Durkheim's University Library Loans at Bordeaux

Preliminary Investigations

Matthieu Béra

Abstract: This article explores the significance of recently discovered records of Durkheim's university library loans during his time at Bordeaux. After introducing and explaining the nature of these records, and presenting various quantitative and qualitative issues raised by them, the article concentrates on understanding Durkheim's loans through tracking the different main uses he made of them. This first involves their role in his publications, but is then above all a concern with how they fed into his lectures. Discussion starts with his courses in sociology, moves on to those in education and psychology, and finishes with his preparation of students for an examination in philosophy (the *agrégation*). Although a few of Durkheim's courses survive, his library loans are a way to throw light on lectures that mostly seem lost forever.

Keywords: Durkheim, library loans, publications, surviving and lost lectures, working practices

Introduction

I came across the loan registers quite by chance, via Nicolas Sembel, while I was helping to prepare an exhibition on 'Durkheim in Bordeaux' at the Musée d'Aquitaine in May 2012.[1] In considering objects for show in the museum's display cabinets, it occurred to me to turn to Durkheim's 'natural' source of documentation, that is, the Bordeaux University Library. One of the cabinets was dedicated to the *Année sociologique*, and I wanted to include copies of the journal's first five issues (1898 to 1902), not least to indicate roots of Durkheim's research, while still at Bordeaux, for *Les Formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse* (1912a). Another cabinet showed books of the time – for example, by Robertson Smith, Frazer and Spencer

Durkheimian Studies, Volume 20, 2014: 3–34, © Durkheim Press
doi: 10.3167/ds.2014.200101 ISSN 1362-024X (Print) ISSN 1752-2307 (Online)

and Gillen – that were relevant not only to Durkheim's *Année* essays of 1898, 1899 and 1902 and the lectures on religion he gave in 1894–95 and 1900–01 but also, again, as sources of *Les Formes*. Nicolas Sembel, who co-organized with me the conference on *Les Formes* held in Bordeaux in the summer of 2012, had kindly offered to help me get hold of these books and in the course of frequent trips between the Museum and the University Library had established regular contact with Paul-Henri Allioux, curator of the library's literature section and responsible for the special authorization required to borrow such precious documents for the duration of the exhibition. One day, the latter produced two registers in which he had spotted a 'few' entries of loans taken out by Durkheim, and which he thought might be of interest to us. This was the beginning of an exciting adventure, and the road to the eventual publication of our discoveries in *Durkheimian Studies* involved a presentation of first results to a conference at the Musée du Quai Branly in February 2013.

The role of the library in the development of social science has often been ignored, but was a theme of the Quai Branly conference as well as of the book on Mauss's 'workshop' by its organizer, Jean-François Bert (2012). As in Durkheim's case, moreover, uncovering this role very much depends on a collaboration between university researchers and library and museum curators. What might also be noted at this stage is the rare glimpse that Durkheim offers us of himself as a library user in a letter of October 1902. Writing soon after his arrival in Paris and referring to his essay on totemism, he apologises to Salomon Reinach for having only just read the latter's review of it in *Anthropologie*, and explains that the journal is not taken by the Sorbonne, which, as in this case, is 'less well stocked than our poor University of Bordeaux' (Durkheim 2010: 27).

The Material: Some Initial Points

Durkheim's first academic appointment was at the University of Bordeaux in 1887, just after the opening, in 1886, of the new library of the Faculty of Arts and Science.[2] The discovery both of loan and acquisition registers helps to reveal how he used the library's resources but also pressed for additions to strengthen these. Sorting through the material of the registers was a long, exacting task. Without going into too much detail, I would first like to give some idea of what this involved and of questions raised by the material's discovery.

The Loan Registers: 1889-1902

It is unfortunate that no loan registers have been found for Durkheim's first two years at Bordeaux. Otherwise, all his borrowings from the arts and science library are recorded in a set of three registers that cover his career from 1889 to 1902.[3] The registers have six columns per row of data, and use the first column to enumerate each row. The second column lists the borrower's name. The third column provides details of the borrowed item, such as a book's author and title. The fourth column gives the catalogue number. The fifth and sixth columns record the dates of the item's loan and return.

This information, written down by a librarian attendant, was not always consistent, clear or complete. For example, the borrower's name was probably communicated orally, and this might be one of the reasons why Durkheim's name appears in quite different spellings; indeed, at least eighteen variations were identified by Nicolas Sembel (2013: 39, n. 10). In any case, the significance of the data – involving a record of as many as 505 loans by Durkheim – is something that will be taken up in a moment.[4]

The Acquisition Request Registers: 1887–1902

A further discovery was of three registers of requests for additions to the arts and science library.[5] Each of these registers runs to two hundred pages and has four columns – the first was for a requested item's author and title, the second for the requester's signature, the third for the acquisition committee's decision, and the fourth for an acquired item's date of registration in the catalogue together with its catalogue number. As with the loan registers, this information is not always consistent, clear and complete. A distinctive feature, however, is inclusion of the handwriting and signatures of those making requests. Another is that the data starts in 1887 and covers the whole of Durkheim's time at Bordeaux, including, in contrast with the loan registers, his first two years.

Registers were also kept of requests for additions to the university's law library, and it was possible to find a register for 1886 to 1892, which lists two requests by Durkheim, and a register for 1900 to 1907, which does not list any.[6] The acquisition committee rejected one of his requests, for a book on Algeria, but accepted another, Weinhold's *Die Deutschen Frauen in dem Mittelalter*, which he then borrowed via the arts and science library and which has been incorporated in the table of acquisition requests that are otherwise for this library.[7]

Various initial points might now be made about the significance of the data contained in the registers as a whole, starting with what they reveal about the material available to Durkheim through the library and moving on to his patterns of borrowing.

Material Availability

Durkheim's project required access to a vast range of specialized, up-to-date material. This in turn required access to well-stocked, up-to-date libraries, and indeed, as soon as he arrived at Bordeaux, he began to ask for additions to fill gaps in the university library coverage. However, he was unsuccessful with a quarter of his recorded requests (thirteen out of fifty), and there is need to explore not only what the library made available to him but also what it did not. An important though not infallible way of doing this is to use the university's online library catalogue *Babord +* (accessible in both French and English)[8] to check authors, titles and dates of editions but also classification marks. These help to differentiate material the library already held from what was added while Durkheim was at Bordeaux, as well as from what was not acquired until after his departure.

Books, theses and journals constituted three types of material, each of which had its own classification system. In the case of books, two criteria were used to shelve and catalogue them, their size and their date of acquisition.[9] The classification marks of a minority of books, given a special location due to their size, started with 10000 and 13000; those of most books, the 'normal' sized, started with 30000. A general guide to books acquired between the beginning of 1887 and the end of 1902 – roughly Durkheim's time at Bordeaux – is that 'special' classification marks ranged from 13651 to 15022, the 'normal' from 37402 to 41115.

True, there are exceptions to this, while there is also a need for a similar guide to theses and journals. It nonetheless provides a basic rule of thumb for identifying what was available to Durkheim in the library and what was not, including books published before 1902 but only acquired afterwards.

For example, a French edition of Herbert Spencer's *Principles of Sociology* – borrowed by Durkheim on a number of occasions [67, 241, 290] – had a classification mark of 30652, indicating it was already held when he arrived. Ellis's *The Ewe-speaking Peoples* [A21] was successfully requested by him soon after its publication in 1890 and given a classification mark of 39407. But he could not have accessed Bordeaux library copies of Morgan's *Ancient Society* (1877), Fison and Howitt's *Kamilaroi and Kurnai* (1880) or Frazer's *Totemism* (1887), given that there are no catalogue records of them. However, he could have consulted, and no doubt did consult, the abridged version of Frazer's book that appeared as the entry on totemism in volume 23 of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1888), a volume that he

borrowed twice [304, 362]. Again, on the other hand, he could not have accessed a university copy of Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites* (1889), given that the earliest catalogued edition is of 1914, with a classification mark of 49430. Nor, finally, could he have consulted a university copy of Spencer and Gillen's *Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), given that its classification mark is 45912 and accordingly indicates its acquisition well after his departure from Bordeaux.

Although little is known about the library that Durkheim kept in the apartments he and his family lived in while at Bordeaux, he clearly had the resources to acquire and accommodate at least some reference works in a private, personal collection at home, and obvious candidates include Frazer's little guidebook to totemism. He also had access to a number of variously public or institutional libraries, such as that, in Paris, of the École Normale Supérieure (ENS). As will be discussed later, however, it was through his editorship of the *Année sociologique* that he was increasingly able to obtain key material, such as Spencer and Gillen's *Native Tribes*. But like Ellis's *Ewe-speaking Peoples* and many other works, this was a case of the large, highly specialized and highly expensive volumes that only help to underline the importance for scholars of access to 'the library' as a collective resource.

Borrowing Patterns

Even if originally kept only for practical purposes, the dates of loan and return nowadays constitute an invaluable historical record that helps to throw light on the life of the university and the workings of its library. Students were allowed to take out loans for a month, but which does not seem to have been long enough, since they often borrowed the same books from one month to the next. Teaching staff were officially entitled to take out loans for three months, but often borrowed books for much longer.[10] In Durkheim's case, just under half of his loans were within the three-month limit of around ninety days, but the average length of all his loans was 115 days, and a reason is that many were for six months or more, and thus at least double the official limit.

