

tended the meetings, including both scholars and students from varying disciplines; or, to indicate that discussions and the exchange of ideas continued into the leisure hours of the participants, many of whom had not seen each other for a number of years and were eager to renew old friendships; or, to indicate the great degree of good-fellowship that was everywhere in evidence during those days we spent together.

It only remains to add, that we who were involved in organizing the Symposium felt that the theme was appropriate: to consider the entire development of a civilization, but with an anchor well fixed in a special period. Also, its timing was auspicious, as our Symposium followed — by a little more than a week — the more elaborate three day Symposium on “Greece Since the Second World War: The Twentieth Anniversary of the Truman Doctrine,” that was held at the University of Wisconsin, on April 10th to 12th, 1967, and sponsored by the Institute for Research in the Humanities at that institution.

University of Colorado

BYRON C. P. TSANGADAS

POLITICS AND SCHOLARSHIP IN BULGARIA*

The contemporary relationship between science and politics in Eastern Europe presents an intriguing focus for students of comparative politics and history. On one hand, the undeniable importance of science and scientists to the present Eastern European regimes has led them to efforts to control closely the intellectual community. At the same time, the long-presumed incompatibility between political discipline and scientific creativity seems to have occasioned periods of “thaw” in which the requisiteness of dogma and political activity has been somewhat eased in the hopes of stimulating scientific output and reducing anti-regime sentiment among leading intellectuals.

The contemporary science-politics nexus in Eastern Europe can be understood only in the context of two parallel factors: 1) the pre-Communist relationships between the scientific and political communities in these countries; and 2) the crucial and changing relationship between the Soviet Union and

*A somewhat lengthier version of this article was presented as “The Intellectuals-Politics Nexus in Bulgaria” to the annual meeting of the Southern Conference on Slavic Studies, Nashville, Tennessee, October 22, 1965. The research on which the article is based was supported by the Ford Foundation, through the program of Graduate Training and Research in Comparative Politics, Northwestern University.

her Eastern European Bloc partners since 1945. The present paper explores the current science-politics connection in one Eastern European country, Bulgaria, from these two perspectives. That is, the paper initially inquires about the extent to which science and politics were related in Bulgaria before the take-over. It then explores the degree to which the post-war nexus has been influenced by "cues" from Moscow.

A preliminary caveat needs to be entered. All political systems make some efforts to channel and/or control the creative segments of society. Differences among systems must be stated in terms of degree, not kind. This helps us recognize that political systems slide back and forth along the continuum of control. Thus, it is possible to identify pre-Communist political patterns which have contributed substantially to the present state of politics in Eastern Europe.

Bulgaria presents a useful focus for studying the intellectual-politics link. The general presumption that the Bulgarian regime is the most thoroughly Moscow-dominated in Eastern Europe would suggest that the organization and functioning of its scientific enterprise might follow closely that of its Soviet exemplar.

Our concern here is to trace the evolution of the intellectuals-politics nexus in Bulgaria from the early years of this century to the present. The research focuses on the National Academy of Sciences. As in most Eastern European countries, the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences has been at the apex of the scientific community from its founding in 1911. Further, academies of sciences occupy unique places in the contemporary societies of Eastern Europe. They serve as institutional links between the intellectuals (and or intelligentsia) and the Party and state hierarchies. These academies have been variously categorized as manipulative tools being used as control mechanisms by the Communist Party, and as sanctioned channels through which overt compliance and covert evasion are effected by dissident intellectual groups.

Aside from historical research into the development of the Academy, the data base for this study is biographic information on the 186 individuals who held membership in the Academy between 1937 and mid 1965. An average of about 60 items of information was obtained for the full sample. These data were grouped as indices of five major variables — political commitment, intellectual commitment, intellectual recognition, social system participation, and intra-Academy position. The data were cross-tabulated and analyzed through the use of a series of computer programs.¹

1. This research is reported in considerably greater detail in *Intellectuals and Politics in*

Between 1869, the year of the founding of the predecessor of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (the Bulgarian Literary Society) and 1911, when the present Academy was first organized, there was little coordination of scholarly activities in Bulgaria. The Literary Society did succeed in broadening the scope of its publishing enterprise somewhat, but by present standards the scope of scientific output was marginal.

