

Lev Semenovich Vygotsky

G.L. Vygodskaja
and
T.M. Lifanova

Part 2

Part 1: Life and Works (Cont.)	3
Part 2: Through the Eyes of Others	32
Notes	81

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without permission in writing from the copyright holder.

Photocopy Information for Users in the USA: The item fee code for this publication indicates that authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by the copyright holder for libraries and other users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) Transactional Reporting Service, provided the stated fee for copying beyond that permitted by Section 107 or 108 of the United States Copyright Law is paid. The appropriate remittance of \$9.50 per copy per article is paid directly to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923.

Permission for Other Use: The copyright owner's consent does not extend to copying for general distribution, for promotion, for creating new works, or for resale. Specific written permission must be obtained from the publisher for such copying.

Item Fee Code for this publication is: 1061-0405/1998 \$9.50 + 0.00.

To order 50 or more copies, please call the Sheridan Press Reprint Department at 1-800-352-2210; outside the USA, please call 1-717-632-3535; or fax 1-717-633-8900.

⊕ The text paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48.

The following statement of Ownership, Management, and Circulation is provided in accordance with the requirements contained in 39 USC 3685. *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology* (Publication no. 1061-0405), formerly *Soviet Psychology* (Publication no. 0038-5751), appears bimonthly and the annual subscription price is \$812.00. It is owned, managed, and published by M.E. Sharpe, Inc., which is located at 80 Business Park Drive, Armonk, Westchester County, NY 10504-1715. The Owner and Publisher is M.E. Sharpe, at the same address. The Editor is Professor Michael Cole, Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093. The Managing Editor is Patricia A. Kolb, M.E. Sharpe, Inc., 80 Business Park Drive, Armonk, NY 10504. During the preceding twelve months the average number of copies printed for each issue was 359; the average paid circulation (by mail subscription) was 179; the average free distribution, 7; the average number of copies distributed, 186. Corresponding figures for the issue published nearest to the filing date: total number of copies printed, 349; total paid circulation (by mail subscription), 181; total free distribution, 3; total distribution, 184. Filed by Vincent Fuentes, Senior Vice-President.

Journal of Russian and East European Psychology (ISSN 1061-0405) continues *Soviet Psychology* (ISSN 0038-5751). The journal is published bimonthly by M. E. Sharpe, Inc., 80 Business Park Drive, Armonk, NY 10504. Subscription rates for U.S. institutions: one year, \$738.00 (vol. 37); \$812.00 (vol. 38). For foreign institutions: one year, \$831.00 (vol. 37); \$911.00 (vol. 38). Prices are subject to change without notice. Subscriptions are non-refundable. Back issues of this journal are available at the subscription price effective on the date of the order. Price information on bulk orders or back volumes of the journal (to Volume I, No. 1) is available upon request. For individual subscription rates and other inquiries, please call 1-800-541-6563 or fax 914-273-2106.

Periodicals postage paid at Armonk, NY, and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster send address changes to *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, c/o M. E. Sharpe, Inc., 80 Business Park Drive, Armonk, NY 10504.

Journal of Russian and East European Psychology,
vol. 37, No. 3, May-June 1999, pp. 3-31.
© 2000 M.E. Sharpe, Inc. All rights reserved.
ISSN 1061-0405/2000 \$9.50 + 0.00.

G.L. VYGODSKAIA AND T.M. LIFANOVA

Life and Works (Cont.)

Such criticism sounds, at the very least, unconvincing, since earlier, in 1927, Lev Semenovich had written:

We must determine what we can, and must, get from Marxism. . . . The teachers of Marxism can give us not the solution to a question, not even working hypotheses (since they have their roots in the soil of the particular science), but a method for constructing such hypotheses. I do not want to find out what the mind can gather on a free ride through a pair of quotation marks; I want to learn the whole of Marx's method, how to build a science, how to approach the study of the mind . . . What we need is not disconnected statements, but a method.¹⁹⁰

Disagreeing with a number of accusations and charges against this book, [*Essays on the history of behavior*], Vygotsky was apparently preparing to answer one of his reviewers. There are handwritten notes in his archives in which he, in abstract form, refutes the reviewer's mistaken statements. The notes are titled "Distortions in the review" and are arranged as follows: First, Lev Semenovich cites the comment of the reviewer, and then, on the next line, gives his answer to it. Here are some of the points from the manuscript, with Vygotsky's references to the corresponding pages of the book [*Essays on the history of behavior*] (1930 edition):

2. "The primitive . . . also not yet a person." In the book, the contrary:

Translation © 2000 M.E. Sharpe, Inc., from the Russian text © 1996 G.L. Vygotskaia and T.M. Lifanova and "Smysl" Publishers, *Lev Semenovich* (Moscow: "Smysl" Publishers, 1996), pp. 108-49.

The journal issues devoted to this book have been edited by Dr. James V. Wertsch, Department of Education, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Washington University, Campus Box 1183, One Brookings Drive, St. Louis, MO 63130-4899; tel.: 314-935-6707; fax: 314-935-4982.

"The primitive is a human being in full measure" (p. 70).

5. "In the primitive (everything is weak): even the memory is weak, etc."

In the book, the contrary: "The outstanding natural memory of the primitive" (pp. 72-74).

6. "There are so many stages yet ahead of the primitive before he becomes a real person."

In the book (P. 117) there is nothing of the sort.

7. The charge of biogeneticism.

In the book (p. 124): "A child is qualitatively different from an adult." Where is there any biogeneticism here?! There is only a reference to the qualitative uniqueness of the child.

9. "The fact that a child's thought is unique is given in support of the idea that there is an analogy between the child and the primitive."

Where is this!? In the text there is a reference to the concreteness of children's thought (p. 146).

10. Quotation from the book "the child is in a stage of profound intellectual retardation."

From the text (pp. 160-62) it is clear that we are speaking of the protocols of an experiment with a mentally retarded child (Bogen's experiment on the feebleminded)!! The reviewer simply did not understand what we were talking about.

11. "when the child leaves the stage of the primate, he passes into the stage of the primitive."

Where is this!? It's a simple invention of the reviewer. On page 166 there is nothing of the sort!!

13. The reference to stages is completely confused by the reviewer. Walking is not a stage, but a simple example of natural development that has nothing to do with cultural development (pp. 201-2).

14. "the next stage of a child's development is primitive man."

The author did not understand. The book (pp. 203-4) speaks of the primitive nature of behavior; nowhere is there a statement to the effect that "the primitive is not a human." This is simply the reviewer's misunderstanding.

16. "Cultural backwardness is not biological insufficiency as the author thinks."

In the book the exact opposite is stated (pp. 65-71 and the whole book).

Summing up these comments, then preparing an answer to the reviewer, Lev Semenovitch summarized:

"Historical development is a different type of development from biological development" (p. 57).

"Primitive man" is at the lowest level of cultural development. This is a convention: "Primitive man" in the strict sense does not exist.

"Primitive man" is the lowest stage and the starting point of historical development" (p. 58).

"The biologically primitive is not lower (sometimes it is higher) than cultural man (in regard to natural functions)" (pp. 65-71).

"There are no differences between cultural man and primitive man in terms of organic functions" (pp. 67, 69, 70).

"The primitive man is a human being in full measure" (p. 70).

"Human development is, from the very beginning, social development" (p. 71).

"There are no references to 'the parallelism' of the historical and the biological in the book; there is a statement to the effect that the two processes do not coincide" (p. 71).¹⁹¹

From Vygotsky's responses one can see the reviewer's level of competence and the extent of his understanding of the cultural-historical theory in general and Vygotsky's book [*Essays on the history of behavior*] in particular.

Not everything in that book fully satisfied Lev Semenovitch himself. Correcting a chapter written by Luria, he noted that this part

is wholly in accord with the Freudians (actually, not in accord with Freud, but with V.F. Shmidt in terms of its content, and with Melanie Klein and other stars of second magnitude); further, Piaget, who absolutized beyond all measure, is the stumbling block; further, tool and sign are mixed together, etc., etc. This is not something for which Luria is personally to blame: it is rather the entire epoch of our thought that is at fault. We must mercilessly put an end to it. Anything about which we are not clear how to rework from our point of view so that it can become an organic part of our theory should not be included in the system. Let us wait. Thus, a rigorous, monastic order of thought; apostasy and ideas if this should be necessary. The same is to be required of others. Clarify what cultural psychology does—seriously, not at odd moments, and not along with other things. There is no reason for every new person to add his conjectures. Outwardly, therefore, the same organizational regime. Present in such a way that the "primate" errors, Luria's article, Zankov's parallelism, etc., become impossible. I should be happy if we achieved maximum clarity and precision regarding this question.¹⁹²

Nonetheless, the [*Essays . . .*] were for Lev Semenovich a fundamentally important stage in the demonstration and exposure of the essence of the cultural-historical theory.

"Vygotsky's hypothesis that the forms of thought and higher mental functions in general are conditioned culturally and historically and, most importantly, that these functions depend on the historical and social development of society," writes A.A. Leont'ev, "was tested and proven by A.R. Luria in two expeditions to remote regions of Uzbekistan that he organized (1931 and 1932)."¹⁹³

Aleksandr Romanovich himself, in his scientific autobiography written at the end of his life, tells us that they studied the influence of culture on the development of thought in those years. Existing scientific assumptions had to be empirically proven. The decision was therefore made to study the intellectual activity of adults so as to be able to clarify changes in the process of thought that are the consequences of social change. "We would have liked to pursue our work in remote Russian villages, but for our studies we chose villages and trading posts of the nomads of Uzbekistan and Kirgiziia, where the vast differences between past and contemporary culture promised to provide maximum possibilities to observe the changes in the basic forms and content of people's thought."¹⁹⁴

Lev Semenovich valued very highly the materials he received from these expeditions. One can see this from preserved letters that he wrote to Aleksandr Romanovich at that time. We shall quote two of them:

Dear Aleksandr Romanovich!

I am writing to you in a state of excitement that one rarely experiences. I received report No. 3 and the protocols of the experiments. I haven't had such a bright and happy day for a long time. These are literally the key to open the locks of many psychological problems. That is my impression. I have no doubt regarding the prime importance of the experiments; our new path has been now embarked upon (by yourself), and not only through ideas but in actions, in experiments. A new chapter in psychology, concrete psychology, has been opened. I have a feeling of gratitude, joy, and pride. . . .¹⁹⁵

Dear Aleksandr Romanovich,

. . . I already wrote to you in Samarkand and in Ferghan about the tremendous, incomparable impression your reports and protocols made on me. In our investigation this is a huge, decisive, and revolutionary step toward a new viewpoint. But even within the context of any European research,

such an expedition would have been an event. I have a feeling of rapture, in the literal sense of the word, as when one has realized great inner achievement. I have received report No. 5; and like the rest, it marks an event: a systematic study of systemic relations in historical psychology, in living phylogeny, something no one had accomplished until now, from any perspective. This is a new, unexpectedly (for me, I confess) happy, and brilliant chapter for our clinic, and for our experiments with children.¹⁹⁶

However, the malicious rumors surrounding the results of these expeditions prevented their publication, and they were published only forty years later.¹⁹⁷

It should be said that, despite Vygotsky's extremely broad scientific interests, attentive analysis of his works would probably reveal a central line, or even a point at which, as at the focus of a lens, all of the questions that concerned him came together. This focus, as many contemporary investigators of Vygotsky's works have noted, is the problem of development in psychology. The true significance of all the component parts of the cultural-historical conception becomes clear within the context of this problem:

—the theory of higher mental functions, in which the idea of mediation is the key to understanding the mechanisms of mental development;

—a causal-dynamic analysis directed toward identifying a unit capable of self-development that contains all the essential characteristics of the complex whole;

—the experimental-genetic method, which is a method for modeling processes of development.

Vygotsky also examined individual mental functions and processes and whole areas of scientific knowledge within the context of the problem of development. Thus, his book [*Thought and language*] is based, from beginning to end, on the idea of development; and his main conclusion in this study has to do with how word meanings evolve. Vygotsky also studied memory and imagination, volition and attention, and emotion and intelligence from this standpoint. His theory of mental development demonstrated its viability in many areas, especially in child and developmental psychology. An original scientific approach, announced in the book [*The problem of age*], received its concretization in articles devoted to analysis of the different age periods of development—infancy, early and preschool childhood, the main stages of the schoolchild, and most thoroughly, adolescence, in the book [*The pedagogy of the adolescent*]. The many concepts Vygotsky introduced into child development constitute the methodological and theoretical foundation of modern research in this area of science. These include the

concepts of psychological age, critical and stable periods, the social situation of development, a dominant activity, the zone of proximal development, and others. Similarly, according to the estimates of a number of authors, many of Vygotsky's ideas, for example, the dynamic unity of intelligence and affect, the leading role of instruction in the broad sense, in its relationship to development, the systemic and semantic structure of consciousness, etc., belong not to the past, but to the future of the science of psychology.

Lev Semenovich worked continually on improving the individual postulates of the cultural-historical theory in the few years of life remaining to him. Despite the fact that it was not granted to him to complete the development of this theory, it is highly regarded by both our own and foreign scholars.

In the activities of Vygotsky and his group, especially in the thirties, the ideas of the cultural-historical theory had a notable influence on the formation and development of the young Soviet science of psychology. However, Vygotsky's ideas began truly to live only after the death of their founder.

Vygotsky's cultural-historical theory today occupies a firm place as one of the strongest and most promising global programs for the development of psychology. Moreover, there is not one, be it ever so trivial, current of contemporary Soviet and, in the most recent years, world psychology that has not experienced, in one form or another, the decisive influence of the idea of the cultural-historical concept. The cultural-historical theory has become a profound and indelible part of the very foundations of modern psychological thought.¹⁹⁸

A.A. Smirnov said, in an evening lecture given at the 18th International Congress of Psychology, in Moscow in 1966: "The most outstanding phenomenon in Soviet psychology at that time was the system of views, known as the cultural-historical theory of development of the mind, created by the talented young scholar Vygotsky."¹⁹⁹

One of Vygotsky's closest disciples, Lidiia Il'inichna Bozhovich, began her last talk with the words: "A plethora of ideas lies buried in Vygotsky's cultural-historical concept of the development of the mind; these ideas have become the starting point in Soviet psychology for the development of new research and the construction of original theoretical positions."²⁰⁰

In his book [*The history of psychology*], M.G. Iaroshevskii evaluates this theory as follows: "His cultural-historical concept has had an undying influence on the fate of Soviet psychology. With regard to its reception in the West, we have the testimony of the outstanding American psychologist Jerome Bruner, otherwise chary in his judgments, from the seventies: 'Every psy-

chologist who has ever been concerned with cognitive processes and their development in the past quarter-century must acknowledge the great influence Lev Semenovich Vygotsky has had on him."²⁰¹

Stephen Toulmin, the well-known American philosopher and philosopher of science and professor at the University of Chicago, in an article devoted to Lev Semenovich, called him a genius, the Mozart of psychology, and considered him the central figure in Soviet psychology of the 1920s and 1930s. Toulmin believed that the "achievements of Soviet psychology are attributable first and foremost to its orientation to the cultural-historical approach to psychological problems. As a result, a high level of integration of and mutual enrichment of interdisciplinary sciences has been achieved." Later Toulmin wrote:

I believe that many of us who have read the brilliant works of Vygotsky and his comrades-in-arms have had necessarily to accept his idea of the unity of nature and culture and use this approach in our writings. This became the basis of a theoretical orientation for many of us, in whatever area we were working: questions of inner speech or aphasia, the functions of the brain or affective components of the brain's workings, the development of aesthetic perception, etc.²⁰²

* * *

The nature of Vygotsky's activity in the area of abnormal developmental psychology flowed organically from his theoretical and methodological positions. By all appearances, the profound tasks of psychology led the scientist to the idea of the necessity of accomplishing them in close connection with the area of abnormal development. Studies in these two sciences were done in close unity and mutually enriched one another.

Throughout the Moscow period of his life, ten years in all, Lev Semenovich did theoretical and experimental work in abnormal development along with his psychological studies.

As he studied the processes of mental development in the various forms of abnormal development, Vygotsky came to the conclusion that the facts of abnormal development as studied in that area could be the key to the resolution of general psychological problems. The experiment designed by nature to change the course of development depending on disorders in various mental processes in abnormal children would shed light, Vygotsky thought, on the general laws of development of cognitive activity of the normal child as well.²⁰³

The problems of abnormal development occupied a key place in Lev Semenovich's activity and creative writings. Studies done on this problem

occupy a considerable portion of his research, which justifies spending some time exploring these questions in detail.

As we have said, Lev Semenovich began his scientific and practical activity in the area of abnormal development back in 1924 when he was appointed head of the Subsection on Abnormal Childhood attached to the People's Commissar of Education. We have already written about his brilliant report, revolutionary for the development of the science of abnormal development, at the Second Congress of SPON. I should like to mention that interest in this area of knowledge was a stable interest, and it continued to grow in following years. Vygotsky conducted not only intensive scientific work but also did considerable practical and organizational work in this area.

In 1926 he organized the Laboratory of Psychology of Abnormal Childhood attached to the Medical Pedagogical Station (in Moscow, at No. 8 Pogordinskaia ulitsa). In the three years of its existence, the workers in this laboratory accumulated interesting research material and conducted important educational work. Lev Semenovich was director of the entire station for about a year,²⁰⁴ after which he became its scientific consultant.

In 1929 the Experimental Institute of Abnormal Development (EDI) was established by the People's Commissariat of Education in the above laboratory.²⁰⁵ The director of the institute was I.I. Daniushevskii. Vygotsky was the research leader and consultant at this institution from the moment it was founded to the last day of his life.²⁰⁶

The research staff grew steadily, and the research broadened. The institute studied abnormal children and diagnosed and planned further remedial work with deaf and mentally retarded children.

Many experts in abnormal development recall even today how scientific and practical workers from all the districts of Moscow flocked to observe Vygotsky as he examined children and then analyzed in detail each individual child, uncovering the structure of the defect and giving practical recommendations to parents and teachers. "His analyses were extremely important and interesting not only in terms of his analyses of specific cases but also in the depth and breadth of their theoretical generalizations."²⁰⁷

The EDI had a commune school for children with behavior disorders, a remedial school (for mentally retarded children), a school for the deaf, and a clinical diagnostic section. In 1933 Vygotsky and the director of the institute, I.I. Daniushevskii, decided to study children with speech disorders.

The studies done by Vygotsky at this institute are still fundamental in the productive development of problems of abnormal development. The theoretical system created by Vygotsky in this area of knowledge not only is of historic significance but also has had an essential influence on the develop-

ment of theory and practice in the area of abnormal development.

It is difficult to name one work of the last few years in the psychology and education of abnormal children that has not felt the influence of Vygotsky's ideas and has not drawn directly or indirectly on his scientific legacy. His theory has retained its timeliness and significance.

Among Vygotsky's scientific interests was a broad range of questions referring to the development, education, and upbringing of abnormal children. In our view, the most important of these were problems that help to understand the essence and nature of a defect and ways to compensate for it and to correctly organize the education and upbringing of abnormal children. Let us briefly describe some of them.

Lev Semenovich's understanding of the nature and essence of abnormal development differed from the widespread biologizing approach to defects. He regarded a defect as a social "oddy" brought about by a change in the relationship between the child and the environment, which leads to a disturbance in the social aspects of behavior. He concluded that to understand the essence of abnormal development, it was necessary to identify and take into account the primary defect, secondary defect, a third defect, and so on. Vygotsky thought that the distinction between primary and secondary defect symptoms, etc., was extremely important for the study of children with various kinds of pathology. He wrote that the elementary functions, which are the first to be affected by the defect, and are directly linked to it, are less susceptible of correction.

The problem of compensating for a defect was reflected in a multitude of Vygotsky's works on abnormal development.²⁰⁸

This theory of compensation was an organic part of the problem of development and disintegration of higher mental functions that he studied. In the twenties, Vygotsky proposed and argued for the necessity of social compensation of defects as a task of prime importance: "Mankind will probably, sooner or later, conquer blindness, deafness, and feeble-mindedness, but it will conquer them socially and educationally much sooner than medically and biologically."²⁰⁹

In subsequent years Lev Semenovich deepened and concretized the theory of compensation. His thesis that detours in development occur in the pathologically evolving child was extremely important for improving the theory of compensation and the problems of studying the abnormal child. In his later works Vygotsky returned often to the question of detours in development, noting their major importance for the process of compensation. In the process of cultural development, he writes, "certain functions are replaced by others, detours are formed, and this opens up totally new possibilities for the development of the abnormal child. If such a child cannot achieve some-

thing directly, the development of detours becomes the basis on which compensation is achieved."²¹⁰

On the subject of compensation, Vygotsky pointed out that the entire practice of education of abnormal children consists in creating detours for the development of the abnormal child. To use Vygotsky's expression, this is the alpha and omega of special education.

Thus, in the twenties Vygotsky presented the idea of replacing biological compensation with social compensation in only its most general form. In his subsequent works this idea acquired concrete form: the path of compensation of a defect is through the formation of detours in the development of the abnormal child.

Lev Semenovich said that the normal and the abnormal child developed in accordance with the same laws. But, aside from the general laws, he noted that the development of the abnormal child had certain special features as well, primarily a discrepancy between biological and cultural processes of development.

For each category of abnormal children, the accumulation of life experience is retarded for different reasons and to different degrees; hence, the role of education assumes special importance in the development of these children. Education and upbringing, begun early and correctly organized, are much more urgent for the mentally retarded or deaf or blind child than for a normally developing child, who is able independently to draw on the knowledge of the world around him.

In describing a defect as a "social oddity," Lev Semenovich was not denying that organic defects (in deafness, blindness, and feeble-mindedness) are biological facts. But, since the educator must in practice deal not so much with the biological facts themselves as with their social consequences and with the conflicts arising when the "abnormal child embarks upon life," Vygotsky had sufficient basis for saying that the education of an abnormal child is basically social in nature. An education that is incorrect or begun too late merely intensifies the aberrations in the development of the abnormal child's personality, and behavioral disorders appear.

According to Vygotsky, a special school should deal first and foremost with such tasks as bringing the abnormal child out of a state of isolation, providing him with broad possibilities for a genuinely human life, bringing him into contact with socially useful labor, and teaching him to be an active, conscious member of society.

Lev Semenovich refuted the false view that an abnormal child has diminished "social impulses," and raised the question of the necessity of rearing him not as an invalid and a parasite or a socially neutral being, but as an active, conscious personality.

In the process of educational work with children with sensory or intellectual abnormalities, Vygotsky felt it was necessary to focus not on the "wee bits of illness" in the child, but on the "pounds of health" the child still possessed.

At the time, remedial work in special schools consisted basically of training the processes of memory, attention, observation, and the sense organs, and formed a system of formal isolated exercises. Vygotsky was one of the first to call attention to the onerous nature of this training. He thought it was wrong to create a system of such exercises as isolated tasks, making them into a goal in themselves, and struggled to make remedial and educational work aiming to correct flaws in the cognitive activity of abnormal children into a component part of overall educational work. This would be fully integrated into the overall process of education and upbringing, and would take place in play, in study, and in work.

In developing the problem of the relationship between education and development in child psychology, Vygotsky came to the conclusion that formal education and training should precede and be ahead of a child's development, and thus take it in hand.

This understanding of the relationship between these processes led him to the necessity of taking into account both the present level of a child's development and his potential level ("the zone of proximal development"). The "zone of proximal development" refers to functions that are "in the process of maturation, functions that will mature tomorrow, but that now, at present, are in an embryonic state, functions that may be called not the fruits of development, but the buds of development, the blossoms of development, i.e., that which is gradually maturing."²¹¹

Thus, as he developed the concept of the "zone of proximal development," Lev Semenovich came up with the important thesis that the definition of a child's mental development cannot be based solely on what he has achieved, i.e., on stages already traversed and completed, but that it is also necessary to take into account the "dynamic state of his development," "those processes that are now in a state of becoming."

Vygotsky thought that the "zone of proximal development" acquired definition as a child goes about accomplishing tasks difficult for his age with the help of an adult. Hence, an evaluation of mental development must be based on two indices: receptivity to the help offered, and preparedness to acquire the capacity to solve similar tasks independently in the future.

In his day-to-day work, Lev Semenovich not only encountered normally developing children but studied children with aberrations in their development (we have already spoken of these analyses). He came to believe that

the idea of zones of development was very productive when applied to all categories of abnormal children.