There are other ways in which the data help with building up a picture of Durkheim's working practices, for example, how and when he researched material for articles, books and lecture courses, and how, in the process, he worked on different topics simultaneously. But it is instructive to start with a very basic borrowing pattern that emerges from statistics on the number and total length of his loans per academic year (see Table 1).

There are clearly three main phases. The first, from the winter of 1889 to the summer of 1892, is the most intensive and is when Durkheim was working to finish his main doctoral thesis, *De la Division du travail social*,

Table 1. Number and Length of Durkheim's Loans by Academic Year

Academic Year	No. of Loans	Total Days	
1889-90	62	7747	
1890-91	59	6071	
1891-92	82	5771	average per year: 68 loans / 6530 days
1892-93	44	5193	
1893-94	36	3800	
1894-95	37	4666	
1895-96	31	4552	
1896-97	34	3876	
1897-98	30	5124	
1898-99	42	4861	average per year: 36 loans / 4482 days
1899-1900	10	1512	
1900-01	16	1795	
1901-02	21	3182	average per year: 16 loans / 2163 days

submitted in March 1892. His level of borrowing went into noticeable decline in the period that followed, extending to the summer of 1899 and the first years of the *Année*, but fell even further during his last years at Bordeaux. His acquisition requests reveal a similar overall pattern, in which he made thirty-five of his fifty requests during an initial period from 1887 to 1892, then slowed down to a point at which, by 1898, he made hardly any.

Both sets of data suggest that the university's arts and science library began as a key research resource and 'workshop' for Durkheim, but ended up as of secondary importance. Accordingly, a question they generate is why this happened, and a possibility for consideration involves the project of the *Année sociologique* together with Durkheim's increasing research focus, around this time, on religion and ethnology.

Another basic yet nonetheless instructive approach is to try to identify the authors he consulted most. This runs into various technical as well as other problems, and details of statistical results should be treated with caution. According to one method of enumeration, however, it is possible to identify 32 authors whose books accounted for just over half of the loans and were borrowed four or more times, while it is also possible to identify a similarly sized group of 33 authors whose books were borrowed for four hundred days or more. Durkheim's 'top' authors can then be viewed as those who appear in both these groups, but further distinguished according to whether or not he borrowed only a single title by them (see Table 2).

Although, to repeat, particular statistical details should be treated with caution, they involve overall patterns that need to be noticed and indeed could seem puzzling. Authors such as Fustel de Coulanges, Kant, Spencer and Wundt are well-known references in Durkheim's work, often discussed by his commentators. But authors such as Lucretius, Sainte-Beuve, Vico and Xenophon and Lucretius are a less familiar part of the Durkheimian landscape and their prominence in his list of loans is something of a surprise. Or again, given Durkheim's intense interest in Comte and Renouvier, why is the list instead headed by Plato and Aristotle?

Working Practices

Records of Durkheim's library loans are only a surviving, visible track of his overall reading activity. Besides his use of a private collection at home, it could also be that, instead of borrowing material from an institution's library, he read it on site. Indeed, a revealing documented instance of this, in the case of the Bordeaux university library, is discussed by Sembel (2013: 22–23). But even or especially if records do not cover all of Durkheim's consultations on site, it is worth exploring the practice and trying to build up an overall picture of the role of libraries in his working life and environment.

A first clue is that the *habitus* of a library reader had become engrained in Durkheim, not least during his time as a student, between 1879 and 1882, at the ENS. Entry to this prestigious institution depended on surmounting formidable academic hurdles and the library constituted a privileged working place for the few who succeeded. As a boarder, with a room

Table 2. Durkheim's 'Top' Authors*

Multi-title Authors

Plato (22/2182)	Spencer (11/1536)	Montesquieu (8/747)	Waitz (7/626)
Aristotle (20/3338)	Kant (10/1269)	Fustel de Coulanges (7/758)	Xenophon (7/441)
	Tylor (7/1653)	Hobbes (7/703)	Ribot (6/598)
	Réville (7/1014)	Condorcet (6/676)	Taine (5/590)
		Leibniz (4/934)	Spinoza (5/407)
		Vico (4/696)	Wundt (4/650)

Single-title Authors

D'Argenson, *Journal et mémoires* (9/2016)
Sainte-Beuve, *Port Royal* (9/1611)
Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* (8/1554)
Marquardt & Mommsen, *Handbuch der Romischer Althertum* (5/436)
Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen / Philosophie des Grecs* (7/412)

* Borrowed for 4 or more times and for 400 or more days, so that '4/400' = 4 times, 400 days

of his own, he could make full use of the school's facilities and devote much of his time to searching through the shelves of its library, where everything was directly accessible.[11] In pioneering research, Giovanni Paoletti traced 248 loans that Durkheim took out from the ENS library during his studies there.[12] Kept up at the same rate, this would have amounted to more than a thousand loans over a time-span equivalent to that of the Bordeaux registers – double the actual number that these record, and a level of activity that could only have been a small part of his largely invisible work as a reader and of an institutional environment that helped to make on-site library consultation 'natural' to him. Durkheim married in 1887 (just before his arrival in Bordeaux) and had two children in 1888 and 1892, but although family life no doubt affected his working habits, it is unlikely it changed them fundamentally.

A second clue arises from undertaking a random survey of the Bordeaux registers in order to identify, with the help of a perpetual calendar,[13] dates of loan and return as days of the week. This shows that Durkheim visited the library on days distributed throughout the week, not just when he had to go into the university to give lectures (all day Thursdays and in the late afternoon on Saturdays[14]). The implication is that going to the library was often his main or indeed only business at the university, and it is difficult to believe that he made these journeys simply to take out or return books, without also using the opportunity to work there.[15]

The same survey indicates that there were many weeks when Durkheim never made any library visit, mostly during academic vacations. In termtime, the average frequency of his visits reached almost twice a week in the early period of his career at Bordeaux and declined to below once a week in the final years. Investigating the relationship between home and university accordingly offers a third clue. We know that he had a personal working space in each of the two apartments he and his family successively occupied in the boulevard de Talence, on the outskirts of Bordeaux (see Béra 2009). We also know that the university did not provide its lecturers with offices. The faculty's architectural plan is very clear on this (see Béra 2014: 61–62). The teaching staff shared a cloakroom, a post box room and a lounge. But they were not allocated any individual spaces of their own, and had little choice except to work at home or in the library. An invaluable contemporary account of the library describes in detail the grand central reading room – with 120 places for both staff and students – but also two subsidiary rooms, one of which was reserved for staff and displayed 'the most recent copies of journals and part of the thesis collection' (Mortet 1888).[16] So it could be used by lecturers as a convenient, relatively private place to work, yet also to socialize. Indeed, another meeting point was the library counter itself, as seems evident from sampling the registers and noting names of lecturers that appear next to one another. Often, what

this helps to track is simply a meeting of two colleagues, for instance, Durkheim with his friend, Hamelin, or with another philosopher, Rodier, or with the mathematician, Brunel.[17] But there were also larger gatherings round the counter and, for example, it is possible to imagine the conversations that took place when, on Thursday 15 November 1900, Durkheim borrowed Leibniz, Hamelin Descartes, Rodier Plato and Rouge, a lecturer in German, Renan's *Le Peuple d'Israël*.

Another clue takes us back to the issue of Durkheim's acquisition requests. Where there is no record that he borrowed books he had successfully asked the library to obtain – 14 out of 37 cases, or almost 40 per cent – he could well have read them on site. On the other hand, his requests were not necessarily just for his own work but part of an effort to improve the library as a collective resource.

Durkheim had become accustomed to well-equipped libraries through his studies not only in Paris but also in Germany, and his acquisition requests suggest that an early concern was to internationalize and update the library at Bordeaux. Over half of all his requests were for books in modern foreign languages (21 in German and 6 in English). Again, over half were for recent publications (twenty-nine of the forty-seven that can be dated had come out in the previous ten years). Put another way, however, just under half were for reference works that had been published for some time – twenty, thirty or even forty years before – but that were needed to fill what he saw as a gap in the library's holdings.

Even so, and as already noted, Durkheim's use of the library went into decline in the mid to late 1890s. Just as he paid fewer visits and took out fewer loans, he also made fewer acquisition requests and indeed after 1896 – during almost half his time at Bordeaux – made only five. There are many possible reasons for this and perhaps, for example, he gave up on ideas of the library's transformation as a research resource. But it can hardly have been an accident that the change coincided with his increasing involvement in the project of the *Année sociologique* and increasing access, through it, to up-to-date international publications in the social sciences and related fields. More and more, his home functioned simultaneously as a study, a library and an office, where he received books for the *Année* that he then either held in his own collection, or sent out to colleagues, or found a way to share.[18]

'Inputs'/'Outputs'

The documentation of Durkheim's Bordeaux university library loans and acquisition requests, although in itself a considerable task, is bound up with a whole set of questions that require further investigation and that include his sources of access to material, borrowing patterns and working

practices but also, not least, how his loans were put to use and fed into his sociological project and career. A basic approach to this question could be described in economic terms as an effort to relate 'inputs' and 'outputs', and one of the main ways of doing so is to connect Durkheim's loans with his publications. However, another way is to connect them with his lecture courses. Indeed, a key concern of the present article is to go on to explore what the loans reveal about courses that seem lost forever.