During 1911-1912, the Bulgarian Literary Society voted to dissolve itself and to re-organize as a national Academy of Sciences, hopefully to serve as a coordinating agency for all intellectual undertakings in the country. The birth of the new Academy was approved by the Bulgarian parliament in July, 1912.

The Academy's relationship with the government was defined in Articles 4-7 of the 1912 Law. BAN was obliged to present lists of its members, as well as reports on the activities of major scientific-research institutes, to the Ministry of Public Education. It was also required to provide the Ministry with copies of all its publications. There is no evidence, however, that any censorship of membership selection or of publications was attempted by the Bulgarian government; certainly until 1940.

Proceeding from the notion that financial dependence may be converted into a channel of influence, the percentage of Academy budgets contributed by the state is a matter of some interest. From 1911 to the late 1920's, the state provided the vast majority of the Academy's operating fund. During the early 1930's the relative importance of state support for BAN decreased, until it reached a low of about 30 percent of the 1935 budget. From this point, however, despite the considerable increase in the Academy's expenditures, the government's contribution rose to become more than half of the 1942 and 1943 budgets. Not until 1940, however, is there evidence of political concern with the membership composition or activities of the Academy.

Beyond this financial relationship with the Bulgarian government, the nature of the Academy clearly was influenced by the educational and cultural backgrounds of the individuals who held Academy membership. During the 1920's and 1930's, the membership of BAN became increasingly composed of persons who had pursued most or all of their academic study in the West,

Eastern Europe: The Bulgarian Academy of Sciences As A Case Study (Ph. D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1965). For encouragement and support in this research, I wish to thank Arthur M. Hanhardt, Jr. (University of Oregon), R. Barry Farrell (Northwestern University), George I. Blanksten (Northwestern University), Richard V. Burks (Wayne State University), Kaloyan D. Kaloyanoff, and the staffs of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (Munich) and the Seminar for Baltic and Slavic Philology at the University of Munich.

especially in Germany. About 72 per cent of the 1938/39 membership of the Academy had studied in Germany. The influence of German education seems apparent in the work of Bulgarian social scientists, in particular.

After 1917, only a handful of the members of the Academy spent time in the Soviet Union, and the influence of the then increasingly-stagnant Russian intellectual life on Bulgarian science seems to have been slight.

During the 1920's and 1930's the participation of the Bulgarian intellectual elite in the political life of the country was very considerable. More than half of the 1938/39 members of the Academy had held positions in the state apparatus, most of them at high levels, including important posts in the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Justice, Education, and Public Health. Several members of the Academy had been elected for extended terms to the national parliament. Just before and after the adherence of Bulgaria to the Axis in 1941, the German influence on the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences apparently was substantial. Of the 11 persons known to have been elected to foreign honorary membership in BAN between 1940 and 1943, seven were German scientists. This is particularly noteworthy since few Germans had been previously elected to honorary membership in the Academy.

We might digress here to mention that the very considerable emphasis which has been placed since the communist take-over on the election of foreign members from academies within the Bloc is not as great a departure in the Bulgarian case from previous practice as might have been expected. For example, while Czechoslovakia, Poland and the USSR dominate the groupings of foreign members elected since 1944, it was precisely these same three countries which dominated the foreign membership of the Academy in 1937/38. Czechoslovakia, in particular, represented more than 25 per cent of the foreign membership of BAN, and the USSR and Poland, slightly less than 20 per cent each. As a result, the hypothesis that the membership linkages between the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences and foreign academies have been radically altered in *direction* by the communist accession to power in Bulgaria (and elsewhere in Eastern Europe) does not seem to be supported by the evidence available. The *quantity* of interactions among the Eastern European academies clearly has increased, but the direction, at least in the Bulgarian case, remains much the same.

One of the important indicators of the tie between politics and science in pre-Communist Bulgaria may be mentioned in passing: both the first President of BAN (Ivan Geshov) and its last pre-World War II president (Bogdan Filov) were heads of state while remaining at the top of the Academy hierarchy.

Nearly 40 per cent of the persons who held membership in the Academy between 1937 and 1944 were formally affiliated with political parties before 1934, and continued to assume rather well-defined political positions after these parties were made illegal in Bulgaria. The plurality of these were affiliated with the Conservative (National) Party and remained actively associated with the political right after 1934. The political center also was well-represented, with virtually no BAN members of that time claiming affiliation with groupings of the political left.

