

Russian Early Period of Sociology: Predecessors and First Professionals

Abstract The first sociological works appeared in Russia in the 1860s. This fact means that the image of Russian sociology as a very young discipline born in the Soviet time is wrong. The main Russian schools of thought (positivist, neo-positivist, subjective, Neo-Kantian, Marxist, and Christian) reflect the variety of theoretical approaches that were applied to the understanding of social life by Russian thinkers. Each school puts forward its own leaders, Lavrov and Sorokin, among them. However, there were no departments of sociology or special journals in the country until the beginning of the twentieth century. Sociological education was introduced in Russia also with a delay. Therefore, institutionalization of sociology was not complete during this period.

Keywords Historical periods · Predecessors · Danilevsky · Mikhailovsky Kovalevsky · Sorokin · Sociological society

In the contemporary Russian sociological community, there is a stable and significant interest in its pre-revolutionary past (Golosenko [1992](#); Kukushkina [1994](#); Galaktionov [2002](#)). At the global level, there is also some curiosity about this period of Russian sociology, especially about Pitirim Sorokin who emigrated to the USA in the 1920s and became a world-known sociologist (Nichols [2012](#)). Currently, this part of the history of Russian sociology is well researched; however, it is not well known by rank and file sociologists.

Post-Soviet Russian scholars provide to the Western readers quite different views on this period and prefer to analyze it within the discourse of contemporary Russian discussions on sociological schools, cultural national traditions, and the segmentation of sociology (Voronkov and Zdravomyslova 1996; Zdravomyslov 2010; Sorokin 2015).

THE MID- TO LATE-NINETEENTH-CENTURY DEVELOPMENT: PREDECESSORS AND FIRST SOCIOLOGISTS

Currently, sociology in Russia recognizes its own national sociological traditions and claims the date of sociology's birth in this region as being as early as in France, Germany or England—in the mid-nineteenth century, when reflections on the writings of positivists Comte and Spencer became popular among the Russian intellectuals.

The first acquaintance of educated Russians with the sociological ideas from the West happened in the mid-nineteenth century. The first mentioning of the system of positivism by A. Comte in Russia was made in 1845 by the young Russian publicist Valerian Maikov. Maikov knew French, read Comte in original, and gave an overview of his *Course of Positive Philosophy* in his article in a journal *Finskiy Vestnik* (Finnish Messenger) published in St. Petersburg. Maikov critically assessed positivism and stressed the necessity for the future Russian social science to adopt only those ideas from Comte that might be useful for Russian society.¹ In 1847 another publicist, V. Milyutin, published three articles in the famous public journal *Otechestvennie Zapiski* (Domestic Notes) where he described positivism in more detail. However, the name of Comte, whose views Milyutin described was mentioned only once in the endnotes to escape Tsarist censorship. It is important to notice that some educated Russians were among those who attended sociological lectures by A. Comte in Paris—for e.g., N. Satin, N. Frolov, V. Botkin. They wrote about these lectures to their friends, and one of them, Russian democrat Nikolai Ogarev shared this information with his colleagues, writers Alexander Herzen and Vissarion Belinskiy (Novikova 2002, 122).

Russian sociology started its development after the economic reforms in the early 1860s that brought about the abolition of serfdom and created incentives for capitalist social-economic relations in both urban and rural places. New social and economic development caused Russian intellectuals to reassess the future of Russian society and to search for theoretical explanation of its problems and practices. Interest

of Russian intellectual elite in the new ideas from the West turned it toward sociology.

From its origin, Russian sociology was developed in two different branches: publicist and academic (university). The early emergence of Russian sociology was first connected with the publicist branch, as sociology was not allowed at the universities. The spread of positivist ideas from the Western Europe highly contributed to the process of democratic development of Russian public thought. Positivist ideas, as well as interest to the natural sciences, took popularity in Russia as a negative reaction to the abstract German philosophy previously popular in Russia. Positivist ideas seemed to be more practical and useful for many young educated people: students, writers, journalists, that were ready to embrace the spirit of positive changes. Therefore, ideas of positivism were spread rather fast in Russia and were discussed in the different democratic circles along with such democratically oriented literary journals as *Otechestvennie Zapiski*, *Delo*, *Znanie*, and later in *Juridicheskiy Vestnik* and *Kriticheskoe Obozrenie* (Kareev 1896). Therefore, it is not a surprise that Positivism (along with Marxism) was among the most popular schools of thought in Russia by the end of the nineteenth century (both adopted from the West).