The dominant method used by educators to investigate children was psychometric tests. In a number of cases, these tests, although interesting in themselves, did not give any idea of the structure of the defect, of the child's real capabilities. Educators thought that aptitudes could and should be quantitatively measured in order later to be able to place children in different schools as a function of the results of those measurements. A formal evaluation of children's abilities done by test methods led to errors, and as a result normal children were often sent to remedial schools.

In his works Vygotsky criticized the methodological inconsistency of a quantitative approach to study of the mind through tests. To repeat his apt expression, in such investigations "kilometers are summed up in kilograms."

After one of Vygotsky's talks (23 December 1933),²¹² he was asked to give his opinion of tests. Vygotsky answered:

Very intelligent scientists have argued at our congresses about what is the best method, a laboratory method or an experimental method. This is the same as disputing which is better, a knife or a hammer. A method is always a means, a method is always a way. Can one say that the best road is from Moscow to Leningrad? If you want to go to Leningrad, of course, this is so. But if you want to go to Pskov, that is a bad way to go.

We cannot say that tests are always bad or good, but we can state one general rule, namely, that tests in themselves are not an objective indicator of mental development. Tests always reveal attributes; however, attributes are not direct indicators of the process of development, but always need to be supplemented by other criteria.²¹³

When Vygotsky was asked whether tests can serve as a criterion for development at a given moment, he replied: "It seems to me that the issue is which tests and how they are used. This question can be answered in the same way as if I had been asked if a knife might be a good tool for surgical intervention. But which knife? A knife from a restaurant, of course, would be a bad tool, but a surgical knife would be a good one."²¹⁴

Vygotsky wrote:

The study of difficult children, more than any other type of child, must be based on long observation of the child during the process of upbringing, on a educational experiment, and on study of the products of creativity, play, and all aspects of the child's behavior.

Tests to study the will, emotional aspects, imagination, character, etc., can be used as auxiliary and orienting devices.²¹⁵

It is evident from the above statements by Vygotsky that he thought that tests in themselves could not be an objective index of mental development. However, he did not deny their admissibility for limited use along with other methods for studying the child. Essentially, Vygotsky's view of tests was the same as that held by psychologists and experts in abnormal development at the time.

Vygotsky devoted considerable attention in his writings to the problem of studying abnormal children and ensuring that the process of selection was correct when assigning them to special establishments. Modern principles of selection (comprehensive, integral, dynamic, systemic, and complex study) of children go back to Vygotsky's ideas.

Vygotsky's ideas about the distinctive features of the child's mental development; the zones of current and proximal development; the leading role of education and upbringing; the necessity of a dynamic and a systemic approach to remedial activities, taking into account the undivided, integral nature of the development of the personality; and a number of other features found reflection and further development in theoretical and experimental studies by our own scientists and in the practice of various types of schools for abnormal children.

In the early 1930s, Vygotsky fruitfully worked in the area of clinical psychology. Of all the leading theses of this science that have contributed to a valid understanding of abnormal development of mental activity one of the most important is, according to the opinion of well-known specialists, the view that intelligence and affect form a unity. Vygotsky called this the cornerstone of the development of both a child with intact intelligence and of a mentally retarded child. The importance of this idea goes far beyond the problems in connection with which it was first put forth. Lev Semenovitch thought that the "unity of intelligence and affect is fundamental to the regulation and mediation of our behavior" (in Vygotsky's terms, "it alters our actions").²¹⁶

Vygotsky returned anew to experimental study of the basic processes of thought and of how higher mental functions are formed and disintegrate in pathological states of the brain. Thanks to studies done by Vygotsky and his fellow workers, these processes of disintegration gained a new scientific explanation.

In the 1930s Lev Semenovitch attributed fundamental importance to study of the development and pathology of language and thought. He used a method of experimental psychological investigation of concept development (the Vygotsky-Sakharov method) such as that employed in the study of changes in thought in schizophrenia and was the first to demonstrate the structure thought acquires in that disease. The main theses derived from psychologi-

cal study of schizophrenia were reported many times by Vygotsky at psychiatry congresses and in the psychiatric press, and received an extensive response from psychoneurologists.

Vygotsky's studies made an important contribution to the theory of schizophrenia and demonstrated the possibility of an experimental-psychological approach to the main problems of pathological changes in consciousness. Vygotsky laid the foundations for a number of studies of fundamental importance for clinical neurology.²¹⁷

Vygotsky began to study the problems of speech pathology of interest to him when he was director of the School for Remedial Speech of the EDI. In particular, one of Lev Semenovich's pupils, Rosa Evgen'evna Levina, concentrated on questions of children's speech disabilities from 1933-34 on.

Lev Semenovich attempted to make a careful psychological analysis of the alterations in speech and thought in aphasia (these ideas were later developed and worked on in detail by A.R. Luria).

Lev Semenovich's studies on the characteristics of the behavior of people with Parkinson's disease are of considerable interest. He presented his results numerous times in lectures and reports.

A.R. Luria wrote: "Vygotsky's work on these problems created an intricate network of studies in which psychology was used to solve timely problems of neurological and psychiatric clinical practice. The distinctive feature of these studies was that they amounted to much more than isolated efforts to study one or another particular process."²¹⁸

Vygotsky's theoretical and methodological concepts shifted the study of abnormal child development away from the empirical, descriptive realm and put them on genuinely scientific foundations, thereby contributing to the emergence of study of abnormal development as a science.

Such well-known experts in abnormal development as E.S. Bein, T.A. Glasova, R.E. Levina, N.G. Morozova, and Zh.I. Shiff, who were happy to work with Lev Semenovich, also noted his contribution to the development of theory and practice in that area: "His works served as a scientific basis for the development of special schools and as a theoretical foundation for principles and methods for studying the diagnostics of difficult (abnormal) children. Vygotsky left a legacy of unfading scientific importance, which has become part of the treasure of Soviet and world psychology, psychoneurology, defectology, and other related sciences."²¹⁹

His interest in clinical psychology and neuropsychology made Lev Semenovich aware of the necessity of obtaining a medical education. He was always eager to improve his knowledge. In 1931, Vygotsky entered the Medical Faculty of the Kharkov Psychoneurological Institute. He completed only three courses before death took him away. His third enrollment in higher

education must be especially stressed. Although he was already a professor with a world name, Lev Semenovich would himself sit at a student's desk on his regular trips to Kharkov to give lectures. He passed all his tests and exams.

Here is how one of his pupils evaluated this many years later: "During this time he, although an outstanding Soviet scientist, was a student at the Medical Institute. That he, a combination of Professor of Psychology and student, was still studying and submitting to student discipline, bordered on the unbelievable for us."²²⁰

Luria wrote, in his scientific autobiography: "We accepted his bold decision to enter the Medical Institute. I resumed my studies in medicine, beginning where I had left them in Kazan many years before. Vygotsky also began his medical studies.²²¹ Professors in one team and students in another, we would teach, learn, and conduct our research all at one and the same time."²²²

Lev Semenovich wrote in a letter to Luria: "I am infinitely grateful for the opportunity to study surgery. Will we work together? If only I succeed in combining this with gynecology or some other clinical discipline, I will come in December without fail. . . . To combine work with study assignments and complete two major courses and three or four minor ones (ear, eyes, teeth) is what I really want."²²³ As one can see from the context of this letter, he is speaking about practical studies in clinics in the medical disciplines.

In the 1930s Vygotsky worked productively in the system of public health, and from 1929 through 1931, he was an assistant in, and then head of, the laboratory in the Seppa Clinic for Nervous Diseases attached to the First Moscow State University.²²⁴

In February 1931 Professor Vygotsky was appointed deputy director in the Science Section of the Institute of Child and Adolescent Health (OZDiP).²²⁵ Among the documents of the Commissariat of Public Health in the central archives of the RSFSR are materials that bear witness to how carefully candidates for this job were selected.

Here are two such documents.

To the Commissariat of Public Health, Administration of Research Institutes, and Comrade Popov:

The OZDiP Institute nominates Professor L.S. Vygotsky for the position of Deputy of Research and asks that he be transferred to the OZDiP Institute from the Seppa Clinic attached to Moscow State University No. 1: Professor Vygotsky is now employed in a minor post that, in light of the dearth of trained personnel, is at variance with an appropriate distribution of scientific workers.

18-12-1930. Director of the Institute (signature).²²⁶

After much bureaucratic correspondence, the People's Commissar of Public Health signed the order:

Order from the People's Commissariat of Public Health of 17 February 1931, No. 95

Professor L.S. Vygotsky is appointed Deputy Director for Research of the OZDiP Institute of the Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution as of 5 February 1931.

18-2-1931. The People's Commissar of Public Health M. Vladimirkii.²²⁷

At the beginning of the 1930s, Vygotsky, Luria, Leont'ev, and Lebedinskii proposed that a Department of Psychology be established at the Ukrainian Psychoneurological Academy in Kharkov. The nucleus of the Kharkov group consisted of young scholars who had come from Moscow: L.I. Bozhovich, A.V. Zaporozhets, and A.N. Leont'ev. Soon thereafter psychologists from Kharkov joined their ranks: V.I. Asnin, P.Ia. Gal'perin, P.I. Zinchenko, G.D. Lukov, and others. This group was in fact headed by A.N. Leont'ev, who had decided to "develop his own variant of the theory."²²⁸

In the words of Gal'perin, he [Leont'ev] "became the head of the sector and, in addition, headed the Department of Psychology of the Pedagogical Institute and the Department of Psychology of the Scientific Research Institute of Pedagogy. . . . Leont'ev had noted a gap [in Vygotsky's system of ideas—The author], and he directed the efforts of his team toward filling this gap theoretically and experimentally."²²⁹ Luria "began to commute between Kharkov and Moscow."²³⁰

Lev Semenovich also planned to relocate in Kharkov, but was unable to do so. He would make short trips to Kharkov, where he would fulfill his obligations as a student, give lectures, and present reports to scientific conferences. In November 1931 he was approved in his position as Head of the Department of Developmental Psychology of the State Institute for the Training of Cadres attached the People's Commissariat of Public Health of the Ukraine.²³¹

At the very beginning of 1934, Vygotsky was asked to head the Department of Psychology at the All-Union Institute of Experimental Medicine (VIEM). He began to prepare himself enthusiastically for this work. He drafted plans and not only pondered about the areas in general and possible topics for research²³² but also addressed some of the organizational questions that always accompanied the creation of new departments. Thus, on a small slip of yellowed paper we found (Lev Semenovich loved to write on bits of paper) can be seen comments on the urgent tasks he had to accomplish in connection with this appointment. On one side of the slip is the proposed staffing.

The people he intended to invite to work at the VIEM included the following familiar names: I.M. Solov'ev, L.V. Zankov, K.I. Veresotskaia, R.E. Levina, L.S. Slavina, Zh.I. Shiff, and others. This list included not only fellow research workers but also technical staff.

On the other side of the slip of paper we find Lev Semenovich's notes and a list of questions the directorship of an institute was required to decide promptly: "vacations; supplies and files; new rooms; tests, assistants, distribution of people, jobs, and locales; the beginning of work; money for equipment and other points."²³³

But Lev Semenovich was unable to pursue his experimental work. Death destroyed all his plans.

The last of Vygotsky's writings were ["Problems of the development and disintegration of higher mental functions"] and ["The psychology and theory of localization of mental functions"]. The first was presented as a programmatic report to the Conference of the All-Union Institute of Experimental Medicine on 28 April 1934 (i.e., a month and a half before his death). The second was presented in June 1934 (in the form of theses of a report) to the First Ukrainian Congress of Psychoneurologists. These works "provide a thorough critical analysis of existing theories and present Vygotsky's own positive theory, in which the prospectives of the entire future study of this complex problem are set forth in clear terms."²³⁴

Despite his intense research work, Vygotsky did not abandon his educational activities. He was aided in this by his popularity among broad scientific circles. He regularly gave lectures and conducted research work in different establishments in Moscow, Leningrad, and Kharkov.

According to the recollections of pupils and fellow workers, Vygotsky's "speaking skills, his restrained speech, replete with creative ideas and logically polished, could hold the attention of his audience for hours on end. His lectures and reports were a celebration of science and attracted such huge numbers of people from very diverse areas of knowledge (not just psychologists, specialists in abnormal development, and doctors) that at times there was no hall at the institute big enough to accommodate all those wishing to attend."²³⁵

In early 1929 Lev Semenovich received an invitation from the Central Asian State University (SAGU) to give a series of lectures. On 18 January 1929 the question of granting lecturer L.S. Vygotsky leave to travel to Tashkent was discussed at a session of the Dean's administration of the Pedagogical Faculty of the 2nd Moscow State University.²³⁶ It was granted on condition that he faithfully complete his teaching duties in the faculty. In the first days of April, Lev Semenovich went off with his wife to Tashkent. Photographs have been preserved: Lev Semenovich conducting lessons before his audi-

ence at the SAGU, and he among teachers and pupils at that university.

In Tashkent Lev Semenovich worked intensely, as we have said, giving lectures and conducting seminars. But, as may be seen from his letters, he still did not leave behind his ideas about his job. In a letter to A.N. Leont'ev, he wrote: "For the time being, I can say nothing about myself. I am preparing myself for the job (research), and we're temporarily living in a hotel, strolling about the city, and taking in central Asia—the magnificent tatters of the East, the singularity and uniqueness of a high ancient culture. But at the center of all interests is our problem, which alone will provide the key to human psychology."²³⁷

He writes to Aleksandr Romanovich from Tashkent: "I am setting up experiments, and hope to have some results. Most important is I am taking in the sun and oriental dust. Blessed dust!"²³⁸ In another letter he writes: "the work is especially interesting: it is very interesting; we will talk about it together. . . . We're setting up some experiments, but I don't know whether they will be successful."²³⁹

Here is a list of a number of the educational establishments whose lecture halls were filled to overflowing when he gave lectures there (from 1924 through 1926 as assistant; from 1926 to 1931, as lecturer; after 1931, as professor): First Moscow State University (two faculties: physics and mathematics, and social sciences);²⁴⁰ Second Moscow State University (Department of Psychology, Pedology, and Abnormal Development of the Pedagogical Faculty²⁴¹—today this is the Moscow State Pedagogical University); the Krupskaja Academy of Communist Education (AKB);²⁴² advanced courses in pedagogical theory;²⁴³ the Institute of Pedology and Abnormal Development;²⁴⁴ the Institute of Child and Adolescent Health;²⁴⁵ the Second Moscow Medical Institute;²⁴⁶ the Moscow Conservatory, the Pedagogical Faculty;²⁴⁷ the K. Liebknecht Industrial Pedagogy Institute;²⁴⁸ the A.I. Gertsen Pedagogical Institute in Leningrad;²⁴⁹ the Institute for the Retraining of Cadres of the People's Commissariat of Health of the Ukraine;²⁵⁰ the Kharkov Psychoneurological Institute;²⁵¹ etc.

Lev Semenovich conducted his research in a number of scientific establishments, such as the Institute of Experimental Psychology, the Experimental Institute for Abnormal Development, the State Institute of Scientific Pedagogy, the Psychological Laboratory attached to the Second Moscow State University, the Clinic of Nervous Diseases, the Laboratory of Experimental Art History (GAIS), etc.

Lev Semenovich headed laboratories, departments, and chairs in a number of higher educational institutions and scientific establishments. We have found in various archives some interesting material about his talks at student conferences,²⁵² his speeches in the department,²⁵³ and the themes of disserta-

tions on which Vygotsky tutored (for example, the "Development of recollection in school-age children"; "Experimental study of concept formation"; etc.).²⁵⁴

The schedule of the Department of Abnormal Development of the Pedagogical Faculty of Second Moscow University has been preserved, in which we note that Vygotsky conducted a special seminar in the departments for the Pedagogy of the Feeble-minded and the Deaf and Mute.²⁵⁵ (The program of the special courses is kept in the archives of the Moscow oblast.) Here are some questions Lev Semenovich noted for discussion in his seminar sessions: "Debated questions in psychology and psychological pedagogical examination of the schoolchild," "Psychology and the teacher."²⁵⁶

Vygotsky's vast research and pedagogical work was rounded off with his active social engagement. He participated in many scientific congresses, conferences, plenums, meetings, and commissions on public education, and as part of the Society of Materialist Psychoneurologists (he was a member of the presidium of that society).

In October 1925, Vygotsky was selected, along with P.P. Blonskii and K.N. Kornilov, to join the staff of the Methods Commission on Psychology attached to the State Science Council (GUS). In subsequent years he also worked in numerous sections and commissions of that council (on public education, on children's literature, on polytechnism, etc.). In 1929 Vygotsky was elected member of the presidium of the GUS.²⁵⁷ It should be pointed out that Lev Semenovich felt very responsible for his work in the State Science Council. Quite a few of his valuable comments on how to improve teaching in schools and higher education establishments throughout the country have been preserved in the archives of the People's Commissariat of Education.²⁵⁸

Vygotsky was a member of the editorial boards of the journals *Psikhologična* and *Pediatriia*, and editor-in-chief of the collection *Voprosy defektologii*. At the same time, he was a member of the presidium of the Krupskaja Academy of Communist Education, and headed the section for problem children under the People's Commissariat of Education, working for three years in the Cultural Department of the Oblast Society of Education Workers; he was also head of the theme commission of the Second Moscow State University and chairman of the VARNITSO.²⁵⁹

Lev Semenovich was very proud of his title of Deputy of the Frunz District Council of Workers, Peasants, and Red Army Deputies (the Section on Public Education).²⁶⁰

Shortly before his death, he completed his work on the monograph [*Thought and language*]. In it he sums up the results of the studies he conducted, together with his co-workers, in the preceding decade. The results of these studies were reflected in a number of previously published works.²⁶¹

The theses of the monograph were discussed in the sections of the Institute for Scientific Pedagogy²⁶² (one copy has been preserved in the Vygotsky family archives).

We thought it would be interesting to familiarize the readers with these theses since they have never before been published.

[*Thought and language*]

Theses

L.S. Vygotsky

Psychological research

1. The book contains a systematic study of thought and language undertaken as part of research on the development of speech and thought in the child, on the disintegration of these functions in mental and nervous diseases, and on the course of these processes in the adult in their highly developed form. Thus, the research was comparative. In the theoretical part, we drew on research material from elsewhere in the domains of zoopsychology and ethnopsychology to clarify the phylogenetic problems of language and thought.

2. The book consists of the following basic parts:

- (1) posing the problem;
- (2) critical study of the main theories of thought and language;
- (3) experimental studies;
- (4) theoretical conclusions.

3. An exploration and experimental demonstration of the point that word meanings develop and that the path of their development is one of development of concepts in human thought; therein lies the novelty of this book compared with other writings on similar themes in the Russian and foreign literature.

4. The main theoretical conclusions of the study are the following:

(1) All attempts to establish one constant relation between the processes of thought and language have been misconceived since this relationship is a historical and practical variable that is different at different stages of development.

(2) The specific functional structure of language and thought at each stage of development determines, in the first instance, the structure of word meanings, i.e., the specific level in the development of a concept.

(3) The dominant forms of conceptual thought at a given stage determine the entire structure of consciousness and its functions.

5. The practical and theoretical significance of the research—in the view of the author—consists in the fact that experimental findings have shown that it is possible to present the problem of language and thought in a new light from the perspective of historical development and to mark the main

guideposts along the way toward its resolution, which, in turn, will enable us to pose a number of psychological, psychotechnical, and practical psychological problems in a new way.

Lev Semenovich was not destined to see his book [*Thought and language*] published—it was not ready for print until late 1934, after his death.

The further fate of this book was unique. Published posthumously, with essentially no time to receive an objective critical evaluation²⁶³ before it was prohibited, Vygotsky's monograph was one of the first publications after 4 July 1936 to be the target of harsh and unjustified criticism.²⁶⁴ Thereafter it was hardly ever mentioned in the psychological literature. But specialists who have studied the problem of thought and language cannot disregard the results of the studies he presented therein.

Publication of the [*Selected psychological works of Vygotsky*]²⁶⁵ (which included the monograph [*Thought and language*]) and rehabilitation of his psychological theory marked an extremely important moment in the development of our psychology.

The book [*Thought and language*] was published three times in our country in the second volume of the author's six-volume collected works. After 1962 it was published widely abroad as well. This is undoubtedly Vygotsky's principal work, now a classic, the one most widely available and best known to the reader. Hence, we shall not dissect it here, but merely refer to evaluations of it by eminent scientists throughout the world.

The first foreign edition of the monograph *Thought and language* was produced by MIT Press in 1962.

In a letter to one of the translators, Luria wrote:

I received the Vygotsky volume which you translated. Need I say how much satisfaction this brought me? A remarkable translation, an intelligent choice of material, and splendid editing, combined with Bruner's cogent and kind preface. And, to top it all off, a surprise: Piaget's commentary on Vygotsky's critique. What a clever idea to send him the translation and receive his critical comments. I know of no similar case in the history of science in which two outstanding scientists, one of whom is still alive, have exchanged their points of view separated by thirty years! I am sure the book will have great success and a broad response.²⁶⁶

Aleksandr Romanovich was not wrong in his prediction.

This was the first foreign edition of the book, and it contained an appendix (in the form of a separate brochure entitled *Comments on Vygotsky's critical remarks on "The language and thought of the child" and "Judgment and reasoning in the child" by Jean Piaget*). In it Piaget writes:

It was not without chagrin that the author discovered, twenty-five years after its publication, a work of a colleague, now dead, that has many aspects of direct interest to himself and that could have been discussed in person and in detail. Although my friend A. Luria told me that Vygotsky's position on my work was sympathetic but critical, I never had a chance to read his work or encounter him personally; and when I read this book today, I was deeply saddened that we were unable to arrive at a mutual understanding on a number of questions.²⁶⁷

Referring rightfully to a number of critical comments, Piaget thought that on some of them he still had a reply for Vygotsky in light of his later work, written after Vygotsky's death. Thus, he writes that he decided to "try to see whether Vygotsky's critical comments were correct in light of my latest works. The answer was both yes and no. On the main questions I am now more in agreement with Vygotsky than I was in 1934, but on other questions I have some arguments to give him in response."²⁶⁸ And a few pages later: "My commentary on the second part of Vygotsky's comments on my work, in the sixth chapter, will be simpler, since I am much more in agreement with him on these questions and mainly because my most recent works, which Vygotsky did not know, answer the questions he posed, or at least the majority of them."²⁶⁹

The book [*Thought and language*] was published for the first time in French in 1985. Lucien Sève, the well-known French philosopher and psychologist, wrote the foreword to it: "Publishing for the first time in French Vygotsky's work—in this case his last and best book (and this half a century after his death)—means to begin to fill an incomprehensible bibliographic gap that has existed in France, placing there a landmark of Soviet psychology, whose founder was Vygotsky."²⁷⁰ The author noted that interest in Vygotsky's work "throughout the world, from America to Japan, is extremely great."²⁷¹ At the end of the foreword Sève writes: "Vygotsky belongs to world psychological culture, and we hope that this first complete publication of [*Thought and language*] in French will show readers and specialists the richness of which they had been deprived."²⁷²

The eminent American scientist George Miller, in an article published as a book review, wrote:

This is an outstanding book, and the most striking point about it is the fact that it has kept its freshness and interest to the present time. . . . Its Russian author still appears sincere and convincing. His arguments can still be used in psychology. . . . Vygotsky's own interpretation of the development of thought from social communication through personal monologues to inner speech is precisely confirmed by anecdote, by logical and rhetorical argu-

ments, literary quotations from Tolstoy and other authors, references to authorities both scientific and philosophic, linguistic analysis, and every conceivable form of proof and argument that an inventive and highly educated person could bring to such a question. But most convincing are his own studies of small children. . . . It is a pleasure to meet such a person, if only on the pages of a book. It is delightful to know that his work now has become better known to the English-speaking reader.²⁷³

J. Bruner, who wrote the preface to *Thought and language* in 1962, called it the best book of the year.²⁷⁴ In the preface to the publication in the USA of the Vygotsky's six-volume collected works, Bruner calls it an outstanding event and says that many scientists in his country have been impatiently awaiting this publication.²⁷⁵

In the spring of 1934, Lev Semenovitch's illness became more acute (he had tuberculosis of the lungs). The doctors insisted on prompt hospitalization, but Vygotsky did not heed their recommendations, referring to the extremely heavy workload he had at the end of the school year.

