

Durkheim in Hungary

Durkheim in Hungary	1
Durkheim the impossible model.....	2
Traumatic Paris experiences.....	3
Jászi and Durkheim's reception after 1905	5
Mauss and Somló – an encounter that did not take place.....	8
New actors – new interpretations	10
Forget Durkheim	13
Durkheim the model sociologist.....	16
Three Durkheims – three roles for sociologists.....	17
Literature	20

As I was writing this article¹, Ákos Szilágyi, literary critic and political essayist published in the Hungarian daily *Népszabadság* a comment on the street disturbances in Budapest in September and October 2006. [231] He described them as anomic quoting the well-known Durkheimian definition: “On ne sait plus ce qui est possible et ce qui ne l’est pas, ce qui est juste et ce qui est injuste, quelles sont les revendications et les espérances légitimes, quelles sont celles qui passent la mesure. Par suite, il n’est rien à quoi on ne prétende.” [46, 280-281] Obviously, Durkheim became a solid point of reference in Hungary – at least among intellectuals having a basic social scientific orientation.

Durkheim's road to recognition was a tortuous and difficult one. The three periods that can be separated in the reception of Durkheim's ideas were at the same time three distinct phases in general history, too.² The last years of the old monarchy till the end of the First World War were in social and economical respects one of the most progressive eras of Hungary. There was a real effervescence in intellectual and literary sphere – in politics it was rather confused. After the revolutions and counter-revolution in 1918-1919 the now independent country was reduced to its present size (approximately one-third of its former extension), the earlier economical and social dynamism was lost, intellectual life became more closed, inward-looking – partly because an important portion of the former intellectual elite left the country. After the Second World War a state socialist regime was established, copied on and controlled by the Soviet Union. The state-centered economical and social development implied a severe control of intellectual life which was not eased until the mid-sixties.

¹ I have to thank József Saád for bibliographical help and for placing at my disposal his manuscript *Two programs of positivistic methodology* dealing with Somló. Dénes Frank's master thesis *Durkheim in Hungary* (2004) made an attempt to describe Durkheim's reception in the Huszadik Század. While he worked through a great deal of material, the superficial character of some of his analyses and the untidiness of his bibliography made his work less useful than expected.

² For general information see [95, 146]

Durkheim the impossible model

Sociology had no definite meaning in the first years of the XX. century in Hungary. The term 'sociology' was applied mostly to the liberal-progressive, secular, rather positivistic and reform-minded current in Hungarian public thought and not to a specialized section of knowledge. However, there were 'sociologists' who had the avowed intention to establish sociology as an established science, too. The question was how these different and in many ways incompatible intentions could be balanced.

The leading revue of the 'progressive' current of opinion was *Huszadik Század* (HSZ; Twentieth Century)³ which published articles on political, economical, legal and philosophical issues as well as on social problems. Among the contributors to HSZ there were university men, free-lance journalists and active politicians. The dominant figure – in the first years behind the scene, later as official editor – was Oszkár Jászi (1875-1957).⁴ HSZ wished to be open to new ideas in science, to prospects of social development, to socialism – to Western thought in general. Closely attached to HSZ was the series Social Science Library (*Társadalomtudományi Könyvtár*) publishing works judged modern and relevant.

The first volume of the revue started with a letter from Herbert Spencer [223] – certainly not the most up-to-date sociologist. The 'epitome' of Spencer's philosophy by Collins was translated by Jászi in 1903. [32] (The translation of the First Principles followed in 1909. [224]) Besides Spencer, the first volume contained an abridged version of the famous essay on the problem of sociology by Simmel [213], published already in French, English, Italian and Russian. [38, 586] Simmel's Philosophy of Money was reviewed in 1902. [81] Gusztáv Leopold – member of Jászi's circle – reviewed the 'recent tendencies in sociology' and mentioned first of all Rudolf Stammler and the Hungarian born Ludwig Stein, then Spencer, Gumpłowicz, de Roberty, the organicists (Lilienfeld, Schäffle, Worms), the Americans Giddings and Ward – despite the broad spectrum of authors discussed he said nothing of Durkheim. [158] The English speaking sociological world was represented by a review of the work of the statistician Arthur Bowley [90], by a detailed report on the teaching of sociology in the United States [232], and by Jászi's enthusiastic review of Lester Ward's *Pure Sociology*. [114] The French literature was more present. Jászi wrote a sympathetic review of the philosopher-embryologist Le Dantec [109], reviewed Worms' *Annales de l'institut international de sociologie* and Durkheim's (sic!) *Année sociologique* [111, 112] The first time Durkheim's name appeared was in a review of the *Rivista italiana di sociologia*. [1] Special attention was given to Tarde (Jászi: „the most important sociologist of France”). [119, 238] Le Bon who was much discussed later was already mentioned in a positive manner. [199] While organicism had several followers in the group of HSZ, the first volume of the revue contained an essay by Bouglé arguing against the organicist (physiological) sociology. [26] Jászi reviewed Bouglé's book on egalitarian ideas, too. [118] Viktor Jászi (Oszkár's brother) reviewed concepts of collective mind and he analyzed Tarde, Worms and Espinas – but not Durkheim. [134]

The cover of the first volumes of HSZ listed many 'contributors', venerable men of knowledge and ideas, among them some scholars from Western Europe, who by their presence on the list supported the aims of the group of HSZ. The list of 'contributors' included the sociologists C. Bouglé, E. Durkheim, G. Simmel, W. Sombart and G. Tarde.⁵ It is far from natural that Durkheim (and Bouglé) appeared on the 'contributor's list': Around the turn of century, Durkheim was not yet particularly well known internationally. [19, 211, 244] He was not the dominant point of reference to the contributors of HSZ, either. In the

³ See the selection of readings and the introduction published in 1973. [164]

⁴ On Jászi see [163]

⁵ The contact to Durkheim (and most probably to Bouglé) was established by Oszkár Jászi. See Jászi's letter to Felix Somló the 8. November 1899. [166, 10] The contact could not be intense: when Jászi arrived in Paris in 1905 he needed a letter of recommendation to Durkheim. See his letter to Felix Somló the 16. February 1905 [166, 71]

eyes of the promoters of HSZ, he was only one of the representatives of French sociology or social science, besides René Worms, Gabriel Tarde and Félix Le Dantec.

Traumatic Paris experiences

The year 1905 certainly was a turning point in Durkheim's Hungarian reception. Oszkár Jászi who already had written several reviews on French publications spent the first half of the year in Paris. His letters to friends (Félix Somló, Ervin Szabó) reflect a certain uneasiness, distress, and feelings of inferiority. Jászi certainly experienced a shock in Paris⁶ as many East European intellectuals before and after him did. They were confronted with the superior intellectual and scientific milieu and with the rich bourgeois society in Paris. The true nature of the shock reveals the peculiarity of Durkheim's reception, too.

Jászi – who was 30 years old at that time – was in a difficult personal situation. A lawyer by education he was government official while he had political as well as scientific ambitions. On leave in Paris he tried to find out his real vocation. First he met Le Dantec whom he described earlier as 'the genial leader of French biology'⁷ The encounter with Le Dantec made him clear that his own knowledge of natural science was defective, that in general Hungarian intellectual life was behind the times and that there was a general lack of positive knowledge.⁸ The meeting with Durkheim ("... resembling a German professor in his appearance and in his books with his ponderous definitions ..." [I23, 329]) came several days later, sometimes between the 2 and 12 March. Jászi was not unprepared for the meeting with Durkheim: he already reviewed the *Année sociologique* and before the meeting read the *Règles*. The meeting itself was 'a dark day' for him. He described the encounter in almost identical words to Ervin Szabó [I65, 75-76] and to Félix Somló [I66, 81-85]. Durkheim (as before him Le Dantec, too) tried to convince him that the introspective speculative psychological theory of his professor Julius Pikler was an antiquated conception⁹, that Spencer's sociology of religion held in high regard by Jászi was *pur enfantillage*. Jászi interpreted Durkheim's standpoint as a kind of collective psychology. He was fascinated by the factual knowledge Durkheim and his collaborators¹⁰ had. "Facts, facts again and again" – did he summarize the lesson of his visit to Durkheim. However, he found his views antipathic, reactionary, even petty-bourgeois and he quoted approvingly Ribot (whom he met in April) that "Durkheim and his circle do metaphysics in the guise of positivity".¹¹ [80]

Jászi's published summary of his visits to Le Dantec and Durkheim [I23] repeated the main points developed in his letters. As far as Durkheim was concerned, Jászi summarized the main theses of the *Règles* [70] which must have impressed him: the definition of social facts,

⁶ See [I87]. My interpretation of Jászi's Paris experiences is different from that of Nagy. See the Dénes Frank's MA thesis (mentioned above), too.

⁷ See his letter to Félix Somló 9. November 1904 [I66, 42]

⁸ See his letters on 1 and 2 March 1905 to Félix Somló [I66, 76] and to Ervin Szabó [I65, 71]. He explained the organicist ideas of his friend Károly Méray-Horváth to Le Dantec who declared that they are ridiculous and refused even to look into Méray's German publications.

⁹ Perhaps under the influence of his Paris experience Jászi launched an attack on introspective psychology in summer 1905, stressed the necessity to study „external, objective facts”. [I21] Pikler reacted angrily [200] and Jászi in his reply mentioned Durkheim's *Suicide* as an example of the possibility to explain phenomena by social factors, not reducing them to individual psychic factors. [I22]

¹⁰ Jászi met Mauss and Hubert on 5 April 1905. See his letter to Félix Somló 2 April 1905. [I66, 86] 'A different, strange world' – he wrote on reading Mauss' and Hubert's essay on magic.

¹¹ See his letter to Félix Somló 11-12 April 1905 [I66, 91]

the necessity to consider social facts as things, the elimination of prenotions etc. However, he ended the review by accusing Durkheim of mass psychology, metaphysics and even of rejecting rational explanations.¹² [123, 332] In an essay published somewhat later he reviewed Mauss' and Hubert's essay on magic [175] where he found a lot of facts besides mysterious explanation: "Magic appears as the mystic offspring of collective soul (the new god) ...". [121, 540]

Jászi's ambivalence in his evaluation of Durkheim was the result of his own uncertainty in theoretical and personal matters. The personal and theoretical aspects cannot be separated and taken together they reflect the uneasiness of Hungarian progressive intellectuals. Jászi's Paris impressions were somewhat biased by his Budapest experiences. 1904 he made some moves to obtain the *Habilitation* which would have opened the way to academic science. However, he realized that his radical views and the subject he preferred (sociology) made a university career improbable. Jászi had political ambitions, too, but the then existing political framework offered few possibilities for the radical, in modern terms socio-liberal and anticlerical politics Jászi envisioned. As he wrote to Ervin Szabó he would not do some little science¹³ prostituted by politics, be it clerical or socialist¹⁴, and he saw no chance for open political work, either. [See his letter 2 March 1905 166, 71] Jászi tried to bridge the gap between science and politics. In his first essays in HSZ he proclaimed the necessity of 'scientific journalism': "... it takes as its starting point the basic laws of social life, it considers and criticizes future developments, plans and procedures of progress from the point of view of those laws, not from the viewpoint of party leader decisions, club intrigues or legal constructions." [133, 58] The whole project of HSZ was contained in this formulation: it wished to be scientific and at the same time it wished to take sides in political and social issues (the range of options was in the first years quite wide, from traditional liberalism to socialism and anarchism; later it became more restricted and comprised only the range from left liberalism to socialism). Jászi was the model example of the East European intellectual who tried to combine roles that were incompatible.¹⁵ The issue was not only Jászi's personal matter. The position he aspired to did not exist in Hungary. In the early XX. century, one precondition of the establishment of professional sociology was a dynamic, expanding and therefore in a minimal way open-minded university system. There was an unprecedented effervescence in intellectual life in Hungary at that time – no effervescence in the universities.

In theoretical matters, Jászi was eclectic: he was enthusiastic about Le Dantec's project which tried to build social science on laws of natural science, he had no objection to the Durkheimian concept of social facts which excluded Le Dantec's naturalism; he rejected the Durkheimian idea of collective representations treating it as a kind of collective psychology, but he attacked Pikler's psychologism with Durkheimian arguments. Certainly, there was a personal element in this but the role of 'public intellectual' which was embraced

¹² While Jászi refused the rationalist introspective psychology of his teacher Pikler he could not accept the opposite stance, either.

¹³ Science (*tudomány*) means in Hungarian and in Jászi's writings both science (natural and social) and humanities. The term's meaning is similar to the German *Wissenschaft* – in fact, it is its translation.

¹⁴ Jászi as well as his friend Szabó despised the unimaginative, petty-minded politics of the social democratic leadership in Hungary. However, Szabó who was active in socialist politics was a little bit offended by his friend's remarks.