Discussion of the sociological publications of August Comte, Herbert Spencer, Lester Ward, Karl Marx, and many others stimulated the creation of Russian versions of modernization theories supported by popular social movements (*narodniki*), circles of public figures, social philosophers, political thinkers, and writers. Most of them had a liberal, populist, or, later, a socialist-democratic character and became the bases of the first sociological schools: positivist, subjectivist, new-Kantian, and the like. As a result of this influence, several books and articles written by Russian authors appeared in this period. Their authors were scholars and public figures, among others: P. Lavrov, N. Mikhailovsky, S. Yuzhakov, Ye. De Roberti, B. Chicherin, N. Danilevsky, A. Gradovsky. These early sociologists promised to provide scientific knowledge on how to improve Russian society and make it less unequal. In other words, Russian sociology was socially and publicly oriented from its very beginning. In the mid- to end of the nineteenth century, sociological thought has become an integral part of a broad cultural process, in which social science was a part of a cultural dialogue (in a sense of M. Bakhtin's concept of culture) (1975) that reflected traditional Russian interests in the ideas of social equality, justice, and the public good.

Two main directions of social thought and two intellectual groups were created: *Westernism* (direct adoption of Western concepts and ideas) and *Slavophilism* (prioritization of Russian national specifics in historical development). Their disputes have influenced the process of the formation of sociology. The Russian social thinker Alexander Herzen can also be viewed as a direct predecessor of sociology. In his memoir book *The Past and Thoughts* (1969/1868), Herzen presented a pattern of sociological analysis of Russia in the mid-century (Zdravomyslov 2010, 196–198). Since the 1880s, the leaders of Russian populist movements, Nikolai Mikhaylovsky and Petr Lavrov, had tried to present a scientific picture of social life on the basis of Western positivist ideas (Subjective school). Subjective school of sociology was one of the most important in Russia, partly because of its political connection with Narodniki. In fact, the leaders of Subjective school, Lavrov and Mikhailovsky, were revolutionary Narodniki (unlike religious Narodniki—Slavophiles Aksakov, Kireevsky, Khomyakov). All Narodniki acknowledged originality of Russian social-economic way of life and believed that Russia can reach socialism without capitalist step of development. The very term *Subjective* refers to Comte and his recognition of the role of moral attitude toward the world (along with objective method). Russian sociologists wanted to combine objective method with ethical aspect in the analysis of social processes and facts (therefore, another name of this school is Ethical-Sociological). Since then, almost all Russian sociology stressed the role of moral aspect of social life (Kareev 1896).

In parallel to it, followers of Marxism have also appeared in Russia (Georgy Plekhanov, Vladimir Lenin) and the nonstop discussion about the Russian future between the populists and social democrats had started. Positivists (including neo-positivists), subjective school, behaviorist, and Marxists (including social democrats and legal Marxists) represented the leading schools of sociological thought in Russia in the 1880–1890s. By the end of that century, there were many other schools, such as Christian, neo-Kantian, and Psychological, so that there was a mosaic of social thought in Russia (Vorontsov and Gromov 2005, 51–62).

Russian sociology as a university discipline and a recognized science started much later than publicist branch. Until the early eighties, sociological ideas were taught only within the other social sciences, mainly, Law and History. Therefore, many scholars who are recognized as first sociologists were trained as lawyers and historians; some others were philosophers and even natural scientists. Only in the end of the century, the

first programs of self-education in sociology and systematic books were published by Russian scholars (Kareev and De Roberti), then sociology was allowed as a facultative in some universities; sociological issues were discussed in scientific students circles (Novikova 2002, 128). Only in 1908, sociology became an official discipline in the private Neurological Institution organized by famous Russian physiologist and psychiatrist, father of Russian reflexology Vladimir Bekhterev.²

Syncretism of social thinking was typical for the scholars of the second part of the nineteenth century who were the “early sociologists” (or their predecessors) in Russia. A cohort of outstanding scholars contributed to construction of the basis of Russian sociology with its main approaches, schools, concepts, and traditions. These thinkers closely interacted with democratically oriented representatives of other social sciences, leaders of social populist movements, and writers. According to the contemporary scope of knowledge of this period, authors such as N. Danilevsky, N. Mikhailovsky, P. Lavrov, P. Kropotkin, S. Trubeckoi, G. Plekhanov are recognized in modern Russian textbooks as the influential and original Russian sociologists of the nineteenth century, and M. Kovalevsky is viewed as the most prominent Russian sociologist of this period (Golosenko and Kozlovsky 1995). However, Kovalevsky would have never succeeded as a sociologist without a broad intellectual environment of which he was a part. Therefore, he was not similar to a lonely mountain top; there was a high intellectual plateau of thinkers over which he towered.