He spent his last working day at the VIEM. There, on 9 May 1934, his throat began to hemorrhage. He was brought home and was confined to bed. On the night of 25 May the bleeding recurred; and on 2 June Lev Semenovitch was hospitalized in the Serebranyi Bor sanatorium, where he died at night between 10 and 11 June 1934, at the age of 37½. He was buried in the Novodevichii cemetery.

Two years after Vygotsky's death, the grievous resolution entitled "On pedagogical distortions in the system of people's popular education" was passed by the Communist Party Central Committee on 4 July 1936. And although Lev Semenovitch was not among the living, this resolution sealed the fate of his works. The press and many public speakers began to fulminate against everyone who had anything directly or indirectly to do with pedagogy in numerous public statements. Next it was the scientist's name and works that became the target of rabid criticism. Many were those who were accused of switching sides, of being turncoats, and of going their own way. Lev Semenovitch could explain nothing. He could not defend himself and his position; hence, it was easier to attack him.

The archive preserves a stenographer's records of a number of statements made at one such discussion within the walls of the Institute of Psychology. For instance, P.A. Rudik (who was concerned with problems of selection of professionals and sports psychology) said that a speaker had

dealt with only one point in Vygotsky's cultural-historical theory. We must aim our fire at the overall conception of the theory as a whole. . . . I know of no other psychological theory that contains so many pseudoscientific and

anti-Marxist postulates and is so thoroughly enmeshed in pedagogical practice as Vygotsky's theory of thought. In practice this theory is against the interests of the working class, and I think that we must launch a very serious critique of it. We must judge whether Vygotsky has distorted the Marxist idea of development with his theory. . . . We should not forget that in Vygotsky's theory we have a clear example of noncritical borrowings from, even enslavement to, bourgeois theories. . . . Vygotsky's theory has existed and has been evolving unobstructed for more than ten years. . . . We constantly hear that this theory is the "gold reserve of Soviet psychology." I must assure my comrades that I have studied in detail, line by line, both the theoretical foundations and the experimental material gathered by this theory; and this study has convinced me that the cultural-historical theory is not only not a gold reserve, it is not even a copper reserve. And in no case can it be called the steel foundation of our science. If one must attach some label to it, I would say that it is idealistic rubbish.

Fortunately, not everyone in the hall agreed with Rudik. This is clear from the same discussion: "I think that the shouts from the audience are dictated by a desire to create an atmosphere of public disdain against persons who dare to express criticism of Vygotsky's theory and thus not allow this criticism, or at least postpone it for a year or two. I did not think this could happen now!"²⁷⁶

Then some scholars who did not like the general tone of the discussion had the courage to honestly say so and defend their viewpoint:

Lev Semenovich was one of the most talented of our psychologists, and it is idle for someone in the first session to have said that his theory is one hostile to the working class (I think that it was Rudik who expressed this view). . . . Anyone who was with Lev Semenovich even once will object to such an unworthy characterization. For us it is obvious that Vygotsky's main misfortune was that he was unable in his short lifetime to complete his reworking of the entire rich content of the science of psychology in which he was so adept.²⁷⁷

The institute director, V.N. Kolbanovskii, spoke, saying:²⁷⁸

What is flawed in Vygotsky's system? It is his original and fundamental methodological position as expressed in the cultural-historical theory. Does Vygotsky stand on Marxist positions on this question? No, of course not. . . . What is our attitude toward this theory? I must say that I never recognized this theory as a Marxist theory or anything close to it. But if one examines the core of the theory, it requires from us a circumstantial critique as an anti-Marxist theory, as a theory that does not go beyond the bounds of a bourgeois understanding of historicism, and hence is at root hostile to Marxism.²⁷⁹

The situation was so heated that many scientists, in the words of one of the speakers, were repudiating everything they had done their whole life long, everything on which they had worked for many years.

To judge from the archival material that is available to us, Mikhailov's intervention struck a dissident note in this discussion (unfortunately, we were unable to find out anything about this person, his fate, or even to determine his initials): "V.N. Kolbanovskii has said here that Vygotsky's theory is a reactionary theory. One might hear even harsher statements at a meeting of psychologists and pedagogists, yet we hear no arguments to back up such a view."

Though Kolbanovskii had characterized Vygotsky as "a progressive Soviet scientist for whom Marxism and Leninism became a world view, for whom communism was the highest ideal, and for whom the struggle to attain it was a lifetime cause" in the book [*Thought and language*], this same Kolbanovskii, without bothering with proof, dubbed Vygotsky's theory anti-Marxist and reactionary. I think that, if even half of the descriptions given above were true, such a scientist would be entitled to be treated in a more considerate manner. Though we have a great dearth of people, we indulge in extreme carelessness with regard to human material. And if Vygotsky, who is described in such notable words, is at the same time a "reactionary anti-Marxist," then, out of respect for one's own description, one should present arguments and ideas that would reinforce this position.

With regard to the zone of proximal development, which Kolbanovskii called reactionary, he had written that this was an "extremely interesting, original, and extraordinarily important result of tremendous significance for the belabored question of forming classroom groups" and that this work of Vygotsky's "constituted a radical turning point in the status and role of psychology as a science." "The psychological analysis produced by Vygotsky sheds new light on existing pedagogical practice and calls for new guidelines that would undoubtedly raise pedagogy to a higher level" (cited in [*Thought and language*], pp. 3, 4, 29-30).

I find it quite striking that it was possible to give such a high evaluation of Vygotsky and then, a short time later, without burdening oneself with evidence, to declare that this same person . . . was a reactionary scientist, anti-Marxist, etc.

Kolbanovskii is a relatively benign critic of Vygotsky. Many other "critics" were utterly unpardonable in their comments. "They hang a number of labels on him, and make completely groundless accusations."²⁸⁰

After the resolution and the discussions that followed, Lev Semenovich's name was stricken from science for long years; his works were not published, and those that had been published earlier became unavailable to the

reader since they were taken out of circulation, and some were even destroyed.

As we were compiling a bibliography of the works of Lev Semenovich in the country's principal storehouse of books, namely, the public Lenin State Library, in the early seventies, we repeatedly encountered journal issues from which pages of Vygotsky's articles had been ripped out; and in place of them was the stamp: "Removed pursuant to the resolution 'On pedagogical distortions in the system of public education.'" Even in the 1960s and the early 1970s, some of Vygotsky's writings could be withdrawn from the library only if one had special permission.

The years passed; and there was a whole generation of people who had never read Lev Semenovich's books and knew about him only by hearsay from the tales of his pupils and their lectures. Thanks to the first publications,²⁸¹ though in a limited run, after a long interruption, it became possible to become directly acquainted with Vygotsky.

Interest in his works rose sharply—moreover, among representatives of a variety of disciplines. This is not surprising since Lev Semenovich's works were multifaceted. We have attempted to show how broad was the range of his scientific interests and how varied the scope of the problems he raised.

Happily, each of us was a specialist in some specific area: in the localization of brain functions, autonomic reflexes, learning and development, affects, etc.

Indeed, Lev Semenovich was directly interested in problems of the localization of functions, of the unity of affect and intelligence, of clinical aspects of the abnormal child, of learning and development in terms of age, and in the general problems of psychology.²⁸²

It is difficult to find among our contemporaries a psychologist with such a broad range of research interests as Vygotsky had. He drew on materials from the most diverse fields to work on his own problems: e.g., from the area of abnormal development, from neurology, psychiatry, etc.; he also did experimental work in all of these areas.²⁸³

When one leafs through the pages of Vygotsky's works, accomplished in such a short time, one is struck by the wealth of ideas in them. Lev Semenovich was able to critically draw on a great many literary sources, to analyze and generalize the results of experimental studies, to define cardinal problems for careful study, and, what is "most surprising, to foresee the future development of the science for decades ahead."²⁸⁴

Lev Semenovich's ideas have stood the test of time. Few theories created in the late 1920s and early 1930s are so interesting for contemporary science and so timely for our day.

Describing one of Vygotsky's works, written in the early thirties, D.B. El'konin said that even now it could be presented "without qualms as a report at psychological conferences. How contemporary and how right it is!²⁸⁵ How truly great it appears at a distance!" Despite their cruel fate, Vygotsky's works have survived. Vygotsky's ideas began their second life in the 1950s.

It seems to us correct to say that

a scientist's contribution to the development of science is determined not only by what problems he worked on and solved but also on the extent to which his works influenced the subsequent development of science and helped resolve new and current problems. One can say quite rightly that Vygotsky remains an active and fundamental participant in the present stage of the development of the science of psychology, helping to resolve complex and contentious problems.²⁸⁶

Lev Semenovich's students continued the work he was unable to complete. In their research they not only further developed his theory themselves but also nurtured their own students in these traditions, i.e., in the mainstream of Vygotsky's ideas.

Such continuity between generations and ideas can be preserved only when the founder of a school of thought is not only a talented scientist, a thinker on a grand scale, and widely educated in various areas of knowledge but also a model of selfless service to science.

Lev Semenovich's students remained loyal to his ideas, and in subsequent years regarded him as their beacon, lighting the path in science for them even when their Teacher was no more. One of Vygotsky's students, Nataliia Grigor'evna Morozova, had the following to say about this:

You have left . . . But your life is in me—
The memories live on.
Your noble impulses are in me,
Like the wind in a blue wave;
The departed train still hums
As if somewhere near.
Your words are in my breast
In a song still being sung.

The traditions founded by Vygotsky are alive, unconquered by time—as evidenced by the anniversary gatherings and the scientific conferences in which not only is tribute paid to the memory of the famous scientist but his scientific works are analyzed.

Beginning in 1966, his colleagues and students regularly spoke at gather-

ings in memory of Vygotsky—the same people who in their youth worked with him (A.R. Luria, A.N. Leont'ev, A.V. Zaporozhets, N.G. Morozova, R.E. Levina, L.I. Bozhovich, L.S. Slavina, D.B. El'konin, P.Ia. Gal'perin, B.V. Zeigarnik, E.S. Bein, M.B. Eidinova, R.M. Boskis, T.A. Vlasova, L.V. Zankov, M.S. Pevzner, I.M. Solov'ev, and Zh.I. Shif):

Note that the last of them are gone; we can be especially grateful to these scientists for their memories preserved in reports, stenographic records, on tape, and in various articles.

Scientific conferences devoted to analyzing Vygotsky's creative heritage take place both in our country and abroad. They examine a broad range of problems, embracing various scientific trends, in which Vygotsky's ideas have not lost their timeliness. These include theoretical questions of psychology, questions of child and educational psychology, the study of abnormal development, clinical psychology, semiotics, and many others. Such conferences took place in January 1979 in Rome and in autumn 1980 in Chicago. A symposium on Vygotsky's works was especially organized in 1984 as part of the International Psychological Congress in Mexico. The Seventh Annual European Conference of the Association of the History of Psychology and Social Sciences took place in September 1988 at the Institute of Psychology of the Hungarian Academy of Science in Budapest. What was remarkable about it was that one of the three topics was devoted exclusively to the significance of Vygotsky's legacy for world psychology. The conference opened with a report by one of the authors of this book. Two of the largest and most representative scientific conferences held in our country were on "The scientific works of L.S. Vygotsky and contemporary psychology" (Moscow, 1981) and "The scientific legacy of L.S. Vygotsky and current problems in education and upbringing" (Minsk, 1986, and Gomel', 1989).

Recent years have seen several international conferences: "Vygotsky's cultural-historical theory: Past, present, and future" (Moscow, 1992); "Lev Semenovich Vygotsky and contemporary human sciences" (Moscow, 1994); "The role of the family and preschool institutions in the development of the child's personality in light of the ideas of Vygotsky and his followers" (Gomel', 1994); and "The human sciences in a historical perspective: The dialogue between Russia and the West concerning the works of M.M. Bakhtin, L.S. Vygotsky, and S.L. Rubinshtein" (Moscow, 1995).

A notable event for science was the publication of the six-volume collected works of L.S. Vygotsky in 1982–1984.

A book was recently published²⁸⁷ that contains all Vygotsky's currently known works on abnormal development and handicaps, plus fragments of his psychological writings on problems in the study, instruction, and upbringing of children with developmental abnormalities.

* * *

In endeavoring to capture the full scope of Lev Semenovich's life and creative career, one is always struck by how he was able to do so much in such a short time—more than 270 works issued from his pen.

In the words of Academician A.A. Smirnov, "What Vygotsky has done will become a permanent part of Soviet psychology—indeed, its best pages."²⁸⁸

Speaking of the significance of Vygotsky's works, M.Ia. Iaroshevskii commented:

If Pavlov had died at Vygotsky's age, we would not know his theory of conditioned reflexes; if Freud had died at that age, he would not have been the founder of psychoanalysis. What Vygotsky succeeded in accomplishing has remained a permanent page in the chronicle of world psychology to which the contemporary scientist turns again and again."²⁸⁹

In an article written on Vygotsky for a UNESCO journal, Ivan Ivich, professor at Belgrade University, writes: "More than a half-century after his death, now that his basic writings have been published, Vygotsky is recognized as a leader of world psychology. There is no doubt that Vygotsky was, in many respects, far ahead of our time as well. (Riviere, 1984)."²⁹⁰

* * *

Daniil Borisovich El'konin, a student of Vygotsky's, said: "Vygotsky's scientific biography has not yet been written; this is a difficult task, and will require the efforts of an entire team."²⁹¹ He thought that this was a task for the future. I should like to believe and hope that what we have done will be the first step in accomplishing this task.

We remember well Lev Semenovich's words: "In taking the first step, there are perhaps many serious mistakes we shall be unable to avoid. But the important thing is that the first step has been taken in the right direction. The rest remains to be done. What is in error will fall away, and what is lacking will be made up."²⁹²

Journal of Russian and East European Psychology,
vol. 37, no. 3, May-June 1999, pp. 32-80.
© 2000 M.E. Sharpe, Inc. All rights reserved.
ISSN 1061-0405/2000 \$9.50 + 0.00.

PART 2

Through the Eyes of Others

He was a man. Take him for all in all.
I shall not look upon his like again.
—William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*

Any description of Vygotsky's life and career would be incomplete if it omitted how he felt about science, work, and people, and what he was like in everyday life.

Now that Vygotsky's basic works have recently been published in our country and abroad, the general reader has access to his thoughts, ideas, his logic and patterns of thought, and the results of his scientific inquiries. One can get an idea of the kind of scientist he was from his work. But what kind of a man was he?

When we began to write this book, some people who knew Lev Semenovich well were still alive and were able to tell about him—some of his students, and his younger sister. But now, unfortunately, none is still alive who could give a true account of him.²⁹³

There are no longer witnesses to events,
There is no one with whom to cry,
No one with whom to remember.²⁹⁴

But far from waning with the years, interest in him, in his person, has perhaps even increased, especially recently. Perhaps that is why we hear ever more frequently the question: "Who was he?" And the request, ever more

Translation © 2000 M.E. Sharpe, Inc., from the Russian text © 1996 by G.L. Vygotskaia and T.M. Lifanova and "Smysl" Publishers. *Lev Semenovich Vygotsky* (Moscow: "Smysl" Publishers, 1996), pp. 150-209.

Parts of this chapter are written in the first person by Gita L'vova Vygotskaia since they involve personal observations.—Ed.

insistent: "Tell us what kind of a person he was."

I had this asked of me in Minsk in December 1986 at a conference in honor of Vygotsky's 90th anniversary. As they took their leave of me, the Minsk psychologists said: "It's your duty to remember and tell about Lev Semenovich. You are simply obligated to do so."

I confess that for a long time I procrastinated. Time passed.

But in talks I gave on my recollections of Lev Semenovich in various places (including twice in Minsk), I could not help but note the lively, unfeigned interest with which my audience received my tale about him. They truly found it interesting; they needed it. And in my hands, in my memory, was material that was unknown to others; and I thought I ought probably to share with them what I know and could relate. Otherwise, a poor image of Lev Semenovich might be created that diverged from the truth and the facts.

All that aside, various idle conjectures began to appear in the press because of the lack of published information on Vygotsky's life and activity or of recollections of him. He was ascribed actions he did not commit, thoughts he never uttered; and then they began to inveigh against him, in the heat of envy, for things that never happened.

All this together forced me to take up my pen, and thus was born the idea for this part of the book.

Wherever possible in my narrative, I shall try to draw on documents, on recollections of people close to him who knew him at various times in his life, and on his letters.

It so happened that, after Lev Semenovich's death, I kept in contact with his close friends. At first such meetings would take place in our home when they would come to visit us. Then, much later, as I grew up, I began to meet with them in places other than at home. I worked together with many of them under the same roof, at the same institute (A.R. Luria, L.V. Zankov, I.M. Solov'ev, N.G. Morozova, R.M. Boskis, R.E. Levina, Zh.I. Shif, M.S. Pevzner, M.B. Eidinova, and others); and I visited many in their homes. Once, in summer 1940, and throughout roughly the ensuing three weeks, I lived with the family of Aleksandr Romanovich Luria. Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zaporozhets was my teacher in my student years (and in fact remained so until his death). Work on a volume of Lev Semenovich's collected works brought me very close to Daniil Borisovich El'konin. With all the others I maintained good relations, and with many I even became friends—in some cases, very close friends (Zaporozhets, Morozova). Contact with them, even during joint work, of course, went beyond just practical matters; they would all tell me about my father, and reminisced about him to the end of their days.

They reminisced about working with him, how he taught them to "do"

science, how he directed their work, and how he studied children. They said he was a good comrade and helpful to everyone, that he shared with them their joys and sorrows; and they told how he would express delight at others' achievements, and was unfailingly there whenever anyone needed help. As they spoke, they would recall various incidents in his life, and recount his stories and his jokes.

It is their recollections and their tales that underlie this part of the book. I shall not only speak with their words but, wherever possible, in their words (I shall quote them). They shared some precious and very personal memories with me, and now it is my turn to pass them on to others. I shall present only those facts that are firmly established, and refer only to incidents that more than one person remembered.

How can I tell about Lev Semenovich so that you, my readers, can form a true idea about him? As I remember him and as I see him? What must I do so that you can see him as I did?

I can try to compile a psychological portrait of him. Following the usual procedure, I should then begin by describing his sensations, perception, or attention. But would it bring insight if I wrote, for example, what I knew about the characteristics of his visual or auditory perception? Would this help to give an idea of him and aid in understanding his personality? His fate? His creativity? Of course not. The product might even be like what you often get when specific works are analyzed in a school literature course—such a formal description, patched together in accordance with a prescribed plan, of the characters of a work rends the artistic fabric of an integral literary work yet, contrary to presumptions, does nothing at all to further understanding.

I shall, if you will, follow another course. I shall try to describe his bearing, his essential qualities, which always came to the surface in communicating with him. I shall tell about his relations with people, about his friends, about his research and teaching, about his interests and his pastimes, and about some of the features of his personality.

If I succeed, then from these lines you, too, will perhaps be able to gain if not a portrait of him, then at least its contours. You, too, will then have a relatively complete idea of him. It is very important that you see in him a *human being*, with his distinctive features, his strong and weak sides, his ideas and feelings—in brief, a *living person*. Only then will you be able to understand the person and his fate. I should like my tale (and the book as a whole) to help to reconstruct an image of Lev Semenovich that, in the final analysis, will be a true picture of this remarkable person.

So what kind of a person was he?

Let us try to see him through the eyes of his pupils, his colleagues, his

comrades-in-arms, and those who knew him not from hearsay, but who communicated with him for many years and worked with him side by side.

But let me still begin with a description of how he was outwardly. I do this not because I believe this to be the most important, but because it is concerning this aspect that those who knew and remember him differ, concerning which divergent opinions are encountered. In some cases the stories I heard were simply mutually incompatible. Let us note some of them.

One of his first pupils in Gomel' writes as follows:

Fate was kind to me: I was one of the first of his pupils in the earliest period of his activity, when he was only a little over twenty years old. . . . The regular features of his face, his deep, attentive eyes, his soft, slightly ironic smile, his very modest manner of behaving in any company—these were the outward features that set him apart. A supreme intellectuality, and intense and lively thought radiated from his whole being.²⁹⁵

Luria, in reminiscing about Lev Semenovich, once described his first impression of him: "A young man of small stature, neatly shaven, with black hair and a very handsome face, mounted the podium."²⁹⁶

On hearing this, one of Lev Semenovich's pupils (N.G. Morozova) exclaimed: "Nothing of the sort! He was not small. He was of average height. His hair was brown, he was bald."

S.M. Eisenstein, the greatest movie director of our time, wrote: "I loved this wonderful person with the peculiar haircut very much. His hair was patchy following typhus, or some other disease in which they shave your head."²⁹⁷ "Out from under this strange looking hair peered the eyes of one of the most brilliant psychologists of our time, out into a world of heavenly brightness and translucence."²⁹⁸

Bliuma Vul'fovna Zeigarnik said, "Lev Semenovich had an astonishing way of listening: only from the little beam of reflected light in his green eyes could you tell whether you were making sense or not."²⁹⁹

Such different, and at times contradictory, descriptions of Lev Semenovich's appearance come from people who knew him well. But despite all their differences, these descriptions have one common feature—they are all impassioned: the people who have given them loved Lev Semenovich (although each of them perceived him in his or her own way).

So what was he actually like?

Let us turn to an unbiased witness.

Before me is a copy of a certificate of assignment to the local recruitment center. It was issued by the Gomel' municipal administration on 15 July 1913, No. 245. A column entitled "Attributes" is to be found in this document.

Let us read this column:

Average height
 Brown hair
 Eyes brown
 Nose moderate
 Mouth moderate
 Beard usual
 Face clean
 Special marks: none
 No. . . . on list 15
 No. of certificate 245
 No. of present page 2059.³⁰⁰

I hope that the officials from the municipal administration were not trying to flatter him, but were objective in their description.

There are dozens of jokes about famous scientists. Actually, these jokes are not so much about the scientists themselves as about their absentmindedness, supposedly a characteristic of all scientists. For instance, there is the joke that Newton cooked his watch instead of eggs for breakfast. Another scientist took off his galoshes and entered a streetcar. A third, seeing a note on the door of his apartment that no one was home, sighed dejectedly and went away, vowing to drop in again.

Nothing of the like was the case with Lev Semenovich. He was not absentminded in the usual sense of the term. He did not take off his galoshes to get on a streetcar, and he did not wear unmatched shoes (actually, he never had more than one pair!). Nothing of the like was true of him. He in no way resembled the butt of these jokes. True, he was immersed in his work; and true, he was a scientist as well—and, as we now know beyond a doubt, he was an extraordinary scientist. Nevertheless, he appeared to be a totally down-to-earth, normal person; and essentially, that's what he was. Of course, if he was absorbed in his work, he might simply not notice or simply not respond if someone called him. But he was not at all absentminded in the way common opinion regards as an almost indelible feature of servants of science. On the contrary, he had an enviable memory. He was familiar with the literature on art, psychology, philosophy, and pedagogy, and could easily recall from memory many facts, arguments, or quotations that he needed in a lecture, a polemic, or a conversation (and he always remembered the source of such information).

True, what was, was: during his work he lost track of time; he became simply oblivious to it. The effects were distressing to him: If on this account he was late for some conference or meeting, he would arrive looking distraught and upset.

Once he was late for another reason. "So many people sought out Lev Semenovich, and so many people abused his kindness and indulgence and attentiveness to people that they would often detain him; and if he was late for a meeting, he would always feel very guilty."³⁰¹ Being a very sensitive person, he suffered if someone was waiting for him and he arrived late. "But he would say: 'I couldn't get away, you understand? They were asking me questions, and it is simply impossible for me not to respond to another person.'"³⁰²

He would feel awkward and guilty toward those who were waiting for him. He would be distressed. Nonetheless, this did not mean that the same thing would not happen again or that the next time he would come promptly. Even though he loved me very much, once he made me to wait at school for more than three hours! (And this was the first day of my school life. However, more details about that elsewhere.)

His pupils R.E. Levina and N.G. Morozova recalled that, when he happened to be late, it was an intolerable thought to them that he might feel guilty toward them, so they would always try to calm him, saying that they had worked on some new material while they were waiting, had checked some experiment protocols, had done a new experiment, or had been examining a patient.

We had to apply all our efforts to persuade him that we were not in the least angry, that we just waited for him and, in the meantime, had been able to accomplish all kinds of necessary things, so there was no loss. Only then would he calm down. But it was very characteristic of him that he could never deny anyone the attention the person sought.³⁰³

He once was late because he got lost: he simply forgot the way. If he had to go to some new place for a lecture or a meeting where he had been only once before or never, or rarely, it was highly likely that he would spend a great deal of time looking for the place and hence might arrive late. This always bothered him tremendously. He tried to make allowances for this by leaving not at the last minute, but with some time to spare; but there was still no guarantee that he would find the way immediately.