¹⁵ 2 April 1905 he wrote to Somló. „Returning home I have to make a final choice between Science and Politics.” [166, 85] Of course, Jászi was unable to make a choice until he was forced to do it. In his American emigration he was deprived of means of political influence and he was uneasy about that.

by Jászi reinforced his theoretical eclecticism. After all, relevance and innovation were more important in public debates than strict consistency.

Jászi's ambivalence toward Durkheim resulted from his situation. The whole Durkheimian phenomenon – sociology as a university subject, the possibility of scientific cooperation, the collaborative accumulation of knowledge¹⁶ – painfully reminded him of his own position. “Our life, my friend, is the caricature of Western European life” – he wrote to Somló on 15 March 1905, in the same letter in which he explained in detail the reasons of his disagreement with Durkheim. [166, 84] Durkheim – and first of all the *Règles*, the study of which he strongly recommended to his friend [see 166, 77] – represented the success of sociology and Jászi dreamed of instituting a social science in Hungary, based on observation of facts and liberated from illusions and delusions.¹⁷ At the same time, Durkheim, his university status and his detachment from politics represented the position he knew he would be on the one hand unable to attain, on the other hand unwilling to take up. Jászi – as he mentioned in letters and even in his essay – had a certain aversion to Durkheim and to his school, he disliked them – the intellectual outlook, never the person.¹⁸ [e.g. 123, 332, 165, 76, e.g. 166, 77, 82-83] He was ambivalent about Durkheimian sociology: while he recognized its achievements in methodology and research, he had serious reservations as far as its general attitude to public life was concerned. Durkheim did not do the ‘scientific journalism’ Jászi was proposing and doing.

Jászi and Durkheim's reception after 1905

Durkheim's reception in the HSZ after 1905 should be considered within the framework of the general orientation to Western social thought of the revue. In general, more and more sociologists were reviewed, many aspects of sociology institutionalizing on both sides of the Atlantic became visible. The Social Science Library, too, produced new titles.

From the German speaking sociological world, Simmel was one of the most reviewed: his *Probleme der Geschichtsphilosophie* [82] and *Soziologie* [239], his Goethe-book [210] was discussed. A new approach to him was initiated toward the end of the war by the young Karl Mannheim. [170, 171] Other reviews deal with Martin Buber's famous *Gesellschaft* series [136], with Michels' political sociology. [106] Michels himself gave a lecture in the Social Science Society (*Társadalomtudományi Társaság*), associated with HSZ. [177] The Heidelberg Privatdozent Emil Lederer published two texts in HSZ (two lectures in the Social Science Society). [156, 157] While an anonymous reviewer in 1912 mentioned “the sociology represented by Max Weber, Simmel, Tönnies and Sombart” [147, 835], Max Weber himself was absent from the panorama of sociology offered to the readers of HSZ – his brother, Alfred as author of the *Standort*-theory not. [14, 242] One of the most important initiatives of early German empirical research on the selection and accommodation of industrial workers (launched by Alfred Weber with important contributions from Max Weber) was reviewed. [227, the volume reviewed did not contain texts from Max Weber] Sombart received some attention. His European best-seller *Sozialismus und soziale Bewegung* was translated in the Social Science Library series [215], and he was – sometimes critically, sometimes approvingly – reviewed. [35, 235] However, it was the amateur social scientist and liberal socialist Franz Oppenheimer who was most

¹⁶ In his letters to Somló Jászi returned again and again to the cooperative character of the sociological work done in the Durkheimian group [166, 76, 91, 96] – a character that was stressed repeatedly by Durkheim himself, too.

¹⁷ See his somewhat belated program of an empirical sociology in [132]

¹⁸ Durkheim according to the contemporaries was a kind person but he was very sure not so much of himself but of his convictions. Paul Lapie wrote to Bouglé on 7 May 1897 of his meeting with Durkheim: „Je n'ai que mollement protesté devant un certain nombre d'affirmations qui me paraissent contestables; mais je n'ai pas la compétence voulue pour discuter avec un Monsieur aussi documenté et aussi sûr de ses affirmations *actuelles*. A part cela, il est charmant ...” [30, 39] Jászi was perhaps in the same situation – or with his moderate knowledge of French, in a much more difficult situation.

visible with reviews of his works [89, 243], with translations [192, 193, 189, 194], with a lecture in the Social Science Society [190] and even with a critical rejoinder. [191] The Netherland sociographer Steinmetz published a paper in HSZ which was later many times cited as legitimating a special approach to social phenomena. [225]

In Austria the HSZ group had lively connections with left-wing and socialist intellectuals. [See 162] In sociology Ratzehofer [203, 204] and Gumpłowicz were rather well known. [94, 151] The leader of the *Wiener Soziologische Gesellschaft* (and one of the initiators of the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie*) Rudolf Goldscheid gave a lecture in the Social Science Society which was published in HSZ. [93]

The American sociological world became more visible, too. A chapter of Albion W. Small's *General Sociology* was translated and published [214] as well as an essay by W.I. Thomas. [234] Thomas himself visited Hungary, established contacts with members of the HSZ group [98] and one of them published an empirical investigation, partly inspired by Thomas. [31] Other American authors reviewed were Small (rather critically) [105], Ward ('the most respected and most original American sociologist') [37, 152, 220], Sumner's *Folkways* [226], Ross. [107] Sociological handbooks (by Dealey-Ward, Blackman and Giddings) [115] and conferences [104] were registered, too. Wards *Psychic Factors of Civilization* and Giddings' *Principles of Sociology* were translated in the Social Science Library series. [91, 245] The most famous product of the 'survey movement', the *Pittsburgh Survey* came to the attention of the authors of HSZ, too. [7]

The English speaking anthropology was represented by Westermarck whose *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* was both reviewed [96] and a section of it translated. [246] Frazer, too appeared as the subject of a review [181] and his Liverpool inaugural address was translated. [88]

Among the French social scientists, the organicist Le Dantec remained popular as he was earlier [16, 167] The publications of Worms' *Institut International de Sociologie* were reviewed [117, 228] as well as Worms himself (rather critically). [2] Fouillée was remembered as the doyen of the French sociology. [4] Le Bon was one of the most visible French social scientist (if he can be counted as such) – represented by translations [154, 155] and essays, reviews. [17, 240, 241] Jászi did not hide his aversion to Le Bon's conservative politics and to the commonplace character of his assertions, but counted him among "the most original spirits of our age". [108, 128] In general: as editor he did not close the pages of HSZ to reviews of concurrents of the Durkheimian group (e.g. Vacher de Lapouge [36] or Van Gennep [179]).

Jászi's small booklet on the sociology reflected HSZ's general orientation: the bibliography contained works by Bouglé, Comte, Durkheim, Espinas, Ferri, Frazer, Giddings, Gumpłowicz, Kautsky, Kidd, Le Bon, Lévy-Bruhl, Marx, Morgan, Ratzehofer, Roberty, Ross, Schmoller, Small, Sombart, Tarde, Veblen, Ward, Westermarck. [126, 70-71]

HSZ did not accord a privileged place to Durkheim or to the Durkheim school after 1905 and it cannot be said that the editors of HSZ were very attentive to the literary production of Durkheim and his school.. On the contrary, the contemporary reader would have had the impression that Oppenheimer, Ward or even Le Bon were equally or even more important. There was one factor that separated Durkheim and the Durkheimians from people like Oppenheimer, Le Bon or even Sombart (but not from the Americans): Durkheim was professional academic sociologist. The contributors to HSZ knew that and from time to time reminded the readers of it.

Besides some notes on matters related to him¹⁹ Durkheim appeared in a politically delicate context, too. The electoral reform the government proposed to avoid universal suffrage would have given plural votes to those having higher education. The editors of HSZ asked famous intellectuals and university men (e.g. Fouillée, Kautsky, Tönnies, Loria, Masaryk, Oppenheimer, Gumpłowicz, Michels, Jaffé, Bouglé, Ross) to give their opinion on the planned electoral law. Durkheim in his short reply, his first text appearing in Hungarian,

¹⁹ In 1908 a short notice referred to the *enquête* of *Les documents du progrès* in which Durkheim take part [3], next year the review of the volume *De la méthode dans les sciences* gave detailed attention to Durkheim's contribution. [197] Later the HSZ published Parodi's lecture on the problem of religion where he referred approvingly to the *Formes*. [198]

emphasized the unavoidability of universal suffrage and underlined the necessity of organization. [169, 682-683, 149, 253-254]²⁰

A second and at that time more scientific translation followed. In 1909 HSZ published Durkheim's text on the 'critical examination of the classical systems on the origins of religious thought'. [49] It is as yet unknown whose idea it was to translate and publish it as well as who the translator was. The text in question was published in the *Revue philosophique*. [48] and later incorporated as chapters II. and III. in Book I. in the *Formes* [53, 67-122]

Jászi, in his voluminous literary activity kept referring to Durkheim and to his collaborators. However, he did not give a privileged position to him. Jászi reviewed Lévy-Bruhl's *La morale et la science des mœurs* [159] (which was considered by contemporaries as a Durkheimian treatise) and praised the author for not being as scholastic and metaphysical as Durkheim was. [113] He reproached Bouglé for being against the natural scientific approach [120] – one has to remember of his enthusiasm for Le Dantec. Both in the essay on the future of democracy and in a review on the sociology of revolutions he mentioned casually Durkheim [110, 124] – the main argument was based on other authors. Jászi – who at that time in his characteristic eclectic manner considered himself as a representative of historical materialism [see 127] – reviewed Mauss's and Beuchat's essay on social morphology [174] as an empirical confirmation of historical materialism [125] – an evaluation that would have been contradicted both by the authors themselves and by faithful Marxists, too. Jászi reviewed Bouglé's book on the caste society [28] where he blamed Bouglé for the timid eclecticism characteristic of the whole Durkheim school (sic!), an eclecticism which manifests itself in the reluctance to establish social laws. [116] Jászi's *magnum opus*, the book on the nationality problem referred to the Durkheimian distinction between mechanical and organic solidarity – the latter achieving its highest development in the national states [129, 26] – but on the whole it was rather Un-Durkheimian.

Jászi's evaluation of Durkheim was contradictory. In his booklet on sociology he quoted extensively and approvingly the *Règles*, especially Durkheim's well-known discussion of the faults of the 'ideological analysis'. [70, 108 ff]²¹ However, in his 1912 essay on social progress [131] he criticized Durkheim for not providing the general ideas which would orient action. Jászi distinguished between evolution and progress. While evolution was according to him an external, objective process, independent of individual goals and value statements, social progress "is a subjective, normative, teleological concept, it means advancement, accelerating motion, upgrading toward a state or states accepted as desirable, agreeable, materially or morally useful goals of human cooperation." [131, 505] No wonder that he did not find in Durkheim arguments for this conception – on the contrary, Durkheim's arguments were according to him the most consequential ones of the anti-progress standpoint. [131, 509] Jászi believed that the relativistic argument in the *Division* which asserted that the growth of the division of labor cannot be attributed to the search of happiness was not valid. The two central points of the Durkheimian argument as he understood them were that the anticipation of future happiness (which is too far away to be perceived by the actors) cannot be the cause of present increases in the division of labor and that the human capacity of

²⁰ See the Appendix.

²¹ He differentiated between scientific knowledge and the practical knowledge of agitators and he argued forcefully that sociology should remain an activity dedicated to the finding of social facts and laws. [126, 62-63] He closed his arguments in a Durkheimian manner by praising the virtues of the scientific empirical approach and rejected the search of general ideas. [126, 64]

pleasure is limited while the development of the division of labor is unlimited. [66, 211, 214-215, 131, 510-511] Jászi did not accept them because he believed that human happiness increased in small steps parallel to the development of the division of labor. Accordingly, the search of happiness was a real factor in human development. Jászi quoted the Durkheimian argument that the rate of suicide increased with the development of the division of labor (and therefore the latter did not produce happiness) and objected to it that suicide can be a sign in the growth of human dignity. [66, 229-231, 131, 514, 518-521] Jászi's statements implied that human progress can be objectively, quasi scientifically measured and that there are really different degrees of increasing happiness. Jászi accepted the implication that human nature is basically the same everywhere and contrasted it with Durkheim's belief that happiness is relative to the nature of the being in question (and therefore the savage can be as happy as the civilized while the material conditions were quite different). [66, 224, 131, 517] Jászi asserted that social science should produce valid results which at the same time would establish the valuations he was acting on.

The problem was the same he had had confronted in Paris: However, at that time he had already given up all hopes of a university career. Therefore he was less inclined to accept Durkheim's cautious and slightly relativistic approach. In fact, Jászi could have found arguments legitimating social valuations in Chapter III of Durkheim's *Règles*. In his Paris days Jászi read the *Règles* and urged Somló to read it, too. He did not forget the lessons of the *Règles*. In an essay published in the same year he referred to Durkheim having said that social science has to have some practical significance. [130] In fact, Durkheim wrote: "...à quoi bon se travailler pour connaître le réel, si la connaissance que nous en acquérons ne peut nous servir dans la vie?" [70, 141] That was not enough for Jászi's moderate social utilitarianism which was neither really new nor particularly profound. For him it was important to have a secure and universally valid base of political activism. He could not find it in Durkheim.