From Loans to Publications

The starting-point of the present, exploratory analysis is simply to relate texts that Durkheim borrowed from the Bordeaux library with texts that are explicit references in work he brought out between 1889 and 1902. However, instead of trying to cover all of his publications during this time, the present discussion begins with a focus on four main works, and then moves on to essays for the *Année sociologique* that were important in the journey to *Les Formes*.

Four Works

When Durkheim arrived in Bordeaux in 1887, he had already made considerable progress on a draft of his main thesis, *De la Division du travail social* (1893a). It was nonetheless at Bordeaux that he eventually completed the thesis, which he submitted to the Sorbonne in March 1892. He then concentrated on his subsidiary Latin thesis on Montesquieu, *Quid Secundatus* (1892a), submitted in November and printed by the end of the year. His main thesis, though handed in earlier, took longer to print and did not come out until the beginning of 1893. In any case, copies of both theses as well as of the first editions of *Les Règles de la méthode sociologique* (1895a) and of *Le Suicide* (1897a) are now readily accessible online at Gallica, Bibliothèque Nationale de France. Moreover, to construct an input/output analysis that covers all four works, it is possible to identify library loans cited in them by drawing on Nicolas Sembel (2013), and to enumerate the many references in *La Division* and *Le Suicide* by drawing on Massimo Borlandi (1993, 2000).[19] The resultant statistics are set out in Table 3.

In going over issues of interpretation of these statistics, a case with which to begin involves Durkheim's interest in Aristotle. Indeed, his very first acquisition request was for an edition of Aristotle's complete works. Moreover, Durkheim took the motto of his main thesis's title-page from Aristotle's *Politics* and got the introduction going with a quotation from his *Nicomachean Ethics*. Aristotle is also a key figure in Durkheim's subsidiary thesis, and although the number of references to him in both theses is

quite small, Durkheim's library loans help to bring out how these explicit citations were only the tip of an iceberg.

From the start of the loan registers in 1889 to Durkheim's submission of both his theses by the end of 1892, he borrowed a variety of French, English, German and Latin editions of original Greek texts of Aristotle's work, some of them quite venerable, such as *Aristotelis Graecae* (1831, ed. Bekker [25, 26]), others more recent, such as *Aristotle's Psychology* (1882, ed. Wallace [212]), *Schrift vom Staatswesen der Athener* (1891, ed. Kaibel and Kiessling [139]) and *La République athénienne* (1891, ed. Reinach [169]). These loans covered a range of major Aristotelian texts, although Durkheim's theses cited only two, *Politics* and *Nicomachean Ethics*. But it was without citing any edition, and the loans show that in the case of *Nicomachean Ethics* he consulted an edition of 1851 by Barthélémy-Saint-Hilaire [19, 40, 104]. In the case of *Politics*, however, he consulted as many as three editions, one of 1831 by Bekker [26] and another of 1848 by Barthélémy-Saint-Hilaire [20], but also and not least, a modern critical edition of 1887 by Newman that Durkheim himself had urged the library to acquire [18, 98, 116, A16].

The loan registers fill in similar gaps of information in many other instances. A notable example is their evidence that Durkheim, in focusing his subsidiary thesis on Montesquieu's *Spirit of the Laws* and extensively quoting from it yet without citing any edition, in fact drew on the text of this and related writings as established and annotated by Laboulaye in a first modern, landmark publication of Montesquieu's complete works, brought out in seven volumes between 1875 and 1879 (cf. [184], [191], [192]). Information about editions is important for a number of reasons. One in particular, however, involves the nineteenth-century development of critical editions of classic authors and, as with Newman's Aristotle or Laboulaye's Montesqueiu, a whole scholarly apparatus of introductory background and ongoing notes. In consulting if without citing such editions, Durkheim went not just to a text but also to a closely informed, detailed commentary.

Table 3: Citations and Loans from *La Division* to *Le Suicide*

	Texts Cited*	Also Borrowed**
La Division (1893)	154	31
Quid Secundatus (1892)	9	4
Les Règles (1895)	10	3
Le Suicide (1897)	159	12

* Sources: Borlandi (1993) for *La Division*, Borlandi (2000) for *Le Suicide*
** Source: Sembel (2013)

At the same time, of course, he also consulted wider intellectual and historical studies, such as those of Fustel de Coulanges, who had taught him at the ENS and to whose memory he dedicated his Latin thesis. Durkheim borrowed Fustel's study of the city in ancient Greece and Rome [89], as well as the first part of his history of political institutions in ancient France [37], works that he cited nine times in *La Division* (see Borlandi 1993: 70). But he also borrowed Fustel's collection of essays on historiographical issues [70], which is an example of a work with a particular detectable input into his thesis, although not cited in it (see Sembel 2013: 22). A different case concerns Zeller's history of Greek philosophy, both in its German edition and in an unfinished French translation. Durkheim's only reference to this work is in his subsidiary thesis and is to a part he did not borrow at Bordeaux, namely the untranslated volume on Aristotle. However, the loans he did take out not only included Zeller's general introduction but also covered his detailed accounts of early schools of thought, Socrates, Plato and post-Aristotelian philosophy. That is, the loan registers help to show how even just a single reference could involve Durkheim in extensive background reading and research.

Understanding the role of such reading in Durkheim's eventual publications is one of many ways of gaining insight into his working practices. Another is how these were geared to his different 'outputs'. Indeed, the registers suggest a marked contrast between the years it took him to complete *La Division*, and the speed with which he prepared his subsidiary thesis and its discussion of social scientific method through a focus on Montesquieu. It was after finishing his main thesis in March 1892 that he began to take out his first loans of Montesquieu's works in April (see [181], [184], [191], [192]). He returned them all by July and wrote everything up for submission in November.

This was also to complete the thesis by the start of a new academic session, with its teaching commitments, and was part of a pattern in which the timing of Durkheim's loans reflected a need to juggle writing, lectures and research. Following on from his theses and pursuing their methodological arguments, *Les Règles* first appeared as a set of articles in the *Revue philosophique* between May and August 1894. But he must have finished it some while before, since a letter early in 1894 looks forward to its publication in March (Durkheim 1998: 30), and he might well have done most of the preparation in the summer of 1893. Comte, Mill and Spencer were the most frequently cited authors in *Les Règles* and Durkheim's loans between March and July of that year included Comte's *Lettres à John Stuart Mill* [232], various works by Mill himself [231], [234], [235] and, together with Spencer's *Principes de sociologie* [241], his *Introduction à la science sociale* [242]. It is true that Durkheim included only the last two of these texts in the citations of *Les Règles*. On the other hand, his references were quite

limited, totalling ten texts by nine authors and mentioning another eleven writers just by name. A list of the twenty authors was drawn up by Laurent Mucchielli (1995: 18), who commented that it in no way represented the extent of Durkheim's reading and reflection for the work and the issues he tackled in it.

The publication of *Les Règles* helped to clear the way for *Le Suicide*, which Durkheim began to draft in 1895 and finally completed early in 1897.[20] His new book came with a mass of detailed references, many of them to journal articles. But it appears to have involved, compared with *La Division*, a much lower library use. However, since medicine had become the discipline most concerned with suicide, a major source of his statistical and other specialized material was to be found, not in the law or the arts and science libraries, but a few hundred yards away from them, in the medical faculty's library on the place de l'Aquitaine (now the place de la Victoire). It is possible to identify a number of books and journals cited in *Le Suicide* and available in this library for its author to consult.[21] But it is impossible to document if he borrowed them, since there are no surviving loan registers.[22] It nonetheless remains important to consider issues raised by a type of investigation of *Le Suicide* that has not so far been undertaken for Durkheim's other principal works.

Massimo Borlandi (2000) set out not just to note all of the book's references but to focus on those specifically dealing with suicide (87 out of 159 cited texts). He then used various forms of evidence to identify thirty-nine out of the eighty-seven as 'decorative references' that Durkheim inserted without reading for himself. This leaves forty-eight cited studies of suicide that he did directly consult and that generate further questions, such as which he drew on most, in what ways and whether or not he always adequately acknowledged a debt. Corre's *Crime et suicide*, for instance, although getting the odd mention, was systematically 'pillaged' (ibid.: 23), and no doubt other examples would emerge from similar in-depth analyses of Durkheim's use of references throughout his work as a whole. Here, however, my aim is simply to get going with preliminary investigations of Durkheim's loans at Bordeaux and how they can help with understanding his 'output'.

Essays for L'Année sociologique

Whether or not Durkheim was still at Bordeaux when he first had the idea of a great new work on religion, the earliest identifiable draft of *Les Formes* is a lecture course he gave in 1906–1907, some time after his arrival in Paris, and it took him around another five years to produce the eventually published version.[23] Certainly, it is possible to match references in *Les Formes* with sixteen texts that were among Durkheim's loans at Bordeaux

(cf. Sembel 2013: 24). But the work has more evident and significant roots in the project of the *Année sociologique*, floated in 1896, well advanced by the autumn of 1897, and achieving publication of the first issue in February 1898 (cf. Fournier 2007: 332–351 / t. 261–275). The three major essays that Durkheim wrote for the *Année* while at Bordeaux involved an interest in specialist ethnographic studies of kinship and religion that helped to prepare the way for *Les Formes* but that was also part of a gradual disengagement from the university library as a research resource.