In the spring of 1929 he had to give some lectures in Tashkent. Mother went with him, and this spared him many unpleasant experiences that no one needs. When they arrived in Tashkent, they discovered that they were to stay in one part of town, and the lectures were to be held in another, hence they would have to pass through the old, very chaotically arranged part of the city. According to Mama, when Lev Semenovich saw this, he literally plunged into despair. The winding streets and alleys seemed an insuperable obstacle. But Mama was there to help. She had a splendid sense of direction, and all she needed was to go a route once and she would remember it perfectly. She

asked someone to show her the way from the house to the university on the preceding evening, and then every morning she would accompany Papa that way and later go to fetch him.

And so Lev Semenovich was not late even once the entire time in Tashkent; he always arrived at the designated hour.

Lev Semenovich was a very communicative person; His circle of contacts was extremely broad and included students and graduate students, colleagues and fellow workers, and parents whose children he was testing.

He was invariably very attentive, modest, heartily interested, and astonishingly sensitive toward all the people with whom he came into contact regardless of whether they were his co-workers or students, relatives or friends, parents who would come to him with their children for a consultation, or foreign scholars come for a visit. He was straightforward in talking to people, and was never condescending or officious toward anyone. He spoke the same way whether he was with a well-known scientist or a first-year student, and was always himself. He never sought to meet famous people or people of merit; he never tried to stand out, never put himself forward. This seemed to him simply bad manners. He was an unusually modest person—modest to the point that he did not like speaking with the “great of his world,” recalled El’konin. “I remember when Luria was unable to get him to visit Academician Marr when the latter came to Leningrad, although Aleksandr Romanovich wanted terribly to bring Lev Semenovich and Marr together.”³⁰⁴ But, Daniil Borisovich tells us,

I then knew only one person in Leningrad, extremely modest, forgotten by all, whom Lev Semenovich would visit with pleasure, and I several times accompanied him there. This was Vladimir Aleksandrovich Vagner, an extraordinarily modest person, extremely devoted to science, who occupied no position at all at the time. Lev Semenovich never missed a chance to drop in on Vladimir Aleksandrovich and console him and speak with him, especially about psychology. I remember that apartment well.³⁰⁵

For him neither the social position of the person to whom he was speaking nor how well he knew him mattered. His manner of speaking was always pervaded by respect for the other person and a desire to understand him as well as possible. No one who had ever spoken with him ever harbored the least suspicion that he was in any way insincere.

Lev Semenovich’s way of conversing with anyone regardless of rank or status was greatly appreciated. He could listen, was never distracted from the topic of conversation, and never betrayed the least impatience. His sensitivity toward a weak partner in conversation was a hallmark of this very humane person.³⁰⁶

Lev Semenovich’s comrades would often tell me about how attentive and sensitive he was to parents who came to him with their children for a consultation, how he would speak with them with tremendous tact, and give advice. His kindness, his good contact with the children, and his quiet, respectful manner were most effective—parents would invariably go away from such consultations reassured and encouraged.

T.A. Vlasova, reminiscing about this, called Lev Semenovich’s relation with children and parents who came to him for help “touching and patient.” She told how once an old man came from some remote place in the rural provinces for a consultation with Lev Semenovich. He asked that his grandson be examined. Everyone in the village thought that the boy was mentally retarded, but his grandfather thought they were wrong, and did not agree. During the consultation, it was found that the boy’s hearing was impaired: he was deaf. “Thank you, Chief,” said the old man, to Lev Semenovich. “Thank you for diagnosing my grandson and for being so respectful toward me, an old man. I have been many places, but here I have seen good people.”³⁰⁷

It is an understatement to say that Lev Semenovich loved children—his own and others. He was uncommonly caring toward them. When he talked to children, he would show tremendous respect for the child’s personality and interests. He always tried to understand the child, and he succeeded in doing so because the children probably felt at ease with him; they liked making contact with him. When he talked to children, Lev Semenovich never displayed even a trace of condescension. He always spoke with them seriously and with respect. He was able to “reach” a child without doing anything special.

Leonid Vladimirovich Zankov remembered the striking manner in which Lev Semenovich talked to a child. These conversations “were truly remarkable, especially compared with the way children are usually questioned and the way they answer. No! This was an intimate conversation with the little person, and the subtext was as follows: This little fellow has it bad. He needs help.”³⁰⁸

R.E. Levina and N.G. Morozova, his closest pupils, remembered: “During an examination Lev Semenovich was always able to establish a trusting contact with children and adults. He would talk to the subject face to face as an equal, seriously, and listen to their replies confidentially; and a child would readily open himself to Lev Semenovich, sometimes in a new way, compared with those who had previously examined him.”³⁰⁹

He was a splendid experimenter, knew and understood children, and was very adept in working with them. Children often perceived this as a game. I can say this confidently because I myself was one of those children many times.

Once I asked people who knew Lev Semenovitch well which of his personality traits they would emphasize. I received the most varied responses:

Aleksandr Romanovich Luria: His mind, his genius.

Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zaporozhets: His gratitude. His extreme morality, his sensitivity.

Rosa Evgen'evna Levina: His boundless modesty, his warmth.

Daniil Borisovich El'konin: His kindness, his breadth, his scientific generosity.

A year before her death, Nataliia Grigor'evna Morozova also answered this question for me:

A characteristic trait of Lev Semenovitch was his desire to help everyone. People would come to him in an unending stream for advice on both personal and scientific questions. He could never refuse anyone his attention. It would seem that a person of such lofty thoughts and such a great mind might be inaccessible for broad contact. But people would come to him with questions, for explanations, wanting to test themselves, or simply to talk [in pauses during conferences—G.V.]. He was very attentive and indulgent with everyone. In his responses he was very tactful and never let the person to whom he was talking know that what he was saying was wrong or uninformed. He sometimes would hint at the right answer and then lead the conversation in that direction himself. His kindness and gentleness toward people were evident in this regard.³¹⁰

Do not the following incidents testify to this?

Elizaveta Onufrievna Vasilenko, a high-school classmate of his older sister, wrote to me: "When in 1916 I came to Moscow to study, your father, who then was still a student, immediately came to meet me and expressed an interest in how I was getting along, whether I needed his help in anything."³¹¹

Mariia Mikhailovna Krylova remembers in her letter that in Leningrad, during breaks between lectures,

All the professors would surround him [Lev Semenovitch—G.V.], and a big crowd would move along the corridor (they, too, had been listening to his lectures). . . . Once as this company moved toward us, Lev Semenovitch separated himself from the crowd and walked briskly up to us (I was walking with a girl student who had moved up from Moscow). I froze, and my friend blushed red as a poppy. Lev Semenovitch extended his hand affably and asked: "Well, you're here? Do you like it? Is there anything you need?" By that time the crowd was upon us and took Lev Semenovitch away. I asked my friend from where she knew him, and she answered that they came from the same town and they both liked horses.³¹²

Nataliia Grigor'evna Morozova said:

Even though we moved to different cities after we finished at the university, we, his pupils, nonetheless kept in touch with him. He always answered our letters . . . inquiring into where we were going and what we were doing and supporting our scientific research. Slavina, for example, went to her husband in Yaroslavl', where she had difficulties arranging a job in the city in her area of specialization, but was offered a job in the oblast.³¹³ Aleksandr Romanovich thought this a splendid way out of the situation, saying that she could, after all, go once a week to see her husband. But Lev Semenovitch did not feel the prospect was so inviting. "What are you saying, Aleksandr Romanovich, see her husband once a week?! They have to live together, set up the samovar together, drink tea together, and eat together. She can work in nurseries, and there are some in the city. We very much need the early age period to study the sources of child development!" Thus were both a family problem and a scientific problem solved.³¹⁴

The above came from the words of three different people. And what they said referred to different periods in the life of Lev Semenovitch: 1916, 1926, and 1930–1931. But each of these incidents testifies to the same attributes: engagement in another person's fate, empathy, and a desire and a readiness to help. One of the first questions he asked E.O. Vasilenko, a young female student who came from his hometown, was whether she needed help. Just take note: a famous scientist, a teacher, and he himself approaches the student to ask her whether she needs his help. Of course, there is nothing special and extraordinary about this. It is just normal behavior for an intelligent person. But tell me, honestly, have you seen this often? Have you ever encountered this?

Always ready to help anyone who needed it, willingly and eagerly offering his own help, yet he himself would feel embarrassed if he had to seek help from anyone else.

It is probably difficult to overestimate what he did for his pupils, but we know of only a few cases in which he sought their help; and each time it was almost a self-sacrifice for him to accept that help.

In 1973, at the request of G.I. Sakharova, the widow of L.S. Sakharov, I was given a letter from Lev Semenovitch to her husband that she had kept. He had written this letter in a hospital in 1926 when he was hospitalized for a serious flareup of tuberculosis. Let us read the letter together: "You offered, some time in the autumn recently, to look at my galley proofs for me. Now I have decided to accept your self-sacrifice, although I know well its price, and that I have no moral right to do so. Circumstances force me to it, since I don't have the physical ability to do it myself, and it's a matter that can't be put off."

Lev Semenovich explained why he couldn't do it himself: first, the situation in the ward was very difficult, and there were no suitable working conditions (there were six gravely ill patients in the ward, noise, screams, the beds packed close together, without any space between them, and no tables); and second, he felt terrible ("I feel physically horrible, morally oppressed and dispirited").

Then Lev Semenovich outlines what has to be done with the manuscript and asks that L.V. Zankov and I.M. Solov'ev be drawn into the work. Let us go back to the letter: "Forgive me for troubling you with my barren and mechanical personal chore that I haven't been able to cope with myself. That's the whole story. Thanks in advance for your help." And Lev Semenovich proceeds to express his interest in how Bakharov's work is going and gives him some interesting scientific advice.³¹⁵

El'konin was unable to forget his whole life long how Lev Semenovich related to his pupils.

I remember one other thing that has been engraved in my memory, namely, how he related to his pupils.

I was young then, and not yet ready for scientific work. And although Lev Semenovich was older than I by eight years, the difference between us was enormous. Lev Semenovich was already quite mature, with an established system of views, and I was a beginning pupil.

In 1932—I was then working a great deal on the problem of children's play—I had developed a number of theoretical points concerning children's play, and was bold enough to present some of them to a session of the department in Leningrad. They received utterly devastating criticism. The entire department, with the exception of one person, Lev Semenovich Vygotsky, tore my theories to pieces, leaving nothing standing. The only person who defended them was Lev Semenovich. I then left with him, "to speak in Greek," as he put it. This meant to go to a café—one of his hideaways—where we drank several cups of coffee and discussed science. He encouraged and supported me. He said that I had made many valuable and useful points in my theses. He said to me: "If you ever want to put forth a new, fresh idea and expose yourself to crushing criticism, such as you experienced today, you must absolutely have at least one person in whom you completely believe. You must go to that one person, who is absolutely honest and direct with you, and speak to him. If just that one person supports you, you can rest assured that you should pursue it.

Daniil Borisovich said that one characteristic that set Lev Semenovich apart was

his extraordinary ability to support every idea, to find something new,

sane, progressive in it, and sometimes to correct it, without its being noticed at all.

For a long time we did not notice what he invested in our poorly formulated and ill thought-out ideas, which he would then return to us as our own theoretical creations.

I perhaps have met no other person who so appreciated what Lev Semenovich had written.

His was the extreme intellectual generosity and scope of a person who had something for everyone. Ideas erupted from him like a volcano: I still find this impressive. And on top of that, one must consider that the conditions of Lev Semenovich's activity were very difficult. It is hard for us now to imagine the unbelievably hard conditions under which Lev Semenovich worked.³¹⁶

I have already quoted the statement of Natalia Grigor'evna Morozova that when they went off to work in various cities (Kursk, Yaroslavl', Nizhegorodskii oblast, after graduating from the university), Lev Semenovich's pupils never broke their ties with him. In the first place, they would accumulate free days so that they would be able to go regularly to visit Lev Semenovich for advice, and have a chance to speak with him personally. "Though we worked in different cities with no days off, we would travel every month to Moscow to participate in conferences held by Lev Semenovich in the Psychological Laboratory of the Clinic of Nervous Diseases."³¹⁷ Second, they would regularly write to him, not only about their work but about all the circumstances of their life. Indeed, in the words of N.G. Morozova, they considered him a *teacher of life*. And he always found time to answer his students' letters. "Lev Semenovich always answered letters, and would immerse himself in the work of each of his students and support and encourage their scientific inquiries."³¹⁸

Leont'ev and Luria also wrote to Lev Semenovich when they went off for a rest, and Aleksandr Romanovich even did so on expeditions. Unfortunately, the letters written to Lev Semenovich have not been preserved (during the war, the house in which the family lived and where Lev Semenovich's manuscripts and papers were kept suffered from the bombings. The apartment on the first floor had no doors, and the windows were broken. Thus, many books, papers, and, most probably, letters disappeared.) But, fortunately, his letters to his students and friends, which they carefully kept, have been preserved intact. One can see from these letters how Lev Semenovich's relations with close pupils and colleagues developed.

Lev Semenovich always showed a genuine interest in the lives and the work of all those with whom fate brought him into contact. He felt responsible for them, and for everyone whom, in the words of Saint Exupéry, "he

had tamed." His letters to students are indeed testimony to this. Let us read some of them:

N.G. Morozova, 7/04 1930

Dear Natalia Grigor'evna,

I received your letter only yesterday, and I again felt how impossible and inadmissible it was that you and L.I. (Bozhovich) are still in the same situation. We are eagerly awaiting good news from you. In any case, save us at least a radio rescue wail like sinking ships send an SOS (Save Our Souls), and we will save your souls . . . Here it is the second day of spring:

No matter how harsh the trial
You've been through,
What can resist the breath of spring
And the first meeting with her.
—Tiushchev

This wholly applies to you, and L.I. (Bozhovich). A heartfelt welcome to her. We await news. Keep strong.

Yours, L.V.

What a kind and warm letter. No maxims, no moral theories, and no appeals to firmness. Simply concern, human concern.

Here is one more letter to N.G. Morozova,

Ismailovskii Zvervinets

29/7 1930

Dear Natalia Grigor'evna,

I have just received your letter of 18/07. First, I confess, it frightened me and alarmed me. Later, after I thought a bit, I understood well the state in which you wrote it, and I was deeply grieved that you should be experiencing, perhaps day in and day out, such states; but my fright passed. I know very well these minutes and hours of powerlessness, of faintness of soul and spirit (indeed, each of us knows them in equal measure), and the deep bitterness—almost despair—that, when remnants of our will are spent getting out of this state, escaping from it, and feeling, at least in the mind, in a voluntary act, remote from life, to bid farewell to it all, as you put it in your letter.

My heart stood still in the midst of life, and I know this feeling; as Fet describes another psychological variant of this condition. Such conditions have their start in childhood, actually, at the end of childhood and the

beginning of adolescence and youth; and all its stages are preserved in us³¹⁹ in compact forms after we have been through them so that at a moment of powerlessness, weakness of the spirit, lack of will, we sever ourselves from the whole of our inner life and are thrown far back, deep into the past, to the still irrational and unfree, and hence spontaneous, strong, and crushing sorrow of our adolescent years. This should all be familiar to you, and you can test the veracity of what I say and grasp behind these dry words the essence of the inner state that has taken possession of you.

I think that you were in just such a state when you wrote that letter. I also think that you know that you must fight against such states and that you can cope. Man conquers nature outside himself; but inside himself, that— isn't it true?—is where our psychology and ethics lie. So you see that I am not objecting to your letter; but I do have one objection. This is about the team. How can you say that we will get along without you, that the team will get along without you just as well, that you're the individualist in the team, etc.? This is totally wrong, through and through. We will not get along without you; we cannot get along without you; the team will not get along without you. Our team, and indeed any team that calls itself a team, does not deny individualism, but thrives on it. It is of no importance that the organism relies on organized collaboration between specialized, differentiated (i.e., individualized) organs. A team is a collaboration of individualities. The more clearly, more fully, and more strongly it is pervaded by self-awareness, i.e., the more its members are aware of themselves as individuals (and this is indeed individualism properly understood), the greater the team. Hence, no matter how much you are tormented, no matter how much it is "one thing on top of another," always know and understand this: everyone in such matters must be firm and unbending, everyone must maintain solidarity with everyone else and be committed to the matter at hand in this business. "Hier stehe ich,"³²⁰ as Luther said. Every person must know where he stands. We, you and I, too know and must stand firmly. Hence, to sum up: you and no one else will write the reaction of choice, that chapter on man's evolving freedom from the external constraints of things and their wills. That's all. And now, if you agree with me, I shall ask you very urgently to write *concretely, thoroughly*, in detail, without any fear or embarrassment—*what* is the matter with you, *what* is bothering you, *what* isn't working, *what* happened and how, *what* inspires despair. I am eagerly waiting and am listening with great attention.

Yours, L. Vygotsky

The whole letter is pervaded by a subtle and deep understanding of the state of mind, the inner life, of someone else; a desire to help, to understand what's going on with the other person, to encourage, to support, to inspire

faith in oneself. He is "eagerly waiting" and "listening with great attention" to offer the necessary help, the help precisely as it was needed then. Lev Semenovich wrote again to N.G. Morozova three weeks later. That time as well, the main point was the desire to reassure, to support, to help her to free herself from those heavy thoughts and ideas, to help her overcome the grave state in which she found herself. This letter is calm and full of profound respect.

N.G. Morozova, 19/8 1930

Dear Natalia Grigor'evna,

I think that time does its work, and this letter will find you in better straits inwardly. After your letter I was even more convinced that fatigue, a kind of inner debility, a loss of inner strength had exacted its toll on you. It is difficult to rid oneself of this condition: you need rest, physical and moral—and you must resist succumbing to the first desires and ideas that enter your head. The rule here (for inner struggle and for subduing strong and resistant adversaries) is the same as in any other kind of submission: divide and rule. Specifically, you must not allow "one thing on top of another," you must not allow the most diverse desires and thoughts trying to get possession of you to unite into one formless mass. You must keep them separate (consciously): overcome them—that is perhaps the most correct word for getting control of emotions. For a person who knows the "magic of verse" (your own and others') and how to attain truth in scientific inquiry (what self-denial and subjugation of everything to the basic core of the personality is required), finding a way out is simply a question of inner effort. I believe that you will make this effort and will find a way out. It is up to you—or, more accurately, you have it in you (i.e., through continuing along the path of creativity and through believing in the best part of your own being). Banish your depression, read slowly, over and over again, Pushkin's "The extinguished joy of mindless days," which cleanses and illuminates, and pick up the basic thread of your life: your main attachment, your main cause, your work. After you have a rest, of course. You know that we all (and I am speaking for myself as always) are totally with you. Vanquish all that is nasty and ugly and return to the good in yourself: we can always be free and courageous within ourselves. Those circumstances obstructing your life will pass. Be strong, get well, and get a hold on yourself.

Yours, L. Vygotsky

P.S. When does your exile end, and when do you think you will be back in Moscow?

It is often the case that when you finish some work that has had prece-

dence over everything and have wrapped it up, you suddenly feel an emptiness, and see all the shortcomings in the work, all its flaws; you see its imperfections, and you feel an acute dissatisfaction with it.

Something of this order is what Aleksei Nikolaev Leont'ev experienced when he finished his work on the development of memory.

And how important it is if, at moments like these, you have someone on whom you can count, whose opinion you value, someone who likes you and will be able to find just the words needed to put everything in its place, to reassure you, to show you the good things in your work, which you yourself, however, are unable to evaluate.

Aleksei Nikolaevich had such a person at hand. This was Lev Semenovich. Read his letter, so heartfelt. Note how tactfully and patiently he speaks to his friend. How he not only reassures him, but also highly esteems the work done by Aleksei Nikolaevich.

Here is a fragment from a letter to A.N. Leont'ev.

Izmailovskii Zverinets, 31/7 1930

I, alas, have not yet managed to free myself from secondary [word undecipherable], fruitless, petty chores. Nonetheless, I am successfully bringing everything to completion. From tomorrow, 1 August, to 1 September I intend to set these chores entirely aside and reflect, read, let my mind wander, etc. I envy you because you are surrounded by palms, tea, and flowers. The south is my dream from my high-school years (because I, like the majority of devotees of Maina Reed and Cooper, accomplished all my heroic exploits at age twelve in a subtropical environment). But for the time being, I must be satisfied with Izmailovskii. However, a big thanks to you for your apprehensions—in a few lines. It was consoling. But now about the book . . . From the standpoint of contemporary idealist psychology, which, of course, is partly right on one or another point and contributes this part to a future, unified psychology, so-called *verstehende Psychologie*,³²¹ in which the purpose of psychology is to understand, not to explain, the ideal is sympathy, empathy, a mental resonance in oneself, etc. I understand perfectly how you feel [word undecipherable]—"after the book." But from the standpoint of our psychology, for which you are a subject, not an object, *you are not right*. Let me say this to you straightforwardly (I do this especially boldly [word undecipherable] because I feel your condition completely clearly, I understand it). "A trifle born of a mountain"—that's how your book seems to you now. I understand what a mountain of ideas not embodied in the book, but standing behind it, and awaiting embodiment in the future, you speak of. But I would invert the comparison—it seems to me that would be closer to the truth: your book is a mountain that grew out of a trifle. So it is. When I recall how it began, out

of what it grew, how a card was used for the first time for remembering, how, from what inarticulate, undifferentiated mist of a basic idea the new theory of memory embodied in your book first sprang, it is clear that this is so. Our writings are not perfect, but there is a great amount of truth in them. This is my symbol intended of faith in [two or three words undecipherable] a new truth: compared to its unfathomably vast topic (just think, the truth about memory!), your book is a trifle; yet in it is embodied the basic part, the nucleus of this topic, and that is the mountain. *Also, one cannot judge oneself subjectively*: Our [word undecipherable] deceive us. The entire question in [word undecipherable] is whether this book really is a mountain. I should say unconditionally: yes. That's my belief. As Luther said, *Hier stehe ich*, here I stand; and woe to him who [text breaks off] . . . your book—and you should be aware of this because this is not a personal question of yours and not a personal question of [word undecipherable] indeed, not a personal question at all, but a question of thought, a philosophical question—an event of tremendous significance in the sphere of scientific thought about human psychology [the letter breaks off here].

The people to whom Lev Semenovitch sent his letters said that these letters cheered them up and helped them get by. "He expressed himself with a wisdom astonishing for his age; in an almost carefree manner, he taught us to live, to master our jobs and moods. . . . He answered scientific questions thoroughly; he wrote about our lives; he would answer extensively, giving unstintingly of his valuable time."²²

Here, for example, is a letter to R.E. Levina. It was written absolutely between equals. In the first part of the letter, Lev Semenovitch writes about matters in the laboratory and constant problems. Then he goes on to answer something the author asked about, to the personal level of the letter. Discussing with Rosa Evgen'evna her "internal distress" and "problems of life," he offers profound thoughts about life, about what is important in life, about the meaning and significance of work. He speaks of the necessity of finding a meaning in life, and says that without philosophy, there cannot be life. This letter is very interesting; please read it.

R. E. Levina, 16/6 1931.

I received your letter dear Rosa Evgen'evna, and I am responding to it immediately since it arrived on a free day. I was able to ponder it and also ponder my reply. . . . What you write about your work impels me to think about what is being done in the name of pedagogy at present around you. The trouble is not the remoteness, not the primitiveness, but the falseness, the lies, and the counterfeiting. But, of course, that's not all. There are

grains of honesty and truth in every work, and that is what one must look at in the first instance. And they are also in your work in Kursk. Of course, it is also necessary to keep going on with your research, which would nourish, teach, and offer something to breathe and to live by, and would be objectively necessary, i.e., it would lead to truth.

It is difficult to get down to work after a pause. But everyone is doing something. The last meeting of the laboratory and tomorrow's meeting are devoted to a conversation with Zeigarnik²³ about the work being done at the Berlin Institute. I have received Lewin's²⁴ new book on the methodological problem of psychology. I see from all the evidence that something great is taking place before our very eyes in psychology (world psychology). Not to sense this and to belittle the significance of what is occurring with these passionate, tragic attempts to find our way to study of the soul, which is what the crisis is all about (i.e., simply to comment on the confusion in psychology, that we do not need it, etc.), means to look at things and the history of human thought in a pedestrian manner.