After the Abolition of political parties, the Academy members who had held party affiliations apparently could assume one of three political postures. They could join no groups with explicit political aims, and refuse to side with any particular political point of view; i. e., they could be neutrally passive. Second, they might remain outside political groupings, but verbally take sides on political questions, usually concerning Bulgaria's relationships with the Soviet Union and Germany; for convenience, we might label these persons "neutral left" or "neutral right," depending on the substance of their views. Finally, they might overtly associate themselves with politically-active groups having a specific set of policy preferences; i. e., they could be activists, either Right or Left.

Of the 76 men who were members of the Bulgarian Academy between 1937 and 1944, 33 are known to have been party members before 1934. Of these 33, 14 had been Conservatives, 13 were affiliated with parties of the Center, and six, with Leftist parties.

After 1934, 10 of these 33 became neutrally passive. Almost all of these 10 had been members of Center parties. Of the remaining 23, 16 were associated with the political Right, 10 in active roles. Of the seven Leftists, five continued in active roles. Thus, the Right gained some strength after 1934 among these politically-active intellectuals, a finding which is not surprising given the apparently increasing influence during the late 1930's of pro-German elements in Bulgarian science and politics.

In short, science and politics have never been fully separable in twentieth-century Bulgaria. Not only did pre-War members of the national Academy occupy many positions of importance in the government and political party hierarchies; it also appears that the leaders of the intellectual community were those Academicians who participated most vigorously in political affairs. And there seems little doubt that the vagaries of politics, both domestic and international, exerted some influence on the functioning of the Academy itself.

The 1947 decree "reconstructing" the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences specified that the Academy was to "become a state establishment;"² more specifically, an administrative organ directly under the control of the Ministry of Education and Culture. The Academy was to "carry out planned scientific and research work," with the planning to be done in the Party and state hierarchies. It was to aid in making "first efforts toward reconstruction of science on dialectical materialistic foundations," and to link scientific work with the state economic plans.

The official publications of the Bulgarian Academy since 1945 have energetically applauded the accomplishments of Soviet science, and of the Soviet Academy in particular, and have offered continuing self-exhortation to emulate the Soviet Academy, both in terms of *activities* and *organizational structure*. The structure of BAN had, indeed, paralleled that of the Soviet Academy, with sometimes distressing regularity. The problems encountered in integrating the Academy into the Bulgarian Party's plans interestingly parallel the difficulties experienced by the Soviets at an earlier time. But the internal operating dynamics of the two institutions have not always been similar.

Just as the Soviet Academy "strayed back to pure science" shortly after Lenin's death, the Bulgarian Academy lost sight of its socialist responsibilities as early as 1949. In response, the regime promulgated a new law on BAN in late 1949,³ providing that the Academy should "cease to be an administrative establishment under the supervision of a ministry." Instead it was to be made "the highest scientific establishment, of state and national importance, responsible directly to the Council of Ministers." At that time BAN was reorganized to bring its structure into closer congruence with that of its Soviet exemplar.

The 1949 law on the Bulgarian Academy seems to correspond quite directly with the 1935 statute on the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

Thus, the administrative importance of the Bulgarian Academy was substantially increased. At the same time, it was prodded to connect its activities more closely with the five-year plans for the development of the economy. Further — and most significantly — the scientific secretariat of the Academy was considerably strengthened, ostensibly on the basis of a need

2. The Law on the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (BAN) of February 19, 1947, is outlined in A. I. Khadzhiolov, "Razvitie na BAN," *BAN Sled 9 Septemvri 1944* (Sofia, 1958).

3. This law, also summarized in Khadzhiolov, *op. cit.*, was promulgated on October 11, 1949.

to better coordinate the administrative council of the Academy with the undertakings of the various departments and research institutes.

The year 1949 also signalled the beginning of an attack against "non-fruitful" scientific activities in Bulgaria. It is significant that this campaign coincided with an attack in the Soviet Union against "useless" scientific projects. One of the features of the Soviet campaign was a rapid strengthening of the technical sciences departments of the Academy, to the point where technical scientists outnumbered all Academy members in the social sciences and humanities combined. The same move was forthcoming in Bulgaria less than three years later.