His essay on the origin of the prohibition against incest (Durkheim 1898a[ii]) – the lead article in the *Année*'s first issue – involved a continuation of *La Division*'s argument about human life's socioreligious roots, but together with a newfound interest in the ethnography of Australia as evidence of the world of totemism, which he now located at the socioreligious source of things. At the same time this opening essay for his new journal marks a drift away from his use of the university library. A number of references were either very general, for example, to Montesquieu and Spencer, or were to classical sources such as Leviticus, Plato and Saint Augustine, and a handful of these can be matched with library loans. But in the case of the vast majority of citations, involving around forty specialized ethnographic books and articles, there are no matches at all. Although Durkheim had put in an acquisition request for one of these books, Ploss's German-language survey of the biological and ethnographic literature on women [A47], it was not until after finishing the essay that he went on to borrow it [415, 416]. Or again, Frazer's book on totemism, published in Edinburgh in 1887, was one of Durkheim's key citations, repeatedly drawn on and utilized. Yet although, like most of his other references, it was unavailable in the library, he no doubt also consulted the abridged version that, as the entry on totemism, was contained in the volume of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* that he borrowed twice [304, 362], once in 1895 when he was giving a course on the sociology of religion and again in 1897 when he was writing the *Année*'s opening essay.

Things are a bit different with his essay on the definition of religious phenomena (Durkheim 1899a[ii]). But although briefer and less specialized, only four of its seventeen cited texts correspond with library loans, and the only recent loan of these four was of Bergaigne's study of Vedic religion [412, 413], borrowed from July to December 1898. The others date back to 1894 and 1895 – Oldenberg on the Buddha [271], Réville on the history of religion [275], and Barth's article on India in the *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses* [288] – and so date back, like his first loan of Frazer's article on totemism, to around the time of his lectures on religion and what he later recalled as a 'revelation' in a sociological approach to its understanding. Perhaps, then, what he taught in 1895 was the basis of the approach developed in his first two essays for the *Année*. In any case, they were written

before the publication of Spencer and Gillen's *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* at the beginning of 1899, and Durkheim's essay on totemism (1902a[i]) – the last written at Bordeaux – was an effort to defend his old views against their new ethnography. Indeed, its references included key citations in Durkheim's earlier essays, not least Frazer's *Totemism*, while its main references were to Spencer and Gillen's book itself and to articles in which Frazer changed his theory in light of their pioneering fieldwork. But all nine references were ethnographic, mainly involved the ethnography of Australia, and none corresponded with library loans.

Durkheim's final *Année* essay at Bordeaux highlighted a situation in which it was increasingly the case that the library did not stock the material he was anxious to read, keep up to date with and comment on for his research. This situation applied not only to books but also, and just as crucially, to journal articles. The library stocked some of the periodicals, series and reference works that interested him, including Réville's *Revue de l'histoire des religions* and the series run from the *École des Hautes Études* that brought out Bergaigne's studies of Vedic religion. But it did not take publications such as the *Fortnightly Review*, *Kosmos*, the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute* or the *Zeitschrift für Vergleichrechtwissenschaft*, to mention a few of the diverse range of periodicals cited in Durkheim's *Année* essays. Instead, it was the project of the *Année* itself that became a key route of access not only to books sent for review but also to journals reciprocally exchanged with his own. This fed into a trend in which over 40 per cent of the 250 or so references in *Les Formes* are to journal articles, a trend that continued and even accelerated in Paris but had begun in Bordeaux.[24]

Alternative Lines of Investigation

Our main concern so far has been to explore how Durkheim's loans link with his references in this or that particular publication. But there are other, if nonetheless complementary lines of investigation.

Nicolas Sembel (2013) draws on the discoveries of the loan registers to enter Durkheim's 'workshop' and build up a picture of the materials and practices it involved. This approach helps to reveal a 'hidden' Durkheim, in providing evidence of materials he read yet never referenced in any publication – undoubtedly a key reason for the interest of the discoveries. In the process, moreover, it goes beyond a focus on particular texts that Durkheim published, in a concern with understanding his development of an overall vision of sociology, not least as an increasingly specialized science.

At the same time it needs to be kept in mind that Durkheim had other commitments besides research. As the registers make clear, he went on using the library throughout his years at Bordeaux, and a basic reason is its

role as a resource for teaching. Indeed, since most of his lectures are lost, the discovery of the registers has special significance not just as an aid to understanding the few that have survived but as a way to throw light on a whole series of courses that seem to have disappeared forever.

Durkheim as Teacher and His Lost Lectures

A list of Durkheim's university lecture courses was first compiled by Harry Alpert (1939: 64–66). A fuller, hopefully complete list was subsequently published by Steven Lukes (1973: 617–620),[25] who warned that the sources on which it is based are sometimes contradictory and not always reliable. It nonetheless remains a more or less definitive list that has not been superseded and is reproduced, without amendment, by Fournier (2007: 124–125 / t.103–104). In the case of Durkheim's lectures at Bordeaux, it shows that they essentially divide into three groups, namely, courses concerned with sociology, with education and with the *agrégation* in philosophy.

Evidence of Durkheim's working practices as a teacher can be found, not least, in his own letters. For example, in a letter of February 1900 to Hubert, he remarks that he needed four days a week to prepare a new course on religion, but between a mere afternoon and one and a half to two days a week when repeating older lectures (Durkheim 1987: 503). In a letter of June 1901 to Hamelin, after starting the new course, he explains that it had roots in the course on religion he had given in 1894–95, and that he had a draft of this, though not the lectures themselves (Durkheim 1975, vol. 2: 452). A letter to Bouglé, of May 1900, records that he had written up all his lectures on the family, and is also testimony to his habit of lending out manuscripts of his courses to colleagues (Durkheim 1976: 170). Indeed, as well as using a filing cabinet to organize his various papers, he kept a safe for detailed manuscripts, according to Xavier Léon's introduction to the posthumous publication of one of these, a course on Rousseau (Durkheim 1918).

Sadly, it is also one of the few courses now available to us from the pen of Durkheim himself (supplemented by some others based on student notes). As in the case of his lectures on religion, many important manuscripts have gone missing. Perhaps the papers that after his death were left with his family did not all end up destroyed, and the circumstances of their disappearance during the German occupation of Paris in the Second World War have recently been reassessed by W. S. F. Pickering (2012). The fact remains that most of Durkheim's lectures remain lost, and in a way constitute an entire continent still to be discovered.

Courses in Sociology

There can be no doubt about the significance, for Durkheim, of what began on his arrival at Bordeaux in 1887 as a course in 'social science' and that from then on were entitled courses in 'sociology'. Yet perhaps the only one of these that has survived intact is a course on socialism, published posthumously in 1928 with an introduction by Mauss. It was also given only for a single year – in 1895–96 – and accordingly it might be noted that there were three other courses of this kind, all of them lost.

One, on the history of sociological doctrines, was given in 1901–02, Durkheim's last year at Bordeaux. Another, on suicide, was given in 1889–90, and presumably a major source was the article he had just published on the subject (Durkheim 1888d). The most important was the course on social solidarity that, given in 1887–88, helped to launch his university career. But his inaugural lecture at Bordeaux in 1887, which led on to the course, has survived (Durkheim 1888a). So has the lecture that introduced the following year's course on the family (Durkheim 1888c), and that began with a summary of his lectures on solidarity, from which it is clear that he had taught in these the main ideas of his thesis on the division of labour.

Moreover, it is apparent that he continued to develop the complex web of interests of his thesis in his subsequent teaching, especially in his lectures on the family, on various issues in law and morals, and on religion. Indeed, these three series of courses might be identified as the core of his sociological lectures, and although they will be discussed separately, they involve interrelated concerns.

The Family

Durkheim's lectures on the family included three courses at Bordeaux, in 1888–89, 1890–91 and 1891–92. According to Mauss (1925: 13; 1969: 480–481), these were the lectures that mattered most to Durkheim and he had long hoped to write a book on the subject. But all of them have been lost, with two exceptions – the lecture that introduced the course of 1888–89, along with the lecture that concluded the course of 1891–92 and that was eventually published posthumously (Durkheim 1921).

