeat this step if I were once again faced with the decision I was faced with at that time. It should be added that the editor of the cultural department of *Das Reich* was a man who stood so sharply against the system that he was heavily involved in the assassination attempt of 20 July [referring to the failed attempt to assassinate Adolf Hitler in 1944]. This additional fact has been an essential condition for my taking up this connection.”<sup>61</sup>

Thus, Scholz argued that he had contributed to *Das Reich*, which after the *Völkische Beobachter* was the most widely distributed German newspaper during the Second World War,<sup>62</sup> because he had to defend his work against Steck’s attack in 1942 and to be able to help Polish colleagues.<sup>63</sup> Scholz responded to Steck with a biting, ironical piece in *Deutsche Mathematik*,<sup>64</sup> but does it explain the attachment to Goebbels’ weekly publication? It would undoubtedly be an insufficient explanation to most, as Scholz’s first contribution to the newspaper already appeared in January 1941.<sup>65</sup> Presently we don’t know the details about

**61** Scholz to Beth, 24 August 1946: “Ich werde Ihnen nicht sagen müssen, was wir auf Grund dieses Buches [Steck’s *Das Hauptproblem der Mathematik* (1942), ALM] von gewissen Stellen für uns zu befürchten hatten. Ich musste einen Gegenzug riskieren oder ich war mitverantwortlich dafür, dass unsere Forschung zu Grunde ging; denn damals musste noch mit der Möglichkeit gerechnet werden, dass der Krieg so ausgehen würde, dass das System ihn irgendwie überstand. Dies hat die Verbindung mit dem ‘Reich’ geleistet, und so, dass ich Grund habe zu glauben, dass ich diesen Schritt wiederholen würde, wenn ich noch einmal vor die Entscheidung gestellt würde, vor die ich damals gestellt war. Es kommt hinzu, dass der Schriftleiter der Kulturabteilung des ‘Reich’ ein Mann war, der so scharf gegen das System gestanden hat, dass er in das Attentat vom 20. Juli schwer verwickelt worden ist. Diese zusätzliche Tatsache ist eine wesentliche Bedingung dafür gewesen, dass ich diese Verbindung aufgenommen habe.”

**62** See <https://www.zukunft-braucht-erinnerung.de/die-wochenzeitung-das-reich/>. Accessed 29 June 2022. The comparatively liberal-minded editors of this newspaper had some leeway to publish articles that avoided the normally obligatory propagandistic phrases. This way, they were able to attract esteemed authors such as Theodor Heuss and Max Planck as well as Scholz, who published most of his war-time contributions in the *Kölnische Zeitung*.

**63** Much has been written about this potentially very dangerous controversy with Steck. Sanford L. Segal, *Mathematicians under the Nazis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003, 258 f. and 392 f.; Peckhaus, “Moral Integrity during a difficult period: Beth and Scholz”, 159–162; and Eckhart Menzler-Trott, *Gentzens Problem. Mathematische Logik im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland*. Basel: Birkhäuser, 2001, 213–223 (including Scholz’s correspondence with Ludwig Bieberach, the editor of *Deutsche Mathematik*).

**64** Heinrich Scholz, “Was will die formalisierte Grundlagenforschung?” *Deutsche Mathematik* 7 (1942–1944): 206–248.

**65** Heinrich Scholz, “Platon als Erzieher.” *Das Reich* (26 January 1941).

how Scholz became involved in *Das Reich* but, generally speaking, it is clear he tried to adapt to the new regime.<sup>66</sup>

In any case, Beth remained unconvinced by Scholz’s argument but was impressed by Scholz’s second argument about what he did for his Polish colleagues:

“Not only did I save Mr and Mrs Lukasiewicz, but I also maintained the connection between Mr Tarski in the USA and his wife, who had stayed behind in Warsaw with his two children, in a subterranean and extremely laborious way for so long until Mrs Tarski, with my cooperation, finally obtained the exit pass to the USA for herself and her children. I finally succeeded in rescuing one of Mr Lukasiewicz’s best theological students, Mr Salamucha, from the concentration camp before the worst had happened. It is a misfortune that I will not forget that this excellent person was murdered in the battle for Warsaw in August 1943\* (\* Not by the Germans!). Furthermore, I corresponded with the other Warsaw and Krakow friends time and again, although all correspondence was strictly forbidden. I won’t tell you here what I risked. Suffice it to say that the Gestapo visited me three times and that our minister notified me after the liberation of Mr. S. from the concentration camp that disciplinary proceedings would be instituted against me with the aim of removing me from office in case I would make a similar attempt.”<sup>67</sup>

Especially significant is what Scholz wrote to Beth about Justus Meyer: “My best friend Justus Meyer in Bloemendaal had to go into hiding for two-and-a-half

---

**66** Scholz to Max Bense, 7 August 1943, about “*starke Hemmungen*” (strong impediments) to publish in *Das Reich*, because he had “*nichts zu suchen*” here (no business here), quoted in Andrea Albrecht, Christian Blohmann, Lutz Danneberg, “Mathematik ist reine Wissenschaft, nichts anderes”. Max Bense zwischen Oswald Spengler und Heinrich Scholz.” In *Max Bense. Werk – Kontext – Wirkung*, ed. Andrea Albrecht, Masetto Bonitz, Alexandra Skowronski, Claus Zittel. Berlin: J. B. Metzler Verlag – Springer, 2019, 43–112, here 78. On the early relationship between Scholz and the philosopher and publicist Max Bense (1910–1990), who attended Scholz’s lectures in Münster in 1933–1934, see 74–76.

**67** Scholz to Beth, 24 August 1946: “Ich habe nicht nur Herrn und Frau Lukasiewicz gerettet, sondern ich habe auch die Verbindung zwischen Herrn Tarski in USA und seiner mit seinen beiden Kindern in Warschau zurückgebliebenen Frau auf eine unterirdische Art so lange aufrecht erhalten, bis Frau Tarski unter meiner Mitwirkung auf mühevollsten Umwegen für sich und ihre Kinder schliesslich den Ausreisepass nach USA erhalten hat. Ich habe endlich einen der besten theologischen Schüler von Herrn Lukasiewicz, Herrn Salamucha, aus dem Konzentrationslager gerettet, bevor das Schlimmste geschehen war. Es ist ein Unglücksfall, den ich nicht vergessen werde, dass dieser ausgezeichnete Mensch in den Kämpfen um Warschau im August 1943 ermordet worden ist\* (\*Nicht von den Deutschen!). Und ich habe mit den übrigen Warschauer und Krakauer Freunden immer wieder einmal korrespondiert, obschon uns jede Korrespondenz streng verboten gewesen ist. Ich erzähle Ihnen hier nicht, was ich alles riskiert habe. Aber ich werde sagen dürfen, dass die Gestapo dreimal bei mir gewesen ist und dass unser Minister mich nach der Befreiung von Herrn S. aus dem Konzentrationslager hat wissen lassen, dass im Wiederholungsfalle ein Disziplinarverfahren mit dem Ziel der Amtsentsetzung gegen mich eröffnet werden würde.”

years. His sister was murdered. Through him I am also well informed about how people in Holland feel about us now, and for reasons that no one can want to touch”.<sup>68</sup>

Because of the war, the relationship between Beth and Scholz became delicate and somewhat strained, aptly illustrated by the following episode: At the start of 1946, Scholz wrote a series of short comments on the concept of collective responsibility, which was printed in *Zwischen den Zeiten* (Between the Times), a widely read booklet of which 500,000 copies were distributed at the instigation of the French occupation authorities.<sup>69</sup> In this booklet, printed in Stuttgart, Scholz wrote that an attempt must be made to rebuild moral culture and that this was an endeavour “which, like no other, will fortify the deeply shaken honour of the German spirit anew in tenacious labour”.<sup>70</sup> Scholz also sent the booklet to Beth, who reacted positively on the whole. However, Beth wrote that, to his regret, he had noticed several times “the language of a presumptuous nationalism”, and proposed an *Index verborum prohibitorum* of such nationalist terms for the German daily press.<sup>71</sup> And it is true – Scholz speaks of heroism, heroic courage, of a holy patriotism, and so on. This is why it was sometimes difficult to distinguish between the language of national socialism and that of old Prussianism.