. . . Now about another matter you write about: Your inner distress, how hard life is. I have just (almost by chance) read Chekov's [*Three years*]. Please read it as well. Here you have life. Life is deeper and broader than its outward expression. Everything is constantly changing in life. Everything becomes something else. Always, and even now the most important, it seems to me, is not to equate life with its outward expression and consider that all. Then, by listening to life (this is a most important virtue, a somewhat passive posture to begin with), you will find in yourself, outside yourself, in everything, only that which none of us would be able to contain within himself. Of course, one cannot live without finding a spiritual meaning in life. Without philosophy (one's own personal life philosophy) there can be nihilism, cynicism, suicide, but not life. But everyone has a philosophy. We must cultivate it in ourselves, give it space within us, because it sustains the life within us. Then there is art—for me, poetry; for others, music. And then, finally, work. What can shake a person who is seeking the truth? How much inner light, warmth, and support there is in the very quest. And then the most important, life itself, the sky, the sun, love, people, and suffering. These are all not just words: these things are. They are genuine. They are woven into life. Crises are not a temporary condition, but the way of inner life. When we move from systems to destinies (it is both terrible and joyful to utter that word, knowing that tomorrow we shall be studying what it hides), to the birth and death of systems, we are looking this squarely in the eye, I am convinced. In particular, all of us, when we look back at our own past, see that we are drying up. That is so. That's the way it is. Developing is dying. This is especially bitter in times of radical change—for you, and again at my age. Dostoevsky spoke with horror of the drying up of the heart. Gogol is even more terrible. There is truly a "little death" in us. And so one must accept it. But behind it all is life, i.e., movement, a journey, one's own fate. (Nietzsche taught *amor faci*—love of destiny.)

But now I've started to philosophize. . . . Your states are close to my heart and understandable to me, and—if you forgive my presumption—there is a lucid something in what lies behind them: I have a little experience in these matters. Not that I want to say that everything will pass. No, behind them—this for me signifies behind their relative significance—behind it all, stand life and work, i.e., work to reach the truth. These are not high-sounding words like *fate*. They say something that should be an everyday commonplace. . . .

Write to me. In particular, we should still continue our conversation about the main topic.

Warm greetings to you.

Your Lev Vygotsky

Lev Semenovich always had very warm and good relations with his fellow workers, his assistants, and his pupils. They all recalled his "good qualities, which won over everyone who knew him and worked with him."³²⁵ Thus, they would say that "He could explain something for hours on end to a weak fellow-worker who conscientiously desired to understand some point or another."³²⁶ They recalled his "great inner delicacy, his concern, the evenness of his relations," the "extraordinary modesty in his behavior, in matters of his personal well-being" (T.A. Vlasova). They could not forget his inner generosity, his "gentle kindness, his ability to listen—such a rare quality in a leader!" (Zh.I. Shif, V.V. Zeigarnik), and said that "being near him gave people a boost in their own eyes" (Zh.I. Shif).

He united his pupils into friendly scientific teams. N.G. Morozova recalled that Lev Semenovich created an unusual moral climate around himself—people became closer and more intimate with one another. She said that they all—his pupils—felt like one big family and retained friendship and a sense of closeness all their lives. "People who worked together became the closest of friends, and each member of such a team was prepared to do anything necessary to support, to help, one another in their work and in their lives. People who worked with Lev Semenovich have maintained almost a kinship down to this very day. It was a second family."³²⁷

Lev Semenovich always insisted on probity in personal relations ("no hidden insults, discontent, evasions"). His "personal qualities and moral positions . . . were, like his psychological theory, 'summits' with regard to what he demanded of himself."³²⁸ His pupils recall that once, when he encountered an instance of unkind behavior, he said to them: "I would never step on another person for my own well-being or even happiness."³²⁹ He

even said then that it was easier to endure the death of someone close to you than "to lose faith in that person."³³⁰

All of his behavior, the entire system of his relations with people, taught and educated his students, because they thought he was teaching them "not only an attitude toward science, he was teaching them life."³³¹ They believed in his goodness and wisdom, in his lighthearted seriousness; they knew his readiness to "promptly extend a hand in help and to see that things went as they should both in work and in life."³³²

Not only his colleagues but other co-workers, everyone who worked under the same roof with him, had good memories of Lev Semenovich.

I once had occasion to be witness to a conversation. (It impressed me, so I immediately wrote it down.) It was quite a long time ago, but I still remember this conversation word for word.

I don't remember what I was doing at the institute, but with me were two maintenance workers, two cleaning ladies, who were speaking very unkindly about one of the workers at the institute and condemning something he did. Suddenly one of them, without forewarning, said, turning to me:

No, your father wasn't like that. He was a good person. Very good. And simple . . . But that [she once again named the staff worker whom she had spoken very unflatteringly about—G.V.], he struts about without regard to where he's stepping. He doesn't notice anyone around him, as if he were the only one present [she imitated how he walked with his nose in the air—G.V.]. But Lev Semenovich? No, he would never walk by without saying something to you—either greeting you or saying goodbye to you or simply smiling or saying something nice. . . . All of us loved him. And respected him very much . . . No, he was very simple and good.

The second entered the conversation:

And how kind he was! In the morning when you were cleaning, but hadn't had time to finish, and he arrived, the first thing he did was greet you and then he would always ask, "Pardon me, please I won't disturb you if I sit down over here on the side?" When you'd finished the cleaning, he would say: "Thanks very much. Now everything looks quite nice." It makes you feel good when people notice your work and respect you.

And a guard standing next to us, smoking, who had worked at the institute since time immemorial, chimed in:

He was very respectful. Sometimes I'd be sweeping the street near the gate or the yard itself and he would be on his way to work. Then, as soon as he saw me from a distance, he would take off his hat, bow to me, and greet

me. He would never wait for someone to greet him first. He put himself on an equal footing with me; he would always ask how you were, say good morning, and call you by name. . . . He was very respectful.

Indeed, it was true. He was always the first one to greet a person, and he taught me this. We would be taking a walk with him or accompanying him somewhere on business, and he was always invariably the first to greet someone he knew whenever we met.

Always greet first; don't wait for someone to acknowledge you. After all, when you greet a person, you are wishing him well, good health. That's very nice, to want what is good. You know, in olden times they used to say, "A nod will never break your head." Remember this always and, most importantly, do it. It means that you are showing attention and respect for a person. And this everyone needs.

It is not everyone's lot to be able to empathize with another. Lev Semenovich, however, possessed this ability to the fullest. He had an inborn ability to empathize with other people; he was always full of sympathy for another's misfortunes, always ready to help others. He had an intrinsic and permanent desire to help the weak, the powerless, the downtrodden—everyone who needed help. He was able to share the distress of others and help them cope.

Here is what he wrote to G.I. Sakharova after the death of her husband:³³³

I left the railroad station feeling very sad after the departure of your train. I felt terrible for you. It seemed to me that we were wrong in not preventing you from leaving for work. Grief knocks a person off his feet; you fell to the ground from grief, and we did not give you time to get up, to rest a bit, to come to terms with your grief and thoughtlessly sent you off to a new and difficult job that required both energy and, most important, peace, at least a little bit.

I await your arrival urgently. I'd be very happy if you would agree to spend the summer with us in our summer house near Moscow: we would arrange a separate room for you.

Every line of this letter breathes attention, kindness, concern, and sympathy.

Lev Semenovich was also able to rejoice in other people's happiness. The success of his colleagues and his pupils made him as glad as his own success. Listen, please:

"I was very happy to receive your article in German. I am proud of you."³³⁴

"I am sincerely happy about your good fortunes."³³⁵

"A.R. [Luria] is going to America. I am very happy for him and for us."³³⁶

He writes that he was tormented by illness and the expectation of an operation that was deemed unavoidable; but to Luria, who had gone off to the south for a rest, he writes: "I am very happy for both of you: rest, imbibe the powers of southern wine, the sky, the wind, and the sun, so that you have something to live on in Moscow in the winter."³³⁷

He knew how to console, to support, and to encourage people in difficult moments, to share difficulties and unpleasantness with his comrades.

"I am very sorry that I'm not with you, and all the rest at the institute, in this difficult time of crisis."³³⁸

"I won't write about business. Be calm. I'll straighten out everything."³³⁹

People often would turn to him for advice, and not just on scientific matters; sometimes they would seek his counsel on something deeply personal and intimate, conscious of his kindness, his sincerity, and his desire to understand and help. His advice was never of the lecturing kind. To be able to give advice one must be able to understand a person, understand not only his thoughts but also his feelings, his innermost experiences, his state of mind; one must be able to put oneself in the place of the person whom one is advising. Vygotsky was able to understand people because he succeeded in helping people "both at work and in life, sometimes even console them, to find a way out of their difficult situation together. People would come to him, as to a wise man, with their personal questions, with their thoughts, and with their tentative plans . . . All, scientists with degrees and neophyte scientists alike, would come to him."³⁴⁰

Although he was gentle and very kind, Lev Semenovich was also a man of principle. He was always ready to help anyone who needed it, yet was unforgiving of triteness and opportunism in science. For him the search for truth was the purpose and the meaning of his activity ("Who can shake a person seeking the truth . . ."). He found an "inner light," "warmth" and "support" in this quest. He himself was extremely conscientious and demanded the same scientific conscientiousness of others. He was very strict, demanding, and critical of himself and his writings, which entitled him to be critical of the works of his colleagues.

Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zaporozhets, who worked with Lev Semenovich from his student days, recalls:

Vygotsky combined a great creative enthusiasm with critical thinking. He was always critical toward his own achievements and made splendid critical analyses of them, and he also criticized the work of other scientists. Sometimes his criticism was very harsh and merciless when an idea seemed to him to be false. I recall once an American psychologist, Black, came to the laboratory and boringly told us about his studies of emotions; essen-

tially, the study amounted to firing a huge pistol near the ear of a subject, after which the latter's blood pressure, pulse, and galvanic reflexes were measured. I recall how Vygotsky was simply furious over the crudeness and triviality of this investigation and retorted to Black: "Why didn't you beat your subjects over the head with a hammer? What could you be aiming at?" And when tea time came—the woman on duty was Slavina—Lev Semenovich said to her, laughing: "Don't give Black any tea; he doesn't deserve it."

Yet, at the same time as he was merciless in his criticism, Vygotsky was also able to pluck whatever positive elements some work might contain, even, it would seem, one that was not very good. . . . Vygotsky . . . could see something valuable and needed even in dross, in anything.

Here is a story. Vygotsky came to the laboratory in an exalted state, saying he was reading a book that had many interesting facts, although it also had some flaws, and that this book contained an idea of development maintaining that development is itself a factor, that it has its own logic of self-movement.

—What book is it?

—It's Gesell's book *Mental development*.

We read this book and were utterly confounded. We found in it nothing of what Vygotsky had said. We sat and read this book an entire day; and somewhere in the fourth chapter, we found a few phrases that remotely resembled what Vygotsky had said. We were surprised about how Vygotsky could see such crucial ideas in commonplace Gesell.

Such was the attention, the interest in things positive, to be found in another author that was typical of Vygotsky's criticism, quite aside from its acuity, nobility, and moral stature. He himself was great, so strong, so significant, that he did not need to humiliate another in order to enhance himself. He stood firmly on his own legs.³⁴¹

Lev Semenovich knew how to work with others' views and opinions. He was able to understand a person and adopt his viewpoint as if exchanging places with him, and was prompt with support and encouragement. All these things attracted people to him.

He was not simply a profoundly decent person. He was noble and magnanimous.

Many people with whom Lev Semenovich communicated were not simply acquaintances but also friends and, of course, those with whom he was bound in intimate friendship.

It is said: Tell me who is your friend, and I'll tell you who you are. If this statement is correct, then one should be able to get a clearer idea and better

understanding of him by telling about his close friends. I want to tell about those people whom he loved and who also loved him.

There is enough general information about his psychologist friends and colleagues and students with whom he maintained close relationships. They were very productive scientists, made great achievements, and themselves gained recognition and renown. These included Luria, Leont'ev, Zaporozhets, Morozova, El'konin, Levina, Bozhovich, Zankov, and many others.

But the circle of Lev Semenovich's social contacts was not confined to psychologists. His multifaceted interests, his erudition, his knowledge of literature, art, and philosophy made him interesting to many. People of different professions derived great satisfaction from talking with him; they sought his friendship and valued relations with him and those around him very highly.

Lev Semenovich's friendly relations with many people extended not just over many years but sometimes even over decades. Many of his friends kept in touch with our family even after Lev Semenovich's death, and remained true to his memory to their own very last moments.

His friends were splendid people, and I feel it is appropriate to say a few words, however brief, about each of them. Unfortunately, I did not know some of them well; and now, alas, it is too late to fill in this gap—there is no one I can ask about the details of interest to me, no one to question. In such cases I shall limit myself to brief but reliable information.

For fairness's sake, I think I should begin my tale with his wife, who was his very close friend. Their relationship began in Gomel', probably in 1919 or 1920, because on photographs (one of which is marked 1921), Rosa Noevna Smekhova (1899–1979) is seen, with Lev Semenovich, among those who were perhaps his closest friends at that time.

Judging from the photographs and the stories of those who knew her in those years, she was a very good person. She was a vivacious, intelligent, and indefatigable young girl with a happy, communicative nature and was very quick-witted. She had artistic and creative abilities, was very artistic (she drew not at all badly, she was very musical, and in her youth she performed in the Theater for People's Education and wrote good humorous verses). She was a strong person with extraordinary courage, which she would come to need very much during her life.

In 1924 R.N. Smekhova and Lev Semenovich moved to Moscow, where they were married. Their attachment grew only stronger with the years. Lev Semenovich loved his wife dearly and valued her relationship. He dedicated verses to her and was proud of her. She was a true friend to him, kept abreast of everything he was doing, always helped him in everything as much as she could, and shared all of his griefs and joys.

And, although my mother was well received in her husband's family after

their marriage and had a good relationship with the family all the years they lived together, after Lev Semenovich's death she and the children were separated from the family, and she was left alone with two children on her hands. My guess is that grandmother acted as she did in the belief that perhaps mother wanted to find another to live her life with (after all, she was only 35 years old!), and the family would hold her back and tie her down. But Rosa Noevna devoted her life to rearing her daughters. Since she did not have a complete higher specialized education, she worked her entire life in the very difficult job of educator of abnormal children. To ensure that her daughters were in want of nothing, she took on extra day-work on holidays and weekends, as well as at night, for the pay was better. These were very difficult and very hungry war years; but she never stopped working, never fell into despair, and never complained to anyone about her fate.

Her daughters owe not only their lives but also everything they were able to achieve to her industriousness, courage, and undying optimism. She worked hard, but enabled both of them to get a higher education and stand on their own two feet.

Mama outlived Lev Semenovich by many years, and to the end of her days she would recall with gratitude and joy the short years of their life together.

She was buried alongside her husband.

Lev Semenovich was very close to his cousin David Isaakovich Vygodskii (1893–1943) throughout his life.

There was only a slight difference in age (David was three years older); but in childhood, and probably during high school, David was for Lev Semenovich an indisputable authority and had a great influence on him. Undoubtedly his interest in Esperanto and desire to study it originated with David.

In 1942 David Isaakovich sent me a letter from Karlag (Karaganda). He described his relationship with Lev Semenovich as follows: "If the love and friendship that bound me throughout my life to your father and half my life to your mother should be continued in the relationship between our children, I should be happy."

Thus, at the very end of his life, in the Karaganda camp, under conditions one can imagine were terrible, David Vygodskii summed up his relationship with Lev Semenovich as one of love and friendship.

And Lev Semenovich returned the love and friendship as well.

It had begun in very earliest childhood. The very close relationship between their families was foreordained by the fact that Lev Semenovich's father actually supported the family of his deceased brother, who had had

three children. They lived completely together—the houses were separated by a narrow street (it still exists in Gomel', this street, and is now called Pionerskii). The children of the two families (there were eleven of them) spent whole days together. They studied in different high schools: Lev Semenovich initially at home and then in a private gymnasium, and David Isaakovich in a public gymnasium. But the rest of the time they were always seen together. They were bound by common interests and common amusements: books, chess, stamps, Esperanto, long walks, the river and swimming, and boating. Their paths diverged after they finished the gymnasium: David Isaakovich enrolled at Petersburg University, and Lev Semenovich, at Moscow University. But in the summer, when they returned to their families for the holidays, they were almost inseparable, as in former times.

At the very end of 1917, both were again in Gomel': David (as he wrote in his autobiography) was afraid "to leave mother alone before the invading Germans," and Lev Semenovich's arrival was due to the illness of his mother and the fatal illness of his younger brother. Once again they were together for several years (until 1921, when David Vygodskii returned to Petrograd), both at a newspaper and at the Museum of Printing. We see them together in the photos of that period. Later, when Lev Semenovich was again living in Moscow, they would meet regularly: at our home, in Leningrad, or on Mokhovaia Street at David's house.

Though their meetings were frequent, they were invariably very happy about them, as if they had not seen each other for a long time.

They maintained their good relationship and interest and respect for one another and for each other's careers throughout their lives. They were bound their entire life long by common interests, common friends, common attachments, and—in Gomel'—by common jobs (newspaper, the Museum of Printing, school). Their interests in poetry and literature were also similar. They always understood each other well.

David "was one of the most modest and gentle of people. It was simply impossible not to love and respect him. He was very pale, thin, and small, with kind eyes, clear as a child's, and unusual eyebrows for his age, growing in a thicket over his eyes and almost casting a shadow on them."³⁴² That is what Mariette Sergievna Shaginan, his close friend, by her own admission, had to say about him.

V. Kaverin remembers how once, when a surprise gathering was arranged for V. Shklovskii in Iu. Tynianov's apartment, David Vygodskii unexpectedly arrived, a "well-known expert in Spanish, a historian of literature, and a translator, he about whom Mandel'shtam wrote 'like a flourish in the Jewish alphabet,'³⁴³ thus depicting the external appearance of this kind and intelligent person with uncommon precision."³⁴⁴

Mikhail Slonimskii wrote in his memoirs:

D.I. Vygodskii was a highly talented Hispanicist, one of the pioneers of Soviet translating . . .

He became increasingly well known in our country and abroad. His name became the solid respected name of a serious and talented literateur; but he still remained the same quiet David, whom neither Don nor Cabalero at all fit, although the wondrous word 'Comarade' did fit splendidly.³⁴⁵

D.I. Vygodskii was a "well-known . . . Hispanicist, a connoisseur of Latin American literature, a poet, a translator, a critic, a polyglot who knew many foreign languages."³⁴⁶ "He translated poetry and prose from thirty modern and ancient Western and Eastern languages"³⁴⁷ (more than twenty books and many verses). He was a member of the Leningrad section of the Union of Soviet Writers from the day it was founded and had an unsullied reputation.

In 1937, the Spanish Ambassador Marcelino Pasqua came to Moscow. When he was asked what Soviet people were known in his homeland he said without reflecting: Stalin, Voroshilov, Koltsov, and Vygodskii (Koltsov was arrested a few months earlier than David).

On 14 February 1938 David Isaakovich was arrested for "preparing terrorist acts."

A half-year before his arrest, he "was unanimously elected member of the Union of Soviet Writers, Leningrad Section, with the highest recommendations."³⁴⁸

"The whole of David Vygodskii's being was bright and transparent, indisputably bright. We, his friends, knew with the absolutely certainty reserved solely for one's own conscience that this person and writer, extremely devoted to the Soviet homeland, could not possibly be guilty of anything against his homeland."³⁴⁹

In an article devoted to the memory of N. Zabolotskii, Lev Ozerov writes: "At that time many friends and even relatives distanced themselves from the families of those arrested on one or another pretext, or even without pretext, and avoided them like the plague. All the more important it is then to recall those cases when humane attention and nobility were shown."³⁵⁰

Intercession for an "enemy of the people" was an act of extreme human courage, since people risked not only their careers but also their lives. Even this did not prevent a group of well-known Leningrad writers from putting in a plea for D.I. Vygodskii and vouching for him. These supportive testimonials were presented in Moscow to the NKVD on 21 November 1939 and a few days later were submitted to Beria, after which, on his orders, they were included in the case file and copies of them were sent to the Chairman of the Special Commission of the NKVD.³⁵¹ "When the poet David Vygodskii was

arrested, Iu. Tynianov, B.Lavrenev, K. Fedin, M. Slonimskii, M. Zoshchenko, and V. Shklovskii signed a declaration in his defense."³⁵²

Let us read together what these courageous and honest people wrote about David Vygodskii in those terrible years.³⁵³

Iurii Tynianov: David Vygodskii "always was a deeply honest Soviet writer and man, and his work in the Union of Soviet Writers earned him general respect."

Boris Lavrenev: "Vygodskii enjoyed so much popularity and respect in the Union of Soviet Writers that, to the best of my knowledge, the Party organization of the Union of Soviet Writers asked him to join the Party, and he was given the highest recommendations at Party meetings."

Konstantin Fedin: "He specialized in Romance literatures mainly as a Hispanicist and accumulated so much experience in this area that he became an acknowledged and recognized translator. . . . I never had any reason to doubt his honesty, his rectitude, and his moral probity."

M. Slonimskii and M. Zoshchenko: "We have known Vygodskii since 1922. Throughout all these years, we never encountered any incident in Vygodskii's activity that could detract from our notion of him as an honest Soviet citizen."

Viktor Shklovskii: "The ink well might freeze in Vygodskii's room, but he would always work well and with good spirit. He translated Vladimir Maiarkovskii into Spanish. This translation was well known in Spain and Latin America. The new rhythm of the translation had a decisive influence on revolutionary Spanish poetry, and opened the new country of socialism with its new culture to the peoples of Spanish culture."

But David was languishing in prison, and then in the camp during this time. In the above-quoted article, L. Ozorov presents a recollection of Nikolai Zabolovskii, arrested in March 1938, that, when he was thrown into the prison cell "filled to overflowing with arrestees," among them were D.I. Vygodskii and P.N. Medvedev. It was a room for 12-15 people, with a barred door, which opened onto a dark corridor. There were 70-80 people in it, and sometimes even 100, recalled N.A. Zabolovskii.

A cloud of vapor with that special prison odor emanated from it into the corridor, and I remember how it impressed me. The door closed with difficulty behind me, and I found myself in a crowd of people standing very close to one another or sitting in disordered bunches around the room. Learning that the newcomer was a writer, my neighbors told me that there were other writers in the room, and they immediately brought me to P.N. Medvedev and D.I. Vygodskii, who had been arrested before me. Seeing me in my sorry situation, the comrades arranged a little corner for me.³⁵⁴

We learn about Vygodskii's stay from his fellow cellmate: "Everyone who tried to behave in the interrogations in a way the investigator didn't like, i.e., simply speaking, everyone who did not want to be an informer suffered derision and beatings. The interrogator pulled David Isaakovich Vygodskii by the beard and spat in his face, this honest man, this talented writer, and an old man."³⁵⁵

The "old man" was no more than 45 years old!

But he managed to remain a human being both in the prison and in the camp. He retained his ability to empathize with someone for whom things were going badly and to be happy when fate smiled upon someone or someone was lucky. Thus, when he read the names Dobin and Kazakov in the newspaper, he wrote to his wife from the camp: "I am happy for Misha, that his novel came out anyway, and for Efim, that he has returned to work."³⁵⁶

And another astonishing thing about this man was that the desire to work never left him, not even for a second. Here are some extracts from his camp letters. Swollen from illness, he writes:

This is the fifth day I don't work, and I still don't know when I'll work since I'm in fact no longer able. But so long as I have a head on my shoulders, I refuse to call myself an invalid. The most important remains as before: I am still the same person, with the same love for you, with the same eagerness to work, the same thirst for knowledge, and the same faith in the motherland.³⁵⁷ [And three months before his death]: It is torture to want to work, to want to write in prose and in poetry quite a number of things that these difficult years have wrought. I should still like to study the Turkish languages and the Eastern Caucasus, to systematize, to clarify, and to assimilate everything that I have found out, thought about, and seen here. However, I'm very much afraid that I shall never be able to do any of this.³⁵⁸ [And a week before his death]: . . . I should still like to work and participate in the rebirth of the motherland after the rout of the fascists, but I have less and less hope of this.³⁵⁹

He was tormented by worry about those close to him (his son was at the front) and by the fact that he had been rejected by the motherland. From his letter:

The fact that I've been torn away from everything dissipates my energies perhaps more than any physical hardships I have experienced and undergone for five years. The thought that you are behind me and Asik is with me, although at a distance, is a steady support for me. I want to survive until the hour when the motherland acknowledges me not as an enemy but as a son, as I have been my whole life.³⁶⁰

His poetry has the same theme. Read one of them.