Some of these thinkers spent years in exile and wrote their main works far from the political centers. Thus, in the late 1860s Petr Lavrov, a member of the illegal circle “Land and Freedom” in St. Petersburg, was sent by the police to a province where he wrote his main work, *Historical Letters* (2013), in which the foundations of Lavrov’s sociological conception were described. The word “sociology” was used more than 35 times throughout the *Historical Letters* suggesting indirect self-identification of the author as a sociologist. He shaped the agenda for sociology as an integrative science that was viewed as a problem-oriented discourse where Russian public moral concerns were expressed. Lavrov, as well as his friend and follower Nikolai Mikhailovsky (a member of the revolutionary organization “The People’s Will”), elaborated the “subjective method of sociology,” according to which the active individual was viewed as major driver of social transformations. Both authors are currently viewed as leaders of the Subjective school.

In the intellectual environment of Russia in the second part of the nineteenth century, a large engagement of social thinkers with leftist political ideology was typical. Many thinkers were liberals, and some sympathized with socialism and Marxism. However, there were notable exceptions. Thus, famous thinkers Nikolai Danilevsky and Nikolai Leontiev had conservative political preferences (Batygin and Deviatko 1994), and the religious social scholars Sergei Bulgakov, Semion Frank, and Nikolai Berdyaev were fully opposed to Marxist and socialist ideas. As for the boundaries between different schools in early Russian sociology, they were not totally clear-cut, and the same author could belong to different schools due to the evolution of his/her own views (e.g., during this period of time Pitirim Sorokin was positivist, later in the 1920s he shifted his views to moral issues and opposed positivism). The boundaries between the schools were flexible, some ideas were recognized by several schools, and the same people could move from one school to another. Therefore, classification of Russian sociological schools, first made by Kareev (1896), did not coincide with the one later made by Sorokin (1920) or with current classifications (Vorontsov and Gromov 2005).

The main goals of the early Russian sociological schools were similar to goals of sociologists in the same period in other countries: institutionalization of sociology as an independent discipline (free from social philosophy, psychology, history, e.g.), development of sociological education, and professional publications in professional journals. A lot of publications contributed to the achievement of these goals. The first textbook *Sociology* was published in 1880 by De Roberti and another one in 1897 by Kareev: its bibliography included almost 900 publications, one-third of them were written by Russian authors (Boronoev et al. 2016b, 17). On the whole, Russian sociologists of all schools discussed the possible approaches and directions of Russian development aimed to make Russia a modern country.

PROMINENT THINKERS

In the mid-nineteenth century, one of the most famous figures among Russian intellectuals was **Nikolai Danilevsky** (1822–1885)—sociologist, culturologist, geopolitologist, and publicist. Graduated from the university as a natural scholar, he was interested in socialist ideas of Fourier, arrested, and later sent out of St. Petersburg. He developed a theory

of cultural-historical types of civilization—a predecessor to the theory of local civilizations developed by Spengler and Toynbee. Danilevsky's theory was explained in his book *Russia and Europe* (1991, originally 1871). The basic features of a civilization, according to Danilevsky, included religion, culture, politics, and social-economic sphere. They shape a unique nature of each civilization. Development of any civilization has a cyclical character. Because of the uniqueness, Russian civilization does not need to follow any other civilization in its historical development. Following the ideas of pan-Slavism, Danilevsky supported the unity of all Slavic nations and the formation of Slavic federation (pan-Slavism). His book became popular after the death of its writer and had both supporters (among them nationally oriented thinkers K. Leont'ev, N. Trubeckoi, L. Gumilev, writer Dostoevsky) and liberal opponents (historian V.S. Solov'ev, sociologist Kareev).

Maksim Kovalevsky (1851–1916) is often called the first Russian sociologist and the key figure in the emergence of Russian sociology (Kukushkina 2000, 105). Indeed, he was the most prominent figure in this field in the end of nineteenth—beginning of the twentieth century. Kovalevsky graduated from the Kharkov University as a lawyer. However, current Russian literature treats him as a sociologist who also played the important roles of politician and civil society activist in Russian society (Boronoev et al. 2016a, 7). After completing his education in Russia, Kovalevsky continued it abroad (Berlin, Paris, and London) and became brilliantly educated for this period. For years, he was a professor of law at Moscow University, later he taught at Petersburg University and other schools. Kovalevsky was the Academician of the Imperial St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences.