Many German nationalists also welcomed the rise of Hitler. What is characteristic of Scholz is that, on the basis of his old German idealistic values, he tried to come to terms with the recent past and wanted to contribute to a new Germany. This did not mean that Scholz had to construct his point of view anew ad hoc. As early as 1917, he had distanced himself from forms of “Teutonic” patriotism:<sup>72</sup> “Genuine patriotism will never tolerate being displaced by a patriotism that conceals inability, and certainly not by a patriotism that falsifies the truth”.<sup>73</sup> In his view, national socialism did not mean the debilitation of Prussianism. For him, there was no way from Otto von Bismarck to Hitler, let alone a straight path.

**68** Scholz to Beth, 24 August 1946: “Mein bester Freund Justus Meyer in Bloemendaal hat für 2 1/2 Jahre untertauchen müssen. Seine Schwester ist ermordet worden. Durch ihn bin ich auch gut unterrichtet darüber, wie man in Holland jetzt zu uns steht, und aus Gründen, die niemand kann antasten wollen.”

**69** Scholz to Beth, 24 August 1946; Scholz to von Kirschbaum, 5 April 1946. The pamphlet was widely distributed and could be found in the waiting rooms of physicians.

**70** Heinrich Scholz, *Zwischen den Zeiten*. Tübingen, Stuttgart: Furche Verlag, 1946, 21.

**71** Beth to Scholz, 19 October 1946.

**72** Heinrich Scholz, *Wesen des deutschen Geistes*. Berlin: G. Grote, 1917, 21 f.

**73** Heinrich Scholz, “In memoriam Max Planck.” *Frankfurter Hefte*, 3 (1948): 146–161, here 153.

#### 4 Scholz and his Polish Friends

There is no doubt that Scholz went to extreme lengths to help his threatened Polish friends. Both Łukasiewicz and Tarski thanked Scholz many times, with Tarski dedicating his *Undecidable Theories* as thus: “To Heinrich Scholz. The Scholar and the Man”.<sup>74</sup> Scholz’s relationship with Łukasiewicz dates to at least from 1932, as it was then that Scholz gave lectures in Warsaw and Lwów. The Warsaw connection was of tremendous importance to Scholz, and in 1938 he succeeded in getting Łukasiewicz an honorary doctorate from Münster, which was handed over by Hans-Adolf von Moltke, the then German ambassador to Poland.<sup>75</sup> In his report, Scholz emphasized the fine cooperation of the German authorities in Poland and the excellent relations between the German and Polish scholars. At this occasion Scholz and Tarski must have seen each other, their relationship probably going back to 1935, as they both attended the Paris congress on the unity of science.<sup>76</sup>

Tarski was reunited with his family at the train station in Berkeley, California, on 5 January 1946, as a moving photo in the *Oakland Tribune* (6 January 1946) shows. His wife and two children were among the first post-war refugees from Poland.<sup>77</sup> On 21 October 1946, Tarski wrote a long letter to Scholz in English (their earlier correspondence had been in German), which gives an insight into his thoughts. Tarski noticed “with great joy” that three weeks ago he had received Scholz’s letter of July,<sup>78</sup> and informed him that only food packages could be sent to the British occupation zone in Germany (which included the city of Münster). He hoped that the package that his wife had prepared two weeks ago

<sup>74</sup> Alfred Tarski, in collaboration with Andrzej Mostowski and Raphael Robinson, *Undecidable Theories*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1953; cf. Jan Łukasiewicz, *Aristotle’s Syllogistic. From the Standpoint of Modern Formal Logic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957, ix: the section on Galen is “dedicated to my friend Heinrich Scholz, who was of great assistance to myself and to my wife during the war, and especially during our stay in Münster in 1944”.

<sup>75</sup> Schmidt am Busch and Wehmeier, “Scholz and Łukasiewicz”, 68; cf. Heinrich Scholz, “Bericht über einen Aufenthalt in Warschau in der Zeit vom 16.-23. Dezember 1938” (dated 29 December 1938, a copy is kept in the Beth *Nachlass*).

<sup>76</sup> Rudolf Carnap, *Tagebücher*, 2 Volumes, ed. by Christian Damböck. Hamburg: Meiner 2022, Volume 2 (1920–1935), 710. The first letter in the correspondence is Tarski to Scholz, 6 October 1938, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Münster, Scholz Archive (Nachlass), sign. 113, 056. Scholz published a review of Tarski’s *Einführung in die mathematische Logik*, 1937, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* (issue 16), 17 April 1938: 571–572.

<sup>77</sup> Anita Burdman Feferman, Solomon Feferman, *Alfred Tarski. Life and Logic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Page 168 shows the picture; cf. 162–167 is about their escape to the United States.

<sup>78</sup> As far as I know, this letter has not been preserved.

had arrived in the meanwhile. As soon as it was possible, he would mail a copy of the second edition of his *Introduction to Logic* and some reprints. He then he goes on to thank Scholz:

"You need not tell me of all your efforts to keep in touch with my family in Warsaw and to help them during the war. I know of them very well from your letters of 1940 and 1941 which I still have here, and from my wife's detailed report. [...] And what you did was not restricted to your private life. In your wartime publications you devoted even more time and space than in your earlier writings to discuss the work of Polish scientists and to emphasize the value of their achievements, and you did this during the period in which the government of the country to which you belong made all possible efforts to annihilate the Polish nation. Knowing you, I realise that your behaviour was prompted not only by your great scientific conscientiousness but more so by an inner urge which compelled you to counteract, up to the limit of your possibilities, what you considered a great wrong. There are few human traits which I hold in as great esteem as I do inner integrity and civil courage; that these virtues are essential elements of your character, your actions during the past few years have proved beyond doubt."<sup>79</sup>

This is doubtless a very favourable assessment of Scholz's behaviour, but it cannot be denied that Scholz showed great character and took a lot of personal risk during the Second World War.

Discussing the personal loss of family, friends and colleagues, Tarski noted that around 30 of his close relatives had been murdered.<sup>80</sup> Despite this, the tone of the letter is not gloomy. Although he felt "intellectually [...] somewhat isolated", he was happy with his professorship, which gave him a sense of stability. The final sentences of the letter are also telling:

"Do you remember that in the last letter you sent me before the war you expressed the hope of meeting me in the United States in 1940, if '*unsere schöne abendländische Kultur noch existieren wird*'? These words resounded prophetically to me during the whole time of the war. Well, '*unsere schöne abendländische Kultur*' [our beautiful occidental culture] still exists – though badly hurt and crippled; and I do hope, my friend (if you permit me to call you in this way), that I shall see you again in the not too distant future."<sup>81</sup>

Finally, I wish to draw the attention to a painful passage in Tarski's letter:

"I am afraid you may feel personally hurt by not finding here any sympathetic reaction to your information on the fate of still another Polish logician and his wife, and to your plans concerning them. But I cannot sympathize with people (even with a man who was my

<sup>79</sup> Tarski to Scholz, 21 October 1946, Scholz Archive, sign. 113, 059.