To the Motherland

Newspaper pages during the day
Alarm captive dreams.
People's lives pass,
And for a long time now
I am no participant in them.
So clearly, almost visibly,
The last traces of life,
Unneeded by my fatherland,
Are leaving my breast.

How sweet it would be to die
If the Homeland, like a mother,
With eyes dimmed by tears,
Would bend down quietly over me,
With her gentle hands
Cool my feverish forehead,
And accept my last breath
In the hour of farewell.

But it is terrible to go off
Into the darkness, alone,
Rejected, and to know that
What was dearer than anything else to you will not,
No matter how much you pray,
No matter how much you plead,
Look attentively at you
With the clear bright eyes of love,
That only contempt and malice
Will accompany you to the grave.

Oh Motherland, in the last hour,
While reason has not yet died,
I beg you, with the last transport of thought
That I saved from destruction,
I plead with you, with tears suspended
From the corners of eyes gone dim—
I was faithful to my fatherland,
And faithful do I depart this life.
No, an undeserved banishment
You have given me in punishment.

In exile, I bend this graying head to you.
Oh Motherland, I am yours, I am yours.

When you read these lines, you rightfully do not think about their literary merits. They were written with the blood of the heart.

In Gomel', Lev Semenovich became very close friends with Vladimir Martinovich Vasilenko (1892–1960), and their relationship continued until Lev Semenovich's death. V.M. Vasilenko was a poet and a journalist. He worked from the end of 1921 until he retired in 1960 in various jobs on the editorial board of the newspaper *Izvestiia*. He was an assistant to the *Izvestiia* board, an assistant to the secretary to the editorial board, a deputy secretary, a literary secretary, and a deputy of the Section on Religion and Welfare.³⁶¹

Vladimir Martinovich is the author of two books: *Bezjabloe serdise* (1925), a book of verses, and *Chernaia rechka* (1928), a book of poems and translations. A letter by V.V. Veresaev, written 23 February 1928 to Vladimir Martinovich with a good, kind review of the book *Chernaia rechka*, has been preserved.³⁶²

In his article ["Mayakovsky in the newspaper"],³⁶³ Vladimir Martinovich wrote: "Professor L.S. Vygotsky gave me a "protocol of an investigation of the mathematical talent of the poet and artist Vladimir Mayakovsky in Koh's cubic drawing test."³⁶⁴ Vasilenko goes on to write that the study of Mayakovsky's creative talent was done by one of Lev Semenovich's workers who had been in Evpatoria on vacation in July 1929.

Unfortunately, an attempt by employees at the Mayakovsky Museum to find this protocol was not crowned by success—they couldn't find it.

This exhausts the documentary information at my disposal. But I am absolutely certain that they, Lev Semenovich and Vladimir Martinovich, were on very friendly terms. Lev Semenovich could not bear being photographed. But they appear together in several photographs from the Gomel' period, not only together but side by side—in the Museum of Printing that they founded and in the park of culture. This tells us a lot.

Their relationship did not end with the move to Moscow (Vladimir Martinovich moved several years before Lev Semenovich). Both of V.M. Vasilenko's books (which had already been published in Moscow), with very warm dedications, were in Lev Semenovich's library. I have known his poems since childhood, and I still remember two or three of them. I remember well how Vladimir Martinovich would visit us. He and Lev Semenovich were delighted with these visits and could not part for a long time. He usually left our house very late, when I was already asleep.

The friendship between Aleksandr Iakovlevich Bykhovskii and Lev Semenovich lasted many years. It began in the years when they were still in Gomel' and continued throughout the Moscow period of my father's life.

A.Ia. Bykhovskii, an artist, worked mainly as an engraver. While we were still in Gomel', Lev Semenovich arranged an exhibition of Bykhovskii's works and gave the introductory speech at its opening. Later, in 1926 in Moscow, an album of Bykhovskii's drawings was published with a foreword by Lev Semenovich, a small article entitled ["Bykhovskii's drawings"].

Bykhovskii was an original and unique artist. Judging from all the evidence, Lev Semenovich liked his work. He wrote:

His portrait remains a portrait, and its sharpness does not make it less unlike the original. The fidelity to reality, combined with a keen stylistic freedom from objective forms, is the secret of his style. How does he, a maximalist of style, succeed in presenting this maximalism so sparingly?

... Having studied under no one, taking up the brush himself and mastering it without a guiding influence from others, his creativity came from within himself, not from adherence to a craft, but from inner impulses directing the craft. Hence, each of his drawings is nourished by an idea, nursed by blood, and brought to maturity and generated by spirit.³⁶⁵

Two works of the artist, his self-portrait and a landscape (both done in the Cubist manner), hung in one of our rooms. I think this is sufficient grounds for saying that my parents liked Bykhovskii's work and that it was pleasant for them to see it from one day to the next.

I should like to say something about the human features of Aleksandr Iakovlevich. I was in contact with him to the day of his death (in 1978) and knew him fairly well.

He was uncorruptibly honest, to an extreme. Possessing absolutely no sense of diplomacy at all, he would say what he thought about a person directly to his face. Often the consequences were unpleasant and bitter for him—hence, for many long years, he was not accepted into the Union of Artists (he would tell its leaders everything he thought about them, about their activities, their creativity, about the customs reigning in the Union, about injustices, etc.). As a result, he had no steady income, and did not even have a studio, much less a room in which to live. He spent the greater part of his difficult life knocking about, taking a room somewhere in the outskirts or in the suburbs, since the rent was less. All these years he actually had no chance of working since the interests of the landlords from whom he rented his quarters and his creative plans usually did not coincide; none of his landlords liked it when the tenant transformed his room into a studio and, as they said, "spread filth around everywhere." He was forced to change his resi-

dence often. But, since he was very unpretentious and had very modest needs, none of this disorder spoiled his moods. He was always in top form, and always in a good mood.

He was accepted into the Union only at the threshold to old age, and his life became better—he was given a room, and a few years before his death a small studio. Thereafter, he worked to his heart's content.

He lived from hand to mouth, but was always happy, alert, and full of interest in what was taking place around him; he would visit exhibitions and always had an opinion about some art event that often did not coincide with accepted or official opinions. I had occasion to be with him at exhibitions; and my sister, who walked with him to museums and exhibitions, would say that his judgments were very interesting, acute, and at times unexpected. Once it happened that the arguments, commentaries, and explanations he gave my sister in the hall of the museum were in conflict with what the museum guides were saying. Of course, his talk drew people's attention to him, and a crowd gathered around him to listen to him and ask him questions. Naturally, neither the tour guide nor the administration liked this; and there were instances in which he was asked to be silent or leave the premises. This didn't bother him or anger him. He would say, submissively, placing his hands on his breast: "I'll shut up! I'll shut up!" and continue to look at what interested him.

Despite all of his burdens, he was an extremely good person, an extraordinarily kind person. He befriended us and often came to visit us; he also often visited the sister of Lev Semenovich. He felt welcome and at ease in both houses. This is a very important detail since, knowing his lifestyle, we always wanted, above all, to feed him.

As things went, he usually came to us on Sunday; and we ate together, and then occasionally, from time to time, would go with him to visit my father's sister. There everyone gathered, as in old times, around the tea table; and usually the heart and soul of this feast was Aleksandr Iakovlevich. He then would accompany my mother and me home; and our assurances that we could get home ourselves quite easily, that it would take him a long time to get home, and that he would arrive only very late, were usually futile. He was adamant, and accompanied us to the door of our house. I remember once when we were leaving my aunt's house to go home, my daughter (she was already six or maybe even seven) complained that her leg hurt. Neither my mother nor I had even time to utter a word before Aleksandr Iakovlevich had picked my daughter up and quickly went ahead of us, telling her some amusing story. We hurried after them, begging Aleksandr Iakovlevich to put the child down, insisting that she was a big girl, and heavy, and that he shouldn't be carrying her, that that would be hard for him. He continued to

walk ahead of us. When our pleas became especially insistent, he suddenly stopped, gently but firmly clutched the child to himself, and said to us: "But it's so nice to carry his granddaughter! Don't you understand? This is his granddaughter!" We were thrown into confusion, but fortunately the child caught on quickly and said that she felt better, that the pain in her leg had almost passed, and that she could walk by herself to the metro. He put her down, took her firmly by the hand, and walked ahead with her, conversing with her about something or telling her some story. We all remember this as clearly as if it had been just yesterday.

He died about a year before mother died. It so happened that we were both ill and couldn't accompany him on his final journey. But we will always remember him fondly and with gratitude.

V.S. Uzin (1887–1957) was a close and great friend of Lev Semenovich's. He was a person with extraordinary capabilities, a person with natural gifts.

Their friendship dates back to the years when Lev Semenovich was still in high school, and outlived him by a quite long time—Vladimir Samoilovich continued to be interested in our family, the family of Lev Semenovich, not only while father was alive but remained friends with us to his last moments. The difference in age, so significant in youth (just think, Uzin married in 1911, the same year that Lev Semenovich entered the sixth grade of the gymnasium!), evened out with the years, and they always communicated as equals.

Lev Semenovich belonged to one of the most intellectual families in the city, but Uzin was the son of small shopkeepers who could barely make ends meet.³⁶⁶ Lev Semenovich's youngest sister, Mariia Semenovna, told me that their shop was not very far from the house where the Vygodskiis lived, on the same street. It would often happen that mother sent one of the children there when she had to buy some small item. In the words of Mariia Semenovna, the squalor of the shop and the poverty of its owners elicited the sympathy of others. Sometimes the eldest son, father's friend, would be sitting at the counter. The parents did not have the means to put the children in school, and until the age of 12, he studied in the Jewish primary school. It was only at the age of 13 that he learned how to read and write Russian and entered into a lower educational establishment, the municipal secondary school. But Uzin did not complete it, since he was excluded from five divisions for "questionable" behavior.

He began his self-education without any outside help and mastered the knowledge in the gymnasium course. He then began to earn a living as a prompter, and later by literary writings in the newspapers of Gorn'ye, Minsk, and Bobruisk, where he published in prose and poetry pamphlets on every-

day themes, and then, later, articles on questions of the theater and literature.

His interest in foreign languages and his desire to master them led him to begin to study languages independently, without help from anyone.

His daughter told me what he said when he began to study French. He took off his trousers, gave them to his mother, and said: "Mother, please put these trousers aside for me and, no matter how much I ask for them, don't give them to me until I have read this whole book." Then he showed her *Madame Bovary* in French.

According to his daughter's stories, he felt he owed the Vygodskii family a great deal in the study of languages: his talks with Lev Semenovich and his sisters enabled him to assimilate the standards of pronunciation and acquire the skills and practice of conversational speech. However, he was far ahead of those with whom he communicated, since he learned independently, without the help of teachers, 12 foreign languages, according to some informants, or 14 according to others. His translations from French, Italian, and Spanish were published in the periodical press and in special publications.

He became well known as a writer, a poet, a translator, and one of the greatest specialists in Western (mainly Spanish) literature and the Spanish theater. All the great creations of the Spanish classics—Cervantes, Calderon, Lope de Vega—were published in our country, invariably by his hand. When it was decided in 1940 to award him a scientific degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences, a special resolution of the Supreme Certification Committee was required since he did not have even a secondary education, much less a higher education!

Uzin and Lev Semenovich were great friends; they loved one another. When our family moved to Moscow (I was about two months old), we had nowhere to live, and my parents went to stay with the Uzins—although, of course, there was not so much as a mention of having a separate room in their apartment at that time. We lived there until we got our own residence.

Lev Semenovich and V.S. Uzin loved their meetings and prepared for them beforehand. Every one of the meetings invariably ended with the reading of poems that could last for hours.

Lev Semenovich also maintained friendly relations with Sergei Mikhailovich Eisenstein in Moscow.³⁶⁷ A.R. Luria introduced them to one another, and they would meet quite regularly; gradually this acquaintanceship grew into a real friendship. They were bound by common interests, a love of art, and personal goodwill. Sergei Mikhailovich himself said that not only was he friends with Lev Semenovich but "also loved this miraculous person a lot,"³⁶⁸ and considered him one of the most brilliant psychologists of our time.³⁶⁹

"For a systematic analysis of the problems of a nascent cinema language . . . Eisenstein was to have had regular meetings with his psychologist friends Vygotsky, Luria, and Marr. As he would recall later, 'We even began this, but premature death took the two of them,'"³⁷⁰—Vygotsky and Marr.

Professor Michael Cole (USA) relates, doubtless from Luria's account:

Vygotsky and Luria would meet regularly with the eminent Russian film director Sergei Eisenstein to discuss the question of how the abstract ideas that constitute the core of the theory of historical materialism could be embodied in visual images projected on a movie screen.

. . . Eisenstein enlisted the aid of his psychologist friends in resolving not only the problem of translating from a verbal language to the language of visual images but also the practical problem of evaluating the success of his films with the viewers. He drew on their help to compile a questionnaire for cinema audiences consisting of students, workers, and peasants in order to ascertain whether they understood the images he created in precisely the way the director wished. The fact that the connection between the ways an idea is presented and an image in the mind was as important to the cinema as to the laboratory is a measure of the breadth of their interests [i.e., Luria's and Vygotsky's—G.V.].³⁷¹

Among Lev Semenovich's books that have been preserved is a small volume of Mandel'shtam's poems.³⁷² On the first page of this little book is written: "Lev Semenovich Vygotsky's copy."

When I first discovered this inscription, I rushed immediately to Lev Semenovich's sister, Zinaida Semenovna, for an explanation. She calmly told me that Lev Semenovich and Mandel'shtam not only knew each other quite well but even were friends. Later I found out that they would meet at David Vygodskii's house in Leningrad; Osip Emil'evich was very friendly with David and even dedicated the jocular poem "Na Mokhovoi semeistvo iz Poles'ia" to him. They also saw one another in Moscow. They were bound to one another by their common interest in poetry and by a deep, personal liking for each other.

A few years ago, as I was reading the memoirs of Nadezhda I. Mandel'shtam, I found the following lines: "We also met Vygotsky that year [1933 is meant—G.V.], a man of profound intellect, a psychologist, and the author of the book [*Thought and language*]."³⁷³ The rationalism common to all scientists of that period was to some extent a fetter for Vygotsky.³⁷⁴

Let us disregard this judgment; it is unimportant. Most important is that we must assume that these meetings were frequent, significant, and memo-

rable if a person who had been through as much as had Nadezhda Iakovlevna mentions them forty years later.

In Moscow Lev Semenovich befriended Boris Grigor'evich Stolpner, a philosopher and subtle connoisseur and translator of Hegel.

I do not know how old Stolpner was; he was, of course, older than Lev Semenovich—much older, I believe. I have been unsuccessful in determining Boris Grigor'evich's age at that time; but next to Vygotsky, he looked, quite simply, like an old man.

They were interested in one another and had many topics to discuss. I am able to judge this because Stolpner came to visit us quite frequently; in the summer, when we rented a summer house, he even visited us there. They would usually chat for a long time about things that were totally beyond me; and later, before Boris Grigor'evich left, they would sit down for a game of chess. They played almost in silence, with concentration, neither showing the least sign of excitement.

Boris Grigor'evich had very poor eyesight, and for this reason all kinds of preposterous things would happen to him at our house, to the amusement of us children and to father's consternation. But I shall tell about this elsewhere.

I cannot say how close they were, but there can be no doubt that Lev Semenovich and V.K. Arsen'ev (1872–1930) had a warm and friendly relationship. He was a writer and anthropologist, a student of the Far East, and a person who, in Gorky's words, succeeded in “combining in his own person Brem and James Fenimore Cooper.”³⁷⁵ It is a known fact that they met regularly, for a time, even quite frequently. Lev Semenovich referred in his own writings to tales and materials from V.K. Arsen'ev.³⁷⁶ Vladimir Klavdievich's very warm and friendly inscriptions in his own books, which he passed on to me through Lev Semenovich, testify to their close relationship.

Nor are these the only persons with whom he was united in friendship.

According to his sister Mariia Semenovna, he had many schoolteacher friends in Gomel' (1918–1923). He was especially close to Pumpianskii, a history teacher, and the family of the literature teacher K.D. Kemarskii. Kemarskii and his wife and daughter were frequent visitors to the Vygotsky family, and this friendship between the two families was maintained throughout the time Vygotsky lived in Gomel'.

In Moscow, Lev Semenovich continued to see the friends of his Gomel' childhood and youth. One of them who lived in Leningrad would travel to see us quite frequently, and others who lived in our city would drop in regularly. Father would become quite young again whenever they came: they

would joke, make a lot of noise, and were generally merry—and, of course, no one minded. Not only my father but also his sister, his parents, and the entire family were gladdened by their visits. I liked it very much when they came and always asked mother to let me stay up a bit longer to be present at these meetings. Father's friends usually supported my pleadings, and sometimes we were able to postpone my going to bed.

These people, so different among themselves, were Lev Semenovich's friends. They all loved him, and he returned that love as a true friend, ready at any moment to come to the aid of any of them and to share their griefs and sorrows. They all knew this with absolute certainty.

A.R. Luria told how the students loved Lev Semenovich:

Wherever he gave a lecture or a report, some would always go with him so they could hear him speak in person. Once Lev Semenovich wanted to establish a laboratory in Sukhumi; and we, his students, were ready to go there with him. In general, we would have gone to the ends of the earth. He had taught us how to work, how to think, and how to live. His attitude toward science was our guiding star, a beacon, and our conscience throughout all our lives.³⁷⁷

“Vygotsky was an idol for us. When Vygotsky went somewhere, students wrote verses in honor of his journey.”³⁷⁸

Let me tell about one of these in more detail.³⁷⁹

In early 1929 Lev Semenovich was invited to give a course of lectures in the recently opened Central Asian State University in Tashkent (SAGU). He prepared himself for the long journey (then there was only a train). His students³⁸⁰ were sad about the impending separation from him, which would last quite a long time. They wanted to do something nice for him before he departed. Someone proposed giving him a notebook and writing something friendly and warmhearted in it. Lev Semenovich's tastes were considered: they knew his attachment to small, loose-leaf notebooks (which he used for the notes he took at meetings and talks, and for recording protocols of experiments, etc.) and his love of poetry (he was always quoting lines of poetry); and it was decided, unanimously, to give him a small notebook with verses. A.V. Zaporozhets suggested it would be good to get a notebook with a picture of a monkey on its cover, and that the poems should play on that theme, e.g., they could say that the monkey was from the island of Tenerife³⁸¹ (the allusion was to Koehler's experiments, which then were of great interest to Lev Semenovich). At the time, notebooks with various animals featured on the covers were much in vogue. But they were unable to get a notebook with a monkey on the cover, and instead bought a small book with an elephant portrayed in relief. They thus had to play with the theme of “elephant,”

which, in my opinion, they did successfully. . . . N.G. Morozova was charged with writing the verses, and she wrote a whole cycle, which filled the pages of this notebook. The cycle included: (1) dedication; (2) biography, a portrait and the sources of creativity; (3) an autograph; (4) a sonnet; (5) triolettes; and (6) a salutation. . . .

To illustrate the relations between Lev Semenovich, by then a well-known scientist, and students (including his own), one need only read the letter he sent to them in response to an amicable missive in verse. Here is Vygotsky's response to the letter (from the Five) in verse:

Five-headed Koz'ma Putkov

Tashkent, 15-4-1929

Dear Friends!

Please forgive me for writing to you in prose in response to your verses and your joke, by no means devoid of seriousness and gravity: every joke contains something to be taken seriously. And it is to this part of your letter that I shall respond. First, I confess that the verses are a bit beyond me, and I'll put off a worthy response until I am able to do so.

I read your little book (with verses instead of a monkey from the island of Tenerife) with great satisfaction; I only hope that my "Collected works" will someday bring such satisfaction to each of you.³⁸²

But seriously, in two words: the last line says something that is now the main leitmotif of everything I feel, of my "perception of the world."

"The way is long." I would never have allowed myself such frankness (I hide this leitmotif from myself) if I didn't feel that you are beginning to be aware of the vast road opening up before a psychologist who is trying to reconstruct the history of the mind from traces. This is new territory. When I perceived this in you earlier, I was above all surprised; and it is still surprising to me that under such circumstances and with so many things unclear, there are still many people just embarking on a career who have chosen this path. I was absolutely astonished when Aleksandr Romanovich was, back then, the first to embark upon this path, and when Aleksei Nikolaevich followed him. Now the surprise is compounded by joy, that it is not I alone but another five persons to whom this great path has been revealed.

A sense of the vastness and the scale of contemporary work in psychology (we are living in an epoch of geological upheavals in psychology) overwhelms me.

But this makes the situation of us few who are pursuing a new line in science (especially in the sciences of man) infinitely responsible, deeply serious, and almost tragic (in the best and concrete, not the abstract, sense

of the term). One must try oneself, test oneself, thousands of times, and withstand temptation before taking a decision, because this is a difficult path that demands the whole person. I warmly congratulate each of you. As for Zaporozhets, I should say that, no matter how the basic question of the Birgomskii Forest³⁸³ is decided, we will all maintain our personal attachment and the most genuine friendship regardless of the circumstances.

Your L. Vygotsky

And so they did. Despite the circumstances (which were very, very difficult and complicated indeed), they maintained not only a personal attachment and genuine friendship, as Lev Semenovich called it, but also love, fidelity, and gratitude toward their teacher. They preserved it forever, to the end of their days.

In late 1988, the year before her death, N.G. Morozova showed me many verses dedicated to Lev Semenovich that she had written.

After the war, in 1953, she composed some amiable verses in the form of epigrams to all the close students of Lev Semenovich, A.N. Leont'ev, A.R. Luria, and all members of the "Five"; and she wrote the following about Lev Semenovich:

For No. 8, I composed only hymns,
For me levity was out of place with regard to him.

Lev Semenovich worked in science, he was a scientist. But he was called a thinker. He was termed "the well-known scientist," "an outstanding scientist," and "a scientist of genius." This clearly assumed a special relationship to science. If one were to attempt briefly in one word to define this relationship, one would say he was obsessed. Perhaps this most accurately describes his attitude toward science—he was obsessed with it. "His relation to science was astonishing. He devoted his entire life to it, forgetting to eat, not taking care of himself—he was constantly working, traveling, and thinking about the future of the science of . . . man."³⁸⁴ "He saw in science the prime purpose in life. Science was for life, for man, for school, and for children—precisely that, the purpose of life, in the deep psychological and motivational significance of that word. He also saw in science the source of intellectual life and intellectual joy."³⁸⁵ Science was the basic content of his life. He devoted his entire life and all of his energies to it.

The form of his work varied: it could be working on theoretical or methodological questions, when he pondered and wrote his essays and books; or experimental work, when he would personally collect and work through his

materials in school, in hospital, in a laboratory, and, finally, at home; or it could be scientific conversations with colleagues and other scientists, in which some experimental results or some ongoing work was discussed, or future research was planned; or it could be giving lectures, which invariably included both theoretical and empirical material. But always, every hour of his life, he thought about science and served it. He served science with devotion and fidelity: he took neither days off nor vacations from it. He was always immersed in science—on holidays and during summer vacations. His “rare capacity for work . . . bordered on total obliviousness, day and night, to any concern for himself and his health.”³⁸⁶

He began to do science in his student days and continued uninterruptedly throughout his life. He would do science in any situation, under any circumstances, even after doctors passed the death sentence on him (they gave him only a few months to live; his condition was deemed hopeless, and he knew it!). He wrote, under unbelievably difficult circumstances, one of his fundamental works—[*The historical meaning of the crisis in psychology*]. “The astonishing clarity of thought and logical beauty of this work are without parallel,” said A.R. Luria. “L.S. Vygotsky wrote this work in a tragic situation: he was ill with tuberculosis and the doctors said that he had only three to four months to live and put him in a sanatorium. . . . He began to work and write compulsively to leave some basic work after him.”³⁸⁷ This book “may be considered a truly fundamental work in future Soviet psychology.”³⁸⁸

Never, under any circumstances, did he lose interest in science. Here are some fragments from his letters, from which the reader can judge for himself the validity of this statement. He was gravely ill, tormented by his illness, but did not cease thinking about science and scientific problems.