Although the loan registers are inapplicable to the course of 1888–89, its opening lecture is in a particular way enlightening, thanks to an impressive bibliography of around thirty works by historians, sociologists and ethnologists (Durkheim 1888c: 269–270; 1975, vol. 3: 21–22). Only a few of these could have been borrowed, however, in that only a few of them can be found in the library catalogue. On the other hand, in moving on

to the period the registers cover and the courses of 1890–91 and 1891–92, it is possible to identify a number of relevant historical and ethnographic studies that were borrowed at this time. Durkheim's thesis on the division of labour also uses some of them as references, such as Fustel de Coulanges on the ancient city [89] and Ellis on the Ewe-speaking peoples [95], but does not cite others, such as Weinhold on German women in the middle ages [176, 177] and Tylor on primitive culture [131, 132]. In any case, all of them help to bring out Durkheim's web of interconnected concerns. The main title of the 1890–91 course announced it was about 'law and morals', and his interest in legal forms of the family was a way to grasp it as a moral institution, bound up with notions of heritage, adoption, property, contract, responsibility and so on. At the same time, in his view, the family was clearly linked with religion, and this especially involved his interest in the issue of origins. As in his thesis, and again in subsequent work, he identified 'primitive' forms of kinship and the family that were not only social in character but also, and integrally, religious.

Law and Morals

Durkheim gave two courses in 1892–93 and 1893–94 that were entitled 'Sociologie criminelle', and a series of four courses from 1896–97 to 1899–1900 that were entitled 'Physique générale des mœurs et du droit'. The courses of the early 1890s, both of which have been lost, no doubt tied up with account of crime and punishment in *La Division* and *Les Règles*. They nonetheless involved loans of works that were not cited in these, such as Ferri's *Sociologie criminelle* [229, A36], but also issues not covered in them either, not least, as attested by Fauconnet (1920: iii), the issue of responsibility. The situation is different with the later lectures. Durkheim wrote up a definitive version of them in 1898–1890, according to Mauss (1937: 527–528; 1969, vol. 3: 501) in introducing some extracts, and it was the hopefully complete version that was eventually published as *Leçons de sociologie* (Durkheim 1950).

Durkheim owed much to Fustel de Coulanges, director of the ENS while he was a student there. It was Fustel who helped to implant Durkheim's whole interest in law, an interest that not only informed his doctoral theses but that also ran through his subsequent publications, his university teaching and his work for the *Année*, including his responsibility both as the editor and a major reviewer for its legal sections, as well as his essay, just before his departure from Bordeaux, on two laws of penal evolution (Durkheim 1901a[i]). Indeed, throughout his time at Bordeaux he continued to make acquisition requests for works with a clearly legal focus, for example, on Anglo-Saxon law [A20], canon law [A26], primitive property

[A31] and German law [A46]. Even so, given his engagement with legal issues, his loans in this area seem relatively few, which is partly what prompted a search, in vain, for registers at the library of the faculty of law.

It is also the case, however, that there are relatively few references in the *Leçons de sociologie*, and that many of them are vague, merely citing Aristotle, for example, rather than any particular text. There are less than thirty, and around half can be matched with loans, such as Rousseau on the social contract [375] or Kant on the metaphysical principles of law [353, 419], although it is again important to notice loans of works that are relevant yet not cited, such as two studies by Spencer of morals [421], [422, A39], Bouché-Leclerq on Roman institutions [365] or Pauthier's compilation of sacred books of the East [92, 253, 367]. A key point, moreover, involves Durkheim's general concern with the specialization yet also interaction of different fields. This is particularly evident in the lectures that conclude the surviving version of the course and helps to date them to around the time of the *Année*'s opening essays of 1898 and 1899. In these lectures, there is a whole blend of philosophical, legal, historical and anthropological references, for example, to Kant, Rousseau, Mill, the laws of Manou (in Pauthier), Fustel de Coulanges, Robertson Smith and Waitz.[26] This is in a search for the socioreligious origins of property and the contract, but in the process the lectures work together a whole set of arguments, for example, about incest, the blood-covenant and, not least, the sacred versus the profane. Put another way, they offer us a significant link with the lost lectures on religion that were not long before and also not long after them.

Religion

Durkheim's course of 1900–01 was entitled 'Les Formes élémentaires de la religion', and so in a way pointed ahead to his eventual book, *Les Formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse*. Yet it is his course of 1894–95, simply entitled 'La Religion', which has generated greater interest among commentators. This is thanks to a letter many years later in which he recalled it as the time of a 'revelation' in his whole approach to understanding religion, and in the process emphasized his debt to 'Robertson Smith and his school' (Durkheim 1907b: 613; 1975, vol. 1: 404). But if we also recall the letters, already cited, to Hubert in 1900 and to Hamelin in 1901, it needs to be asked why he put so much effort into the new course and, while still insisting on its basis in his old lectures, completely revised them.

In a letter of June 1894, he looked ahead to the following academic session and mentioned his plan to teach a course on religion (Durkheim 1998: 36). Although, like other annual courses, this probably did not

begin until December (and then went on to April), it is evident from his loans that he had started preparations well before and also made a continuing input during the course itself. In the summer of 1894 he borrowed Oldenberg's newly published study of the Buddha [271, A38], along with three volumes by Réville on religion, especially among 'non-civilized' peoples [275], [276], [277], and two works by Tylor focused on 'primitive' worlds [280], [281]. In the winter, his loans included an article on religion in India [288], another study of Buddhism [289], Spencer on ecclesiastical institutions [290] and Lubbock on pre-historic man and modern 'savages' [291]. However, bearing in mind his letter about a revelation in 1895, the two loans that stand out were made in April and were of two volumes of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, one containing Frazer's article on totemism [304], the other Robertson Smith's article on sacrifice [306].

Frazer on totemism went on to become a key, authoritative reference in Durkheim's opening essay for the *Année* in 1898. Robertson Smith's encyclopaedia article, for its part, went on to become a key reference but also target in Mauss and Hubert's essay on sacrifice, in which Durkheim took a close interest and published alongside his own essay for the *Année* in 1899. But by the time of the course of 1900–01, an effort was needed to find a response to Spencer and Gillen's new fieldwork and there can be little doubt that the arguments developed in his lectures linked with the arguments developed in his essay on totemism. In a letter of around April–May 1901 and so also when he completed the course, he says he has virtually completed the essay (Durkheim 1998: 282). In a letter of October 1900 and so just before he began his lectures, he asks Mauss to return various items required for the new course (ibid.: 273), two of which were the essay's main references, namely, Frazer's *Fortnightly Review* article on totemism and Spencer and Gillen's book itself.

Like so much else, both of these were unavailable in the library. It nonetheless remained important for him as a teacher, even if, in his writing and research, he increasingly relied not only on publishers' vast shipments of books to the *Année* but also on the work of colleagues, especially Mauss and Hubert.

Courses in Education

Education, as a subject, was crucial in Durkheim's academic career. Part of his new job at Bordeaux was to develop the commitment to teaching education that had been initiated by Espinas, and when he moved to Paris it was to take charge of the chair in educational science that had been vacated by Buisson (see Fournier 2007: 109–110, 504–511 / t.91–92, 399–405). His Bordeaux lecture courses concerned with education could be divided into

three groups, on moral and intellectual education, on the history of educational thought and on psychology and its educational applications.

His first courses were on moral and intellectual education, given from 1887–88 to 1890–91, and overlapped with courses on the history of educational thought, given from 1889–90 to 1892–93. He then started to focus on psychology, with courses that ran for six sessions from 1893–94 to 1897–98, followed by a seventh in 1901–02. But he had again lectured on moral and intellectual education in the years between, from 1898–99 to 1900–01. Indeed, one of his few courses to survive, published as *L'Éducation morale* (Durkheim 1925), has been dated to 1899 by Philippe Besnard (1993).

Moral and Intellectual Education

Specific references in *L'Éducation morale* are rather few, and corresponding loans are even fewer. A clue that Besnard used to help to date the course was its most recent reference, a work published in 1898. Durkheim's loans do not include this case, and indeed involve works published much earlier, but nonetheless provide another clue. A number of relevant loans – some cited, such as Guyau [11], some not, such as Bain [35] – were made in or around 1890. In the summer and autumn of 1899, however, Durkheim took out a whole tranche of loans of works he did not reference – Payot [444], Lavisse [454], Marion [455], Martin [456], Paroz [457], Girard [458] – that were not only all published some years before but were also the last he borrowed that were specifically on education.

The registers also help to bring out Durkheim's particular interest in the ideas and research of the English psychologist, James Sully. As well as asking the library to acquire Sully's *The Human Mind* [A35], he borrowed this twice [215, 248] along with two other books by him [245], [247], while lecturing on psychology's application to education in 1893 and 1894. Although these might well have fed into the subsequent lectures not only on intellectual but also moral education, they are not mentioned in the surviving course. This instead cites two other works by Sully, one in the original, *The Teacher's Handbook of Psychology*, and one – its most recent reference – in a French edition, *Études sur l'enfance* (1898). It also cites Karl von Raumer's *Geschichte der Pädogogik*, and includes vague references to the work of Wilhelm Preyer, presumably *Die Seele des Kindes* (1882) / *L'Âme de l'enfant* (1887), as well as of Wilhelm Klein, presumably *Pädogogik im Grundriss* (1890). Durkheim did not borrow any of these, but colleagues also interested in education had made successful acquisition requests for Sully's *Études*, Raumer's *Geschichte* and Preyer's *L'Âme de l'enfant*, which he could therefore have consulted on site.