<sup>80</sup> This passage is quoted in Feferman and Feferman, *Alfred Tarski*, 168–170.

<sup>81</sup> In 1953, Tarski would visit Europe and lecture in Münster.

own teacher) who have been charged with behavior during the war period so diametrically different from your own: one of whom, for example, has been accused of threatening to denounce a colleague of Jewish descent hiding from the Gestapo in case he should appear in the apartment house where they lived. My relation to these people could change only if the accusations proved unfounded.”

This excerpt refers to Łukasiewicz and his wife Regina, whose lives were in danger as the Russian army approached Warsaw at the end of 1943. Łukasiewicz had served as a minister in the Polish government, and his wife was from an aristocratic family. Scholz helped them financially during the war and, due to his persistent support, they were able to travel to Münster on 17 July 1944. In 1946 Łukasiewicz received a professorship in Dublin, where he lived till his death in 1956. This has all been very well documented in the studies of Peter Schreiber, Hans-Christoph Schmidt am Busch and Kai F. Wehmeier.<sup>82</sup>

How should we assess this passage from Tarski’s letter? What should be noted first and foremost is that he writes of an accusation and does not give a precise account of what allegedly happened. So this denouncement is not presented here as an established fact. In the correspondence between Tarski and Scholz, there has been no further mention of this incident. The only other written source that I am aware of is Łukasiewicz’s autobiographical diary, which states that the accusation that his wife Regina was spreading rumours about the neighbour being Jewish was made up. As far as I can judge from the automatic machine translation, Łukasiewicz writes here about a “Karait by origin”, who complained about Regina’s behaviour. He goes on to state that, although Karaites professed the “Mosaic religion”, they were not actually Jews and were not considered to be Jews by the occupying German forces.<sup>83</sup> This may sound a sophisticated way of arguing, but there is indeed evidence that, in principle (not always in practice), the Karaite branch of Judaism was exempt from persecution.

---

**82** Peter Schreiber, “Über Beziehungen zwischen Heinrich Scholz und polnischen Logikern.” *History and Philosophy of Logic*, 20 (1999): 97–109; and, especially, Schmidt am Busch, Wehmeier, “On the relations between Heinrich Scholz and Jan Łukasiewicz”. For the purposes of orientation, the following entry is also useful: Peter Simons, “Jan Łukasiewicz”, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2021), ed. Edward N. Zalta, <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2021/entries/lukasiewicz/>. Accessed 29 June 2022. The biographical part of this entry seems to be based on Jan Łukasiewicz, “Curriculum Vitae [1953].” *Philosophical Studies* 6 (1956): 43–46.

**83** Jan Łukasiewicz, *Pamiętnik*, ed. J. J. Jadacki, P. Surma. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper, 2013, 76. I thank Gabriela Besler who brought this passage to my attention and provided me with an automatic machine translation of the text.

Indeed, on 5 January 1939, the Reich's Department for Genealogical Research decided that the Karaites were not to be considered Jews.<sup>84</sup>

Similar stories about Regina's antisemitism circulated after the war. Polish philosopher Jan Wolenski (born 1940) recalled that the mother of Gisbert Hasenjaeger (1919–2006), who co-created a mathematical textbook with Scholz in 1961,<sup>85</sup> allegedly said after meeting Regina in 1944 that she had never met a person as antisemitic as her. She had made "nasty remarks" about Jewish colleagues,<sup>86</sup> and at the end of his life Łukasiewicz was apparently so embittered that he believed he was the victim of intentionally planned Jew-baiting.<sup>87</sup> Still, we have no conclusive evidence of the "denouncement" about which Tarski writes in his letter to Scholz.

Concerning the fate of the Polish priest and logician Jan Salamucha, Scholz had been misinformed. Firstly, Scholz made the mistake of dating his death in August 1943, whereas the uprising and the battles around Warsaw actually took place a year later. Secondly, he added in handwriting that Salamucha had not been killed by the Germans, which is not true. As an army chaplain, Salamucha did not withdraw with his unit, but decided to stay with the wounded, and was consequently murdered by German troops.<sup>88</sup> Scholz's efforts to help Salamucha led to a chilling reprimand by the minister of Science and National Education, who deemed Scholz's petition "a grave affront upon the dignity of the German nation", which could serve "anti-German propaganda against the political leadership of the German people". If Scholz disobeyed this order, disciplinary criminal proceedings would be taken against him.<sup>89</sup>

The record of Scholz that was kept by the *Sicherheitsdienst* (SD – the intelligence agency of the SS and the Nazi Party) also referred to this incident, which led to a "severe warning" by the Ministry of Education. The field of mathematical logic was here considered to be dominated by Jews ("*Die Logistik ist stark*

**84** <https://robintimweis.wordpress.com/2012/06/25/karaites-the-case-of-jewish-exemption-under-nazi-rule-30>. Accessed 29 June 2022; Kiril Feferman, "Nazi Germany and the Karaites in 1938–1944: Between racial theory and Realpolitik." *Nationalities Papers* 39/2 (2011): 277–294.

**85** Scholz, Hasenjaeger, *Grundzüge der mathematischen Logik*, 1961.

**86** Jan Hertrich-Wolenski, personal communication, 20 December 2021.

**87** Scholz to Bochenski, 10 March 1954, Scholz Archive, 116,016: "Opfer einer planmässigen Judenhetze"; cf. Gabriela Besler, "The correspondence between Józef M. Bocheński (1902–1995) and Heinrich Scholz (1946–1954)." *Studies in East European Thought*, 74 (2021): 197–210.

**88** Peckhaus, "Moral integrity during a difficult period: Beth and Scholz", 165. He quotes Bolesłwa Sobociński, "Jan Salamucha (1903–1944). A Biographical Note." *The New Scholasticism*, 32 (1958): 327–333.

**89** Schmidt am Busch and Wehmeier, "Scholz and Łukasiewicz", 71. They quote the letter of minister Rust (2 October 1940) in its entirety.

*verjudet*”). Further, the report stated that, from a scholarly point of view, Scholz was very important. Politically, he was categorised as a “vehement opponent” of the regime, “because he could not reconcile the State’s claim of totality with the Christian faith”.<sup>90</sup> This assessment confirms the views of Scholz’s friends and colleagues concerning his stance regarding the Nazi regime. The fact that Scholz was reprimanded rather than punished for his actions shows his high standing, even with the regime. While sheer luck may also have played a role in this case, Scholz undoubtedly knew how to play the system. In July 1945 Scholz filled out the Personnel Questionnaire of the Military Government of Germany; his Clearance Certificate was dated 29 April 1948.<sup>91</sup> Despite his good reputation the process of denazification took almost three years.