Mauss and Somló – an encounter that did not take place

The way Bódog (Felix) Somló (1873-1920) – friend of Jászi, contributor to HSZ and university professor in Kolozsvár – approached social science was unique in the HSZ group.²² After publishing some quite original sociological papers and treatises, around 1910 – perhaps adapting himself to what was expected of a professor of law – returned to traditional subjects in philosophy of law. Parallel to that, he severed or suspended his links to HSZ and to Jászi. However, just before the turn to more conventional areas of study, in 1909 he wrote a book on the primitive forms of exchange which was one of the most original pieces of work of the HSZ circle.²³

Somló was certainly influenced by Durkheim and by his 'school'. Jászi in his letters from Paris called his friend's attention to the achievements of the Durkheimians.²⁴ Somló was

²² On Somló see [160, 161, 209, 247, 248]

²³ The book and the booklet which accompanied it were written in German (Somló was bilingual, he spoke with his mother in German) and had a very restricted impact in Hungary. The basic ideas were published in Hungarian in the HSZ [217], the anthropological analyses which supported them, not. Károly (Charles) Polányi wrote in a letter in 1948 that he discovered Somló's book only after reading Mauss whereas he made his doctoral degree in law with Somló. [18]

²⁴ He recommended Somló to read the *Règles* and praised the importance of collective sociological work. [See his letter of 1 March 1905 166, 77-78] "Sociology of religion is the most hard nut to crack but I think that this research would shed more light on social phenomena than any other" – he wrote on 11 April 1905 and made the proposal to work together on this topic. [166, 91] He stressed the importance of objective, comparative research. [Letter of 6 May 1905 166, 95] In 1907 he urged Somló to review the original articles in the last (i.e. the 10th)

perhaps less widely read in Durkheim than his friend but he had a more clear idea of the preconditions of sociological work. The problem was – as he formulated it in a small methodological booklet that “man in der Soziologie so häufig geistreich wird, wo man bloss fleissig sein sollte.“ [219, 10] Somló saw that being hard-working depended on objective conditions. Therefore he proposed not so much a moral reform as a deep-going re-organization of sociological research. He made several – sometimes naïve – suggestions how to establish the cadres for a comprehensive descriptive sociology that would be the result of collective work. While he had some knowledge of the working methods of the *Année*²⁵, he based his suggestion of collective and descriptive sociology on other attempts like Spencer’s *Descriptive Sociology*, on Steinmetz’s proposals, on Thurnwald’s questionnaire and on others. [219, 43-48] Somló saw that while the elaboration of an efficient classification of societies could be considered as the precondition of serious sociological work, on the other hand the classification depends on good descriptions of the main institutions. He did not try to solve the riddle. [219] In this context, he discussed [219, 24-36] Durkheim’s proposal of classification of social types [70, 169-181] – perhaps the less interesting part of the *Règles*. Somló stressed that Durkheim’s classification was a variant of Spencer’s. His main criticism was that Durkheim’s classificatory attempt reduced the relevant social characteristics to the nature, number and mode of combination of the constituent parts, had nothing to say about technology, economical state of the society in question and could not answer the question about the identity of the units to be classified. [219, 31-32] Parallel to his proposals to cooperative research and classifications Somló treated a special issue, that of exchange.

Somló spent some time at the Solvay Institute in Brussels which he described as an ideal collective workplace.[216] The result of his visit there was not only his totally forgotten methodological proposal but also his last sociological product, the book on the primitive forms of exchange.²⁶ [218]

At the Solvay Institute Somló experienced what it means having the necessary research tools at his disposal. He used the tools as the majority of social scientists did around the turn of century: he reviewed the available literature for data on his special problem. It was his problem, not his method which was innovative. He looked for examples of exchange of goods in the ‘most primitive’ societies. As many of his contemporaries, he considered the Australians and foremost the Central Australians as the most primitive and the best known. Somló, too was impressed by the richness of materials given in the two volumes by Spencer and Gillen [221, 222] – utilized extensively by Durkheim.

The book formulated ideas which were taken up later by Mauss. Mauss in his essay on the gift cited approvingly Somló {sic}: “il commence à entrer dans la voie où nous allons nous engager nous-même.” [172, 150]²⁷ Somló’s thesis was that the exchange of goods was a universal phenomenon. “Die fundamentale Tatsache, die uns als Ausgangspunkt dienen muss,

volume of the *Année* (“veritable models of the Durkheim school” – in all probability the articles of Huvelin [103] and Hertz [100]) [166, 159] – Somló did not review them.

²⁵ The essay on exchange contained references to four different volume of the *Année*: the 4th (Mauss’s review on Tasmanian ethnology [173]), the 5th (Durkheim’s essay on totemism [58]), the 6th (the classification essay by Durkheim and Mauss [78], Durkheim’s review of a book on Indian sociology [47], Simiand’s review of a book on ‘primitive economy’ [212]) and the 8th (Durkheim’s review on the silent trade [64]).

²⁶ It was not the first excursion Somló’s in anthropology and sociology. He published together with his professor and mentor, Gyula (Julius) Pikler a small booklet on the origins of totemism. [201].

²⁷ It seems that Mauss knew nothing more of Somló. See Berthoud’s paper who rediscovered the Somló-Mauss connection. [18]

ist, dass alle hier untersuchten Stämme einen Güterverkehr kennen und zwar sowohl den Tausch von Stamm zu Stamm, wie auch einen Güterumlauf innerhalb des Stammes. ... Soweit wir die soziale Entwicklung zurückverfolgen können, finden wir auch Güterzirkulation.“ [218, 155] Somló formulated his thesis polemically: on the one hand against Karl Bücher and his idea of the ‘Stufe der individuellen Bedürfnisbefriedigung’, that is a stage where every individual consumed what he had found, captured or produced, on the other hand against Engels’s or Lafargue’s idea of primitive communism. [218, 166 f]

Mauss must have had the impression that Somló was moving in direction which were congenial with those of the Durkheimians because Somló treated instances of exchange in connection with phenomena of social and religious organization, with patterns of kinship. Somló remarked that in the discussion of primitive economy “dürfen wir nicht von der Annahme ausgehen, als ob wir soziale Phänomene vorfinden könnten, welche schön sauber nur Wirtschafts-Erscheinungen und nicht anderes wären. Im Gegenteil, wir müssen annehmen, dass wir die wirtschaftlichen Tatsachen in bedeutendem Masse mit juristischen Vorschriften, moralischen Befehlen, mit religiösen Glaubenselementen und Zeremonien verquickt antreffen werden.“ [218, 45] It was in this sense that Somló described the exchanges in connection with totemistic ceremonies – especially in the Intichiuma ceremony that was considered by Durkheim as the central moment in the ‘elementary’ religion in Australia. [218, 45-59] Reading Somló, Mauss must have thought that he has found an early intuition of his own idea of ‘total facts’. It must have impressed Mauss that Somló, too stressed the importance of the gift as a form of exchange and the obligations connected with it. [218, 156-157] Somló considered primitive gift as something which amalgamated elements of modern gift and modern barter. However, there was an essential difference in Somló’s and Mauss’s treatment of gift: Somló thought that the essential thing was the exchange of goods and the form of exchange was of secondary importance while Mauss stressed the importance of the exchange forms. In fact, it was the form which had prime importance for him. Somló believed in evolution while Mauss attitude in this respect was more complicated.

It could have come to a dialogue of Mauss and Somló – but it did not. Somló must have seen that if he had important insights that was because in Bruxelles he had extraordinary working conditions he would not have again at home in Kolozsvár. I think that was among the reasons that forced him to abandon sociological research and return to more conventional issues.

New actors – new interpretations

Toward the end of the first decade of the century new actors appeared on the scene and that led to an upsurge of literary activity related to Durkheim. At the same time, the virtual monopoly of HSZ in matters related to Durkheim came to an end.

Dénes (Kislégyi or Kisléghy) Nagy (1884-1984) studied 1907-1908 in Paris. He followed Durkheim’s lectures on the ‘physics of morals’ (presumably a variant of the lectures known later under the title *Leçons de sociologie* [56]). Returning home, he faithfully summarized Durkheim in several reviews before the world war.²⁸ His first review of Durkheim dealt with the 9th volume of *Année sociologique*. There he praised the *Année* for his criticism which helped to drive back premature, simplistic generalizations – and then summarized the content of the volume, as he did in his later contributions, too. [180] It was

²⁸ Between the wars he turned toward economics. He wrote again on Durkheim in the sixties and early seventies. See his autobiography [145]

he who wrote an unusually long review (in fact: summary) of the *Formes* soon after its publication. [182] He reviewed Lévy-Bruhl too [178] and even in the war wrote a summary of the last volume of the *Année*²⁹ [183] and published one of the necrologies of Durkheim. [184] Durkheim was for him *the* sociologist as can be seen in his small booklet on sociology. [185]

Durkheim appeared on the pages of the newly founded *Magyar Társadalomtudományi Szemle* (MTSZ, Hungarian Social Science Review), too. The MTSZ was created by politicians, intellectuals and university men who found the stance of Jászi and his friends too radical and not sufficiently national, left the HSZ and the affiliated *Társadalomtudományi Társaság* and created their own society (*Magyar Társadalomtudományi Egyesület*, Hungarian Social Science Association). The review was written by Bódog (Félix) Vályi (translator of Nietzsche, later editor of the short lived *Revue politique internationale* in Lausanne and an expert in Islamic and Turkish affairs) living at that time in Paris.³⁰ Vályi's review (which considered only the *Division* and *Règles*) was in his approach quite different from those in HSZ.³¹ While the reviewers of HSZ saw a positive achievement in Durkheim's efforts to establish an independent, specialized sociology, Vályi reproached Durkheim that he did not see the dangers in being a specialist. Instead, Vályi preferred the rapprochement of science and humanities (the word he used {*bölcsészet*} can be translated as humanities or philosophy, or both). [237, 213-214] Accordingly, he objected to Durkheim's conception of social facts, to the idea that social facts should be considered as things, and he could not understand the necessity of the delimitation of sociology from psychology.³² [237, 217-219] Vályi stressed the organicist origin of the Durkheimian idea of normal and pathological and had serious reservation concerning his treatment of crime. [237, 220-221] While Jászi had serious misgivings about the practical-political significance of Durkheim's ideas, he complied with the project of instituting a separate scientific sociology. Vályi accepted many ideas of Durkheim but rejected the most essential portion of it: his criticism implied that there was no necessity to establish a separate sociological science. At that time this approach was consonant with the more traditional ideas of higher knowledge.³³

It is not known whether it was Vályi's review that turned Antal Balla's (1886-1953) – a moderate liberal economist and journalist, close to MTSZ – attention to Durkheim. He did the first and for exactly fifty years the only full translation of one of Durkheim's books. Balla, who has translated Le Bon's *Psychologie des foules* in 1913, reviewed the *Formes* in MTSZ in 1914. There he stressed that according to Durkheim religion is the natural product of society. The thesis that science emerged of religion does not mean “that science would be in

²⁹ The same volume was reviewed by another member of the HSZ circle, László Dienes, too. [44]

³⁰ The first sentence in the review expressed the author's pleasure that at last there was a specialized journal in social science in Hungary. [236, 211] Jászi's friend, Ervin Szabó wrote an angry note in HSZ saying that it was unfair to pretend being the first in social science and creating the impression that they were the first reviewing Durkheim because other people (the HSZ) did it already in great extent. [188] Vályi in his reply asserted that the first paragraph was inserted by the editors and declared that he would not write any more in the MTSZ [237] – and he did not.

³¹ In the same issue appeared a summary of the *enquete* of *Les documents du progress* reviewed in the HSZ, too. [196]

³² It was in the same vein that György Bartók argued against naturalistic sociology. He objected to it that society was not “a metaphysical entity ... governing with irresistible force the material and spiritual life of individuals” but composed of men “in their intellectual and moral quality”. [13, 434]

³³ Vályi wrote in German, his review was translated by the editors of MTSZ. He must have known the views on social science dominant in German university circles: in 1907 he prepared an inquiry on *Die Zukunft der Soziologie* for the German periodical *Dokumente des Fortschritts*. [see 202, 899-900]

contradiction to religion or that it would be necessarily the negation of religion.” “Because he {Durkheim} has seen the working of spiritual forces in religious and social formations he provides in this work the most powerful arguments against the theory known as historical materialism.” [10, 69] According to Balla Durkheim considered religious experience as different from but equal to the scientific one, aligning himself in this respect with James, “the most important modern guardian of religion”. [10, 68] Certainly this conservative reading of the *Formes* made earlier works of Durkheim (which were vigorously attacked by contemporary French conservatives) acceptable to Balla. Seriously wounded in the war he translated and published the *Règles*. [45]

The reception of the translation was mixed and mirrored the ongoing transformation of intellectual life toward the end of the war. The reviewer of HSZ called attention to the difference between Pikler’s psychological approach (earlier very much respected in the HSZ group) and Durkheim and sharply criticized the translation. [176] A Catholic review emphasized that the book provoked disagreement. [97] Béla Fogarasi, member of the *Sonntag-Kreis* around György (Georg) Lukács underlined that Durkheim’s timid positivism was very one-sided when regarded social research as similar to the natural scientific one. Durkheim’s Millian logic was obsolete “disregarding the standpoint of the modern logic of history and of the cultural sciences.” [87, 355] Fogarasi’s critic was aimed not so much at Durkheim than at the positivist moderate liberal evolutionism of the HSZ group. At that time he and his friends were idealist anti-positivists – only a year later radical communists.