Kovalevsky had close ties with many foreign scholars. For example, he knew Marx in person and exchanged letters with him. In 1903, Kovalevsky took part in the organization of the International Institute of Sociology with French sociologist R. Worms. Later he was elected the President of this Institute (alongside Russian sociologists Lilienfeld and Sorokin). In 1901–1905, he organized and headed the Russian Higher School of Social Sciences in Paris, and this School was sometimes called “the first European faculty of sociology” (Golosenko 2001, 101).

As a sociologist, Kovalevsky defined the discipline as a science of social organization and social change. He advocated principles of pluralistic methodology and assumed that several social causes determine social evolution. At the same time, Kovalevsky paid special attention to growth

of the population. He stated that this factor gives a constant impulse to economic development (Kovalevsky 1910). However, Kovalevsky argued that the “demographic factor never acts alone”: It can increase or decrease other factors of social evolution. In 1908, Kovalevsky (together with his colleague E. De Roberti) organized the first department of sociology at the newly founded private Psychoneurological Institution in St. Petersburg and served there as a Dean of the Law Faculty. His students P. Sorokin, K. Takhtarev, N. Kondratiev, N. Timasheff later attained reputations as world-class scholars. Together with political involvement, moral concerns were always an essential part of his sociological activity and reflected in his concept of social progress.

A few months after his death, his colleagues and former students founded a sociological society in Petersburg and named it in honor of M. Kovalevsky. Sorokin and Takhtarev played the key role in this process. The charter of this sociological society indicated its major task as elaboration of sociology and other social sciences as well as dissemination of knowledge of all social sciences in Russia. As the tasks were broadly formulated, there were several social scholars as well as natural scientists and politicians among society’s members. For example, the Russian physiologist Nobel Prize laureate Ivan Pavlov was among them.

Despite these achievements, sociology was not institutionalized. There were no regular sociological journals, no research centers and the university education in this field was not systematic. A degree in sociology was introduced in 1917—almost at the logical end of this period. A Sociological Institute was founded in late 1918 and closed in 1921. Therefore, the process of institutionalization of sociology in Russia was not fully completed during this period, although it actually had started in the pre-revolutionary years. Due to the unfavorable conditions of World War I and the 1917 October revolution, the recognition of sociology as an academic discipline was slow and contradictory (Batygin 1998). Sociologists within academia mostly did not support the Bolsheviks’ power, and vice versa. Sociologists were not needed in the emerging Soviet state. On the contrary, pursuing non-Marxist ideologies, they were viewed as ideological or political opponents of the state. This mutual political rejection was one of the reasons why Sociological institute was shortly closed, the sociological society’s functions stopped, and several professors had only limited possibilities to teach at the universities in the early 1920s.

In light of the aforesaid, Pitirim Sorokin’s destiny is typical. **Sorokin** (1889–1968) was born in the countryside. Being extremely talented, he

managed to complete the school education and later continue studies in St. Petersburg through private courses and at the Neurological Institute and later Petersburg University. Maksim Kovalevsky and other famous scholars were among his professors there. Two years after graduation, in 1916, Sorokin started teaching at Petrograd University.³ His ethical views were influenced by traditional Russian values related to *solidarity* and *sobornost*, a kind of spiritual community of the nation (Efremenko and Evseeva 2012). At the same time, Sorokin was familiar with Western socialistic ideology.

Sorokin's contribution to Russian sociology was highly regarded in his motherland much later. He has been recognized as the founder of the Russian sociological school of criminology (his first sociological work *Crime and Punishment: Heroism and Reward* was written in 2006). Before being expelled from Russia in 1922, Sorokin gave lectures on sociology in Neurological Institute and Petrograd State University, published several articles, a public textbook (1920), and his *System of Sociology* (2008/1920). However, Sorokin gained a broad scientific recognition mainly after his emigration to the USA. He was officially expelled from the country for his political views and active involvement in the anti-Bolsheviks political developments of these years.⁴ Regardless of his devotion to science, Sorokin considered his personal involvement in public and political activity as his duty and also as a valuable source of expertise and inspiration in sociological investigations. Political irreconcilability with the Bolsheviks was exactly the reason for mass expulsion of intellectuals from Russia. The paradox was that some of these intellectuals were previously persecuted for their leftist political activities by Tsarist regime.⁵ Both Tsarist and new Bolshevik regimes punished them for the same leftist views and actions. It is a well-known fact that, after Lenin accused Sorokin of having bourgeois views, the latter was sent out of Russia along with many other representatives of democratically and liberally oriented intellectuals (Golenkova and Gridchin 1998, 45). For Sorokin, this departure was a favorable way to escape from Soviet Russia. Many other scholars who stayed at home were later executed or imprisoned. For example, sociologist Alexander Chayanov and economist Nikolai Kondratiev were put to death (Radaev 2013, 5).