## 5 The Dutch Connection

Scholz also forged strong connections with Dutch philosophers and logicians. However, although his correspondence with Beth survives, as well as a few post-war letters from Dutch friends and colleagues (kept in the Scholz *Nachlass* in Münster), there is scant evidence of these relationships. Announcements in daily newspapers document that Scholz visited the Netherlands at the start of October 1923 to give a talk for the Dutch branch of the *Kant Gesellschaft* at the International School of Philosophy in Amersfoort. He also gave a lecture entitled *Der Wert des Lebens*<sup>92</sup> at the *Oudemanspoort* venue at the University of Amsterdam on 5 October 1923. From newspaper clips, it is evident that Scholz is regarded as a well-known German philosopher who published an important *Religionsphilosophie* and a booklet about the idea of immortality in philosophy.<sup>93</sup>

From the recollections of the Jewish mathematician Abraham A. Fraenkel (1891–1965), we learn that Scholz had also been in the Netherlands earlier that year. Fraenkel recounts that, during a visit of his in-laws in the spring of 1923 in Amsterdam, he received a message from the Dutch-Jewish philosopher Leo Polak (1880–1941), who would later be killed in the concentration camp Sachsen-

<sup>90</sup> Gerd Simon, “SD-Dossiers über Philosophie-Professoren”, <https://homepages.uni-tuebingen.de/gerd.simon/philosophendossiers.pdf>, 23 June 2018: “Politisch: Scharfer Gegner des Nationalsozialismus, weil den Totalitätsanspruch des Staates für unvereinbar haltend mit dem Christentum”. Accessed 29 June 2022.

<sup>91</sup> Scholz Archive, documents 121,060, and 121,062.

<sup>92</sup> The website <https://www.delpher.nl/nl/kranten> gives an overview of digitised Dutch newspapers.

<sup>93</sup> Hermann Scholz, *Der Unsterblichkeitsgedanke als philosophisches Problem* (1920), second revised edition. Berlin: Reuther and Reichard, 1922.

hausen.<sup>94</sup> Polak told Fraenkel that Scholz wanted to speak with him as soon as possible about a manuscript which Fraenkel had lent to Polak. This concerned the proofs of the second edition of Fraenkel’s *Einleitung in die Mengenlehre* (Introduction to Set Theory), in which the views of Brouwer, Russell and David Hilbert were discussed.<sup>95</sup> Scholz invited Fraenkel to lecture on the same subject in Kiel<sup>96</sup> and he also played an important role in getting Fraenkel a professorship there in 1928.<sup>97</sup> This first meeting was the starting point of a friendship that would last a lifetime. Further early proof of Scholz’s contacts with Dutch logicians and mathematicians is that he visited Brouwer in 1926 to discuss the foundation of mathematics.<sup>98</sup>

Scholz’s closest relationship was with twin brothers Justus and Herman Meyer (1893–1958 and 1893–1959, respectively). In his obituary of Scholz, Herman Meyer speaks of a friendship that lasted over thirty years.<sup>99</sup> Scholz spoke about “his very good friend” Justus, who was one of the few friends whom Scholz addressed by the intimate pronoun *du*. Both Meyer brothers were businessmen with a particular interest in philosophy and literature. Since at least 1926, Scholz often spent his summer holidays in Zandvoort, near Justus’ house *Mare Liberum* in Bloemendaal.<sup>100</sup> Together with the renowned philosopher Hendrik J. Pos (1898–1955)<sup>101</sup> the four of them bantered and discussed logical matters. Scholz was not particularly fond of Pos’ phenomenological view of language and often began his response to him with the phrase: “But, my dear Pos, for us who don’t

**94** *Nieuw Licht op Leo Polak (1880–1941). Filosoof van het vrije denken*, ed. Klaas van Berkel, Stefan van der Poel. Hilversum: Verloren, 2016.

**95** Abraham A. Fraenkel, *Lebenskreise. Aus den Erinnerungen eines jüdischen Mathematikers*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1967, 179; English translation: Abraham A. Fraenkel, *Recollections of a Jewish mathematician in Germany*. Basel: Birkhäuser (Springer), 2016. Abraham A. Fraenkel, *Einleitung in die Mengenlehre. Eine elementare Einführung in das Reich des Unendlich-grossen* (1919). Berlin: Julius Springer, 1923.

**96** Abraham A. Fraenkel, *Zehn Vorlesungen über die Grundlegung der Mengenlehre* (gehalten in Kiel auf Einladung der Kant-Gesellschaft, Ortsgruppe Kiel, vom 8.–12. Juni 1925). Leipzig: Teubner, 1927. In the preface Fraenkel thanked Scholz for the invitation. Scholz published a review of the book in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 48 (1927): 2416–2426.

**97** Fraenkel, *Lebenskreise*, 181.

**98** Dirk van Dalen, *Mystic, Geometer, and Intuitionist. The Life of L. E. J. Brouwer*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999–2005, Volume II, 559. The oldest document in the Scholz *Nachlass* is a short letter Brouwer wrote to him on 8 February 1927 concerning a text “*Zum dictum de omni et nullo*”, 122,064.

**99** Herman Meyer, “In memoriam Heinrich Scholz.” *Algemeen Nederlandsch Tijdschrift voor Wijsbegeerte en Psychologie*, 49 (1956/57): 113–117.

**100** Herman Meyer, “Justus Meyer als logicus. 31 oktober 1893 – 30 augustus 1958.” *Algemeen Nederlandsch Tijdschrift voor Wijsbegeerte en Psychologie*, 51 (1958/59): 89–91. *Mare Liberum* refers, of course, to Hugo Grotius’ famous book from 1609.

**101** Peter Derkx, *H. J. Pos, 1898–1955. Objectief en Partijdig*. Hilversum: Verloren, 1994.

have the *Wesensschau* [...]". Elements of their exchange of thought found their way into Scholz's lectures on logic at Münster, some of which Meyer said he had the pleasure to attend.<sup>102</sup>

Herman Meyer had spent much time in the Dutch East-Indies before finally returning in 1934 to settle in the Germany-bordering city of Enschede in the Netherlands, where he became executive secretary of a major textile company.<sup>103</sup> The close proximity between Enschede and Münster (70 kilometres apart) made frequent communication between the two men possible. Although Meyer was very interested in the views of Russell, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Rudolf Carnap and Hans Reichenbach, he was no positivist and insisted on the importance of dealing with "the questions of life" philosophically. He defended his thesis *Le rôle médiateur de la logique. Étude métathéorique* at the University of Paris in January 1955. He also published essays on Marcel Proust and compared the thought of Immanuel Kant and Sigmund Freud.<sup>104</sup> He was known to be a strong chess player and a "connoisseur and lover of music".<sup>105</sup> This last trait would have particularly appealed to Scholz, who was an exquisite musician himself, playing various instruments including the church organ at the *Marienkirche* in Berlin, where his father was the main pastor until his retirement in 1925.<sup>106</sup>

Like his brother, we have only scant information about Justus Meyer. He was a stockbroker and published books and articles about economics, most visibly in the prominent weekly newspaper, *De Haagse Post*. He was initially known as a Kant expert,<sup>107</sup> but after the Second World War he wrote about topics such as "contingency"<sup>108</sup> and "language as a biological phenomenon"<sup>109</sup>. He also published a three-volume study on Shakespeare, which was arguably his most popular work in the Netherlands.<sup>110</sup> He attended the meetings of the liberal

**102** Meyer, "Justus Meyer als logicus", 89 f.

**103** Evert W. Beth, "Herman Meyer (Amsterdam, 31 october 1893 – Roquebrune {Fr.}, 16 mei 1959)." *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde*. Leiden: Brill, 1961/1962, 140–142.

**104** Evert W. Beth, "Herman Meyer", including a short bibliography. Herman Meyer, *Le rôle médiateur de la logique. Étude métathéorique*. Paris, Assen: Presses universitaires de France & Van Gorcum, 1956. Members of the "jury" were Jean-Louis Destouches and Pierre-Maxim Schuhl; in the preface Meyer thanked them and "his longtime friend" Beth. An important collection of his essays is Meyer, *Kennis en Realiteit*, Utrecht: De Haan, 1949.