The same was true of Elek Bolgár (1883-1955) the most profound pre-revolution interpreter of Durkheim. Bolgár’s articles on Durkheim³⁴ were written from an idealist, synthesis-yearning point of view. His knowledge of Durkheim was profound, he was equally well versed in the more positivistic works of nineties and in the more philosophical ones of the first decade of the new century. It was only Nagy who had an equal familiarity with Durkheim.

The sociological synthesis Bolgár was looking for was different from the philosophical and scientific ones: it was metaphysical in so far as it assimilated all the explanations and accounts of social life and it was applied and logical in so far as it was empirical. Social science appeared in this perspective as an evaluative approach combining perspectives which were defective if isolated from each other. [22] Bolgár was convinced that the sociological synthesis required the strict separation of sociological explanations from the psychological (restricted) ones. [21] Obviously, Bolgár conceived sociology as something that overcame the limitations of existing fields of knowledge. “The fully developed sociological synthesis will be able even to set the bases of an integrated worldview...” [24, 150] In this way, sociology would have practical significance, too – an inference Bolgár did not speak out in his highly abstract articles.

Bolgár’s views set the base for his evaluation of Durkheim’s contributions. According to him, Durkheim was the man of synthesis – albeit not a fully consequential one. Bolgár summarized Durkheim’s conception of the social determination of cognition citing his essay on the primitive forms of classification [78] and the relevant passages of the *Formes*. [24, 139 ff, 53, 12-28] While he detected some remnants of psychologism in Durkheim, in the end acknowledged that it was a kind of sociologically founded. It was in this sense that Bolgár dealt with the essay on individual and collective representations [24, 141-143, 75] and in the same vein he was well aware of the importance of the definition of social facts in the *Règles*.

³⁴ There were two necrologies in HSZ of Durkheim: one written by Bolgár [25], summarizing one of his articles considered below and one summarizing Halbwach’s articles in the *Revue philosophique*. [135]

[24, 144, 70] Bolgár referred to Durkheim's ambition to establish a synthesis of social sciences. [23, 259]

He considered Durkheim's social epistemology as the first step toward a social metaphysics. [24, 151] As it was mentioned above, Jászi, too accused Durkheim of being a metaphysician. In Jászi's view Durkheim was not empirical enough (e.g. when he spoke of collective representations). Bolgár, on the contrary, believed that Durkheim could not be a fully developed social metaphysician. The reason for that was that he was too positivistic, he was not a really idealist and critical spirit. He saw some prejudice against philosophy in Durkheim. [23, 259] According to him, in Durkheim there were spontaneous metaphysical tendencies which could not become fully matured. Bolgár saw these tendencies in the social epistemology. Unfortunately, Durkheim stopped here and could not develop the logical principles of social philosophy instead of social philosophical bases of the logical principles. [24, 152-153] Durkheim, said Bolgár, neglected the point of view of a unified systematization. The phase of sociology he represented is coming to the end: "... the sociology in the synthetic sense of the word is forced to take a different road. It should be commanded by the philosophy of culture, the general theory of values and the logic of the sciences of spirit {*szellemtudomány*, the Hungarian term for *Geisteswissenschaft*} ..." [23, 273]

Jászi and Bolgár both thought that Durkheim was deficient because he could not give the value directive they were expecting of him. However, they were looking for different things. Jászi was asking for scientific developmental laws which would guide reformist action. Bolgár – echoing the experiences of a new generation disillusioned of material progress and exasperated over the horrors of the war – demanded new cultural values and meaningful ideas. Durkheim, sure, was not the best candidate for the roles expected of him. Durkheim's great achievement was the creation of the discipline of sociology. That was on the one hand too much and on the other hand too little for different representatives of Hungarian intellectual tendencies that looked for spiritual and political guidance.

Forget Durkheim

Hungary in 1920 was a very different country compared with the Hungary in early 1918. It was much smaller and it became one of the independent and impoverished Central European states. After five years of war, revolutions and counter-revolution it was exhausted materially and spiritually. The feeling that Western civilization declined was general in Europe – in Hungary as elsewhere the feeling was compensated by fervent nationalism.³⁵ Resources and willingness were equally missing to introduce sociology in the universities while the importance of social problems and social studies was a lesson even conservative thinkers learned from the events.

A great portion of the intellectual elite disappeared in war or emigrated: Jászi, Lukács, Mannheim, Bolgár left the country, Szabó died in the Spanish fever, Somló committed suicide in 1920. Both HSZ and MTSZ were stopped. True, they had successors: after a painful period of recovery HSZ was restarted in 1926 under the name *Századunk* (SZ, Our Century) and was published until 1939. The revue *Társadalomtudomány* (TT, Social Science), a conservative-liberal continuator of MTSZ was started in 1921 and was published until 1944.³⁶ Both, SZ

³⁵ Right-wing nationalism implied more or less cruel variants of anti-semitism. The majority of those who wrote on Durkheim (Jászi, Somló, Bolgár) were Jewish and they were incriminated for poisoning Hungarian spirit. However, Durkheim's Jewishness which must have been known was never mentioned in print.

³⁶ On the history of TT see [205]

and TT were relatively open to western intellectual developments, albeit in a different way. However, Durkheim was not on the agenda of the day.

The TT reviewed contemporary social science relatively often. The center of interest was shifted to German social science: Max Weber was discovered, Sombart's publications were registered, von Wiese, Spann and Freyer were mentioned relatively often.³⁷ TT (in contrast to the earlier HSZ) showed a very restricted interest in American and French sociology.³⁸

While SZ inherited the political-intellectual interests of HSZ, it did not inherit its engagement for sociology. There were relatively few reviews and articles on international sociology (more on Hungarian social problems). SZ's interest, too was redirected toward the German speaking sociology. Sure, there was a constant American element in SZ: Jászi who was teaching in Oberlin, published regularly in SZ, mostly political essays, less reflections on American sociology. The sociologist most present in SZ was of course Mannheim. [137, 138, 139, 153] Max Weber was discovered [84] and the debates surrounding the sociology of knowledge, too. [101, 208, 233] The only essay referring to Durkheim was an overview of theories of totemism written by the psychoanalyst Alice Bálint. [9]

People who had had invested in Durkheim continued to show interest in him. That was the case with Dénes Nagy as already mentioned³⁹ and with Balla, too. Balla –in his review of the volume edited by Bouglé [76] – found in Durkheim an engaged opponent of the destructive and one-sided individualistic morals. According to Balla Durkheim stressed that "... there must always be certain strict moral rules obligatory to the members of society ..." [11, 250] It was in the same manner that he reviewed the Durkheim volume on socialism edited by Fauconnet [51]: "Substance and strength of {the Durkheimian} definition is that it excludes socialism from the sciences." [12] Durkheim was mentioned sporadically – e.g. in an article on suicide [6] or when his name was found somewhere in a publication reviewed. [168] Bouglé, too, remained in contact with Hungarian social scientists – 1938 he visited the Eötvös College (established on the model of the ENS) and gave a lecture on French social science – reflecting his views developed in his 1935 summary. [27, 29, 42] It is interesting that the relatively well-informed István Bibó Sen., director of the Szeged university library and first editor of TT, in his booklet on 'primitive men' did not know anything of Durkheim (whose *Formes* as it was referred to above was reviewed in Hungary) while he reviewed contributions by Tylor, Lévy-Bruhl, Hubert and Mauss (the essay on magic), Vierkandt, Westermarck and others. [20]

I do not see clearly why István Dékány (1886-1965) writing extensively on sociology and social philosophy neglected Durkheim. Dékány – who was despised by leading figures of the scientific establishment because of his extreme eclecticism – was a long time Privatdozent, one-time editor of TT and from 1942 professor of 'social studies' in Budapest. He read everything and was a prolific writer. Certainly, he was the most informed person in international sociology in Hungary – and was not the man of original ideas. In his Introduction to the psychology of society he mentioned and cited almost everybody in the world who had written something sociological save Max Weber – and Durkheim, who was mentioned only parenthetically. [39, 115] His more voluminous social philosophy cites many

³⁷ On TT see the excellent bibliography of Saád. [206] German authors mentioned in articles and reviews: Sombart 10, Max Weber 9, von Wiese 7, Spann 6, Freyer 4, others 28, all together 64.

³⁸ American authors in social science were mentioned in 7, French ones in 20 articles and reviews (Durkheim 4, Bouglé in 3, Le Bon in 7). Numbers based on Saád's bibliography.

³⁹ He reviewed Mauss's essay on gift, too. [186]

sociologists, too (it seems that Othmar Spann was the most important for him) – Durkheim was absent again. [41] In fact, Dékány did read Durkheim: in an essay dealing with restricted and extensive social formations he mentioned the Durkheimian idea of professional organizations citing the Second Introduction to *Division*. [40] It was not natural or obvious that someone in Hungary in 1930 would know about this piece of Durkheim (nobody alluded to it before the war when Durkheim was more present in intellectual communication). His last sociological publication was an introduction to social science. [43] His knowledge of the international literature reflected the state of the art in the thirties: he knew the most important German sociologists, Weber, Tönnies of course, but Spann, Wiese, Geiger, Vierkandt, too. On the list of Americans were Ross, Bogardus, Ellwood, Hayes, Park and Burgess, MacIver, Sorokin – not bad as a starting point. The Durkheimians were put symbolically in the dustbin. “As we took leave of Spencer, it will be the turn of the Durkheimian school even if it did thorough work through two or three decades.” [43, 383] The position of László Ottlik was very similar to Dékány’s. Ottlik set out to create a normative ‘social study’ centered around the idea of discipline and authority and while he relied on the (possibly misunderstood) German sociologists, he discarded the Durkheimian idea of an objective sociology as self-contradictory. [195, 119]

The most extensive treatment of Durkheim was written by an outsider. István Hajnal (1892-1956) was historian, early initiator of social history in Hungary.⁴⁰ His interests were broader than those of the mainstream historians. He tried to overcome the traditional national point of view. In an essay he tried to explore the possible contributions of sociology to a more open social history of Europe. [99] The central categories of his approach were life and form. He introduced the Hungarian neologism *társadalmasodás*, the equivalent of the Simmelian German term *Vergesellschaftung*. *Vergesellschaftung* means the constant transformation of activity in institutions, stabilized forms of interaction, social formations. While his idea of a constant flow of life which solidifies in structural forms appears as quite Simmelian he did not know Simmel.⁴¹ His main sources were the Weimar sociologists Vierkandt and Freyer. As he declared in the first lines of his essay he would review first of all German sociology. However, Weber, too (whom he certainly knew⁴²) was absent from his treatment of sociological contributions to the theory of history. Freyer, his main source was teaching in Budapest from 1936 to 1942 when Hajnal wrote his essay.

It seems that Hajnal’s knowledge of Durkheim was restricted to the *Règles*. [150, 107] In his short treatment of Durkheim’s contribution he transformed Durkheim’s methodological statements in social philosophical ones. Social facts were according to Hajnal “obstacles resisting to life”, separating themselves from the instinctive stream. [99, 166] He did not give textual evidence for this interpretation – it would have been an impossible task. Hajnal perceived a certain parallelism between Tarde and Durkheim: Tarde described the transformation of life into structure, Durkheim the resistance of structure to life. “Ruthless conceptual separation of life and structure: almost an awful experience ever since then for all sociologists.” [99, 166] He reproached Durkheim for considering structuration mechanically. Durkheim did not perceive the “lively pulsating psyche” opposed to ‘social facts’. [99, 167]

⁴⁰ On Hajnal see [150] and [92]

⁴¹ László Lakatos, personal communication

⁴² Weber was well received by Hungarian historians. See [207, 25-33]

Hajnal read Durkheim through the lenses of Freyer. His reading was more a misinterpretation – it did not influence later reception of Durkheim's ideas.⁴³

Durkheim the model sociologist

In the short-lived democratic transition period between the end of war and the establishment of a Stalinist regime, a chair of sociology was created for Sándor Szalai around whom a group of young people created the first university seminar of sociology. Szalai wrote two introductory texts [229, 230] in which he already gave prominence to the 'classical' figures: Marx, Pareto, Weber, Wiese, Scheler. Mannheim, Oppenheimer were the most cited authors – and Durkheim. In the first book, while he gave more substantial treatment of Marx, Mannheim and Weber, his references to Durkheim were rather incidental. The second one was in this respect more balanced. There Szalai dealt with the Suicide objecting to Durkheim's treatment that he abstracted society from the material and real world. [230, 59] The conclusion of the short presentation of the *Division* stressed that the division of labor is based on the world of production, in the mode of reproduction. [230, 60] Even if the objection is somewhat unclear, it is obvious that it tried to formulate a criticism inspired by Marxism.