Overall, the close association of sociology with politics brought about the situation in which Russian sociologists had to operate both as professionals and as public activists. Such situations are always ambivalent. The overlapping of these roles can be a reason for a sociologist to be

publicly perceived as “the politician, manipulating with the sociological arguments in pursuit of the ideological goals” (Sorokin 2016, 19). In the case of Russian sociology in the 1920s, the public role of sociologists proved fatal for the prospects of sociology under Soviets in general. In addition, due to political confrontations inside the academy, the sociological community remained fragmented and full of inner contradictions.

Together with political involvement, moral concerns were always an essential part of sociological activity. Thus, Kovalevsky believed that freedom of moral manifestations was the key element of individual autonomy while the growth of human solidarity was the most important criterion of progress. He taught that human egoism and the lack of altruistic behavior were major obstacles to further social development (Timasheff 1966).

In total, the early period of Russian sociology contained both universalism and creation of national schools of thought. By the end of this period, sociology was relatively well developed. The radical changes of social-political life in Russia transformed this development in the 1920s.

The early period of Russian sociology manifested the existence and importance of ties between Russian and foreign sociologists—a feature that was not constant in the further history of Russian sociology because of the political restrictions of the Soviet ruling regime. On the one hand, Western concepts (from Comte, Spencer, Ward, Simmel, Durkheim, Quetelet) influenced Russian sociology. Kovalevsky published a book (1905) in which he introduced to the Russian intellectual audience all the famous Western sociologists of the nineteenth century (among them Tard, Giddings, Gumpłowicz, Loria, Bougie, Kidd, Simmel, Durkheim). On the other hand, Russian sociologists such as Lilienfeld, Kovalevsky, Kareev, De Roberti were internationally known and influenced sociology beyond Russia as well (Golenkova and Gridchin 1998, 40). De Roberti was teaching for many years in Paris and Brussels, and his textbook on sociology was translated into several European languages (Golosenko 2001, 100). Some of his books written in French have never been published in Russian, and De Roberti was even more famous in France than in Russia where his books were prohibited along with books of Marx, Spencer, and other sociologists. Russian scholar Yakov Novikov also preferred to publish in French; therefore, he was more known in France than in Russia.

Early Russian sociology was known in the USA as well, and vice versa. Thus, Pitirim Sorokin was influenced by works of A. Small. American

researcher J.F. Hecker published a book on Russian sociology (1915) and made American public acquainted with it, the later editions of this book were published in 1934 and 1969. Overall, the early Russian sociology “was in line with the formation of sociology in world science” (Golenkova and Gridchin 1998, 45).

International ties played a positive role in the formation and further development of sociology in Russia. For example, in 1910 four volumes (five parts) of collected articles titled *Ancestors of Positivism* were published in St. Petersburg: Several works of mainly French philosophers and sociologists such as Turgot, D’Alembert, Saint Simon, and Comte were included. In 1913–1914, four volumes titled *The New Ideas in Sociology* were published in Russia. (Kovalevsky and De Roberti 1913/1914 these volumes presented several translated works of famous foreign sociologists (Durkheim, Simmel, Tarde, Weber) and anthropologists, pedagogues (D. Dragichesko, F. Buisson, A. Loria, L. Manouvrier) along with original articles of Russian scholars (N. Kondrat’ev, N. Pogodin, Ya. Novikov, P. Sorokin) where they interpreted foreign ideas on progress, evolution, religion, relations between sociology and psychology. These books were aimed at sociological self-education of the Russian public and significantly influenced the Russian audience in different ways by providing information on Western sociologists, explaining the major sociological topics of research and pursuing the debates of social problems in Russia.

International influences in sociology, both from outside Russia and inside Russia, can be illustrated not only by the professional lives of Kovalevsky and Sorokin, but also by other scholars. One of them was the sociologist of law Georges Gurvitch (1894–1965) who made a career as a world-level scholar in France after his emigration from Russia (first to Berlin in 1920, then to Prague in 1922, and later to Paris, where he received French citizenship and became a professor). During World War II, Georges Gurvitch migrated to the USA where he was a head of the French Institute of Sociology and taught a sociology course at Harvard. After returning to France, he established and headed the Center of Sociological Research, and was a director of a laboratory of sociology of knowledge and morals in France. In 1944, he founded the journal *Cahiers Internationaux de Sociologie*. Later, Georges Gurvitch held a chair in sociology at the Sorbonne in Paris. It is not by chance that American sociologist Tiryakian, a student of Sorokin, stated that with the departure of Sorokin and Gurvitch Russia lost two great sociologists of the twentieth century (Tiryakian 1999, 23).