Thus, in a letter to one of his favorite pupils he wrote: “I have been here a week now [in the hospital—G.V.] in a large ward with six gravely ill persons, noise, shouts, no table, etc. The beds are right next to each other with no space between them, as in a barracks. On top of that, I feel physically tormented, and morally depressed and dejected.” Nonetheless, a bit later he writes:

I should very much like to know why you are beginning from the beginning. It seems to me (between you and me) that it is necessary now to experiment with the conversion of reactions. . . . One must experiment in the simplest form and demonstrate of what sublimation is a particular case. The experimenter must be a detective, an inventor, a conjurer with numbers, a sly fox, a creator of traps, as well as be infinitely flexible and bold. Stay healthy.

Your LV.³⁸⁹

As you see, he not only is interested in the work of his comrades but also (in a very casual way) gives advice—and this while he was in a tormented state, as he himself wrote.

In another letter (from the sanatorium):

Dear Aleksandr Romanovich,

I have wanted to write to you for a long time, but the conditions in such a terrible place³⁹⁰ never change, so it was shameful and difficult to put pen to paper, and it was impossible to think peacefully. . . . I feel outside of life or, more accurately, between life and death; I have not yet fallen into despair, but I have already stopped hoping. Hence, my thoughts are not directed toward questions concerning my future life and work.

Nevertheless, a little further on he is interested in the life, the plans, and the activities of Aleksandr Romanovich, reflects on his work, and assesses it. He writes:

This is a big brick in the foundation of your previous work: it is a justification of its method. . . . For me the first question is the question of method, and for me this is a question of truth, i.e., scientific discovery and ingenuity. But theoretically, I see many dangers in new experiments or perhaps in your earlier conclusions: indeed, the boundary between affective disorders and every other kind is blurred; you lose sight of what is specific to affect, and your theory of emotions has cracks in it. How I should like to exchange ideas about this—in your seminar or in a “private conversation”! I am preparing (in my thoughts) two methodological “messages”—to my co-workers and to your group (a proposal to join together in one project, keeping the two aspects separate . . . a work on the deaf, mute, and blind). I wait.

Write if you can. What is new in foreign and Russian literature?³⁹¹

And this is written by a man condemned to death!

These two letters were written during an acute flare-up of tuberculosis, which effectively chained him to a bed.

In one other letter: “Tuberculosis is painful, and the expectation of an operation (phrenectomy) is inevitable in the fall (they definitely do not want to close the pulmonary caverna!).” And in the same place he writes about practical matters, that he has been asked to write a book: “I am infinitely happy for this commission: this will be a chance to present psychology from the cultural aspect in its general features.” And, further: “The one serious point: each must work in his own domain, using the instrumental method. *I am putting my whole future life and all my efforts into this.* . . . I

warmly shake your hand and ask you to prepare yourself, inwardly of course, for work together."³⁹²

Suffering from illness, preparing for a serious operation, he thinks about his work, to which he promises to devote the rest of his life.

In summer 1932 he writes: "I am still in Moscow and still don't know whether the operation will be in summer or autumn. That it cannot be avoided is what I understand from the words and intonations of the doctors. I am lying here in the hospital for several days awaiting the resolution of this question." A few lines later, he says: "I made a report on SCH,³⁹³ although I should like to talk with you about many things in connection with it.

Write about the experiments and perform them in full confidence of their objective importance for us in things both large and small."³⁹⁴

In the next letter to Aleksandr Romanovich, he writes:

They've put off the operation after all; perhaps they will do it in the middle of summer, or perhaps in the fall. He made some deep cauterization, which yielded nothing either in the eyes of the doctor or in mine. In general, everything is confused and unclear, in particular, the work of the winter. And that's the most important. I expect a lot of you³⁹⁵ (as if experiments were never run blindly) and from you—for to think while doing experiments means to think more fruitfully, even when one makes a mistake. But you're on the right track, just as am I, and A.N. [Leont'ev].³⁹⁶

The entire letter is devoted to scientific questions.

When he was working at science—developing theoretical questions or conducting an experimental investigation—Lev Semenovich was not the kind of scientist who is detached from life, who creates in the solitude of his own office (actually, he never had his own office). In the words of N.G. Morozova, "he was not an armchair scientist. His thoughts, theories, and plans were born in the hospital, in the school, in the laboratory, in the team of his students, and during analysis of individual children."³⁹⁷

The story of Lev Semenovich's scientific activity would be incomplete if one omitted his study of children, his analyses of individual cases given at specialized conferences. It is difficult to overestimate how important this work was for him in terms of both the amount of time spent at it and its significance.

The examination and analysis of children attracted attention beyond the walls of the institute; teachers from the whole of Moscow, students, doctors, and psychologists all rushed to attend them, as L.V. Zankov, M.S. Pevzner, and T.A. Vlasov recalled.

Teachers in the Moscow remedial schools told me these analyses were a

genuine event for them. As one of them (a teacher in school No. 305, F.M. Polishchuk) told me, many teachers would, after school, scurry from all corners of Moscow to Pogodinskaia No. 8 (where the EDI was located) to attend these analyses. Since the hall could not hold all who wanted to be there (the institute was situated in a few small buildings), the windows of the hall where the conference was being held were opened when it was warm, and those who wished to stood for hours at the open windows listening to what was happening inside. But since there were so many of these who wanted to come in, it was not right for them to have to stand tightly pressed up against the windows and against one another without moving so as not to prevent those standing alongside from hearing. But after a whole working day in school, Moscow teachers would stand for hours listening to Lev Semenovich, who analyzed in detail each particular case, pointing out the difficulties or the abnormalities in the development of a particular child, designing a work plan for that child, or indicating which of the child's positive or intact strengths should be used as a basis for intervention. Of course, no one obliged them to do this. As they told me, the work was necessary, necessary for them in particular. But, most importantly, it was of interest to Lev Semenovich himself.

Here is how some of the participants in this conference recall these sessions:

Lectures, reports, and conferences on the analysis of children were a festive celebration of science and attracted a huge number of participants from the most varied areas of knowledge, not just psychologists, experts in abnormal development, and physicians, so that at times the premises of the institute were so overcrowded that no more people could get in even if they wanted to.³⁹⁸

The whole of Moscow, psychologists and experts in abnormal development, rushed to hear Vygotsky's clinical analyses at the institute; people could not get into the auditorium and listened through open windows.

Vygotsky totally reorganized the study of abnormal children. First he would do a comprehensive study of the child. Doctors in various areas of specialization, physiologists, psychologists, and educators would prepare their material. Then at conferences headed by Lev Semenovich, all these materials would be discussed. In addition, Lev Semenovich would speak with the child, and do a few short experiments with him. He had an astonishing ability to establish contact with a child, a child would open himself to him, and Lev Semenovich seemed to look through him; he understood "what was going on in the child's head"; he would confer with the parents. After all the data had been discussed and weighed, Lev Semenovich not only made a clear preliminary diagnosis but situated the particular case in a theoretical context. He developed theoretical questions of mental retar-

dation, teaching the deaf, and speech therapy; always presented well-founded arguments for his ideas; and was always coming up with new ones as well. These conferences to analyze child subjects were a rich theoretical source for the science of abnormal development and psychology. Many specialists in abnormal development, psychologists, and students would come to these analyses. In his closing remarks he would not only give a generalization and draw conclusions from his and others' impressions on each child but present new points of view that enriched the science of abnormal development and psychology alike.³⁹⁹

His clinical studies of children were invariably thorough, meticulous in their detail, and penetrating. Each child was examined in detail by various specialists, after which the findings were presented to Lev Semenovich at the conference. Leonid Vladimir Zankov said:

I remember that he would make notes in a small notebook as he listened to these reports and then have a chat with the child. . . . Lev Semenovich would speak with the parents or close relatives of the child and often with educators at the school or kindergarten the child attended. Only then would Vygotsky sum up in general form all the material presented and offer his theoretical, multifaceted conclusion.⁴⁰⁰

His analyses would always throw open the door to the innermost recesses of the child's mind, normally hidden from all.

In the words of his pupil N.G. Morozova, at these conferences on the clinical analysis of children and adults, Lev Semenovich, after reviewing all the materials, seemed "to see through the subject." He would do his own examination: he would chat with the child, ask the child to perform certain tasks, and ask questions, always assisting the child in one way or another. It was easy for him to establish rapport with a child or patient despite the presence of many onlookers. Lev Semenovich not only scrutinized the performance of some exercise and its solution but would carefully analyze the problem-solving process itself, how the child approached the problem, and note the child's behavior and statements:

Whenever he examined a child, he would look at him through the prism of his own knowledge about children and child development, enriching this knowledge and adding more to it, and thus raise his theoretical vision of the problem of mental development to a new level. This would be evident in his conclusions presented after the child or patient had departed. It would seem to his audience that he was drifting away from the subject. But actually what he was doing was addressing current notions of a particular abnormality or illness, reexamining them in the light of new findings, and reinterpreting them theoretically. Then he would return to the case at hand,

enriching the analysis with new ideas, and situating all the findings of the examination in a new theoretical context.⁴⁰¹

No matter what Lev Semenovich did, he always remained the scientist. "Whether he was analyzing children or analyzing the findings from adult patients or doing a diagnostic experiment, Lev Semenovich was always an inquiring, active investigator, a talented and inventive experimenter, and at the same time an outstanding theoretician."⁴⁰²

As A.V. Zaporozhets recalls,

If you were to ask what was Vygotsky's dominant quality as a scientist, i.e., the quality that made the greatest impression on those around him, the answer might be his extremely creative capacity for productive synthesis, the ability to put things together in a creative way. One can say that this creativity was no extraordinary episode in Vygotsky's life: it was in his blood, it was the permanent mode of his everyday scientific life and activity. Whenever I was with him, my invariable impression was that of a fire-belching furnace always erupting with new ideas, new notions, new hypotheses, and new original experimental designs.

But in discussing Vygotsky's works, we must not give the impression that he was fascinated by the caprices of the imagination at the cost of logic. He was an ingenious experimenter and valued empirical facts.

I remember once when we were discussing some investigation in the laboratory, one of those present said that this was a bad study, these were bad data. Vygotsky made a rejoinder I shall remember all my life. He said: "There are no such things as bad data, there are bad theories that do not correspond to the facts found and are unable to explain them."⁴⁰³ Lev Semenovich taught his fellow workers to record their observations accurately. The protocol of an experiment or an observation should, he thought, be analyzed immediately after the investigation. The protocol should conform rigorously to the facts, and be based on them. At the same time, the analysis must be theoretical "in light of scientific ideas and comparisons."⁴⁰⁴ Whenever he discussed some finding, Lev Semenovich would reveal, as he liked to say, "what was behind it," and then situate it in the context of broader scientific generalizations. He saw every fact in the light of a theory derived from earlier experiments and observations and based on extensive familiarity with the world literature. He would present his own interpretation of a matter in hypothetical terms, systematically setting out the findings from a new perspective in light of that theory, and then continue his investigations to reinforce and elucidate old findings with new ones.⁴⁰⁵

He was very respectful of his scientific predecessors (even if he did not share their views) and taught his pupils to be the same. Morozova recalls that once she received a book by Gross from Lev Semenovich, with an

inscription that "This is the best that has been said about play, but we must go beyond it, for this is a naturalistic theory of play." But later he wrote: "Don't forget that we are standing on his shoulders. We are higher, we see farther, but we see because of what he has done before us." This respect for what had been done before us was a very important part of his relation to science and to other scientists who came before him, although he also disputed with them.⁴⁰⁶

Many of Lev Semenovich's works were born from his preliminary notes taken "during the investigation of children and adults, during experiments, and even while reading a vast quantity of literature."⁴⁰⁷

Lev Semenovich's work with the scientific literature also, of course, deserves attention. We should pause, if only briefly, to look at how he read and studied the literature. His pupils called him a "talented reader." A.V. Zaporozhets, A.R. Luria, R.E. Levina, and N.G. Morozova recall this and have spoken of it more than once.

A.R. Luria recalls how Lev Semenovich would read the scientific literature: he was able to penetrate to the core of a matter and grasp the sense of what he was reading with astonishing swiftness.

Aleksandr Romanovich Luria tells how he would observe Lev Semenovich reading.

I recall how Vygotsky read books: he would take a book, screw up one eye, and then quickly leaf through it. When, after five minutes, anyone would ask Vygotsky what was in the book, he would say even more than the author himself had written. Vygotsky was ingenious, because he had an incredible ability to penetrate into the core of things and phenomena.

Today some people are studying rapid reading, but the point is not to learn how rapidly to move one's eyes, but to learn how to catch the sense of something rapidly. It was this quality that Vygotsky possessed to an astonishing degree.⁴⁰⁸

Nevertheless, I should say that Vygotsky did not read, but only gave a preliminary perusal of a book to understand in what measure that book merited more thorough study.

He would read alone, and no one other than those in the household had a chance to observe him. He would often read with pencil in hand, and often make small notes directly in the book. I have more than once had books with traces of his active reading in my hands.

A.A. Leont'ev relates how his father, Aleksei Nikolaevich Leont'ev, wrote in one of his articles:

Some of Vygotsky's notes to himself came into my hands by chance; they

show how much he valued his contribution to science. Shortly before his death, Lev Semenovich borrowed from me Cluno Fisher's book on Descartes. The book was later returned to me. I discovered in its margins his penciled notes on the author's text.⁴⁰⁹

Aleksandr Nikolaevich then gives some excerpts from the book and Vygotsky's comments in the margins.

Lev Semenovich read attentively and thoroughly, making notes on scraps of paper or marking certain passages in the book itself. He had an astonishing capacity to concentrate on what he was reading without being distracted by what was taking place around him in the same room. The sources he analyzed are testimony to the breadth of his reading.

A.V. Zaporozhets told how Lev Semenovich was able to read from a book more than the author put in it, and was even able to extract something from a perfectly ordinary book that deserved attention and gave him material for reflection.

Vygotsky's knowledge of world literature—philosophical, medical, political, psychological, and pedagogical—was impressive. This was not simply erudition or being well-read: Vygotsky had a genius for reading. He would read creatively, penetrating to the core of an idea, and carrying further some idea just read, placing it in a new theoretical context, developing it, deepening it, and giving it greater breadth and clarity, so that in the end it fit even better the actual nature of the phenomenon being described.⁴¹⁰ He knew the most important works of world literature on psychology, but he read them in his own way. . . . He read Piaget, Koehler, Stern, Levin, Lévy-Bruhl, and other authors and valued their findings and their observations; but he would criticize their interpretation of findings with the thoroughness and detail characteristic of him; he would measure his theory of development and his historical approach to phenomena against their theoretical judgments.⁴¹¹ But sometimes he would enter into dispute with an author; in some cases he would refute the conclusions, and in others would find new arguments reinforcing the author, and invoke new findings for comparison. . . . He would approach any text he was reading from the perspective of new theoretical and practical tasks.⁴¹²

Characteristic of Vygotsky's creative reading was his acute, critical eye. When he analyzed some author, Lev Semenovich would often test the empirical facts offered and show that the author's interpretation and theoretical constructions were inconsistent or implausible. For instance, he read Adler and Bleuler, picking out the reliable facts and organizing them. He criticized the inconsistency of their general theory, and offered new, positive, theoretical positions.⁴¹³

From his various readings of literary sources, he would often get ideas for new experimental studies to either refute or confirm the facts or phenomena being described. An example of his critical yet creative approach to what he was reading is his criticism of Stern's theory of the development of perception in children.

Stern thought that child development moved from the perception of discrete objects, to the perception of actions, and, only at the very end of development, to the perception of relations.

For Lev Semenovich this sequence appeared neither convincing nor correct. He proposed that the path of development of the child's perception was quite different: from a whole, unarticulated, global perception of a situation to analysis of said situation when speech is included in perception. Experiments done under his direction confirmed the correctness of his judgment.

"When he read Head and other clinical psychologists, he checked their findings on adult patients and came to his own psychological views on the nature of aphasic disorders, parkinsonism, and disorders of thought in schizophrenia."⁴¹⁴

Through his creative reading, Lev Semenovich put together a system of facts, theories, and views in psychology and related sciences that he then brought to bear on his own observations, a system that enabled him to extract the requisite data whenever he needed them in his lectures and reports. He would always refer to the authors; he always knew what they were writing or speaking about, when and where, and who they were. He mentioned very many authors, remembered each of them, and offered his own assessment of their particular place in science.⁴¹⁵ His own work was characterized by the clarity and brilliance of his thought, the persuasiveness of its exposition, and his effort to convince with facts, observations, and achievements in related sciences.⁴¹⁶

[To Be Continued]

Journal of Russian and East European Psychology,
vol. 37, no. 3, May-June 1999, pp. 81-90.
© 2000 M.E. Sharpe, Inc. All rights reserved.
ISSN 1061-0405/2000 \$9.50 + 0.00.

Notes

Life and Works (Cont.)

190. L.S. Vygotsky [The historical meaning of the crisis in psychology]. [*Complete works*] (in 6 vols.). Moscow: "Pedagogika" Publishers, 1982. Vol. 1, p. 421.
191. Handwritten notes of Lev Semenovich. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
192. From a letter by L.S. Vygotsky to A.N. Leont'ev of 23 July 1929. The A.N. Leont'ev family archives.
193. A.A. Leont'ev [*L.S. Vygotsky*]. Moscow: "Prosveshchenie" Publishers, 1990. Pp. 94-95.
194. A.R. Luria [*Stages on a trodden path*]. Moscow: Moscow State University Publishers, 1982. P. 49.
195. From Vygotsky's letter to A.R. Luria of 11 July 1931. The A.R. Luria family archives. Fragments of letters published in the book by E. Luria [*My father*]. Moscow: "Gnosis" Publishers, 1994.
196. From Vygotsky's letter to A.R. Luria of 1 August 1931. The A.R. Luria family archives.
197. A.A. Leont'ev [*L.S. Vygotsky*]. Moscow: "Prosveshchenie" Publishers, 1990. P. 95.
198. A.A. Puzyrei [*Vygotsky's cultural-historical theory in modern psychology*]. Moscow: Moscow State University Publishers, 1986. Pp. 4-5.
199. A.A. Smirnov [*Paths of development of Soviet psychology*]. Moscow, 1966. P. 7.
200. L.I. Bozhovich [The importance of L.S. Vygotsky's cultural-historical concept for contemporary research in the psychology of the personality]. In [*Vygotsky's scientific works and modern psychology*]. Moscow, 1981. P. 24.
201. M.G. Iaroshkevskii [*The history of psychology*]. Moscow: "Mysl'" Publishers, 1985. P. 514.
202. S. Toulmin [The Mozart of psychology]. *Voprosy filosofii*, 1981, No. 10, p. 137.
203. [L.S. Vygotsky and contemporary science of abnormal development]. *Defektologiya*, 1982, No. 3, p. 6.
204. Documents bearing on this question have been kept in the L.S. Vygotsky family archives. The first of these is instructions from Glavsvotsvos order No. 63 of 19 December 1927. According to these instructions, "Professor V.P. Kashchenko on 19 December was relieved of his duties as head of the Medical-Pedagogical Station of the People's Commissariat of Education" and "Professor L.S. Vygotsky was appointed, on 19 December, to the post of head of the Medical-Pedagogical Station of the People's Commissariat of Education." Professor Kashchenko was asked to hand over the institution to Professor Vygotsky promptly.

The second document is Glasvotsvos order No. 109, which states that at the

personal request of L.S. Vygotsky, on 1 October 1928, he was relieved of the post he occupied.

Finally, the third document is the act signed by Vygotsky, which states that on 10 October 1928 he "handed over the directorship, the affairs, and the premises of the Medical-Pedagogical Station to the newly appointed head Yurii Fedorovich Felinskii."

205. The Experimental Institute of Abnormal Development (EDI) was reorganized into the Theoretical and Practical Institute of Special Schools in Abnormal Development of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. Today this is the Research Institute for Remedial Pedagogy of the RAO.

206. Vygotsky took his final journey from within the walls of this institution in June 1934.

207. From a chat with N.G. Morozova on 11 November 1988. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.

208. [On the psychology and pedagogy of children's handicaps] (1924); [Principles of education of the physically handicapped child] (1924); [Handicap and overcompensation] (1927); [On the dynamics of a child's character] (1928); [Fundamental problems in contemporary studies of handicaps] (1929); [The collective as a factor in the development of the abnormal child] (1931); etc.

209. L.S. Vygotsky [On the psychology and pedagogy of children's handicaps]. In [Questions in the education of the blind, the deaf and mute, and mentally retarded children]. Moscow, 1924. P. 16.

210. L.S. Vygotsky [The development of higher mental functions]. Moscow: APN RSFSR Publishers, 1960. P. 201.

211. L.S. Vygotsky [The dynamics of mental development of the schoolchild in terms of schooling]. In [The mental development of the child in the process of formal schooling]. Moscow, 1935. P. 42.

212. L.S. Vygotsky [On the problems of the dynamics of the mental development of the normal and abnormal child]. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.

213. *Ibid.*, p. 41.

214. *Ibid.*, pp. 40-41.

215. L.S. Vygotsky [Study of the development of the difficult child]. In [Complete works] (in 6 vols.). Moscow: "Pedagogika" Publishers, 1983. Vol. 5, p. 179.

216. B.V. Zeigarnik [Prospects of studies in clinical psychology in the light of Vygotsky's theory]. In [The scientific works of L.S. Vygotsky and modern psychology]. Moscow, 1981. P. 63.

217. A.R. Luria [A study of brain damage and the restoration of impaired functions]. In [Psychological science in the USSR]. Moscow: APN RSFSR, 1960. Vol. 2, p. 434.

218. *Ibid.* P. 434.

219. [Afterword]. In L.S. Vygotsky, [Complete works] (in 6 vols.). Moscow: "Pedagogika" Publishers, 1983. Vol. 5, p. 342.

220. D.B. El'konin, from a speech given at the full session of the Scientific Council of the NIIP OPP, 14 November 1966. Arkhiv NII OPP—F. 82—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 397—P. 217.

221. Lev Semenovich also was "restored." If you remember, when he finished the gymnasium, he was accepted into the Medical Faculty of Moscow University, but left again after having he studied only a few weeks.

222. A.R. Luria [Stages on a trodden path]. Moscow: Moscow State University Publishers, 1982. P. 121.

223. From a letter by Vygotsky to A.R. Luria on 21 November 1933. The A.R. Luria family archives.

224. TsGA RSFSR—F. 482—Op. 41—Ed. khr. 644—P. 7.

225. TsGA RSFSR—F. 482—Op. 41—Ed. khr. 644—Pp. 1-4.

226. TsGA RSFSR—F. 482—Op. 41—Ed. khr. 614—L. 1.

227. TsGA RSFSR—F. 482—Op. 41—Ed. khr. 644—L. 4.

228. A.A. Leont'ev [L.S. Vygotsky]. Moscow: "Prosveshchenie" Publishers, 1990. P. 50.

229. P.Ia. Gal'perin [Recollections of A.N. Leont'ev]. In [A.N. Leont'ev and modern psychology]. Moscow: Moscow State University Publishers, 1983. P. 240.

230. A.R. Luria [Stages on a trodden path]. Moscow: Moscow State University Publishers, 1982. P. 121.

231. Information sheet on the confirmation for a position of 26 November 1931. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.

232. Pursuant to order No. 7 from the Moscow branch of the VIEM of 14 January 1934. Professor L.S. Vygotsky joined the Office of Scientific Planning and Methodology organized by the Board of Directors. This order decreed that the newly created Office of Planning and Methodology would "work out plans for 1934 and finish this work by 15 February 1934." The order was signed by I.P. Razenkov, Director of the VIEM. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.

233. Notes written in Lev Semenovich's hand. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.

234. M.S. Pevzner, from a speech to the session of the Scientific Council of the Scientific Research Institute for the Study of Handicaps of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the RSFSR dedicated to the 70th anniversary of L.S. Vygotsky. Archives of the NIID, 27 December 1966. P. 1.

235. T.A. Vlasova, from a speech to the session of the Scientific Council of the Scientific Research Institute for the Study of Handicaps of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the RSFSR dedicated to the 70th anniversary of L.S. Vygotsky. Archives of the NIID, 27 December 1966. P. 9.

236. Extract from Protocol No. 19 of the session of the Dean's Office of the Pedagogical Faculty of the Second Moscow State University of 18 January 1929. ISKH No. 959. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.