However, Szalai's Marxism could not save the chair. Sociology as an independent discipline did not fit in the conception the Party leadership had of science and university. Durkheim had to wait for two more decades to reappear in Hungarian intellectual life. Durkheim could wait – the sort of the Szalai group was more gloomy: Szalai was incarcerated, some of the members emigrated (like János Harsányi), some had to give up scientific ambitions for some time (like László Cseh-Szombathy) or changed to less dangerous fields (like Géza Perjés).

In the sixties, the relative 'thaw' in ideological matters allowed the re-appearance of sociology. With the beginnings of a semi-autonomous sociological discourse Durkheim was re-introduced in Hungary, again. In the sixties Durkheim was already regarded as one of the founding fathers and there could be no sociology in the world which would not have mentioned him. It was obvious that Durkheim should be among the first translated 'Western' sociologists (which does not mean that it was simple and easy to publish 'Western' sociological works). As he had nothing to do with Marxism, he was less suspicious than Mannheim for example (whose works were not translated until the nineties).

Between 1967 and 1980 many basic Durkheimian texts were translated and then there was a pause of two decades. The translation of *Suicide* was published first in 1967 (in the same year as a selection of Weber's works) and re-impressed in 1982 [69] (and in 2000 again in a revised edition [77]), two shorter pieces – the second introduction to the *Règles* [71] and one of his articles in the Buisson lexicon of pedagogy [50] – were published in a reader in 1971. [60, 61] A semi-public selection (with restricted circulation) came out in 1972 [62], including the first chapter of the *Règles*, the introduction to the first volume of *Année* [57], the essay on the development of criminal law [54], the definition of moral facts [73] and the chapter of the *Formes* on the definition of religion. [53, 31-66] The most remarkable feature of this reader was that as a postscript it contained Adorno's extremely hostile comment on Durkheim. [5] A multi-volume reader for use at the universities contained several Durkheimian texts, already published elsewhere (the first chapter of *Règles*, the second introduction to the *Règles*, the first chapter of Book III of *Suicide*). [102] In 1974 a reader

⁴³ The only exception seems to be the sociographer Ferenc Erdei who once mentioned approvingly Durkheim and Hajnal together. [83, 248]

contained three selections of Durkheim's history of education. [72, 9-15, 261-266, 296-303, 86, 19-34, 471-479] The more comprehensive and public selection came out in 1978 [67] containing the integral text of *Règles* (without the second introduction)[63], the essay on factual and value statements [74], and the classification essay co-authored with Mauss. [78] It took over from the earlier semi-public reader the essay on the definition of moral facts and the essay on the definition of religious phenomena. The series of early publication was closed by the translation of his *Éducation et sociologie* (excluding Fauconnet's introduction).⁴⁴ [68]

In the seventies there was already a (very restricted) academic field that required reading materials. In 1968-69 a special course of study was organized at the Social Science Institute of the Party teachers of Marxism and some future sociologists participating. Zsuzsa Ferge spoke there of Durkheim, the *Suicide* was discussed and the problem of social facts was treated as a significant issue.⁴⁵ The first cohort of full-time sociology students started in 1972. They read the *Règles* with Tibor Huszár and the *Suicide* with László Cseh-Szombathy (the latter as an example in sound methodology).⁴⁶ At the Marx University of Economics, László Bertalan spoke extensively on Durkheim.⁴⁷

The modest boom in the edition reflected the classical status of Durkheim. His status was confirmed in general introductions and in teaching materials for students, he was less present in actual research. In the nine volumes of the professional journal *Szociológia* Durkheim was mentioned only five times (disregarding Kislégyi Nagy's two lengthy articles [143, 144] in which he recounted his reading of Durkheim⁴⁸, done half a century earlier): two reviews of recent translations and in the references of three papers (two of them partial translations of foreign articles). Durkheim was less a going concern for the generation of sociologist doing research in the sixties than it was for those sixty years before.

The special way Durkheim was presented in general texts or editorial introductions reflected the different paths social science could follow in the ideological climate of the half-heartedly reformist Kádár era.

Three Durkheims – three roles for sociologists

Kálmán Kulcsár's book [148] was conceived as a theoretical and historical introduction to sociology with the objective to appropriate the achievements of 'bourgeois' sociology. While avowedly Marxist, the book's conception was decisively influenced by 'bourgeois' textbooks, most of all by the voluminous work of Becker and Barnes. [15] According to Kulcsár, the main achievement of French sociology was the macrostructural approach, the thorough study of social facts. The short summaries of the *Division, Suicide* and *Règles* portrayed Durkheim as an empirical scientist. He had practically nothing to say about Durkheim the explorer of 'elementary religious forms'.⁴⁹ According to Kulcsár, the main

⁴⁴ A short piece was already translated in 1948. [52] The two volumes on the HSZ [164] should be mentioned where the introduction already referred to the Durkheimian connection and the selection of readings included Bolgár's necrology of Durkheim. [25]

⁴⁵ Csaba Gombár, personal communication

⁴⁶ László Lakatos, Iván Bajomi, personal communication.

⁴⁷ Ágnes Rényi, personal communication.

⁴⁸ Toward the end of his life, Kislégyi Nagy recounted his knowledge of Durkheim in several papers [140, 141, 142] which were – as his earlier publications, too – scarcely more than excerpts.

⁴⁹ He attributed to Lévy-Bruhl the initiation of studies of primitive peoples! [148, 183]

thrust of Durkheimian sociology was the study of social solidarity, i.e. the study of social (moral) control. By doing this, Durkheim satisfied important social demands, because – says Kulcsár – the social conflicts of monopoly capitalism required powerful efforts to minimize class conflicts. [148, 166, 170] Kulcsár blamed Durkheim for not recognizing that ‘social solidarity’ is nothing but the complex of social relations, full of contradictions and sub- and superordination. The one-sidedness of the Durkheimian approach could be seen in the conception of society as a moral phenomenon. [148, 168] In other words, Durkheim did not see the real basis of the division of labor, the differentiation occurring in the process of production [148, 171] while, by implication, the approach preferred by Kulcsár could do that.⁵⁰

The Kulcsár-Durkheim relationship was the model of the relation of Marxist sociology to ‘bourgeois’ sociology. Kulcsár did not question the scientific quality of the Durkheimian approach. He had two objections: on the one hand, Durkheim saw only part of the reality by not realizing the objective determinants of the division of labor; on the other hand, Durkheim fulfilled a role in the system of monopol capitalism by contributing to the alleviation of social conflicts.⁵¹ All this implied that a Marxist scholar could learn a lot from Durkheim. The only thing he had to do to become aware of the objective social function of ‘bourgeois’ sociology. By completing the Durkheimian sociology, e.g. by adding the Marxist conception of social determination to the analysis of the division of labor he could avoid the pitfalls awaiting ‘bourgeois’ sociology (and awaiting those in Marxist sociology who were not fully aware of the basic lines of demarcation). At the same time the mutual acknowledgment of scientific quality on both sides recreated the conditions of co-operation much needed by the nascent Hungarian sociology. That was exactly what Kulcsár attempted to do – both as a scientific bureaucrat and as a sociologist.

The approach taken by Cseh-Szombathy was rather different. As I have mentioned, he was a member of the Szalai group and read Durkheim in his student days. His Introduction to *Suicide* [34] tried to evaluate its scientific importance by comparing modern methodological and substantial contributions with those of Durkheim. Cseh-Szombathy underlined that the *Suicide* was not only historically important; a modern scholar, too, can learn a lot from Durkheim. According to him Durkheim described the basic processes of sociological analysis in a way which remained valid even to-day. Durkheim appeared as the model methodologist. [34, 6] He took as an example the multivariate analysis which was initiated by Durkheim when he compared the relative frequency of suicide in Catholic and Protestant cantons of Switzerland controlling the ethnic variable. [34, 8-10] Of course, Cseh-Szombathy acknowledged that some of the Durkheimian approaches were defective and sometimes he spent too much energy to repudiate hypotheses which could have been eliminated more economically. However, by considering the main concepts and theses of *Suicide* he demonstrated the lasting relevance of the theoretical side of Durkheim’s contribution. Toward the end of the Introduction he compared Durkheim’s statements and views to modern

⁵⁰ It was in the same vein that the anonymous introduction to the 1972 semi-public reader reproached Durkheim with restricting social phenomena to spiritual factors (sic) and seeking solutions to social crisis in moral education. It emphasized that the basic fact of the history of sociology is the confrontation of bourgeois and Marxist sociology. Durkheim was an extremely coherent and exceptional opponent of revolution and socialism. [79, 6-7]

⁵¹ The fact that Kulcsár several times characterized Durkheim as a politically conservative scientist [148, 166, 179] reflected the then dominant view in the historiography of sociology and cannot be attributed to Kulcsár’s point of view. [See e.g. 33] We have seen that half a century earlier Jászi, too, saw Durkheim as a reactionary, petty bourgeois sociologist. [166, 83]

contributions and demonstrated that while much was modified, some basic insights remained valid, or could be completed and specified.

Cseh-Szombathy's picture of sociology was a cumulative one. In his view, Durkheim was the basis on which a serious sociology could be built. In other words, implicitly he saw the task of Hungarian sociology to acquire the knowledge which was already established elsewhere and to develop it. It is important that he considered Durkheim and the post-Durkheimian suicide research at the same time. It was an exemplary relationship: by acknowledging the accomplishments of the founding figure but not dogmatizing them the sociology as a science would develop and achieve results which complete those of the founding figures. In this picture there was no bourgeois sociologist Durkheim, there was no problem of the relationship between Marxist and bourgeois sociology. There was one social science and Durkheim was one of its most accomplished representatives. Certainly, Cseh-Szombathy adapted a model that was accepted at that time by the majority of sociologists. Durkheim one of the founding fathers – that was the prevalent view in the sixties (the first one being Weber). An important section of the emergent Hungarian sociology shared this vision of the discipline and was not sympathetic to Kulcsár's more officially minded approach.

The essay introducing the 1978 reader written by Zsuzsa Ferge represents the third attitude to the Durkheimian heritage. The introduction reflected changes in the worldwide reception of Durkheim. The French 'retour de ou à Durkheim' [8] transformed the perception of his achievements and defects. There were the important text editions by Jean Duvignaud [55], Jean-Claud Filloux [59] and Victor Karady [65] that enlarged and modified the view the sociological community had of Durkheim. There was the emergence of Bourdieu as one of the leading figure in French sociology who assumed the Durkheimian heritage – and who deeply influenced Ferge's approach. There was the crisis and end of the Parsonsian consensus sociology and the emergent problems with Marxist theory – and Hungarian sociology was no more isolated from these currents and changes.

Ferge agreed with Kulcsár that Durkheim was a bourgeois sociologist who did not see the determinative power of class relationships. However, her argument was not based on the Marxist vulgate but on Bourdieu's conception of symbolic power – and this latter approach had already integrated Durkheim's insights. [85, 11] Before pronouncing the standard Marxist sentence of Durkheim, Ferge had already established a different portrait of him. She situated Durkheim by mentioning his reception in HSZ – i.e. in the progressive Hungarian tradition as it was already received at that time. [85, 5] She proceeded by enumerating Durkheim's works reflecting his reformist leanings: his texts on socialism, his well-known argument on the injustice inherent in property differentials, his connections with Jaurès, his opposition to conservatism and dilettantism. According to her Durkheim opposed the view which saw 'objective' economic laws and just exchange in the self-regulating capitalist market. [85, 6-9] In other words, the non-Marxist Durkheim appeared as a progressive, reformist intellectual (which he was) whose opposition to Marxism is only a minor flaw. Durkheim is the model sociologist again – not the strictly scientific, dispassionate fact-finder and theorist, but the sociologist who is interested in the betterment of the world around him. Therefore her reproach that Durkheim falsely attributed prime importance to spiritual and moral factors modified but did not annihilate the positive evaluation. More than that: Marxists who admit the relative autonomy of consciousness could learn from Durkheim. [85, 15]

As far as Durkheim the sociologist was concerned Ferge stressed the cooperative character of the Durkheimian group: it was a 'real community' where the members ascetically

submitted themselves to the common cause.⁵² [85, 10] According to Ferge, Durkheim was the model sociologist not only in the sense that he had convincing theoretical ideas and reliable methodology but also in the sense that he had built a scientific co-operative community that had a common cause. The emphasis on disciplinary solidarity, co-operation with other disciplines and conscientious research [85, 14-15] should be understood in the context of the seventies. There were repressions in the discipline, forced emigration (Szelényi's case was the most known case) and a feeling of disorientation. The rationalist, mildly anti-capitalist and painstakingly scientific Durkheim was a model for those who – like Ferge – decided that research must go on and reforms or change in the long run were not excluded.