These notable similarities were extended in 1953. Shortly after Stalin's death, the Soviet Academy began to enjoy considerably greater autonomy. In particular, contacts between Soviet and foreign scientists (including Western scholars) were substantially increased, and there is some evidence that "pure" science could again be spoken of favorably in the halls of that institution.⁴

In early 1953, while the Bulgarian Academy seemed to occupy nominally the pre-eminent position in the organizational hierarchy of science in the country, the Academy was formally responsible for the direct supervision of only a minority of Bulgaria's scientific institutes. In June 1953, the Council of Ministers acted to increase further the responsibility of BAN for coordination of science. The Academy received stronger guarantees of professional autonomy, increased supervisory control over research institutes, and a new "scientific coordination council" responsible for the "general management of the totality of scientific work going on in Bulgaria."

This apparent change in the relationship between the state hierarchy and the principal scientific institution in the country seems to have signalled the beginning of some significant internal changes in the ways in which the Academy operated.

For the moment, however, let us remain with the chronology of the Academy's relationship with the government. In 1962, BAN's pre-eminent position in Bulgarian science, which had entailed a partial compromise with the need for "basic scientific research," was considerably reduced, if not eliminated.

Apparently the Bulgarian Party considered the performance of its tasks

4. For an excellent treatment of the changing role of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, see D. A. Senior, "The Organisation of Scientific Research," *Survey*, 52 (1964), pp. 19-35. Also see Alexander Vucinich, *The Soviet Academy of Sciences* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1956).

by BAN still to be inadequate. It is certain that the regime was not, and continues not to be, happy with the state of science, neither as to its technical achievements nor its ideological "purity." Nor had the centralization of science been effected adequately by 1962. In that year, the Committee for Education and Culture was finally relieved in full of its (largely nominal) responsibility for overseeing the control of scientific activities, as responsibility actually exercised by the Academy. These nominal functions were given—along with impressive formal authority for their execution—to the newly formed State Committee for Science and Technical Progress.⁵ This committee was given considerably broader power than any of its predecessors in the field of science and culture, and seems clearly to have replaced *BAN* as the central administrative organ for Bulgarian scientific-research activity. The subsequent regulation of June 10, 1963, on the State Committee for Science and Technical Progress provides in part that this committee should "plan, coordinate, and finance the activities of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences," as well as all other scientific research operations in the country. It is to "control the fulfillment of the most important tasks in the field of science" and is to "carry out the *general political line* on questions of technical progress for the entire country and economy."⁶ It seems clear that the voice of the Academy has been somewhat hushed and carries a good deal less weight than before.

The regulation on the State Committee for Science and Technical Progress followed by only three months a decree on the specialization of scientific workers,⁷ which also has had a considerable impact on the functioning of the Bulgarian Academy, as well as on the general organization of scientific activity. This decree is essentially an order for a considerable increase in the application of scientific know-how and personnel to practical problems, especially economic difficulties. While in the words of the decree, "the purpose of the specialization is to give scientific workers the possibility to acquaint themselves with the latest achievements in science and technology, the newest methods of scientific research, etc.," the optimum development of specialization, according to the decree, is to be found in such places as "construction offices..., model state farms and cooperative farms, machine tractor stations,

5. For the text of the decree establishing this body, see *Rabotnichesko Delo*, September 28, 1962; or, *Izvestiya*, No. 79, 1962.

6. For the text of the 1963 resolution, see *Durzhaven Vestnik*, No. 48 (June 21, 1963), pp. 1-3. The first explicit statement of the political role of this Committee came on May 9, 1963, in a speech by Party First Secretary Todor Zhivkov to the National Assembly. This speech was reported in *Rabotnichesko Delo*, May 22, 1963.

7. See *Durzhaven Vestnik*, No. 23 (March 22, 1963), pp. 1-2.

experimental farms, in the Party organs, ...in local People's Councils and Boards," etc.

These regulations explicitly and implicitly increase the responsibility of the DKNTP and the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences for the maintenance of ideological vigilance within scientific fields. In this regard, the Bulgarian development appears to differ somewhat from its Soviet patternmaker.