Another prominent American (Russian born) sociologist was Aron Gurwitsch (1901–1973) whose family emigrated from Russia before the 1917 October revolution. Gurwitsch was a colleague and friend of the famous phenomenologist Alfred Schutz and did a lot for his scientific archive in New York City. Aron Gurwitsch taught sociology at The New School for Social Research from 1959 to 1973. Gurwitsch is also known for his theory of the Field of Consciousness.

DEBATABLE ISSUES ON THE EARLY RUSSIAN SOCIOLOGY

Overall, there are two important debatable issues related to this period and its assessment in Russian sociology:

1. why and how the early Russian sociology was developed under the influence of Western European sociology and still reflected the original Russian historical and cultural context.

The answer to this question can be found in the explanation of the main tasks of this period of Russian sociological history. The young sociology needed to become recognized and institutionalized; therefore, the early sociologists tried to develop Russian sociology as a science and to defend its autonomy. In this process, they followed the more developed patterns founded in Western sociology that were mainly positivist in its first steps (Comte, Spencer, Durkheim). In the early twentieth century, Sorokin added American sociology as a model to follow. France was also an important historical and cultural model for Russia: Russian scholars respected French culture, knew French, often considered it as language of communication and could read the texts in original.

2. why pre-revolutionary heritage of Russian sociology was ignored by the Soviet sociology and recognized only in post-Soviet period.

In general, the reasons are somewhat similar to those mentioned above as Soviet sociology was also in the stage of “becoming a science.” The Soviet sociologists ignored the heritage of the pre-revolutionary sociology trying to become a part of the world sociology and experiencing its influence (Filippov 2013). The “father-founders” of Soviet sociology often considered it as connected to the Western traditions, although they did not mention it openly in the 1960s for ideological reasons. Russian traditions of the pre-Soviet period have not been taken

into account because Western functionalist theories looked scientific and well elaborated. Boris Firsov in his book (2012) and Boris Doktorov (2016) in his interviews with Russian sociologists of the 1960s clearly indicated that they had not referred to the so-called Russian roots in their memoirs; instead they stressed their attempts to make sociology a “real science” following the pattern of functionalism. Several functionalist texts were translated into Russian and published (1968) as two parts of the *Information Bulletin* of the Soviet Sociological Association, making this theory and method available for Soviet sociologists. Indeed, functionalism seemed to be appropriate for analysis of the Soviet society as a totality without internal contradictions, and its focus on mechanisms of social integration was in line with the ideological goals of the Party authorities.

In general, sociological writings and activities of the early period of Russian sociology were essential for understanding of Russian society and the development of several sociological problems. However, they contributed little to the subsequent institutional development of the discipline. In Soviet society, the early Russian sociologists were practically unknown, and professional research and sociological education were only fully institutionalized and widely spread in the late 1980s without references to the first Russian sociologists. The fact that post-Soviet Russian sociology also does not have theoretical connections with pre-revolutionary Russian sociology is recognized even by those who would like to find organic traditions and unity between the different periods of Russian sociology. As it was recently described:

Between pre-revolutionary sociology and modern sociology, as if we didn't try to present differently, there is no direct common ground. (Mironov 2016, 188)

However, it would be a mistake to ignore this early period after the Russian sociological community got rid of the Soviet ideological taboo (Sokolov 2014) and started intensively to study Russian intellectual heritage. A lot of materials for the subsequent debates were found in this heritage to stimulate contemporary sociological development. Since 1991, the early history of Russian sociology has become a legitimate and fashionable research topic of its own.