* * *

Jászi's stiff, reactionary and petty bourgeois professor was transformed by Ferge into the distant model of the socialist reformer sociologist. The difference lies in the context. On the one hand, in the seventies there was already a beginning of disciplinary science that required new model roles for sociologists. The decision to do science was no more the kind of existential decision like 60-70 years before. There was already a place (sure, a small place) for sociologists and the question was how to do research. On the other hand, the relatively open political arena of the pre-war period was no more there and it was uncertain whether it would come back. The political option that was open for Jászi did not exist for Ferge. Reformist minded disciplinary sociology seemed to be a realistic alternative.

The end of the eighties brought a new turn in Hungarian politics and society, in sociology and in the reception of Durkheim, the beginning of a new history which cannot be told here.

Literature

1. -i.(Jászi, Oszkár), "Egy olasz szociológiai folyóirat". *Huszdik Század*, 1901. vol. 3, p. 385-386.
2. -r.(Jászi, Oszkár), "A szociologia eredményei". *Huszdik Század*, 1907. vol. 15, p. 566-567.
3. -r.(Jászi, Oszkár), "A szociológia feladata és módszere". *Huszdik Század*, 1908. vol. 17, p. 301-304.
4. (E)(Jászi, Oszkár), "Alfred Fouillée 1838-1912". *Huszdik Század*, 1912. vol. 26, p. 417-419.
5. Adorno, Theodor W., *Einleitung* (1967), in Durkheim, Emile, *Soziologie und Philosophie*, 1976. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp. p. 7-44.
6. Angyal, Pál, "Az öngyilkosság és a büntetőjog". *Társadalomtudomány*, 1927. vol. 7, p. 11-21.
7. B.R.(Braun, Róbert), "Pittsburghi szemle". *Huszdik Század*, 1910. vol. 21, p. 472-476.
8. Balandier, Georges, Le retour de Durkheim, in *Le Monde*. 1975. dec. 19. p. 13,19.
9. Bálint, Alice, "A totemizmus". *Századunk*, 1927. vol. 2, p. 43-55.
10. Balla, Antal, "A vallási élet kezdetleges formái". *Magyar Társadalomtudományi Szemle*, 1914. vol. 7 (1), p. 65-69.
11. Balla, Antal, "Az erkölcsi szabályok szociológiai megvilágításban". *Társadalomtudomány*, 1925. vol. 5, p. 245-250.

⁵² That was the idealizing self-representation that had not much to do with the more prosaic reality of internal strives and conflicts.

12. Balla, Antal, "Durkheim a szociálizmusról". *Társadalomtudomány*, 1928. vol. 8, p. 252-255.
13. Bartók, György, "Természet és társadalom (Prolegomena egy leendő sociológiához)". *Magyar Társadalomtudományi Szemle*, 1909. vol. 2, p. 421-446.
14. Basch, Imre, "Az ipari település". *Huszedik Század*, 1911. vol. 23, p. 117-120.
15. Becker, Howard and Barnes, Harry Elmer, *Social Thought from Lore To Science* (1938). 1961, New York: Dover Publications.
16. Benczelits, Jázon, "Le Dantec a monizmusról". *Huszedik Század*, 1906. vol. 14, p. 494-500.
17. Benczelits, Jázon, "Az anyag és az erők fejlődéséről". *Huszedik Század*, 1908. vol. 18, p. 244-248.
18. Berthoud, Gerald, "Somlo et l'ordre generalisée du don". *La revue du MAUSS*, 1991. (nouv.ser. 14.), p. 83-92.
19. Besnard, Philippe, La destinée du Suicide. Réception, diffusion et postérité, in *Le Suicide un siècle après Durkheim*, Borlandi, Massimo and Cherkaoui, Mohamed, eds. 2000, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. p. 184-218.
20. Bibó, István id., *A primitív ember világa*. 1927, Szeged: k.n.
21. Bolgár, Elek, "Psichologizmus a szociológiában". *Huszedik Század*, 1917. vol. 35, p. 481-494.
22. Bolgár, Elek, "A szociológiai szintézis természetéről". *Athenaeum*, 1917. vol. 3, p. 64-83.
23. Bolgár, Elek, "Durkheim szociológiája". *Huszedik Század*, 1918. vol. 37, p. 257-273.
24. Bolgár, Elek, "Durkheim tanainak ismeretelméleti alapjai". *Athenaeum*, 1918. vol. 4, p. 136-153.
25. Bolgár, Elek, "Emile Durkheim". *Huszedik Század*, 1918. vol. 37, p. 35-38.
26. Bouglé, Célestine, "Az élettani sociologia és a kasztok uralma". *Huszedik Század*, 1900. vol. 1, p. 1-17.
27. Bouglé, Célestin, "A francia szociológia tradíciói és irányai". *Társadalomtudomány*, 1938. vol. 18, p. 1-9.
28. Bouglé, Célestin, *Essais sur le régime des castes*. 1908, Paris: Alcan.
29. Bouglé, Célestin, *Bilan de la sociologie française contemporaine*. 1935, Paris: Alcan.
30. Bouglé, Célestin, "Correspondance reçue par ..." *Revue française de sociologie*, 1979. vol. 20 (1), p. 32-48.
31. Braun, Róbert, "A falu lélektana". *Huszedik Század*, 1913. vol. 27, p. 545-571, 690-713.
32. Collins, Howard F., *Spencer Herbert synthetikus filozófiájának kivonata*. 1903, Budapest: Politzer.
33. Coser, Lewis A., Durkheim's conservatism and its implications for his sociological theory, in *Emile Durkheim. 1858-1917* Wolff, Kurt H., ed. 1960, Columbus: Ohio State University Press. p. 211-232.
34. Cseh-Szombathy, László, *A magyar kiadás előszava* (1967), in Durkheim, Emile, *Az öngyilkosság*, 1982. Budapest: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó. p. 5-28.
35. D.(Dániel, Arnold), "A városok keletkezése a középkorban". *Huszedik Század*, 1908. vol. 17, p. 94-96.
36. D.L.(Dienes, Lajos), "Antroposzociológiai tanulmányok". *Huszedik Század*, 1910. vol. 22, p. 151-153.
37. D.P.(Dienes, Pál), "Ward újabb szociológiai munkái". *Huszedik Század*, 1907. vol. 16, p. 641-644.

38. Dahme, Hainz-Jürgen and Frisby, David P., *Editorischer Bericht*, in Simmel, Georg, *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen. 1894 bis 1900*, 1992. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp. p. 585-591.
39. Dékány, István, *Bevezetés a társadalom lélektanába. Szociálpszichológia*. 1923, Pécs: Danubia.
40. Dékány, István, "Szabad és kötött környezetformák". *Társadalomtudomány*, 1930. vol. 10, p. 280-288.
41. Dékány, István, *A társadalomfilozófia alapfogalmai*. 1933, Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
42. Dékány, István, "Célestin Bouglé". *Társadalomtudomány*, 1940. vol. 20, p. 72-74.
43. Dékány, István, *A mai társadalom. Bevezetés a társadalomtudományokba*. 1943, Budapest: Pantheon.
44. Dienes, László, "Kézikönyvtás. Année sociologique". *Könyvtári Szemle*, 1914. vol. 2, p. 56.
45. Durkheim, *A szociologia módszere*. Kultura és Tudomány. 1917, Budapest: Franklin-társulat.
46. Durkheim, (sic!), *Le suicide. Étude de sociologie* (1897). 1991, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
47. Durkheim, Emile, "W.J.Mc Gee The Seri Indians". *L'Année sociologique*, 1903. vol. 6 (1901-1902), p. 323-324.
48. Durkheim, Emile, "Examen critique des systèmes classiques sur les origines de la pensée religieuse". *Revue philosophique*, 1909. vol. 67, p. 1-28, 142-162.
49. Durkheim, Emile, "A vallásos gondolat eredetéről alkotott klasszikus rendszerek kritikai vizsgálata". *Huszedik Század*, 1909. vol. 19, p. 417-442, 529-547.
50. Durkheim, Emile, *Nature et méthode de la pédagogie* (1911), in Durkheim, Emile, *Éducation et sociologie*, 1922. Paris: Alcan. p. 74-103.
51. Durkheim, Emile, *Le socialisme. Sa définition, ses débuts. La doctrine Saint-Simoniennne*. 1928, Paris: Alcan.
52. Durkheim, Emile, *Pedagógia és szociológia* (1902), in *Nevelés és neveléstudomány*, Kiss, Árpád, ed. 1948, Budapest: Egyetemi Nyomda. p. 234-249.
53. Durkheim, Emile, *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse. Le système totémique en Australie* (1912). 4 ed. 1960, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
54. Durkheim, Emile, *Deux lois de l'évolution pénale* (1901), in Durkheim, Emile, *Journal sociologique*, 1969. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. p. 245-273.
55. Durkheim, Emile, *Journal sociologique*, ed. Duvignaud, Jean. 1969, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
56. Durkheim, Emile, *Leçons de sociologie. Physique des moeurs et du droit* (1950). 2. ed. ed. 1969, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
57. Durkheim, Emile, *Préface à l'Année Sociologique, Vol. I. 1896-1897* (1898), in Durkheim, Emile, *Journal sociologique*, 1969. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. p. 31-36.
58. Durkheim, Emile, *Sur le totémisme* (1902), in Durkheim, Emile, *Journal sociologique*, 1969. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. p. 315-352.
59. Durkheim, Emile, *La science sociale et l'action*. 1970, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
60. Durkheim, Emile, *A pedagógia természete és módszere* (1911), in *Francia szociológia (Válogatás)*, Ferge, Zsuzsa, ed. 1971, Budapest: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó. p. 37-56.

61. Durkheim, Emile, A szociológiai módszer szabályai. Előszó a második kiadáshoz (1901), in *Francia szociológia (Válogatás)*, Ferge, Zsuzsa, ed. 1971, Budapest: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó. p. 21-36.
62. Durkheim, Emile, *A társadalmi tényről*. Szociológiai Füzetek 4. 1972, Budapest: A Művelődésügyi Minisztérium Marxizmus-Leninizmus OktatásiFőosztálya.
63. Durkheim, Emile, *Les règles de la méthode sociologique* (1895). 18. ed. 1973, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
64. Durkheim, Emile, *Grierson H.P.J. The silent trade* (1905), in Durkheim, Emile, *Testes. 3. Fonctions sociales et institutions*, 1975. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit. p. 335-337.
65. Durkheim, Emile, *Textes*. 1975, Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
66. Durkheim, Emile, *De la division du travail social* (1893). 10 ed. 1978, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
67. Durkheim, Emile, *A társadalmi tények magyarázatához*. 1978, Budapest: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó.
68. Durkheim, Emile, *Nevelés és szociológia* 1980, Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
69. Durkheim, Emile, *Az öngyilkosság* (1897). 2 ed. 1982, Budapest: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó.
70. Durkheim, Emile, *Les règles de la méthode sociologique* (1895). 1988, Paris: Flammarion.
71. Durkheim, Emile, *Préface de la seconde édition* (1901), in Durkheim, Emile, *Les règles de la méthode sociologique*, 1988. Paris: Flammarion. p. 75-91.
72. Durkheim, Emile, *L'évolution pédagogique en France* (1938). 1990, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
73. Durkheim, Emile, *Détermination du fait moral* (1906), in Durkheim, Emile, *Sociologie et philosophie*, 1996. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. p. 49-90.
74. Durkheim, Emile, *Jugements de valeur et jugements de réalité* (1911), in Durkheim, Emile, *Sociologie et philosophie*, 1996. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. p. 117-141.
75. Durkheim, Emile, *Représentation individuelles et représentations collectives* (1898), in Durkheim, Emile, *Sociologie et philosophie*, 1996. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. p. 1-48.
76. Durkheim, Emile, *Sociologie et philosophie* (1924). 1996, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
77. Durkheim, Emile, *Az öngyilkosság* (1897). 3. ed. 2000, Budapest: Osiris.
78. Durkheim, Emile and Mauss, Marcel, *De quelques formes primitives de classification. Contribution à l'étude des représentations collective* (1903), in Durkheim, Emile, *Journal sociologique*, 1969. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. p. 395-461.
79. *Előszó helyett*, in Durkheim, Emile, *A társadalmi tényről*, 1972. Budapest: A Művelődésügyi Minisztérium Marxizmus-Leninizmus OktatásiFőosztálya. p. 5-7.
80. Emile Durkheim - Relu et enrichi, in *Le Monde*. 1970.
81. Engel, Zsigmond, "A pénz filozófiája". *Huszadik Század*, 1902. vol. 5, p. 511-513.
82. Enyvvári, Jenő, "A történelmi materializmus egy ismeretelméleti kritikájáról". *Huszadik Század*, 1906. vol. 13, p. 226-233.
83. Erdei, Ferenc, *A magyar paraszttársadalom* (1942), in Erdei, Ferenc, *A magyar társadalomról*, 1980. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. p. 83-252.
84. Farkas, Imre, "Max Weber vallásszociológiája I-IV." *Századunk*, 1932. vol. 7, p. 84-96, 174-177, 226-232, 299-303.