State control of scientific research in Bulgaria was further extended by Ministerial Council No. 18 of May 18, 1964, dealing with the operation of research establishments.⁸ This detailed act, which advances an intoxicating combination of profit-motive incentive and more extensive government regulation, essentially is based on two provisions: 1) the "voluntary" subscription of scientific research institutes to "economic accounting" agreements with the State Committee for Science and Technical Progress, the State Planning Committee, and the Ministry of Finance; and 2) closer ties between scientific institutions and the industrial sector of the economy effected through individual agreements for specified tasks to be performed by the scientific establishments.

Any discussion of the organization of scientific research in Bulgaria would be incomplete without reference to the Communist Party organization within the Academy of Sciences. This group, one of the principal ideological watchdogs within the national scientific community, is responsible for the organization and conduct of a constant series of conferences, discussions, and exhibitions centering around both the achievements and problems of scientific — and political — activities of members of the Academy. The Party organization, which is divided into three groups without the rights of primary Party organizations,⁹ and 29 smaller task groups, apparently spends a good deal of its time promoting two kinds of discussions: 1) problems in meeting the annual plan for the execution of scientific tasks by the Academy, and 2) problems associated with the "political self-education" of the younger members of the Academy. To this latter end, the Party organization has set up a series of work groups on the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the history of the Bulgarian Communist Party, and the foundations of dialectical and historical materialism.

Generally, the position of the Bulgarian Academy in the scientific hierar-

8. See *Durzhaven Vestnik*, No. 42 (May 29, 1964), pp. 2-3.

9. This general structure of the BAN Party organization was established in 1953. There is no available evidence to suggest that it has been changed since that date. See "Partinata Organizatsiya pri BAN v Pomosht na Nauchnita Rabotnitsi," *Vecherni Novini*, May 20, 1953.

chy of the country has been down-graded since 1960. The limited but still recognizable latitude exercised by the Academy in the planning and execution of scientific activity during the middle 1950's has been substantially narrowed.

The rough correspondance of the Bulgarian developments described here with the Soviet case is intriguing, though certainly not unexpected. It should be emphasized that the parallel changes in the roles of the two national academies in the administration of scientific activity do *not* necessarily imply equally close congruence in the internal functioning of these institutions. In fact, there is substantial evidence to suggest that the internal dynamics of the two varied significantly during the "thaw" of the middle 1950's. Analysis of comprehensive biographical data on the membership of the Bulgarian and Soviet Academies¹⁰ indicates these differences: 1) The degree of vertical mobility within the Bulgarian Academy hierarchy appears to have been much greater than in the Soviet Academy between 1956 and 1960. Further, this mobility was relatively divorced from political criteria during that period of time. 2) Bulgarian academicians who were allowed to travel to non-Bloc countries during this period were, contrary to expectations, precisely those scholars with no formal ties to the Party and/or state hierarchies. Ideological loyalty was not a controlling criterion in determining the identity of those Academy members permitted to sustain ties with Western scientific communities. This was not the case during the same years with the membership of the Soviet *Akademii Nauk*. 3) Those persons holding positions on the Bulgarian Academy Presidium between 1956 and 1960 had significantly fewer formal commitments to the Party and/or state apparatus than did their colleagues who were not Academy Presidium members. The opposite was true in the Soviet case.

The substantial influx of new members into the Bulgarian Academy between 1958 and 1961 appears to have brought about reversal of all three of these somewhat unexpected findings. Mobility within the Academy hierarchy has taken on distinctly political overtones once again, fewer non-Communist scholars are traveling outside the Bloc, and the Academy presidium has been "revitalized" with new Communist blood. The internal functioning of the *Bulgarskata Akademiya na Naukite*, like its role in the administration

10. This segment of the project is outlined in Arthur M. Hanhardt, Jr., and William A. Welsh, "The Intellectuals-Politics Nexus: Studies Using a Biographical Technique," *American Behavioral Scientist*, VII, 7 (May, 1964), pp. 3-7.

and execution of scientific activity in the country, appears to be headed again for close congruence with that of the Soviet Academy.