NOTES

1. Maikov did not use the term *sociology* and named those who followed Comte system *socialists*. For this reason a few years later, after the revolutions of 1848 in Western Europe, Tsarist censorship prohibited all sociological literature and took out Comte's books from the state libraries. Additionally, courses on philosophy and contemporary history were prohibited in the universities, foreign journals were under strict censorship, while the name sociology disappeared for long time in the public discourse.
2. Neurological Institution was devoted to the complex research and study of human being. It has three faculties: pedagogical, medical, and faculty of Law where department of sociology was established in 1908. In 1916, a private Petrograd University was opened on the basis of these three faculties, while Neurological Institute became oriented to research. Later this Institute was named after Bekhterev.
3. The university was renamed with every significant historical event. Until 1914, its full name was The Imperial St. Petersburg University. After the beginning of the World War I it was renamed to the Imperial Petrograd University (together with the city). Since February 1917, the name was Petrograd University. In 1921, it was called Petrograd State University. Since 1924 till 1991 the name was Leningrad State University. Since 1991 onwards its name is St. Petersburg State University.
4. Sorokin was a member of the Socialist-Revolutionary party (SR) from his youth. Later in 1917, he edited a political newspaper belonging to this party, served as a secretary for science to Prime Minister Alexander Kerensky in the Provisional regime, was the party's deputy of the Constituent Assembly. He did not support the Bolsheviks and publicly criticized them. Sorokin condemned the 1917 October revolution and participated in several political actions, including the preparation of a military revolt against Bolsheviks. Having been arrested and sentenced to death, Sorokin was pardoned by Lenin after his public denial of his previous political activity. However, even after leaving the SR Sorokin remained an opponent to the Bolsheviks and openly expressed his political views in his publications. So did many other Russian intellectuals.
5. Thus, during the period of the first Russian revolution, in 1905, Pitirim Sorokin was under a great influence of the socialism that brought him to the SR party. Soon after that he jailed for his political views. Fortunately he managed to escape from prison and returned to academic study. Much earlier, in 1887, Tsarist censorship prohibited the sociological books by De Roberti for critical positivist views on religious dogmas. After this prohibition De Roberti left Russia and worked abroad for many years (Golosenko 2001, 100).

REFERENCES

- Ancestors of Positivism. (1910). *Collected articles* (Vol. 4, Pt. 5). St. Petersburg: Brokgaus and Efron Publishing House. (in Russian).
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1975). *Questions of literature and aesthetics*. Moscow: Fiction. (in Russian).
- Batygin, G. S. (1998). Continuity of the Russian sociological tradition. In V. Yadov (Ed.), *Sociology in Russia* (2nd ed., pp. 19–39). Moscow: Institute of Sociology. (in Russian).
- Batygin, G. S., & Deviatko, I. F. (1994). Russian sociology: Its origins and current trends. In R. P. Mohan & A. S. Wilke (Eds.). *International handbook of contemporary developments in sociology*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Boronoev, A. O., Lomonosova, M. V., Mironov, D. V., & Skvortsov, N. G. (2016a). Sociological society named after M.M. Kovalevsky: History and modernity. To the 100th anniversary since its foundation. *Journal of Sociology and Cultural Anthropology*, 3, 5–15. (in Russian).
- Boronoev, A. O., Kapustina, E. G., & Skvortsov, N. G. (2016b). *Sociological society named after M.M. Kovalevsky: History and activity*. Sankt-Petersburg: Asterion. (in Russian).
- Danilevsky, N. Ya. (1991/1871). *Russia and Europe* (6th ed.). Moscow: Kniga. (in Russian).
- De Roberti, E. V. (1880). *Sociology*. St. Petersburg: Stasjulevich Printing House. (in Russian).
- Doktorov, B. Z. (2016). Modern Russian sociology: Historic-bibliographic search (Vol. 9). Moscow: Center of Social Forecasting and Marketing. (in Russian). http://www.socioprognoz.ru/hta_9/htm/menu.htm.
- Efremenko, D., & Evseeva, Y. (2012). Studies of social solidarity in Russia: Tradition and modern trends. *The American Sociologist*, 43(4), 349–365.
- Filippov, A. F. (2013). Soviet sociology as a police science. *New Literary Review*, 123(5), 91–105. (in Russian).
- Firsov, B. M. (2012). *History of Russian sociology: 1950s–1980s. Sketches*. St. Petersburg: European University. (in Russian).
- Galaktionov, A. A. (2002). *Russian sociology of the XI–XX centuries*. St. Petersburg: Lan. (in Russian).
- Golenkova, Z., & Gridchin, Y. (1998). Historic-sociological problems. In V. Yadov (Ed.), *Sociology in Russia* (2nd ed., pp. 19–39). Moscow: Institute of Sociology. (in Russian).
- Golosenko, I. A. (1992). *Sociology of Pitirim Sorokin: Russian period of activity*. Samara: Sociological Center Sociop. (in Russian).
- Golosenko, I. A. (2001). Yevgeny De Roberti: Intellectual profile. *Sotsiologicheskiye Issledovaniya*, 2, 99–107. (in Russian).