85. Ferge, Zsuzsa, *Előszó a magyar kiadáshoz*, in Durkheim, Emile, *A társadalmi tények magyarázatához*, 1978. Budapest: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó. p. 5-15.
86. Ferge, Zsuzsa and Haber, Judit, eds. *Az iskola szociológiai problémái. Válogatott tanulmányok*. 1974, Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó: Budapest.
87. Fogarasi, Béla, "Durkheim: A sociologia módszere". *Történeti Szemle*, 1917. vol. 6, p. 354-355.
88. Frazer, J.G., "A Társadalmi Embertan célja". *Huszedik Század*, 1914. vol. 29, p. 281-298.
89. G., "A kapitalizmus lényege és keletkezése". *Huszedik Század*, 1909. vol. 20, p. 215-221.
90. gg.(Gratz, Gusztáv), "A statisztika technikája". *Huszedik Század*, 1901. vol. 4, p. 229-230.
91. Giddings, Franklin Henry, *A sociologia elvei. A társulás és a társas szerveződés jelenségeinek elemzése* (1896). 1909, Budapest: Grill Károly.
92. Glatz, Ferenc, *Hajnal István történetírása*, in Hajnal, István, *Technika, művelődés*, 1993. Budapest: História - MTA Történettudományi Intézete. p. xi-xlii.
93. Goldscheid, Rudolf, "Kulturperspektívák". *Huszedik Század*, 1913. vol. 28, p. 177-199.
94. Gumpowicz, Ludwig, "Ratzenhofer szociológiája". *Huszedik Század*, 1907. vol. 15, p. 397-412.
95. Gyáni, Gábor, et al., *Social History of Hungary from the Reform Era to the End of the Twentieth Century*. 2004, Boulder, Colorado: Atlantic Research and Publications.
96. H.E.(Harkányi, Ede), "Az erkölcsi érzés keletkezése és fejlődése". *Huszedik Század*, 1909. vol. 19, p. 402-404.
97. h.j.(Husztai, József), "Durkheim: A szociologia módszere". *Magyar Középiszkola*, 1918. vol. 11, p. 178-179.
98. Haerle, Rudolf K., "W.I. Thomas and the Helen Culver Fund for Race Psychology: The Beginnings of Scientific Sociology at the University of Chicago". *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 1991. vol. 27, p. 21-41.
99. Hajnal, István, *Történelem és szociológia* (1939), in Hajnal, István, *Technika, művelődés*, 1993. Budapest: História - MTA Történettudományi Intézete. p. 161-204.
100. Hertz, Robert, "Contribution à une étude sur le représentation collective de la mort". *L'Année sociologique*, 1907. vol. 10 (1905-1906), p. 48-137.
101. Hort, Dezső, "A tudás szociológiája (Wissensoziologie)". *Századunk*, 1930. vol. 5, p. 204-211.
102. Huszár, Tibor and Somlai, Péter, eds. *A szociológia története 1917-ig. IV. kötet*. 1972, Tankönyvkiadó: Budapest.
103. Huvelin, Paul, "Magie et droit individuel". *L'Année sociologique*, 1907. vol. 10 (1905-1906), p. 1-47.
104. J.(Jászi, Oszkár), "Az amerikai szociológiai társaság évkönyve. Beszámoló az első amerikai szociológiai kongresszusról". *Huszedik Század*, 1907. vol. 16.
105. J.(Jászi, Oszkár), "Small szociológiája". *Huszedik Század*, 1907. vol. 15, p. 83-85.
106. J.(Jászi, Oszkár), "Az oligarchák szociológiája". *Huszedik Század*, 1908. vol. 18, p. 433-435.
107. J.(Jászi, Oszkár), "Egy tömeglélektani kézikönyv". *Huszedik Század*, 1909. vol. 19, p. 302-304.
108. J.(Jászi, Oszkár), "A politika lélektana". *Huszedik Század*, 1911. vol. 23, p. 114-116.
109. J.O. (Jászi, Oszkár), "Lamarckisták és Darwinisták". *Huszedik Század*, 1900. vol. 2, p. 153-155.

110. J.O. (Jászi, Oszkár), "A forradalom szociológiája". *Huszedik Század*, 1908. vol. 17, p. 63-66.
111. J.O.(Jászi, Oszkár), "Sociologia". *Huszedik Század*, 1902. vol. 5, p. 234-236.
112. J.O.(Jászi, Oszkár), "Két szociológiai könyv". *Huszedik Század*, 1903. vol. 7, p. 174-175.
113. J.O.(Jászi, Oszkár), "A modern erkölcstudomány". *Huszedik Század*, 1905. vol. 12, p. 329-331.
114. J.O.(Jászi, Oszkár), "Ward szociológiája". *Huszedik Század*, 1905. vol. 11, p. 65-71.
115. J.O.(Jászi, Oszkár), "Szociológiai kézikönyvek". *Huszedik Század*, 1907. vol. 16, p. 912-915.
116. J.O.(Jászi, Oszkár), "A kasztok uralma". *Huszedik Század*, 1908. vol. 18, p. 417-420.
117. J.O.(Jászi, Oszkár), "A társadalmi szolidaritás". *Huszedik Század*, 1911. vol. 24, p. 507-509.
118. Jászi, Oszkár, "Az egyenlőségi eszmék". *Huszedik Század*, 1900. vol. 1, p. 157-158.
119. Jászi, Oszkár, "Tarde új könyve". *Huszedik Század*, 1902. vol. 6, p. 65-66.
120. Jászi, Oszkár, "Demokrácia és Természettudomány". *Huszedik Század*, 1905. vol. 12, p. 335-337.
121. Jászi, Oszkár, "Két szociológiai évkönyv". *Huszedik Század*, 1905. vol. 11, p. 533-542.
122. Jászi, Oszkár, "A szociológia két iskolája". *Huszedik Század*, 1905. vol. 12, p. 168-175.
123. Jászi, Oszkár, "A szociológia módszerei. Két vélemény". *Huszedik Század*, 1905. vol. 11, p. 325-332.
124. Jászi, Oszkár, "A demokrácia jövője". *Huszedik Század*, 1906. vol. 13, p. 1-17, 109-124.
125. Jászi, Oszkár, "A történelmi materializmus induktív igazolása". *Huszedik Század*, 1906. vol. 14, p. 274-286.
126. Jászi, Oszkár, *Mi a szociológia?* 1908, Budapest: Deutsch Zsigmond és társa.
127. Jászi, Oszkár, *A történelmi materializmus állambölcselete*. Társadalomtudományi Könyvtár. 1908, Budapest: Grill Károly.
128. Jászi, Oszkár, "Az emberi fejlődés antiracionális tényezői". *Huszedik Század*, 1912. vol. 25, p. 106-108.
129. Jászi, Oszkár, *A nemzeti államok kialakulása és a nemzetiségi kérdés*. 1912, Budapest: Grill Károly.
130. Jászi, Oszkár, "Régi és új politika". *Szabadgondolat*, 1912. vol. 2, p. 233-236.
131. Jászi, Oszkár, "Van-e társadalmi haladás?" *Huszedik Század*, 1912. vol. 26, p. 503-536.
132. Jászi, Oszkár, Tíz év (1910), in *A szociológia első magyar műhelye. A Huszedik Század köre*, Litván, György and Szücs, László, eds. 1973, Budapest: Gondolat. p. 94-106.
133. Jászi, Oszkár, Tudományos publicisztika (1900), in *A szociológia első magyar műhelye. A Huszedik Század köre*, Litván, György and Szücs, László, eds. 1973, Budapest: Gondolat. p. 51-64.
134. Jászi, Viktor, "Kollektív lélek". *Huszedik Század*, 1904. vol. 10., p. 179-199, 267-294, 382-403.
135. K.A. (Kolnai, Aurél), "Durkheim szociológiája". *Huszedik Század*, 1918. vol. 38, p. 349-350.
136. K.M.(Kósa, Miklós), "Újabb tömeglélektani kutatások". *Huszedik Század*, 1907. vol. 15, p. 276-280.

137. Kapos, Endre, "Értelem és szenvedély a mai társadalomban". *Századunk*, 1934. vol. 9, p. 133-135.
138. Kecskeméti, Pál, "A szociológia történetfilozófiai megalapozása: Mannheim Károly". *Századunk*, 1926. vol. 1, p. 447-457.
139. Kinszki, Imre, "Az ipari társadalom válsága". *Századunk*, 1935. vol. 10, p. 70-74.
140. Kislégi Nagy, Dénes, "Emlékezés Maurice Halbwachsra". *Magyar Filozófiai Szemle*, 1970. vol. 14, p. 656-662.
141. Kislégi Nagy, Dénes, "Ismerettan és szociológia". *Magyar Filozófiai Szemle*, 1972. p. 662-673.
142. Kislégi Nagy, Dénes, "Két Durkheim-mű". *Magyar Pedagógia*, 1972. vol. 12, p. 341-352.
143. Kislégi Nagy, Dénes, "Hetvenöt éves a L'Année sociologique I." *Szociológia*, 1973. vol. 2 (1), p. 83-103.
144. Kislégi Nagy, Dénes, "Hetvenöt éves a L'Année sociologique II." *Szociológia*, 1974. vol. 3 (2), p. 250-261.
145. Kislégi Nagy, Dénes, *Életpályám emlékei*. 1979, h.n.: k.n.
146. Kontler, László, *A History of Hungary: Millenium in Central Europe*. 2002, Houndmills Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
147. "Könyvszemle". *Huszadik Század*, 1912. vol. 26, p. 833-839.
148. Kulcsár, Kálmán, *A szociológiai gondolkodás fejlődése* (1966). 2. ed. 1971, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
149. *La Hongrie contemporaine et le suffrage universel. Edition spéciale française du Huszadik Század*. 1909, Paris: Giard et Briere.
150. Lakatos, László, *Az élet és a formák. Hajnal István történelemszociológiája*. 1996, Budapest: Új Mandátum.
151. Láncai, Jenő, "Ludwig Gumplowicz". *Huszadik Század*, 1909. vol. 20.
152. Láncai, Jenő, "Lester F. Ward szociológiája". *Huszadik Század*, 1914. vol. 30, p. 577-595.
153. Láng, Alice, "A konzervatív gondolkodás". *Századunk*, 1927. vol. 2, p. 469-470.
154. Le Bon, Gustave, "Az anyag keletkezése és megszűnése". *Huszadik Század*, 1908. vol. 17, p. 1-19.
155. Le Bon, Gusztáv, "Tudomány és okkultizmus". *Huszadik Század*, 1912. vol. 25, p. 169-193.
156. Lederer, Emil, "A gazdasági elem és a politikai eszme a modern pártalakulatokban". *Huszadik Század*, 1913. vol. 27, p. 673-689.
157. Lederer, Emil, "A világháború szociológiájához". *Huszadik Század*, 1915. vol. 31, p. 1-12.
158. Leopold, Gusztáv, "A szociológia újabb irányai". *Huszadik Század*, 1903. vol. 7, p. 97-112, 190-200.
159. Lévy-Bruhl, Lucien, *La morale et la science des moeurs*. Bibliothèque de philosophie contemporaine. 1903, Paris,: F. Alcan.
160. Litván, György, "Egy magyar tudós tragikus pályája a század elején. Somló Bódog (1873-1920)". *Valóság*, 1973. vol. 16 (8), p. 32-42.
161. Litván, György, "Somló Bódog munkássága". *Szociológia*, 1977. vol. 6 (4), p. 503-507.
162. Litván, György, Wissenschaftstransfer zwischen den Kulturen der Donaumonarchie -- Soziologie, in *Geschichte der österreichischen Soziologie. Konstituierung, Entwicklung und europäische Bezüge*, Langer, Josef, ed. 1988, Wien: Verlag für Gesellschaftskritik. p. 133-141.
163. Litván, György, *Jászi Oszkár*. 2003, Budapest: Osiris.