Another case that might be noted involves Rousseau's *Émile*. One of the main specific references in the surviving course on moral education, it is also relevant to intellectual education. But in 1891, when Durkheim first borrowed the library's edition [85], he was lecturing on educational history, and in 1897, when he borrowed it for the next and last time [377], he was lecturing on psychology. These intertwined interests are evident in his posthumously published notes on 'Rousseau's Pedagogy' (Durkheim 1919). An editorial introduction said they were the basis of courses at Paris, but their discussion by Lukes (1973: chapter 6) suggests they related to courses first given at Bordeaux. What is nonetheless certain is their rootedness in Durkheim's teaching there. The same can be said about his course at Paris in 1904–05, eventually published as *L'Évolution pédagogique en France* (Durkheim 1938)

History of Educational Thought

One of Durkheim's early loans, of a general history of 'pedagogy' [3], linked with his first course on the topic, in 1889–90. Otherwise, however, he borrowed specialist studies that covered ancient Athens [17], the medieval university of Paris [5], two leaders of the Renaissance, Erasmus [6] and Rabelais [2], [8], and, in the seventeenth century, the Jansenists of Port-Royal [13]. In turn, this coverage helped to prepare the ground for loans of similarly specialist material related to the courses that followed, especially concerned with education in the ancient Greek and Roman world and with its evolution in the modern West.

Instructive comparisons can be made with the information on the lectures that was assembled by Lukes (1973: 124), drawing on the testimony of Fauconnet, Halbwachs and Mauss. This gives no hint of Durkheim's interest in the medieval university, which went on to become a key topic in *L'Évolution pédagogique*, complete with references to the long ago borrowed study by Thurot [5]. Or where its general picture is confirmed by the evidence of the library registers, it is filled out by them in illuminating detail, as in the case of the seventeenth century and Durkheim's use of primary sources such as Mme de Maintenon [64, 128], as well as of secondary studies such as Lavallée on the institution she founded at Saint-Cyr [65, 127], but also Sainte-Beuve's monumental, multi-volumed work on Port-Royal [45 to 48, 206 to 208]. In the case of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the registers back up, for example, testimony about Durkheim's interest in the German theorists, Herbart [A5] and Froebel [A32], [A33], [216, A34]. At the same time they can reveal the entirely unknown, such as his interest in the pioneering advocate of women's education, Albertine Necker de Saussure [237, 238]. Finally, they show his concern with psychology, without necessarily contradicting emphasis on his sociohistorical approach.

Psychology

Durkheim's courses of 1892–93 and 1893–94 were entitled 'psychologie appliqué à l'éducation'. However, in a letter of June 1894 he says that he might give a course in the coming session just on psychology (Durkheim 1998: 36), and in fact from 1894–95 to 1897–98 he gave a series of courses simply called 'conférences de psychologie'. But it does not follow that they were very different from the earlier series.

Given the evidence of the registers and what is known about his work patterns, it is likely that he prepared the early courses in a more or less intensive manner, and that the subsequent courses essentially continued on from, even if they did not exactly repeat, what had gone before. Loans linked with the later lectures involved a number of works already borrowed for the earlier ones, and, even including these, the amount of relevant material borrowed for the four sessions of the later lectures was less than that borrowed for the two sessions of the first. Indeed, while loans for both series involved works variously announcing their subject as intelligence, memory, the unconscious, the senses and so on, in the first series there were loans of six works with 'psychology' in their title or sub-title, but in the series announced as just on psychology there were only three, one of which had already been borrowed (Munsterberg [277, 303]).

It is in any case worth noting that he started to borrow key works on psychology – such as Bain [35], Hartmann [77, 78], Ribot [120] and James [147] – in the period before any of his courses on it, and that he also continued to borrow such works after them, notably in 1899, when, for example, his ten or so loans in the area included Wundt [442, 443] and Bergson [453]. In conclusion, then, part of the overall significance of the library registers is that they help to bring out Durkheim's long-running interest in psychology and its importance in his teaching. This is a major discovery, throwing light on courses that have been almost entirely lost. In turn, and taking his lectures on psychology together with his courses on intellectual and moral education as well as on pedagogical history, around a fifth of all his recorded loans at Bordeaux can be linked with these. The proportion is even greater for loans linked with his whole activity as a teacher, which includes his role in preparing students for the *agrégation*, on top of the commitments connected with his various courses, discussed so far, on sociology and education.

The Agrégation *in Philosophy*

The *agrégation* is a formidable, highly selective and highly competitive examination, opening the door to a small number of teaching posts for an elite of students. Durkheim himself sat and passed the *agrégation* in

philosophy in 1882, his final year at the ENS,[27] and helped to prepare his own students for it from 1888 on, soon after his arrival at Bordeaux. He also became involved in other ways, such as membership of the examining jury, advising on the choice of authors and texts to be tested, successfully proposing the inclusion of social science in the syllabus, and generally campaigning for its modernization and reform, as in an essay that included a brief history of the examination from its inception in 1825 to his own day (Durkheim 1895b: 124–134; 1975, vol. 3: 406–418). Yet his interest and involvement in the *agrégation* is almost always ignored by commentators, who are usually more concerned with his lectures on sociology and less often with those on education. Thanks to the registers, however, it is now possible to rescue his *agrégation* courses from neglect and to expand considerably on the few lines on them left by Mauss (1925: 14–15; 1969, vol. 3: 482–483), supplemented in one or two points by Lukes (1973: 106–108).

Towards the beginning of each academic session, the *Bulletin administratif du Ministère de l'Instruction publique* included an announcement of the authors and texts to be examined for that year's *agrégation* in philosophy. Accordingly, I went through the issues of the *Bulletin* from 1887–88 to 1901–02 as an essential first step in trying to build up a comprehensive picture of what Durkheim taught for the *agrégation*. It was then possible to correlate the evidence of the *Bulletin* and of the registers, with striking results. For example, Comte was one of the set authors for the syllabus of 1900–01 and again of 1901–02, and Durkheim not only borrowed Lévy-Bruhl's newly published commentary on Comte [489] but had also made an acquisition request for this [A50], complete with a note that it was needed urgently 'for the preparation of the *agrégation*'. Or again, a recent reform mentioned in his article on the *agrégation* was the inclusion of Latin texts by modern authors 'such as Hobbes, Spinoza and Bacon' (Durkheim 1895b: 145; 1975, vol. 3: 431–432). It is uncertain if he lectured on Bacon's *Novum Organum*, on the syllabus of 1891–92, which is when he made an acquisition request for a recent critical edition of the work [A28]. But he clearly lectured on Hobbes's *De Cive*, on the syllabus of 1894–95: in addition to Mauss's recently rediscovered student notes on his uncle's course (Durkheim 2011), the registers now show that Durkheim's loans in 1895 included Hobbes's *Opera Philosophica* [310–312], as well as his *English Works* [313–314] and a commentary by Robertson [308]. Similarly, in the case of Spinoza's *Tractacus Politicus*, on the syllabus of 1901–02, his loans of that year included the author's *Opera* [499], as well as his *Œuvres* [500–501]. Another preliminary example involves his posthumously published course on Rousseau's *Contrat social* (Durkheim 1918), a course datable to 1896–97 and 1897–98, when the work was on the syllabus of these years and when he also borrowed a library copy [375], together with other texts by Rousseau [376], [375] and a commentary by Chuquet [381].

It is possible to identify over forty courses for the *agrégation* – including repeats of the same text and author – given or probably given by Durkheim at Bordeaux during the years covered by the registers (see the table in Béra 2014: 91). These regularly involved courses related to the ancient world. Indeed, there were five on various works by Aristotle and six on various works by Plato (helping to explain why they topped Durkheim's most borrowed author list). Another two courses were on different books of a single, monumental work by Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*, while there were also two courses on texts by Cicero, including in 1894–95 – when Durkheim was teaching the sociology of religion – a work on theories of the divine, *De Natura Deorum*. The majority of lectures related, however, to early modern classics. In the case of the seventeenth century, they examined works by Descartes (four courses), Leibniz (three courses), Malebranche (two courses) and Hobbes, Locke and Spinoza (one course each). In the case of the eighteenth century, they studied Kant (four courses), Hume (two courses), Rousseau (two courses) and Montesquieu and Condorcet (one course each). Finally, there were four sets of lectures on contemporary, nineteenth-century authors, three on Comte and one each on Stuart Mill and Renouvier.

Almost a hundred of Durkheim's loans can be explained by his preparation of students for the *agrégation* in philosophy. The loans were not just of editions of set and related texts, in the original language and in translation. He also borrowed particular commentaries, such as Marion on Locke [497], Pollock on Spinoza [213, 304], and Sorel on Montesquieu [342], as well as others already mentioned. Along with these, moreover, he borrowed various general reference works on the history of philosophy, for example, by Fischer [211, 301], Flint [393], Janet and Séailles [257] and Joël [218, 219], or, not least, Zeller's philosophy of the Greeks [15, 21, 41, 153, 160, 194, 493]. Just as he no doubt put many of his loans to other uses besides teaching for the *agrégation*, they did not always directly correspond with each year's syllabus, or, when there was this match, they were often repeat loans and also often of short duration. But in their own ways these are all signs of his engagement and familiarity with the materials of his *agrégation* lectures.