- Golosenko, I. A., & Kozlovsky, V. V. (1995). *History of Russian sociology of XIX–XX centuries*. Moscow: Onega. (in Russian).
- Hecker, J. F. (1915). *Russian sociology. A contribution to the history of sociological thought and theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Herzen, A. I. (1969/1868). *Past and thoughts*. Moscow: Fiction. (in Russian).
- Kareev, N. I. (1896). *Fundamentals of the Russian sociology*. St. Petersburg: Libmah Printing House. (in Russian).
- Kareev, N. I. (1897). *Introduction to sociology*. St. Petersburg: Stasjulevich. (in Russian).
- Kovalevsky, M. M. (1905). *Modern sociologists*. St. Petersburg: Panteleev Printing House. (in Russian).
- Kovalevsky, M. M. (1910). *Sociology* (Vol. 2). St. Petersburg: Stasjulevich Printing House. (in Russian).
- Kovalevsky, M., & De Roberti, E. (Eds.). (1913/1914). *New ideas in sociology. Collections of articles* (Vols. 1–4). St. Petersburg: Obrazovanie. (in Russian).
- Kukushkina, E. I. (1994). *Sociological education in Russia XIX-beginning of the XX c.* Moscow: Moscow State University Press. (in Russian).
- Kukushkina, E. I. (2000). The academic tradition in history of sociology in Russia. *Sotsiologicheskije Issledovanija*, 4, 97–107. (in Russian).
- Lavrov, P. L. (2013). *Historical letters: 1868–1869*. Moscow: URSS. (in Russian).
- Maikov, V. N. (1845). Social sciences in Russia. *Finnish Messenger*, 1(4), 1–56. (in Russian).
- Mironov, D. V. 2016. To the problem of updating Russian sociological heritage. In *Russian sociological association: History, modernity, and place in the world science* (pp. 188–189). St. Petersburg: Skifia-Print. (in Russian).
- Nichols, L. T. (2012). Sorokin as lifelong Russian intellectual: The enactment of an historically rooted sensibility. *The American Sociologist*, 43(4), 374–405.
- Novikova, S. S. (2002). Peculiarities of development of sociological thought in Russia. *Sotsiologicheskije Issledovanija*, 10, 122–130. (in Russian).
- Radaev, V. (2013). Russian sociology in search for its identity. *Sotsiologicheskije Issledovanija*, 7, 3–17. (in Russian).
- Sokolov, M. M. (2014, July 13–19). *Famous and forgotten. Types of social secrecy under totalitarianism and the intellectual style of Soviet sociology*. Paper presented at the XVIII ISA World Congress of Sociology, Yokohama, Japan.
- Sorokin, P. A. (2006/1913). *Crime and punishment: Heroism and reward. Sociological etude on the main forms of public behavior and moral*. Moscow: Astrel.
- Sorokin, P. A. (1920). *Public sociology textbook*. Yaroslavl: Publishing House of the Yaroslavl Credit Union of Cooperatives. (in Russian).
- Sorokin, P. (2008/1920). *System of sociology*. Moscow: Astrel. (in Russian).

- Sorokin, P. (2015). The Russian sociological tradition from the XIXth century until the present: Key features and possible value for current discussion. *The American Sociologist*, 46, 341–355. doi:[10.1007/s12108-015-9258-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12108-015-9258-9).
- Sorokin, P. (2016). Vision and mission of sociology: Learning from the Russian sociological experience. *The American Sociologist*. doi:[10.1007/s12108-016-9303-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12108-016-9303-3).
- Structural Functionalism in Modern Sociology. (1968). *Information bulletin of the Soviet sociological association*. Issue 6 (in two parts). Moscow: Nauka.
- Timasheff, N. S. (1966). The sociological theories of Maksim M. Kovalevsky. In A. Simirenko (Ed.), *Soviet sociology. Historical antecedents and current appraisals* (pp. 83–99). Chicago: Quadrangle books.
- Tiryakian, E. (1999). Pitirim Sorokin—My teacher and prophet of the present. *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*, 1, 22–35.
- Vorontsov, A. V., & Gromov, I. A. (2005). *History of sociology. XIX-beginning of the XX. Part II. Russian sociology*. Moscow: VLADOS. (in Russian).
- Zdravomyslov, A. G. (2010). Comparative analysis of national sociological schools in their relation to the national cultures. *Vestnik Instituta Sociologii*, 1(179), 202. (in Russian).

Sociology in Russia

A Brief History

Titarenko, L.; Zdravomyslova, E.

2017, XI, 158 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-58084-5