164. Litván, György and Szücs, László, eds. *A szociológia első magyar műhelye. A Huszadik Század köre*. 1973, Gondolat: Budapest.
165. Litván, György and Szücs, László, eds. *Szabó Ervin levelezése 1905-1918*. 1978, Kossuth: Budapest.
166. Litván, György and Varga, F. János, eds. *Jászi Oszkár válogatott levelei*. 1991, Magvető: Budapest.
167. Lorenz, Viktor, "A biológiai filozófia". *Huszadik Század*, 1907. vol. 16, p. 1085-1059.
168. M.V., "The Sociological Review, XIX. kötet 1927 jan". *Társadalomtudomány*, 1927. vol. 7, p. 120-126.
169. "A mai Magyarország és az általános választójog". *Huszadik Század*, 1908. vol. 18, p. 437-695.
170. Mannheim, Károly, "A háború bölcséletéhez". *Huszadik Század*, 1917. vol. 36, p. 416-418.
171. Mannheim, Károly, "Georg Simmel, mint filozófus". *Huszadik Század*, 1918. vol. 38, p. 194-196.
172. Mauss, Marcel, *Essai sur le don. Forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques* (1925), in Mauss, Marcel, *Sociologie et anthropologie*, 1950. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. p. 143-279.
173. Mauss, Marcel, *Roth L.H. The Aborigenes of Tasmania* (1901), in Mauss, Marcel, *Oeuvres. I. Les fonctions sociales du sacré*, 1968. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit. p. 500.
174. Mauss, Marcel and Beuchat, Henri, *Essai sur les variations saisonnières des sociétés eskimo. Etude de morphologie sociale* (1906), in Mauss, Marcel, *Sociologie et anthropologie*, 1983. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. p. 389-477.
175. Mauss, Marcel and Hubert, Henri, *Esquisse d'une théorie générale de la magie* (1904), in Mauss, Marcel, *Sociologie et anthropologie*, 1983. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. p. 1-141.
176. Mérő, Nándor, "Módszertani kérdések". *Huszadik Század*, 1918. vol. 37, p. 183-187.
177. Michels, Robert, "Jegyzetek a burzsoázia lélektanához". *Huszadik Század*, 1909. vol. 19., p. 217-236.
178. N.D. (Nagy, Dénes), "Az észbeli működések az alsóbbrendű társadalmakban". *Huszadik Század*, 1910. vol. 21, p. 574-580.
179. N.D. (Nagy, Dénes), "A legendák képződése". *Huszadik Század*, 1910. vol. 21, p. 683-687.
180. Nagy, Dénes, "Durkheim: L'Année sociologique". *Huszadik Század*, 1910. vol. 22, p. 529-532.
181. Nagy, Dénes, "Totemizmus és exogámia". *Huszadik Század*, 1910. vol. 22, p. 423-429.
182. Nagy, Dénes, "A vallásos élet elemi formái. E. Durkheim könyve". *Huszadik Század*, 1912. vol. 26, p. 587-623.
183. Nagy, Dénes, "A Durkheim-féle évkönyv legújabb kötete". *Huszadik Század*, 1916. vol. 33, p. 71-75.
184. Nagy, Dénes, "Durkheim szociológiája". *Népművelés*, 1918. vol. 13, p. 97-116.
185. Nagy, Dénes, *Bevezetés a szociológiába*. 1922, Budapest: Genius könyvkiadó.
186. Nagy, Dénes, "Mauss, Marcel: Essai sur le don". *Közgazdasági Szemle*, 1926. vol. 50 (69. kötet), p. 318-322.
187. Nagy, Endre, *A Durkheim-sokk. Jászi találkozás az új szociológiával* (1982), in Nagy, Endre, *Eszme és valóság. Magyar szociológiatörténeti tanulmányok*, 1993. Budapest-Szombathely: Pesti Szalon - Savaria University Press. p. 89-101.

188. óe (Szabó, Ervin), "Kortörténeti jegyzetek". *Huszadik Század*, 1908. vol. 17, p. 394-395.
189. Oppenheimer, Ferenc, "A marxizmus és a revizionizmus vitájához". *Huszadik Század*, 1912. vol. 26, p. 201-221.
190. Oppenheimer, Ferenc, "A szocializmus lélektana". *Huszadik Század*, 1913. vol. 27, p. 137-152.
191. Oppenheimer, Franz, "A liberális szocializmus és a marxista kritika". *Huszadik Század*, 1911. vol. 23, p. 598-600.
192. Oppenheimer, Franz, "A tökenyereség kialakulása". *Huszadik Század*, 1911. vol. 23, p. 1-15.
193. Oppenheimer, Franz, "A zsidók és a gazdasági élet". *Huszadik Század*, 1911. vol. 24, p. 1-19.
194. Oppenheimer, Franz, "A demokrácia". *Huszadik Század*, 1914. vol. 30, p. 713-737.
195. Ottlik, László, *A társadalomtudomány filozófiája*. 1926, Budapest: Magyar Filozófiai Társaság.
196. P., "Sociológiai körkérdés". *Magyar Társadalomtudományi Szemle*, 1908. vol. 1 (3), p. 258-264.
197. P.K.(Polányi, Károly), "A tudomány módszerei". *Huszadik Század*, 1909. vol. 19, p. 201-203.
198. Parodi, Dominique, "A vallás problémája korunk gondolkodásában". *Huszadik Század*, 1914. vol. 30, p. 1-15.
199. Pekár, Károly, "A XIX. század társadalomfilozófiai termése". *Huszadik Század*, 1902. vol. 5, p. 171-187, 255-268.
200. Pikler, Gyula, "A menopszichológikus szociológiai irányról". *Huszadik Század*, 1905. vol. 12, p. 62-77.
201. Pikler, Julius and Somló, Felix, *Der Ursprung des Totemismus: ein Beitrag zur materialistischen Geschichtstheorie*. 1900, Berlin: Hoffman.
202. Rammstedt, Otthein, *Editorischer Bericht*, in Simmel, Georg, *Soziologie. Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung*, 1992. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp. p. 877-905.
203. Ratzenhofer, Gusztáv, *A szociológiai megösmérés lényege* 1908, Budapest: Grill Károly.
204. Rónai, Zoltán, "A fajok harca és az államalakulás". *Huszadik Század*, 1909. vol. 20, p. 180-188.
205. Saád, József, Társadalomtudomány 1921-1944, in *Társadalomtudomány. A Magyar társadalomtudományi Társaság munkássága. Repertórium és történeti feldolgozás*, Saád, József, ed. 1989, Budapest: Fővárosi Szabó Ervin Könyvtár - ELTE Szociológiai és Szociálpolitikai Intézete. p. 5-22.
206. Saád, József, *Társadalomtudomány. A Magyar társadalomtudományi Társaság munkássága. Repertórium és történeti feldolgozás*. 1989, Budapest: Fővárosi Szabó Ervin Könyvtár - ELTE Szociológiai és Szociálpolitikai Intézete.
207. Saád, József, Max Weber Magyarországon. Hatástörténeti áttekintés, in *Szellem és etika. A '100 éves a Protestáns etika' című konferencia előadásai*, Molnár, Attila Károly, ed. 2005, Budapest: Századvég Kiadó. p. 9-50.
208. Salgó, Ottó, "A szociológia kritikája". *Századunk*, 1931. vol. 6, p. 446-447.
209. Sárkány, Mihály, "Somló Bódog az ősi társadalom gazdaságáról". *Szociológia*, 1977. vol. 6 (4), p. 516-521.
210. Sas, Andor, "A történelmi módszer ellen". *Huszadik Század*, 1913. vol. 27, p. 364-366.
211. Schmid, Michael, La réception dans la sociologie allemande, in *Division du travail et lien social. La these de Durkheim un siecle apres*, Besnard, Philippe, Borlandi,

- Massimo, and Vogt, Paul, eds. 1993, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. p. 231-250.
212. Simiand, François, "Thonnar (Albert) Essai sur le système économique des primitives". *L'Année sociologique*, 1903. vol. 6 (1901-1902), p. 483-490.
213. Simmel, Georg, "A sociologia problémája" (1894). *Huszadik Század*, 1900. vol. 1, p. 83-90.
214. Small, Albion W., "A sociológia tárgya". *Huszadik Század*, 1906. vol. 14, p. 96-109.
215. Sombart, Werner, *A szocializmus és a szociális mozgalom* 1908, Budapest: Grill Károly.
216. Somló, Bódog, "A bruxellesi szociológiai Intézet". *Huszadik Század*, 1908. vol. 18, p. 381-387.
217. Somló, Bódog, "A gazdaság őskorából". *Huszadik Század*, 1909. vol. 19, p. 1-9, 121-136.
218. Somló, Felix, *Der Güterverkehr in der Urgesellschaft*. [Instituts Solvay. Travaux de l'Institut de sociologie] Notes et mémoires. fasc. 8. 1909, Bruxelles: Misch & Thron.
219. Somló, Felix, *Zur Gründung einer beschreibender Soziologie*. 1909, Berlin - Leipzig: Walther Rothschild.
220. Spectator, "Lester F. Ward 1841-1913". *Huszadik Század*, 1913. vol. 28, p. 85-88.
221. Spencer, Baldwin and Gillen, Francis James, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*. 1899, London: Macmillan,.
222. Spencer, Baldwin and Gillen, Francis James, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*. 1904, London, New York, : Macmillan.
223. Spencer, Herbert, "levele a Huszadik Századhoz". *Huszadik Század*, 1900. vol. 1, p. 1.
224. Spencer, Herbert, *Alapvető elvek*. 1909, Budapest: Grill Károly.
225. Steinmetz, S.R., "A szociográfia helye a szellemi tudományok sorában". *Huszadik Század*, 1913. vol. 28, p. 1-10.
226. "Sumner, William Graham: Folkways". *Huszadik Század*, 1908. vol. 17, p. 210-211.
227. sz.e.(Szabó, Ervin), "A nagyipari munkásság élet és lélektanához". *Huszadik Század*, 1911. vol. 24, p. 227-231.
228. Szabó, Ervin, "Társadalmi harcok. A nemzetközi sociologiai kongresszus tárgyalása". *Huszadik Század*, 1907. vol. 16, p. 792-805.
229. Szalai, Sándor, *Társadalmi valóság és társadalomtudomány*. 1946, Budapest: Új Idők.
230. Szalai, Sándor, *Bevezetés a társadalomtudományba*. 1948, Budapest: Egyetemi Nyomda.
231. Szilágyi, Ákos, Anómia, in *Népszabadság*. 2006: Budapest. p. 5.
232. "A szociológia tanítása az Amerikai Egyesült Államokban". *Huszadik Század*, 1902. vol. 6, p. 242-251.
233. Szolnoki, István, "Az előítéletek társadalmi gyökerei". *Századunk*, 1936. vol. 11, p. 37-40.
234. Thomas, William Isaac, "A faji előítélet lélektanához". *Huszadik Század*, 1907. vol. 16, p. 581-593.
235. Vajda, Mihály, "A kapitalista szellem fejlődése (Werner Sombart: Der Bourgeois)". *Huszadik Század*, 1914. vol. 29, p. 101-108.
236. Vályi, Bódog, "Durkheim sociológiája". *Magyar Társadalomtudományi Szemle*, 1908. vol. 1 (3), p. 211-224.
237. Vályi, Bódog, "Nyilatkozat". *Huszadik Század*, 1908. vol. 17, p. 517-518.
238. Vámbéry, Ruzsem, "Tarde rendszere". *Huszadik Század*, 1904. vol. 10, p. 1-13.
239. Varjas, Sándor, "Simmel szociológiája". *Huszadik Század*, 1910. vol. 22, p. 310-317.
240. Vaskó, Balázs, "Le Bon tömeglélektana magyarul". *Huszadik Század*, 1914. vol. 29, p. 543-546.

241. Vaskó, Balázs, "Le Bon társadalomlélektani rendszere". *Huszedik Század*, 1915. vol. 32, p. 209-225.
242. Vj.(Varga, Jenő), "Kereskedelmi politika deduktív alapon". *Huszedik Század*, 1911. vol. 24, p. 370-374.
243. vj.(Varga, Jenő), "A szociálliberalizmus elmélete". *Huszedik Század*, 1911. vol. 23, p. 355-367.
244. Vogt, W. Paul, L'influence de la *Division du travail sociale* sur la sociologie Américaine, in *Division du travail et lien social. La these de Durkheim un siecle apres*, Besnard, Philippe, Borlandi, Massimo, and Vogt, Paul, eds. 1993, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. p. 215-230.
245. Ward, Lester F., *A haladás lelki tényezői* (1893). 1908, Budapest: Grill Károly.
246. Westermarck, Edward, "Az erkölcsi tudat természete". *Huszedik Század*, 1909. vol. 19, p. 113-120.
247. Zsigmond, Gábor, Bevezetés, in *Az ősi társadalom magyar kutatói*, Zsigmond, Gábor, ed. 1977, Budapest: Gondolat. p. 5-21.
248. Zsigmond, Gábor, "Somló Bódog és a magyar etnológia". *Szociológia*, 1977. vol. 6 (4), p. 508-515.