**105** Beth, "Herman Meyer", 140.

**106** Scholz to Fanny Kempner, 15 September 1925, quoted in Reinhart, "Mathematische Logik und Grundlagenkrise", 17.

**107** Justus Meyer, "Kants Philosophie der Lebenserscheinungen." *Kant-Studien* 36/1–2 (1931): 51–83.

**108** *Synthese* 8 (1950): 73–90.

**109** *The Journal of Philosophy* 46 (1949): 386–393.

**110** Justus Meyer, *De schoonheid van Shakespeare*. Utrecht: De Haan, 1948–1949.

Mont Pelerin Society, of which Friedrich Hayek was the first president, and has translated Karl Popper's *The Open Society and its Enemies* into Dutch.<sup>111</sup>

Beth was not part of this circle of Dutch friends but, from his correspondence with Scholz and the few remaining post-war letters between Herman Meyer and Scholz (kept in the Scholz *Nachlass*), it is clear that the friendship with the twin brothers had remained intact. Curiously enough, there is no reference in the obituaries and other documents that the twins were Jewish. At least, I surmised them to be Jewish as Beth referred to their bitter experiences during and after the Second World War, and Scholz noted in his letter to Beth from 1946 that the Meyers had to go underground and that their sister had been murdered by the Germans, but why this happened is not made explicit. Their surname also suggests that they were from Jewish descent, but there is currently no conclusive evidence that this was the case. Nevertheless, Scholz made a number of colleagues and close friends in the Netherlands, both professionals and amateurs, who valued his work, his particular way of expressing himself and his humour and courage, which saved the lives of several of his Polish colleagues during the war.<sup>112</sup>

## 6 Personal Crises

The biggest crisis in Scholz's life was the illness and death of his first wife, Elisabeth von Orth (1893–1924) on 6 August 1924. His correspondence with Fanny Kempner (1862–1937), who was married to a Jewish banker and lived in a mansion in Berlin where Scholz was a regular guest, reveals the extent of his grief.<sup>113</sup> He also expresses his devastation in a letter written to his friend Moritz Schlick on 5 September 1924:

"Lieber Herr Schlick, On Wednesday it will have been four weeks since the worst happened. Tomorrow it will be four weeks since we laid her to her final resting-place. One should not praise one's own wife, but *this* woman has been God's goodness in my life. Or would I ever

---

<sup>111</sup> "Justus Meyer, overleden." *Nieuwe Haarlemsche Courant*, 1 September 1958, <https://nha.courant.nu/issue/NHC/1958-09-01/edition/null/page/5?query=justus%20meyer%20overleden&sort=relevance>. Accessed 29 June 2022; Karl R. Popper, *De vrije samenleving en haar vijanden*. Bussum: Kroonder, 1950. In 1950 the Mont Pelerin Society met in Bloemendaal, the Netherlands; the conference was likely co-organised by Justus Meyer.

<sup>112</sup> Evert W. Beth, "In memoriam Heinrich Scholz (Berlijn, 17 December 1884 – Münster, 30 December 1956)." *Algemeen Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Wijsbegeerte en Psychologie* 49 (1956/1957): 113.

<sup>113</sup> This is very well documented in Monja Reinhart, "Mathematische Logik und Grundlagenkrise".

have called her 'my dear Madonna for everything' for any lesser reason? In gratitude for this, she was torn piece by piece from my heart in the cruellest way imaginable. Her dear, sunny being was devastated beyond recognition when, after thirty weeks of the greatest horror, I finally stood at her deathbed. And do you think I shall ever forget the roses which, as a last token of love, I placed in her feverish hands? They had withered even before she had finished suffering, because she was so terribly poisoned. The doctors suspect that a hidden tuberculosis, whose war of extermination brought about the end, was also the last and real cause of this dreadful illness."<sup>114</sup>

In a similar letter to Fanny Kempner, Scholz wrote that he was no longer the person he once was: something in him had died that would not rise again.<sup>115</sup> At her grave Scholz must have said that he can no longer do "substantive" work (as opposed to the *formal* logical work).<sup>116</sup> To Kempner he expressed himself in a more nuanced way and claimed that he was "still miles away from any state of mind in which I can do anything other than mathematics and logistics".<sup>117</sup> He added in this letter that he had doubts about the meaning of life (the topic of his lecture in Amsterdam in 1923) and that the only way to recover for him was to work as hard as possible, but the pain remained. During his stay in Münster in March 1927, Eduard Spranger noted that the visit to Scholz's house became a sort of melancholic memorial service, Elisabeth's room having the aura of an altar space. Scholz hardly lived in the house and both friends had dinner

---

**114** Scholz to Schlick, 5 September 1924: "Lieber Herr Schlick, Am Mittwoch sind es vier Wochen gewesen, seit das Schlimmste geschah. Morgen werden es vier Wochen sein, daß wir sie zur letzten Ruhe getragen haben. Man soll seine eigene Frau zwar nicht loben, aber *diese* Frau ist Gottes Güte in meinem Leben gewesen. Oder hätte ich sie je aus einem geringeren Grunde 'meine liebe Madonna für alles' genannt? Zum Dank dafür ist sie mir auf die grausamste überhaupt denkbare Art stückweise aus dem Herzen gerissen worden. Bis zur Unkenntlichkeit war ihr liebes, sonnenhaftes Wesen verwüstet, als ich, nach dreißig Wochen des höchsten Grauens, endlich an ihrem Sterbebett stand. Und glauben Sie, daß ich je die Rosen vergessen werde, die ich, als letztes Liebeszeichen, in ihre fiebernden Hände legte? Sie waren verwelkt, noch ehe sie ausgelitten hatte, weil sie so furchtbar vergiftet war. Die Ärzte vermuten, daß eine versteckte Tuberkulose, deren Vernichtungskrieg das Ende herbeigeführt hat, auch die letzte und eigentliche Ursache dieser grauenvollen Krankheit gewesen ist." Italicized in the original.

**115** Scholz to Fanny Kempner, 2 September 1924 (311/025): "Aber der Mensch, den Sie kennen, bin ich nicht mehr, sondern der Mensch, in dem etwas zugrunde gegangen ist, was in diesem Leben nicht wieder aufersteht", quoted in Monja Reinhart, "Mathematische Logik und Grundlagenkrise", 14.

**116** Speech by Spranger: "Du verstehst, ich *kann* die inhaltlichen Dinge nun nicht mehr treiben". I have found copies of these short text in the Barth Archive and the Beth Archive. H. Seifert, "Gedenken an Heinrich Scholz." In *Heinrich Scholz*, 5–9, quotes a large part of Spranger's speech.