Part of the interest of the testimony of Mauss (1925: 15; 1975, vol. 3: 483) is his report of Durkheim's project to bring together his lectures on Hobbes and others and publish them as a book on the origins of sociology. Traces of this project – and perhaps also of his course on the history of sociological doctrines – can be found in the series of agrégation courses that lead on from Hobbes in 1894–95 to Montesquieu in 1895–96, Rousseau in 1896–97 and 1897–98, then Condorcet in 1898–99, eventually finishing with Comte in 1900–01 and 1901–02. Mauss emphasized the debt that his uncle felt to philosophers as precursors of social science but also recalled

how, at Bordeaux, teaching the *agrégation* was shared between Durkheim and his colleagues, notably Hamelin and Rodier.[28] Indeed, together with the whole educational background and approach he shared with them, his involvement in the *agrégation* helps to bring out how his culture was primarily philosophical, as was his teaching.

Conclusion

A basic concern of this article has been to relate 'inputs' and 'outputs' in an effort to identify Durkheim's use of his loans and their role and destination in his work. A first step is to match loans with explicit published references in books and articles. But it is also important to identify loans that are not cited in his publications and yet appear highly likely to have fed into them, whether thanks to their particular, quite specific relevance or just as general background. It is nonetheless essential to go much further, and indeed the investigative framework of 'inputs'/'outputs' helps to initiate an effort to throw light on a vast, largely unknown Durkheimian landscape, and to explore what his loans might tell us about lost lectures on education, psychology and philosophy, as well in his sociological courses on the family, law, morals and religion.

It is possible, in this way, to build up an understanding of almost all Durkheim's loans and how he used them, but also of his working practices. Given the disappearance of manuscripts he wrote up for his publications, an alternative is to trace, with the help of his loans, actual books that he used and to look for marks and comments that he might have left on them. Indeed, annotations constitute one of the criteria recognized by librarians for classifying a book as 'precious',[29] and a preliminary search through books that he borrowed reveals, along with underscorings, crosses, lines on margins and the like, a number of remarks and 'corrections' inserted in the text. However, the information contained in the library registers helps to open out many other avenues of research, not least into links between Durkheim's working practices, his collegiate life and his relationships not only with fellow members of staff but also with students.

Thus there might well be further discoveries of student notes of Durkheim's lectures, such as the notes that Mauss took of his uncle's lectures on Hobbes and that have recently been edited by Jean-François Bert. Student notes constitute an important type of document, requiring analysis and interpretation not merely in terms of 'content' but with regard to a whole specific context of social, educational and intellectual life. Indeed, they help to bring out the need for an approach that, as explained elsewhere by Bert (2012: 7–18), and with particular debts to Christian Jacob (2007 and 2010), involves an 'anthropology of intellectual work'.

The richness of the material contained in the Bordeaux library registers is nowhere near exhausted and offers many research leads at the heart of such an anthropology.

Matthieu Béra is lecturer and researcher at the Institut de recherché en droit des affaires et du patrimoine (IRDAP), Université Montesquieu de Bordeaux 4; a specialist in the history of sociology, whose recent work has particularly focused on Durkheim, he is also co-author of *Sociologie de la culture* (2007). Email: bera@u-bordeaux4.fr

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my gratitude to Emmanuelle Béra, who translated a French version of this article, and to Paul-Henri Allioux, without whose help and initiative, as a curator of the Bordeaux inter-university library, the discoveries would not have taken place.

Notes

1. An illustrated book based on this exhibition has now been published (Béra 2014).
2. In French, Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences. It relocated in 1968, and the original site was eventually occupied by the Musée d'Aquitaine in 1987. But this was after extensive rebuilding that involved the elimination of a large part of the old library.
3. The first of these registers covers the academic years from 1889 to 1893, the second covers the next five years, and the third ends in 1903.
4. The loans are listed in chronological order (Sembel and Béra 2013). In the discussion that follows, references to these are in square brackets. E.g., '[1]' refers to loan 1 in time; '[1, 225]' refers to loans of the same item at different times; '[1], [7], [10]' refers to loans of different items.
5. The discovery was made with Monsieur Allioux, while looking for law registers in the library of the law faculty.
6. These registers were discovered thanks to the help of Madame Montbrun Israël.
7. Durkheim's acquisition requests are listed in chronological order in Béra (2013). References to these in the discussion that follows are again in square brackets, e.g., '[A7]', which was his acquisition request for Weinhold's book
8. Go to: www.univ-bordeaux.fr/ddoc/base-doc.html. It does not yet include everything in the catalogue.
9. As explained by Monsieur Allioux and Madame Grard, curators of the arts and civil law faculty libraries.
10. But the situation was more anarchic at the law library, where loan registers were not implemented until 1913 and lecturers could help themselves to books, returning them only at their convenience.

11. Personal communication from Stéphane Baciocchi.
12. The research, first reported in 1992, has been recently republished and updated (Paoletti 2012), but indicates only when loans were taken out, without information on their length and dates of return.
13. For example, go to: www.actu63/free.fr/perpetuel or www.timeanddate.com/calendar
14. Incidentally, this is evidence that he did not respect the Sabbath and had soon broken with Jewish religious practice after his marriage at the Great Synagogue of Paris. See also Béra (2011).
15. For example, counting all loans and returns on the same day as a single library visit, in the academic year 1889–90 he made forty-seven visits, eight on Mondays, seven on Tuesdays, nine on Wednesdays, twelve on Thursdays, six on Fridays and five on Saturdays. In 1901–02, he made nineteen visits, two on Mondays, none on Tuesdays, five on Wednesdays, six on Thursdays, four on Fridays, one on a Saturday and also one recorded as on a Sunday (15 December 1901, when he returned two works by Tylor, [473] and [474]).
16. The medical library was built to a similar plan and still possesses a similar adjoining room in its original condition; a photo of this room is included in an article on the medical faculty's architecture by Laroche (2011).
17. Georges Rodier (1864–1913) was appointed at Bordeaux in 1895 and, like Hamelin, was a friend of Durkheim's. Georges Brunel (1856–1900), who became dean of the faculty in 1899, had made a joint request with the historian, Georges Radet (1859–1941), for the library's purchase of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (acquired in January 1888). Like Durkheim, both Brunel and Radet were ENS alumni.
18. From early on, Durkheim was successful in encouraging authors and publishers to supply free copies of their books for review in the *Année* (see, e.g, Durkheim 1998: 55–56, 59). This was just as well; he mentions an annual book purchase fund of 1,000 francs, but which was not very much, given that Frazer's *Pausanias*, negotiated at a special price with Macmillan's, still cost 110 francs (ibid.: 121, 136, 142). Durkheim and Mauss were the *Année*'s main reviewers, so that each must have kept many books for their own private collections. Often, however, each reviewed the same book in the journal's separate sections, as in the case of Spencer and Gillen's *Native Tribes*, the copy of which they shared with one another in an arrangement involving Durkheim's exasperated requests to his nephew for its return (ibid.: 238, 240, 246, 311).
19. Borlandi excludes Durkheim's references to his own works, and the same has been done, throughout this article, in enumerating references in other texts by him.
20. These dates of *Le Suicide*'s composition were suggested some time ago by Philippe Besnard (1987: 130–133), and have been confirmed by subsequent research: see, e.g., Besnard (2003: 90), Borlandi and Cherkaoui (2000: 2–3) and Durkheim's correspondence with Mauss, especially a letter of February 1897 saying 'my manuscript is finished' (Durkheim 1998: 51).
21. The books include Brière de Boimont's *Du Suicide et de la folie*, Cazauvieilh's *Du Suicide, de l'aliènation mentale et des crimes contre les personnes, comparés dans leurs rapports réciproques* and Esquirol's *Des Maladies mentales,*

considérées sous les rapports médical, hygiénique et médico-légal. The journals include both the 1844 issue of *Annales médico-psychologiques*, which contains Brière de Boimont's article reviewing Étoc-Demazy's *Recherches statistiques sur le suicide*, and the 1872 issue, which contains Lunier's article on the role of alcohol in the increasing number of cases of madness and suicide (as well as also citing Lunier's book on French alcohol consumption, Durkheim borrowed it several times [7, 224, 323] and had asked for it as an acquisition request [A13]).

22. The lack of such registers was confirmed in a meeting with Hélène de Bellaignes, in charge of the medical library heritage collections.
23. On the evolution of *Les Formes* and the significance of the 1906–1907 lectures, see Watts Miller (2012: 93–109).
24. Thanks are due to Myron Achimastos, University of Crete, for providing an advance copy of the bibliography of his forthcoming critical edition of *Les Formes*, to be published by Classiques Garnier.
25. The book, which continues to serve as an indispensable reference work in the field, originated in the research for his doctoral thesis of 1968 and I am grateful to him for kindly sending me a copy.
26. In a personal communication, W. Watts Miller points out that the quotation about taboo among peoples of the Pacific, ending lecture 12 of the *Leçons* and attributed to 'Wurtz, VI, 344', clearly appears to involve a mistranscription of the original manuscript's 'Waitz'. The quotation translates into French a sentence that occurs in Waitz's *Anthropologie der Naturvölker* at vol. VI, p. 344, a volume on peoples of the Pacific and Australia that Durkheim borrowed a number of times [364, 423, 478].
27. See Paoletti (2012: 414–415) for details of the examination of 1882 and also the general nature of the *agrégation* in philosophy around this time.
28. Hamelin was an expert on Kant, Rodier on Aristotle.
29. For this information, thanks are due to Sandrine Maillet, curator of rare and precious books, the Bibliothèque Nationale de France.