The distinct recent trend toward Communist domination of the BAN presidium is particularly noteworthy. Between 1945 and 1955 the membership of the Academy presidium was rather stable, with only seven individuals gaining and four losing positions during the 11-year period. A majority of the 1945-1955 presidium members are known *not* to have been formally affiliated with the Communist Party. Since 1955, however, 23 new faces have appeared at some time on the BAN presidium, while 13 have departed. More than half of the current 20-man body are Party members. And quite aside from numerical dominance, the intra-academy policies pursued by the current leadership, especially regarding promotions and the allocation of research responsibilities and funds, clearly convey the increasing use of political criteria.

Party domination of the Presidium has been reflected in the election of new corresponding and regular members of the Academy as a whole. Between 1956 and 1965, 40 persons were elected to corresponding membership in BAN, while 22 were elected or promoted to full membership. About half of the recently-elected members are known to be Party affiliates, raising the proportion of communists in the total BAN membership to approximately 40 per cent.

At the same time, we should be careful to distinguish different levels of political involvement. To say that an increasing percentage of BAN members is affiliated with the Communist Party in *not* necessarily to assert that the aggregate level of political involvement of the Academy membership has increased. Formal affiliation with the Party is an overt, but not necessarily intense, political commitment. It is likely, for example, that we can consider authors of pro-regime ideological articles to have a deeper level of political involvement. And those academicians who expend substantial time and energy working up to important positions in the party hierarchy may be viewed as still more intensely committed to the existing order.

Thus, it is significant that, while increasing intellectual and political recognition is forthcoming to intellectuals who affiliate with the Party, deeper demonstrations of ideological fidelity do not insure commensurate commendation. Academicians who author ideological overtures to the regime appear to receive no preference in the allocation of state prizes or scientific research grants. Academy members who also hold official positions in the Party hierarchy are no more likely to be so rewarded than are their colleagues whose association with the Party does not go beyond formal affiliation.

Thus, it may be that the political commitment necessary to elicit positive

responses from the regime's scientific directorate is simply formal affiliation with the Party. If so, it would appear that the political function to be served by intellectual elites increasingly is becoming symbolic, as opposed to active, in Bulgaria.

University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

WILLIAM A. WELSH

ÖSTERREICHISCHE WOCHE

Einer der wichtigsten Zwecke des "Institute for Balkan Studies" ist es, die geistigen Bande zwischen ausländischen Wissenschaftlern und Griechenland enger zu knüpfen.

Um diesen Zweck zu erfüllen, war das Institut schon oft in der glücklichen Lage, Wissenschaftler, die auf Gebieten arbeiten, die in den Interessenbereich des Instituts gehören, für längere oder kürzere Zeit zu beherbergen und ihnen so die Gelegenheit zu geben, sei es als Forscher tätig zu werden, sei es Land und Leute, Sitten und Gebräuche, aber auch die Archive und die Denkmäler des Landes, besonders von Nordgriechenland, kennen zu lernen, oder sei es schliesslich mit Vorträgen vor die Öffentlichkeit zu treten.

In diesem Rahmen wurde auch die "Österreichische Woche" vom 14. bis 19. März 1967 organisiert.

Eingeladen waren fünf hervorragende Wissenschaftler, die Professoren der Universität Wien, H. Hunger, Byzantinistik, O. Demus, Kunstgeschichte, J. Hamm, Slavistik, H. Schima, Internationales Recht, und W. Weber, Wirtschaftswissenschaften.

Die Vorträge dieser Wissenschaftler brachten stets neueste Erkenntnisse aus den jeweiligen Arbeitsgebieten, d. h. aus Byzanz, aus Thessaloniki und aus den rechtlichen und wirtschaftlichen Problemen der heutigen Balkanstaaten.

Die Vorträge, die im Saal der Bibliothek des Instituts stattfanden, wurden von vielen Professoren und Studenten besucht.

Bei den Ausführungen zu dem Thema "Christentum und Byzantinisches Eherecht" legte Professor H. Hunger den Hauptakzent auf die Veränderung, die das byzantinische Eherecht dadurch erfahren hat, dass die heidnischen Prinzipien durch christliche ersetzt wurden und dadurch eine Verbesserung eintrat, und zwar in den Bereichen der Scheidung, der Digamie, des Ehebruchs, der Nebenfrauen, der Ehehindernisse aus verwandschaftlichen Gründen, der gemischten Ehen und der Verlobung.