**117** Scholz to Fanny Kempner, 2 September 1924 (311/025), quoted in Monja Reinhart, "Mathematische Logik und Grundlagenkrise", 14.

in Spranger’s hotel.<sup>118</sup> Some, however, considered Scholz’s pain not real, but pathological.<sup>119</sup>

Finally, he established some sort of equilibrium and published a booklet in 1929 entitled *Eros und Caritas*. Here he presented Maria, Elisabeth and Beatrice (“*O Donna, in cui la mia speranza vige*”) as the three female figures in which Christian love triumphs.<sup>120</sup> Soon afterwards he fell in love again, this time with Charlotte von Kirschbaum (1899–1975), who attended his lectures at Münster. Apparently, Scholz even proposed to her, but she must have refused.<sup>121</sup> It is not exactly clear when this proposal was made, but the whole situation was curious, as “Lollo” was also having a long-term affair with the already-married Barth. The situation was extremely complicated, especially as she started to live with the Barth family, including Barth’s wife, on 15 October 1929.<sup>122</sup> In the end, Charlotte rejected him and Scholz found a new love, Erna Koch (1906–1992), who was from Kiel and whom he probably knew before he moved to Münster.<sup>123</sup> They married on 7 March 1930 and Barth conducted the ecclesial wedding ceremony. Barth commented on this “dramatic” development: “Life itself is really more moving than all the stories you read about it”.<sup>124</sup>

The most protracted crisis of Scholz’s existence concerns his health. In retrospect he noted that he may have achieved more “if his medical existence had not been limited since 1909 again and again to the intervals between two *Grundlagenkrisen* (foundational crises)”.<sup>125</sup> His life-long stomach disorders and

**118** Spranger to Käthe Hädlich, 15 March 1927, <https://editionen.bbf.dipf.de/exist/apps/briefedition-spranger-hadlich/briefe/1927/es1927-03-15-019.xml>. Accessed 29 June 2022.

**119** Spranger to Käthe Hädlich, 1 January 1925. This harsh judgement was made by the wife of Alois Riehl.

**120** Heinrich Scholz, *Eros und Caritas. Die platonische Liebe und die Liebe im Sinne des Christentums*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1929, 92.

**121** Renate Köbler, *Schattenarbeit. Charlotte von Kirschbaum. Die Theologin an der Seite Karl Barths*. Köln: Pahl-Rugenstein, 1987, 41.

**122** Christiane Tietz, *Karl Barth. A Life in Conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021 – especially chapter nine: “A Troubled ‘Ménage a Trois’: Charlotte von Kirschbaum”.

**123** In his diary entry from 16 April 1935, Rudolf Carnap characterized Erna Scholz as follows: “Sie gleicht Kasperle, blond, streng, ordentlich; die ‘kleine Herrin’”. Carnap, *Tagebücher*, Volume 2, 680. Kasperle is the main character of the folk German puppet theater. Scholz called Erna endearingly the “*Herrin*” (small boss). Scholz also translated the Italian “*donna*” as “*Herrin*”; so, my translation may be a bit too ‘bossy’, with the intended meaning somewhere between ‘boss’ and ‘lady’.

**124** Barth to Thurneysen, 17 January 1930, *Karl Barth – Eduard Thurneysen. Briefwechsel*, Volume 2 (1921–1930), ed. Eduard Thurneysen. Zürich: TVZ, 1974, 704: “Das Leben selbst ist doch wirklich bewegter als alle Geschichten, die man darüber liest.”

**125** Scholz, “Ich hatt’ einen Kameraden”, 452 (note).

related illnesses are an almost permanent theme in his letters. He was not only complaining but wished to explain to his colleagues and friends that they may have to wait a long time for a response because he could not do real work for weeks or months. He was often admitted into hospital and had to rest for long periods of time. Spranger claimed that Scholz’s second wife Erna did not see much of him at home because he spent most of his time in hospital.<sup>126</sup> This may be a slight exaggeration, but she evidently had a time-consuming task to care for her husband and keep the household running.<sup>127</sup> And running Scholz’s household was no small affair. For example, as one anecdote goes, when having guests for dinner Scholz wanted to have a thorough discussion over an excellent meal. No more than six people should be invited and the guests should prepare themselves as much as possible for a discussion on a set theme.<sup>128</sup>

Although Scholz mentioned the year 1909 as the beginning of his bad condition, Spranger wrote already in February 1908 that Scholz had been ill for a long time.<sup>129</sup> His condition improved and deteriorated over time, but by the end of 1916 his health had worsened. Scholz was hospitalized several times and, in 1919, the decision was made to perform a life-threatening operation on his stomach. Fearing the worst, Scholz said goodbye to his friends and entrusted Spranger with looking after his wife Elisabeth.<sup>130</sup> However, a couple of weeks later, Scholz appeared to be recovering from the invasive surgery.<sup>131</sup> The exact

**126** “Briefwechsel zwischen Eduard Spranger und Käthe Hadlich, Eduard Spranger an Käthe Hadlich”, 9 February 1957, *Bibliothek für Bildungsgeschichtliche Forschung des DIPF*, ed. Karin Priem, Klaus-Peter Horn, <https://editionen.bbf.dipf.de/exist/apps/briefedition-spranger-hadlich/briefe/1957/es1957-02-09-012.xml>. Accessed 29 June 2022. Hadlich (1872–1960) was a dear friend of Spranger; parts of their intimate correspondence were meant to be published after their death; cf. Karin Priem, “Erlebnishunger, Erschöpfung und Metaphysik. Eduard Spranger in seinen Briefen an Käthe Hadlich im Jahre 1913.” *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur* 38/1 (2013): 223–236, here 224.

**127** See, especially, the correspondence with Beth.

**128** Hans-Günther Bigalke, *Heinrich Heesch*. Boston, Basel: Birkhäuser, 1988, 22 f.

**129** Spranger to Hadlich, 23 February 1908: “Scholz ist schon lange recht krank”, <https://editionen.bbf.dipf.de/exist/apps/briefedition-spranger-hadlich/briefe/1908/es1908-02-23-012.xml>. Accessed 29 June 2022.

**130** Spranger to Hadlich, 5 February 1919: “Er hat 4 Monate gelegen und sieht jetzt seiner (lebensgefährlichen) Operation entgegen. Er nimmt Abschied und empfiehlt mir das Schicksal seiner Elisabeth, in seiner lieben kindlichen Weise, die mich freilich vor schwere Konflikte stellen kann. Aber er soll leben.”, <https://editionen.bbf.dipf.de/exist/apps/briefedition-spranger-hadlich/briefe/1919/es1919-02-05-004.xml#>. Accessed 29 June 2022.

**131** Spranger to Hadlich, 23 February 1919: “Bei Scholz soll es günstig gehen”, <https://editionen.bbf.dipf.de/exist/apps/briefedition-spranger-hadlich/briefe/1919/es1919-02-23-006.xml>. Accessed 29 June 2022.

surgical procedure cannot be established with certainty, but it is likely that a large section of his stomach was removed.<sup>132</sup>

Scholz wrote to his teacher Harnack that it “is always the stomach from which all trials and disturbances emanate”.<sup>133</sup> Even his lengthy, enjoyable trip to Switzerland in the spring of 1917 did not alleviate the malady “that had accumulated over eight years”.<sup>134</sup> For a long period of time he was only able to lecture sitting down, and needed repeated physiotherapy and morphine injections to relieve the pain. After surgery he slowly recovered and hoped for a complete *restitutio in integrum*. It is thought the Harnacks had established the contact with the famous surgeon Hermann Küttner (1870–1932), who carried out the operation for free, and even paid for Scholz’s four-week stay in his private clinic.<sup>135</sup> Küttner’s name is still connected with the salivary gland tumour as well as with the introduction of X-ray diagnostics in war surgery.<sup>136</sup>

Scholz had close ties with several of Harnack’s children, especially Ernst and Elisabet von Harnack. He was the godfather of Ernst’s son Helmut who was born in 1918 and died in battle in January 1942. Ernst had strong socialist inclinations and was executed in March 1945 for his opposition to the Nazi regime. Ernst’s sympathy for the Social Democratic Party was incomprehensible to Scholz, as he wrote to Adolf von Harnack on 28 March 1919, but Scholz appreciated this token of their friendship all the more. In the same letter Scholz writes that Harnack’s daughter Elisabet (1892–1976) would, of course, receive feedback on the dissertation sent to him about the day care of school-aged children.<sup>137</sup>