References

Alpert, H. 1939. *Émile Durkheim and His Sociology*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Béra, M. 2009. '179 / 218: Mais où donc habitait Durkheim à Bordeaux?', *Durkheimian Studies / Études durkheimiennes* 15: 99–122.

Béra, M. 2011. 'David, Émile. Les ambivalences de l'identité juive de Durkheim', *Durkheimian Studies / Études durkheimiennes* 17: 121–150.

Béra, M. 2013. 'Demandes d'acquisition de Durkheim / Durkheim's Acquisition Requests: 1887–1901', *Durkheimian Studies / Études durkheimiennes* 19: 72–74.

Béra, M. 2014. *Émile Durkheim à Bordeaux (1887–1902)*. Bordeaux: Confluences.

Bert, J.-F. 2012. *L'Atelier de Mauss*. Paris: CNRS Éditions.

Besnard, P. 1987. *L'Anomie. Ses usages et ses fonctions dans la discipline sociologique depuis Durkheim*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Besnard, P. 1993. 'De la datation des cours pédagogiques de Durkheim à la recherché du thème dominant de l'œuvre', in F. Cardi and J. Plantier (eds.), *Durkheim, sociologue de l'éducation*. Paris: Harmattan, 120–130.
Besnard, P. 2003. 'Un déménagement de Durkheim: des *Règles* au *Suicide*', in P. Besnard, *Études durkheimiennes*. Geneva / Paris: Droz, 87–96.
Borlandi, M. 1993. 'Durkheim lecteur de Spencer', in P. Besnard, M. Borlandi and P. Vogt (eds.), *Division du travail et lien social. La these de Durkheim un siècle après*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 67–109.
Borlandi, M. 2000. 'Lire ce que Durkheim a lu. Enquête sur les sources statistiques et médicales du Suicide', in M. Borlandi and M. Cherkaoui (eds.), Le Suicide *un siècle après Durkheim*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 9–46.
Borlandi, M. and M. Cherkaoui. 2000. 'Introduction', in M. Borlandi and M. Cherkaoui (eds.), Le Suicide *un siècle après Durkheim*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1–6.
Durkheim, É. 1888a. 'Cours de science sociale: leçon d'ouverture', *Revue internationale de l'enseignement* 15: 23–48 (reprinted in Durkheim 1970: 77–110).
Durkheim, É. 1888c. 'Introduction à la sociologie de la famille', *Annales de la Faculté des lettres de Bordeaux* 10: 257–281 (reprinted in Durkheim 1975, vol. 3: 9–34).
Durkheim, É. 1888d. 'Suicide et natalité: etude de statistique morale', *Revue philosophique* 26: 446–463 (reprinted in Durkheim 1975, vol. 2: 216–236).
Durkheim, É. 1892a. *Quid Secundatus Politicae Scientiae Instituendae Contulerit* (subsidiary thesis). Bordeaux: Gounouilhou.
Durkheim, É. 1893a. *De la Division du travail social* (main thesis). Paris: Alcan.
Durkheim, É. 1895a. *Les Règles de la méthode sociologique*. Paris: Alcan.
Durkheim, É. 1895b. 'L'Enseignement philosophique et l'agrégation de philosophie', *Revue philosophique* 39: 121–147 (reprinted in Durkheim 1975, vol. 3: 404–434).
Durkheim, É. 1897a. *Le Suicide: etude de sociologie*. Paris: Alcan.
Durkheim, É. 1898a(ii). 'La Prohibition de l'inceste et ses origines', *L'Année sociologique* 1: 1–70.
Durkheim, É. 1899a(ii). 'De la Définition des phénomènes religieux', *L'Année sociologique* 2: 1–28.
Durkheim, É. 1901a(i). 'Deux lois de l'évolution pénale', *L'Année sociologique* 4: 65–95.
Durkheim, É. 1902a(i). 'Sur le totémisme', *L'Année sociologique* 5: 82–121.
Durkheim, É. 1907b. 'Lettres au Directeur de la *Revue Néo-scolastique*', *Revue Néo-scolastique* 14: 606–607, 612–614 (reprinted in Durkheim 1975, vol. 1: 401–405).
Durkheim, É. 1912a. *Les Formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse: le système totémique en Australie*. Paris: Alcan.
Durkheim, É. 1918. 'Le Contrat social de Rousseau', with note by X. Léon, *Revue de métaphysique et de morale* 25: 1–23, 129–161.
Durkheim, É. 1919. 'La Pédagogie de Rousseau', *Revue de métaphysique et de morale* 26: 153–180 (reprinted in Durkheim 1975, vol. 3: 371–401).

Durkheim, É. 1921. 'La Famille conjugale: conclusion du cours sur la famille', M. Mauss (ed.), *Revue philosophique* 90: 1–14 (reprinted in Durkheim 1975, vol. 3: 35–49).
Durkheim, É. 1925. *L'Éducation morale*, P. Fauconnet (ed.). Paris: Alcan.
Durkheim, É. 1938. *L'Évolution pédagogique en France*, 2 vols., M. Halbwachs (ed.). Paris: Alcan.
Durkheim, É. 1950. *Leçons de sociologie: physique des mœurs et du droit*, H.-N. Kubali (ed.). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
Durkheim, É. 1970. *La science social et l'action*, J-C. Filloux (ed.). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
Durkheim, É. 1975. *Textes*, 3 vols., V. Karady (ed.). Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
Durkheim, É. 1976. 'Lettres à Celestin Bouglé', P. Besnard (ed.), *Revue française de sociologie* 17(2): 165–180.
Durkheim, É. 1987. 'Lettres de Émile Durkheim à Henri Hubert', P. Besnard (ed.), *Revue française de sociologie* 28(3): 483–534.
Durkheim, É. 1998. *Lettres à Mauss*, P. Besnard and M. Fournier (eds.). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
Durkheim, É. 2010. 'Lettres d'Émile Durkheim à Salomon Reinach', edited with an introduction by R. Benthien, *Durkheimian Studies / Études durkheimiennes* 16: 19–35.
Durkheim, É. 2011. *Hobbes à l'agrégation. Un cours d'Émile Durkheim suivi par Marcel Mauss*, J.-F. Bert (ed.). Paris: Éditions EHSS.
Fauconnet, P. 1920. *La Responsabilité*. Paris: Alcan.
Fournier, M. 2007. *Émile Durkheim (1858–1917)*. Paris: Fayard (t. Fournier 2012).
Fournier, M. 2012. *Émile Durkheim*. Cambridge: Polity.
Jacob, C. (ed.). 2007 and 2010. *Lieux de savoir*, 2 vols. Paris: Albin Michel.
Laroche, C. 2011. 'Pro Scientia, Urbe et Patria: l'architecture de la Faculté de Médecine et Pharmacie de Bordeaux, 1876–1888 et 1902–1922', *In Situ, Revue des patrimonies* 17 (www.insitu.revues.org/1126).
Lukes, S. 1973. *Émile Durkheim: His Life and Work*. London: Allen Lane.
Mauss, M. 1925. 'In memoriam. L'œuvre inédite de Durkheim et de ses collaborateurs', *Année sociologique* n.s.: 7–29 (reprinted in Mauss 1969, vol. 3: 473–499).
Mauss, M. 1937. 'Introduction à la "Morale professionelle" de É. Durkheim', Revue de métaphysique et de morale 44: 527–531 (reprinted in Mauss 1969, vol. 3: 527–531).
Mauss, M. 1969. *Œuvres*, 3 vols., V. Karady (ed.). Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
Mortet, V. 1888. 'Note sur la nouvelle installation de la BU', *Revue internationale de l'enseignement* 13: 573–581.
Mucchielli, L. 1995. 'Pourquoi réglementer la sociologie? Les interlocuteurs de Durkheim', in M. Borlandi and L. Mucchielli (eds.), *La Sociologie et sa méthode.* Les Règles *de Durkheim un siècle après Durkheim*. Paris: Harmattan, 15–47.
Paoletti, G. 2012. *Durkheim et la philosophie. Représentation, réalité et lien social*. Paris: Classiques Garnier.

Pickering, W. S. F. 2012. 'The Mystery of Some "Last Things" of Émile Durkheim: Notes for a Research Project', *Durkheimian Studies / Études durkheimiennes* 18: 3–9.

Sembel, N. 2013. 'La liste des emprunts de Durkheim à la bibliothèque universitaire de Bordeaux: une «imagination méthodologique» en acte', *Durkheimian Studies / Études durkheimiennes* 19: 5–48.

Sembel, N., with M. Béra. 2013. 'Emprunts de Durkheim á la bibliothèque universitaire de Bordeaux / Durkheim's Loans from Bordeaux University Library: 1889–1902', *Durkheimian Studies / Études durkheimiennes* 19: 49–71.

Watts Miller, W. 2012. *A Durkheimian Quest: Solidarity and the Sacred*. Oxford: Berghahn.