237. From a letter by Vygotsky to A.N. Leont'ev from Tashkent, 15 April 1929. The A.N. Leont'ev family archives.

238. From a letter by L.S. Vygotsky to A. R. Luria from Tashkent, 18 April 1929. The A.R. Luria family archives.

239. From a letter by L.S. Vygotsky to A.R. Luria from Tashkent, 5 May 1929. The A.R. Luria family archives.

240. Archiv. Mosk. oblast.—F. 937—Op. 3—L. 49—L. 2.

241. Archiv. Mosk. oblast.—F. 948—Op. 1—L. 168—L. 312 and L. 217—L. 97.

242. Archiv. Mosk. oblast.—F. 937—Op. 3—L. 49—L. 5. The AKV was transferred in 1934 to Leningrad, and in 1935 became the N.K. Krupskaja Communist Pedagogical Institute, which in 1941 merged with the A.I. Gertsen Leningrad Pedagogical Institute.

243. Archiv. Mosk. oblast.—F. 927—Op. 1—L. 188—L. 14.

244. Archiv. Mosk. oblast.—F. 937—Op. 3—L. 49—L. 7.

245. T.A. Vlasova, from a speech to the session of the Scientific Council of the Scientific Research Institute for the Study of Handicaps of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the RSFSR dedicated to the 70th anniversary of L.S. Vygotsky. Archives of the NIID, 27 December 1966. P. 3.

246. TsGA RSFSR—F. 948—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 11—P. 84.
247. Information on the preceding scientific and teaching activity of L.S. Vygotsky. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives. P. 1.
248. Archiv. Mosk. oblast.—F. 948—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 421—L. 4.
249. Vygotsky's scientific and teaching biography, 1932. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
250. Information sheet on the confirmation in the post of Head of the Department of Genetic Psychology of the State Institute for the Training of Cadres NK3 of the Ukraine of 26 November 1931. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
251. Scientific and pedagogical biography of L.S. Vygotsky, 1932. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
252. Archiv. Mosk. oblast.—F. 948—Op. 1—L. 749—P. 78.
253. *Ibid.* P. 15.
254. Archiv. Mosk. oblast.—F. 948—Op. 1—L. 749—P. 78.
255. Archiv. Mosk. oblast.—F. 937—Op. 3—L. 49—L. 2.
256. Archiv. Mosk. oblast.—F. 948—Op. 1—L. 613—P. 25.
257. Certificate of Member of the State Scientific Council No. 9001. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
258. TsGA RSFSR—F. 198—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 21—P. 96, Ed. khr. 6—P. 35, Ed. khr. 5—P. 98, Ed. khr. 10—P. 93, et al.
259. VARNITSO—All-Russian Association of Workers in Science, Art, and Technology in the Aid of Socialist Construction.
260. Certification No. 53 of the Deputy of the Frunze Raisovet. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
261. See works by L.S. Vygotsky: [Genetic roots of language and thought]. In [*Natural science and Marxism*], 1929, No. 1 (slightly abridged; it made up the fourth chapter of the book [*Thought and language*]); [The problem of thought and language of the child in Piaget's theory]. Introductory article, J. Piaget, [*The language and thought of the child*]. Moscow-Leningrad, 1932 (second chapter of the book [*Thought and language*]); [Psychology of the adolescent]. In [*The pedagogy of the adolescent*]. Moscow-Leningrad, 1931₁ (tenth chapter of [*The development of thought and concept formation in the adolescent*], which later became the fifth chapter of the book [*Thought and language*]); Preface, Zh. Shiff, [*The development of scientific concepts in the schoolchild*]. Moscow-Leningrad, 1935 (sixth chapter of the book [*Thought and language*]).
262. Scientific archives of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the USSR—F. 5462—Op. 14—Ed. khr. 227—L. 5. Discussion of the book [*Thought and language*] presented for publication. Theses of Vygotsky's report of 2 April 1932.
263. V.N. Kolbanovskii [Foreword]. L.S. Vygotsky, [*Thought and language*]. Moscow: Sotsekgiz, 1934. F. Muzylev & G. Fortunatov [Review of Vygotsky's book *Thought and language*]. *Uchebno-pedagogicheskaja literatura*, 1935, No. 6, pp. 16–20.
264. Arkhiv Instituta Obshchei i Pedagogicheskoi Psikhologii APN SSSR—F. 82—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 16—L. 38–51 et al.
265. L.S. Vygotsky [*Selected psychological studies*]. Moscow: APN RSFSR, 1956.
266. From a letter by A.R. Luria to E. Khanfman of 18 November 1962. The A.R. Luria family archives.
267. J. Piaget, *Comments on Vygotsky's critical remarks concerning "The language and thought of the child" and "Judgment and reasoning in the child" by Jean Piaget*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1962. P. 1.

268. *Idem.* P. 1.
269. *Idem.* Pp. 8–9.
270. *Pensée et langage*. Paris: Editions Sociales, 1985. P. 7.
271. *Idem.* P. 7.
272. *Idem.* P. 19.
273. G. Miller, *Book reviews*.
274. Speech by A.R. Luria. Arkhiv Instituta Obshchei i Pedagogicheskoi Psikhologii APN SSSR—F. 82—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 397—P. 181.
275. L.S. Vygotsky, *Collected works*. Vol. 1, *Problems of general psychology*. New York and London: Plenum Press, 1987.
276. Speech by P.A. Rudik. Arkhiv Instituta Obshchei i Pedagogicheskoi Psikhologii—F. 82—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 16—Pp. 38–51.
277. From a speech by V. Artemov. Arkhiv Instituta Obshchei i Pedagogicheskoi Psikhologii—F. 82—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 16—P. 17.
278. D. Granin, in the story [The conservative], wrote about V.N. Kolbanovskii: "His profession was to struggle for Soviet science against its ideological opponents" (Moscow: *Izvestia*, 1987, p. 207).
279. From a speech by V.N. Kolbanovskii. Arkhiv Instituta Obshchei i Pedagogicheskoi Psikhologii—F. 82—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 16—L. 108 and 127.
280. From a speech by T. Mikhailova. Arkhiv Instituta Obshchei i Pedagogicheskoi Psikhologii—F. 82—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 16—L. 72–73.
281. L.S. Vygotsky, [*Selected psychological studies*]. Moscow: APN RSFSR Publishers, 1956; [*Development of higher mental functions*]. Moscow: APN RSFSR Publishers, 1960.
282. D.B. El'konin, from a speech on 14 November 1966 at a session of the Scientific Council of the Institute of Psychology dedicated to the 70th Anniversary of L.S. Vygotsky. Arkhiv Instituta Obshchei i Pedagogicheskoi Psikhologii—F. 82—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 397—P. 218.
283. D.B. El'konin, [L.S. Vygotsky today]. In [*Scientific works of L.S. Vygotsky and modern psychology*]. Moscow, 1981. P. 183.
284. A.R. Luria, from a speech at a meeting of the Scientific Council of the Institute of Psychology. Archives of the Institute—F. 28—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 397—P. 179.
285. D.B. El'konin, from a speech to a session of the Scientific Council of the Institute of Psychology. Archives of the Institute—F. 82—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 397—P. 223.
286. O.K. Tikhomirov [L.S. Vygotsky and modern psychology]. [*Scientific works of L.S. Vygotsky and modern psychology*]. Moscow, 1981. P. 151.
287. L.S. Vygotsky, [*Problems of the handicapped. Sost., avy. vstup. st. i bibliog. T.N. Nikhanov*]. Moscow: "Prosvetshchenie" Publishers, 1995. 527 pp.
288. A.A. Smirnov, from a speech at a session of the Scientific Council of the Institute of Psychology. Archives of the Institute—F. 82—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 297—P. 178.
289. M.G. Iaroshevskii, [L.S. Vygotsky: The quest for principles for the construction of a general psychology]. *Voprosy Psikhologii*, 1986, No. 6, p. 107.
290. Ivan Ivich, [Portrait of a teacher. L.S. Vygotsky (1896–1934)]. *Perspektivy* (a UNESCO journal, [Responses to problems of education], 1990, No. 3 (published in English, French, Spanish, Arabic, Chinese, and Russian).
291. D.B. El'konin, [Vygotsky today]. In [*Scientific works of L.S. Vygotsky and modern psychology*]. Moscow, 1981. P. 178.
292. L.S. Vygotsky, [Preface]. In [*Questions in the education of blind, deaf and mute, and mentally retarded children*]. Moscow, 1924. P. 4.

Through the Eyes of Others

293. The last of his closest pupils and fellow workers died in these years: L.S. Slavina (1988), R.E. Levina (1989), M.S. Pevzner (1989), N.G. Morozova (1989), and his sister M.S. Vygodskaia (1990).
294. A. Akhmatova, [*Lyrics*]. Moscow: Khudozh. Lit., 1989.
295. E.L. Gelikman, [Recollections of L.S. Vygotsky]. Manuscript. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
296. A.R. Luria, lecture given, on 18 November 1976, at the Psychological Faculty of Moscow State University, to commemorate the 80th Anniversary of L.S. Vygotsky. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
297. Every year, every summer, Lev Semenovich shaved his head (G.V.).
298. S.M. Eisenstein, From a manuscript. TsGALI—Archives of S.M. Eisenstein—F. 1923—Op. 2—Ed. khr. 247.
299. B.V. Zeigarnik, speech to the Scientific Council of the NIID APN SSSR on the 50th Anniversary of L.S. Vygotsky, 5 June 1984.
300. A copy authenticated by Ivan Ivanovich Kosachevskii, a Gomel' notary, in his office on Rumiantstevskaia Street in the Tsyrlin building. The copy is No. 6102 in the registry. The copy was given for presentation to an educational establishment. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
301. From a speech by N.G. Morozova at a meeting dedicated to the 70th anniversary of L.S. Vygotsky, 27 December 1966. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
302. Ibid.
303. Ibid.
304. Later he was introduced to S.M. Eisenstein.
305. From a speech by D. El'konin to the full session of the Scientific Council of the NII OPP on 14 November 1966. Archives of the NII OPP—F. 82—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 397—P. 219.
306. R.E. Levina & N.G. Morozova, [Recollections of L.S. Vygotsky]. *Defektologiya*, 1984, No. 5.
307. T.A. Vlasova, from a speech to a meeting dedicated to the 70th anniversary of L.S. Vygotsky, 27 December 1966. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
308. L.V. Zankov, [Lev Semenovich Vygotsky as a specialist in handicaps]. *Defektologiya*, 1971, No. 6.
309. R.E. Levina & N.G. Morozova, [Recollections of L.S. Vygotsky]. *Defektologiya*, 1984, No. 5.
310. From a recording of a conversation with N.G. Morozova, 11 November 1988. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
311. From a letter by E.O. Vasilenko of 24 May 1972. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
312. From a letter by M.M. Krylova of 21 June 1981. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
313. From a recording of a conversation with N.G. Morozova, 11 November 1988. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
314. Ibid.
315. Letter from L.S. Vygotsky to L.S. Sakharov of 15 November 1926. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
316. From a speech by D.B. El'konin at the full session of the Scientific Council of the NII OPP, 14 November 1966. Archiv NII OPP—F. 82—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 397—Pp. 216–217.
317. From a conversation with N.G. Morozova, 11 November 1988. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
318. Ibid.
319. In this abridged form, which constitutes the subsoil of our life, where waters are accumulated and purified, they are the nutrient medium where many of the deepest decisions have their roots. They are necessary there. It is bad if they are exposed and come to the surface, utilizing every crevasse to emerge into the open (Vygotsky's footnote).
320. Here I stand (German).
321. An interpretive psychology.
322. R.E. Levina & N.G. Morozova, [Recollections of L.S. Vygotsky]. *Defektologiya*, 1984, No. 5.
323. B.V. Zeigarnik.
324. K. Lewin.
325. T.A. Vlasova, from a speech at a meeting dedicated to the 70th anniversary of Vygotsky's birth, 27 December 1955. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
326. Ibid.
327. N.G. Morozova, from a speech given at a meeting dedicated to Vygotsky's 70th anniversary, 27 December 1966. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
328. R.E. Levina & N.G. Morozova, [Recollections of L.S. Vygotsky]. *Defektologiya*, 1984, No. 5.
329. Ibid.
330. Ibid.
331. N.G. Morozova, from a speech given at a meeting dedicated to Vygotsky's 70th anniversary, 27 December 1966. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
332. Ibid.
333. This letter was written on 17 June 1928. G.I. Sakharov met me in 1973 and kindly permitted me to make a copy.
334. From a letter to A.R. Luria, 4 March 1926.
335. From a letter to A.N. Leont'ev of 15 April 1929.
336. From a letter to A.N. Leont'ev of 23 July 1929.
337. From a letter to A.R. Luria on 26 July 1927.
338. From a letter to A.R. Luria on 5 March 1926 (written in the hospital).
339. From a letter to A.R. Luria, 20 June 1931.
340. R.E. Levina & N.G. Morozova, [Recollections of L.S. Vygotsky]. *Defektologiya*, 1984, No. 5.
341. From a speech by A.V. Zaporozhets at the full session of the Scientific Council of the NII OPP of 14 November 1966. Arkhiv. NII OPP—F. 82—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 397—Pp. 200–201.
342. M.S. Shaginian, [Pages from the past]. *Sovremennik*, 1964, No. 6.
343. O. Mandel'shtam also writes about him in his jocular poem dedicated to David:
 "Seven vershki, opaque, bearded,
 Like a flourish in the Jewish alphabet,
 David Vygodskii walked into the state
 publishers."
344. V. Kaverin, [Epilogue]. *Nikogla*, 1989, No. 8.
345. The D.I. Vygodskii family archives.
346. M.S. Shaginian, [Pages from the past]. *Sovremennik*, 1964, No. 6.
347. *The Art of Leningrad*. 1990, No. 2.

348. From a petition to the Special Session of the NKVD from his wife. The D.I. Vygodskii family archives.
349. M.S. Shaginian, [Pages from the past]. *Sovremennik*, 1964, No. 6.
350. L. Ozerov, [The works and days of Nikolai Zavolodskii]. *Ogonek*, 1988, No. 38.
351. From the D.I. Vygodskii family archives.
352. Roy Medvedev, [On Stalin and Stalinism]. *Znamia*, 1989, No. 4.
353. Quoted in M.S. Shaginian, [Pages from the past]. *Sovremennik*, 1964, No. 6.
354. N.A. Zabolotskii, [History of my imprisonment]. *Lautava*, 1988, No. 3; N.A. Zabolotskii, [*Pillars. Verses, poems*]. Lenizdat, 1990. P. 333.
355. *Ibid.* P. 337.
356. Fragments from Vygodskii's letters of 9 March 1941, 28 November 1942, 29 March 1943, and 19 July 1943 written by him from the camp to his wife. The D.I. Vygodskii family archives.
357. *Ibid.*
358. *Ibid.*
359. *Ibid.*
360. *Ibid.*
361. Information was obtained from the archives of the newspaper *Izvestiia*.
362. TsGLAI—F. 1041 (V.V. Veresav)—Op. 2—Ed. khr. 10.
363. *Nash sovremennik* [*Our contemporary*—No. 4—1958.
364. The text purported to "study sensorimotor coordination, the capacity for synthesis of a whole from its parts. The subject was asked to reproduce in succession ten samples of drawings from wooden blocks of various colors. The time was limited for each task. The score depended on both the accuracy and the performance time" (L.F. Burlachuk & S.M. Morozov, [*Glossary of psychological diagnosis*]. Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1989).
365. L.S. Vygot'sky, [Bykhovskii's drawings]. A. Bykhovskii, [*Drawings*]. Moscow: Sovremennaia Rossiia, 1926.
366. This information on V.S. Uzin is taken from his autobiography, given to me by his daughter, R.V. Uzina, and from her own words.
367. S.M. Eisenstein was never at our house; hence, I never saw him with Lev Semenovich. To tell about their relationship, I had to resort to printed sources.
368. From a manuscript of S.M. Eisenstein. TsGALI—F. 1923 (S.M. Eizenshtein)—Op. 2—Ed. khr. 247.
369. *Ibid.*
370. V.V. Ivanov, [*Essays on the history of semiotics in the USSR*]. Moscow: "Nauka" Publishers, 1976.
371. K. Levitin, [*One is not born a personality*]. Moscow: "Progress" Publishers, 1982.
372. *Tristia, Petropolis*. Peterburg, 1921; Berlin, 1922.
373. The name of Vygot'sky's work was cited by N.Ia. Mandel'shtam from memory. He meant [*Thought and language*].
374. N.Ia. Mandel'shtam, *Recollections*. New York: Chekhov Publishers, 1970. P. 241.
375. M. Gor'kii, [*Collected works*]. 1956. Vol. 30, p. 70.
376. L.S. Vygot'sky & A.R. Luria [*Studies in the history of behavior*]. Moscow-Leningrad: GIZ, 1930.
377. N.G. Morozova, from a speech given at a meeting dedicated to the 70th anniversary of Vygot'sky, 27 December 1966. The L.S. Vygot'sky family archives.

378. A.R. Luria, [*Stages on a trodden path: A scientific autobiography*]. Moscow: Moscow State University Publishers, 1982.
379. I am writing this from the words of A.V. Zaporozhets and N.G. Morozova, who told this to me at different times.
380. This is the so-called "Five," which included A.V. Zaporozhets, L.I. Bozhovich, L.S. Slavina, R.E. Levina, and N.G. Morozova.
381. An island (in the Canary group) where the German psychologist Köhler did his experiments on the intelligence of primates.
382. Because of Zaporozhets, one will have to change her entire plan. (comment by L.S. Vygot'sky).
383. The theme of one of the works in your book (Vygot'sky's comment).
384. T.A. Vlasova, R.E. Levina, N.G. Morozova, & M.S. Pevzner, [Lev Semenovich Vygot'sky as a scientist, a teacher, and a person]. Manuscript. The L.S. Vygot'sky family archives.
385. N.G. Morozova, a speech to the Scientific Council of the NIID APN SSSR, 27 December 1966, on Vygot'sky's 70th anniversary. The L.S. Vygot'sky family archives.
386. T.A. Vlasova, a speech to the Scientific Council of the NIID APN SSSR, 27 December 1966, on Vygot'sky's 70th anniversary. The L.S. Vygot'sky family archives.
387. A.R. Luria, Lectures dedicated to Vygot'sky on the occasion of his 80th anniversary. Given at the Faculty of Psychology of Moscow State University, 18 November 1976. The L.S. Vygot'sky family archives.
388. *Ibid.*
389. A letter to L.S. Sakharov of 15 February 1926. The L.S. Vygot'sky family archives.
390. Emphasis by L.S. Vygot'sky.
391. A letter to A.R. Luria of 5 March 1926. The A.R. Luria family archives (my emphasis—G.V.).
392. A letter to A.R. Luria, 26 July 1927. The A.R. Luria family archives.
393. Schizophrenia.
394. A letter to A.R. Luria, 26 June 1932. The A.R. Luria family archives.
395. Vygot'sky's emphasis.
396. A letter to A.R. Luria, 13 May 1932, from Iartsevo. The A.R. Luria family archives.
397. N.G. Morozova, speech to the Scientific Council of the NIID APN SSSR on 27 December 1966 on the occasion of Vygot'sky's 70th anniversary. The L.S. Vygot'sky family archives.
398. T.A. Vlasova, Speech to the Scientific Council of the NIID APN SSSR on 27 December 1966.
399. T.A. Vlasova, R.E. Levina, N.G. Morozova, & M.S. Pevzner, [Lev Semenovich Vygot'sky as a scientist, a teacher, and a person]. Manuscript. The L.S. Vygot'sky family archives.
400. L.D. Zankov [Lev Semenovich Vygot'sky as a specialist in handicaps]. *Defektologiya*, 1971, No. 6.
401. N.G. Morozova. Manuscript. The L.S. Vygot'sky family archives.
402. R.E. Levina & N.G. Morozova, [Recollections of L.S. Vygot'sky]. *Defektologiya*, 1984, No. 5.
403. A.V. Zaporozhets, speech to the full session of the Scientific Council of the NII OPP of 14 November 1966. Archives of the NII OPP—F. 82—Op. 1—Ed. khr. 397—P. 199.

404. R.E. Levina & N.G. Morozova, [Recollections of L.S. Vygotsky]. *Defektologiya*, 1984, No. 5.
405. Ibid
406. N.G. Morozova, speech to the Scientific Council of the NIID APN SSSR on 27 December 1966 on the occasion of Vygotsky's 70th anniversary. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
407. T.A. Vlasova, R.E. Levina, N.G. Morozova, & M.S. Pevzner, [Lev Semenovich Vygotsky as a scientist, a teacher, and a person]. Manuscript. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
408. A.R. Luria, Lecture on L.S. Vygotsky. Given at the Faculty of Psychology of Moscow State University on 18 November 1976. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
409. Quoted from the book by A.A. Leont'ev, [Vygotsky]. Moscow; "Prosveshchenie" Publishers, 1990. P. 111.
410. R.E. Levina & N.G. Morozova, [Recollections of L.S. Vygotsky]. *Defektologiya*, 1984, No. 5.
411. T.A. Vlasova, R.E. Levina, N.G. Morozova, & M.S. Pevzner, [Lev Semenovich Vygotsky as a scientist, a teacher, and a person]. Manuscript. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
412. R.E. Levina & N.G. Morozova, [Recollections of L.S. Vygotsky]. *Defektologiya*, 1984, No. 5.
413. Ibid.
414. N.G. Morozova, manuscript. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.
415. R.E. Levina & N.G. Morozova, [Recollections of L.S. Vygotsky]. *Defektologiya*, 1984, No. 5.
416. T.A. Vlasova, R.E. Levina, N.G. Morozova, & M.S. Pevzner, [Lev Semenovich Vygotsky as a scientist, a teacher, and a person]. Manuscript. The L.S. Vygotsky family archives.

2000 REPRINT ORDER FORM (6" x 9")

Reprints are available for all the articles in this publication. All reprint orders are printed on high quality 60# gloss enamel and are saddle stitched. Allow four weeks for delivery.

No. of Pages	50	100	200	300	400	500	1000
1-2	\$ 70	\$ 73	\$ 80	\$ 89	\$ 95	\$104	\$142
3-4	98	104	117	129	142	154	220
5-8	193	207	236	264	292	320	460
9-12	290	310	351	388	432	470	666
13-16	351	376	426	473	523	572	813
17-20	436	466	526	588	650	710	1016
21-24	514	548	616	688	757	828	1175
25-28	592	635	722	809	896	983	1424
29-32	656	704	800	896	995	1091	1577

Reprint covers available on 67# Blue Vellum cover stock. Price includes typesetting of title, author, and reprint line. 100 covers—\$183.15. Additional 100's—\$21.15.

Reprint Quantity

If you need prices on additional quantities or have any questions concerning reprints, please call The Sheridan Press Reprint Department at 1-800-352-2210. Outside the United States, call (717) 632-3535.

Ordering Information: All orders must be paid in advance by check, money order, Visa or MasterCard. If paying by check or money order, the funds must be drawn on a U.S. Bank and payable in U.S. dollars to The Sheridan Press. Domestic orders will be shipped via UPS—ground service. Foreign orders will be shipped via Printed Matter Books or Air Printed Matter. Please see chart below for freight pricing information. If you prefer a different shipping method, please contact the Reprint Department (717) 632-3535 for the available services.

Mail This Order Form to: The Sheridan Press, Reprint Service
450 Fame Avenue, Hanover, PA 17331
Fax: 717-633-8929

Journal Title: _____
Volume and Issue #: _____
Article title: _____
Author: _____
Page total: _____ Article begins on Page # _____

Bill To: Name: _____
Address: _____
City/State/Zip: _____

Ship To: Name: _____
Company: _____
Address: _____
City/State/Zip: _____
Phone: _____
Signature: _____

Number of reprints ordered _____ \$ _____
Number of covers _____ \$ _____
Postage & Handling _____ \$ _____
TOTAL REPRINT COST \$ _____

Freight: Domestic Orders—UPS Ground \$12.00
Foreign orders—Printed Matter Books \$20.00
Foreign orders—Air Printed Matter
(1) If your order is 8 pages and less or 200 copies and less: \$70.00
(2) If your order is more than 8 pages or more than 200 copies: \$100.00

METHOD OF PAYMENT (CHECK ONE BOX)		CARD NUMBER
<input type="checkbox"/> PAYMENT	<input type="checkbox"/> VISA	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> ENCLOSED	<input type="checkbox"/> MASTERCARD	_____
Check or money order only.		EXP. DATE
Make payable to: The Sheridan Press, Inc.		SIGNATURE _____