Elisabet von Harnack devoted her life to social work in Berlin, helped persecuted Jews and was a major figure in social organisations that supported women and refugees. In 1951, together with Ernst Reuter, she co-founded the *Soziale Arbeit* journal, in which she published many articles. Scholz began courting her in the summer of 1909 and they became engaged around the end of 1911. They

**132** Charles Hartshorne, *Anselm’s Discovery. A Re-examination of the Ontological Argument for God’s Existence*. La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 1965, 279: “With Whitehead he [Scholz] is for me the most high-minded and inspiring rationalist of our century. With angelic steadiness he stuck to his ‘Platonic ideal’, as he called it, all throughout the Nazi period in Germany. Had he not been forced to live almost entirely without a stomach (literally) he might have accomplished far more than this disability, not to mention the spiritual and finally material disorder in his country, permitted him to do.”

**133** Scholz to Harnack, 5 May 1918.

**134** Scholz to Harnack, 6 May 1917.

**135** Scholz to Harnack, 28 March 1919.

**136** Markwart Michler, “Küttner, Hermann.” *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 13 (1982): 241–242, <https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd117553859.html#ndbcontent>. Accessed 29 June 2022.

**137** Scholz to Harnack, 28 March 1919. Elisabet von Harnack, *Fürsorge für schulpflichtige Kinder in Kinderhorten*. Berlin: Frowitzsch, 1918.

broke off their engagement in 1912, though apparently maintained an amicable relationship afterwards. Why this “unhappy engagement” (as Spranger described the relationship to his good friend Käthe Hadlich on 24 November 1912) ended is unclear. Spranger spoke about Scholz being a “victim of the feminist movement”,<sup>138</sup> but it is also evident that Scholz worked so extremely hard that he consequently did not devote much time to his fiancées and spouses.

Scholz’s exceptional work ethos may have been reinforced by his turn to mathematical logic and his never-ending illness, both consuming an enormous amount of time. During his lifetime his medical condition worsened. In 1934 he stated that his “so-called health still is a fragment of the most fragmentary sort”.<sup>139</sup> In June 1935, Scholz wrote to Barth that he had barely survived a bout of dysentery, which brought him near “the end of all things”. He was discharged from hospital weighing just over 50 kilograms.<sup>140</sup> During the Second World War he suffered bad episodes; the severe bombing of Münster and the shortage of food, which lasted into 1946, aggravated his stomach problems.<sup>141</sup> In 1948, he suffered from pneumonia for nine months,<sup>142</sup> and needed two hernia operations in 1951.<sup>143</sup> He was hospitalised again at the end of the winter semester of 1951/52 for at least three weeks.<sup>144</sup>

Scholz also suffered heavily from pleurisy, writing to Beth in 1953 that he was again admitted to the hospital, the sixth time since 1946 and on this occasion for almost seven weeks, because of this ongoing chest infection.<sup>145</sup> His condition deteriorated further and on 10 March 1954 he wrote to his colleague, the Polish logician Jozef Maria Bochenski (1902–1995), that he looked forward to his visit in September but was unsure if he would be able to meet him. At the time of writing this was certainly not possible – because of another bout of pleurisy and

**138** Spranger to Hadlich, 24 November 1912. This correspondence is the only source that mentions the relationship between Scholz and Elisabet von Harnack.

**139** Scholz to Barth, 27 November 1934.

**140** Scholz to Barth, 29 June 1935. The “end of all things” refers to 1 Peter 5: 7.

**141** Scholz to Beth, 13 October 1942 (intestinal complaints for about nine weeks); Scholz to Bense, 15 April 1943, and 28 October 1943 (in hospital with jaundice), quoted in Heitfeld-Rydzik, “Ver(w)irrende Logik”, 6.

**142** Scholz to Beth, 1 March 1949.

**143** Scholz to Beth, 15 September 1951.

**144** Scholz to his dear friend Elli Heesch, 1 March 1952, 117, 133. She had written a doctoral thesis on Bernard Bolzano, which was supervised by Scholz. Adelheid Hamacher-Hermes, “Frauen in der Logik – Elli Heesch.” In *Methodisches Denken im Kontext. Festschrift für Christian Thiel mit einem unveröffentlichten Brief Gottlob Freges*, ed. Peter Bernhard, Volker Peckhaus. Paderborn: Mentis, 2008, 269–282.

**145** Scholz to Beth, 3 December 1953: “Seit fast 7 Wochen existiere ich in der medizinischen Klausur mit einer Pleuritis, der sechsten die mir seit 1946 zugestossen ist.”

persistent circulatory disorders, he weighed no more than 48 kilograms. “The demons” – as Scholz called his medical troubles – persisted.<sup>146</sup> When Scholz had himself chauffeured from the mathematical colloquium to the clinic on Friday afternoon, 21 December 1956, he would have suspected that he would never leave. “With the [42.5 kilograms] to which I have suddenly sunk, even a domestically restricted existence can no longer be sustained. This morning I was once very close to the end of all things,” he wrote to Barth and von Kirschbaum on 23 December. On 26 December Scholz was given Holy Communion. In the early morning of 30 December 1956, he died.

The death announcement read: “It has pleased the Lord over life and death to call my dear husband [...] into eternity”.<sup>147</sup> Instead of gifts for wreaths it was requested, according to the wish of the deceased, to donate to the work of the Münster deaconesses helping out in refugee camps. Even more remarkable is the motto of the death announcement, which must have been chosen by Scholz himself: “*Dulden muss der Mensch, Sein Scheiden aus der Welt wie seine Ankunft. In Bereitschaft sein ist alles.*” These are not biblical texts but, in fact, two quotations from William Shakespeare: “Men must endure their going hence, even as their coming hither,” from *King Lear*, Act 5, scene 2; and “The readiness is all,” from *Hamlet*, also Act 5, scene 2.

The *King Lear* quote is spoken by the noble Edgar who tries to comfort his father Gloucester, pointing to the beginning and the end of life. This text must have appealed to Scholz, who knew how to persevere during his many medical crises and was – understandably – not happy with his condition. At one point he even wrote that he was “*in dieses Leben hineingedrängt*” (forced into life).<sup>148</sup> Interestingly, Scholz chose the line from *Hamlet* – which the protagonist speaks after reaching a state of acceptance following the loss of loved ones, betrayal and apparent insanity – instead of the line from *King Lear* that immediately follows the first quotation: “Ripeness is all”. The words from Hamlet perhaps expressed more clearly Scholz’s readiness to die.

The funeral service was held on 2 January 1957, led by Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, who occupied the chair for New Testament Studies in Münster. At Scholz’s request, the text of the service was Romans 11:36: “From him and through him and to him are all things; to him be glory for ever and ever. Amen”. Scholz was cremated in Dortmund and his urn was placed in the grave where his

<sup>146</sup> Scholz to Bochenski, 10 March 1954, 116.016.

<sup>147</sup> A copy of this announcement is preserved in the Beth *Nachlass*.

<sup>148</sup> Scholz to Fanny Kempner, 18 December 1925 (311/053), quoted in Monja Reinhart, “Mathematische Logik und Grundlagenkrise”, 18.

first wife was buried in 1924.<sup>149</sup> The gravestone inscription reads: “All things transient are but a parable, but the greatest of these is love.” Typically of Scholz, the quote is an amalgamation of the final chorus of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s *Faust* (“*Alles Vergängliche ist nur ein Gleichnis*”) and a line from Corinthians 13:13. He used Goethe’s words – “incommensurable for the mind”<sup>150</sup> – also in his letter of condolence to Harnack’s wife on the death of his teacher.<sup>151</sup>

## 7 Conclusion

In this article I have explored a series of milestone events in the life of Heinrich Scholz and have reserved judgement on how these influenced him personally. It is beyond doubt that his long-lasting illness and the premature loss of his first wife, Elisabeth von Orth, impacted Scholz deeply and led to bouts of depression. Some of his letters show a human in despair who in his darker moments doubts the meaning of life, and tries to overcome his sorrow by working very hard. In his funeral speech Spranger noted that the outside world knew Scholz foremostly as a peculiar character who worked to exhaustion, but here he wanted highlight that Scholz had elevated friendship to an almost religious level.<sup>152</sup> And, indeed, Scholz’s voluminous correspondence is testament to his talent for nurturing friendships. In his characterful language he laid bare not only raw emotions of sorrow and pain, but also expressed his deep gratitude to his friends. His intimate letters to Kempner and others were also a means of coping with his emotions and key events in his life. It is remarkable how a such a conservative man, who strongly valued the Prussian virtues of self-restraint and containment, could write so openly about his innermost feelings.<sup>153</sup>

What is clear from his actions is that the Prussian values of hard work, excellence in performance, and the ability to defend yourself and fight back

**149** Erna Scholz to Eduard Spranger, 6 January 1957. Copies can be found in the Barth *Nachlass* and the Beth *Nachlass*.

**150** Heinrich Scholz, “Sprechen und Denken. Ein Bericht über neue gemeinsame Ziele der polnischen und deutschen Grundlagenforschung.” *Organon* (published by the Mianowski Institute for the Promotion of Science and Letters in Warsaw, Poland) 3 (1939): 1–30, here 21.

**151** Scholz to Frau von Harnack (Amalie Thiers), 12 June 1930; cf. Niko Strobach, “Heinrich Scholz. Eine Dokumentation.” In *Pietät und Weltbezug: Universitätsphilosophie in Münster*, ed. Reinhold Schmücker, Johannes Müller-Salo. Münster: Mentis, 2020, 125–157, here 156 f. (including a photograph of the gravestone).

**152** Funeral Speech Spranger: “Er hat die Freundschaft zum Heiligtum erhöht”. Spranger was not able to travel to Münster for the occasion, but the dean of the faculty Seifert quoted Spranger’s words in his opening address at the memorial event that took place in December 1957.

**153** Molendijk, *Aus dem Dunklen ins Helle*, 39 f.: “[...] wir fühlten Preussisch bis auf den Grund”.

(*Wehrhaftigkeit*) defined his behaviour during the Nazi regime. He took great risks to help his Polish colleagues during the Second World War. He was no doubt a courageous man, but also wanted to protect his work, especially his institute of mathematical logic. After the severe bombing of Münster in 1943 jeopardized the preservation of important Frege research papers, he decided to help clearing out the shelter where the material had been stored, whereas it would have been much better for his health to go immediately to the hospital.<sup>154</sup>

He made personal sacrifices, but he also had to ingratiate himself with the Nazi regime. Generally speaking, his efforts to help Polish colleagues have been considered crucial in the evaluation of his behaviour during the Second World War. Rightly so, in my opinion, but one should not forget that contingent circumstances determine to a large extent the fate of people during a dictatorship and, therefore, one should be cautious to judge in such circumstances. What if Scholz had not established such good contacts with Polish colleagues before war broke out? Would his Dutch friend Beth have held Scholz’s publications in *Das Reich* against him more severely? We simply do not know.

And what of his inflammatory publications during the Great War? Notwithstanding his gift for language, Scholz was a little naive to the potentially negative consequences of strong nationalistic discourse. Beth felt it necessary to let Scholz know after receiving his booklet *Zwischen den Zeiten*, which included such discourse. Also in his courses during the Nazi era he did not shy away from this type of language, as he, for instance, claimed that he wanted to create a spiritual *Sturmschar* (storm squad) out of the German people, inspired by Platonism.<sup>155</sup> *Sturmscharführer* (the equivalent of regiment sergeant major in other military organisations) was a high rank in the Nazi Waffen-SS. According to Scholz, such a squad should be present in the Third Reich,<sup>156</sup> but perhaps he made this compromise as a cunning ploy to avoid being denounced by his Nazi students. It is too early to come to a more final conclusion, as we know so little about Scholz’s

<sup>154</sup> Scholz to Bense, 28 October 1943: “Der Luftschuttkeller mit den kostbarsten Dingen, vor allem den Frege-Manuskripten, ist erst recht so eingestürzt, dass bis heute noch nicht zu erkennen ist, ob überhaupt etwas gerettet ist, oder nicht. Dann bin ich selber nachgekommen. Seit 10 Tagen liege ich im Krankenhaus mit einer höchst fatalen Gelbsucht, die vermutlich acht Tage früher hätte gemeldet werden müssen; aber ich konnte die Aufräumungsarbeiten nicht im Stich lassen”, quoted in Heitfeld-Rydzik, “Ver(w)irrende Logik”.

<sup>155</sup> Heinrich Scholz, *Die Philosophie im Zeitalter der Mathesis universalis*, lecture, winter semester 1933/34 at the University of Münster, Book II, appendix, 30: “aus diesem Volke eine geistige Sturmschar hervor[zu]rufen, die von unserem Platonismus so inspiriert ist, wie wir selbst.” Quoted in Albrecht et al.: “Mathematik is reine Wissenschaft, nichts anderes”, 77.

<sup>156</sup> Scholz, *Die Philosophie im Zeitalter der Mathesis universalis*, 30.

behaviour during these difficult times. Further study of the Scholz *Nachlass* in Münster may shed more light on these issues.

What is clearer is the strong moral character Scholz displayed when dealing with the Nazi regime and his personal crises. The dramatic premature death of his first wife Elisabeth von Orth in 1924 was the biggest crisis of his life and led to a long period of sorrow and depression. The severe stomach problems that sent Scholz into hospital for increasingly longer periods of time were even more detrimental to his output. He coped with these crises by entertaining long-lasting relationships with colleagues and friends such as Spranger, Barth, Schlick, Beth, von Kirschbaum and Kempner. Despite all these setbacks, Scholz was remarkably industrious, achieving accolades and recognition in the fields of theology, philosophy and mathematical logic. He established large scientific networks and evidently became a successful scholarly entrepreneur.

The documents presented here also illustrate that Scholz was a man of great sensitivity and passion, even when filtered through the lens of logical terminology. Scholz always defended his views with great steadfastness, and vigorously pursued the goals he set with all the energy he could muster. Because of his bad health, he had to impose limitations on himself, and so his life became more and more concentrated, as it were, until it “gradually contracted completely into the ellipse, the two focal points of which are mathematics and Christianity”.<sup>157</sup>

---

**157** Carl Friedrich von Weizsäcker, “Die Logik zeitlicher Aussagen und die Grundlagen der Physik.” In *Logik und Grundlagenforschung. Festkolloquium zum 100. Geburtstag von Heinrich Scholz*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1986, 11–32, here 13 (from a letter that Scholz wrote to von Weizsäcker in the 1950s).