
Max Weber and the Cultural Evolution

DÁVID KOLLÁR*

Max Weber a kulturní evoluce

Abstract: Max Weber's ambivalent view of evolutionary theory has sparked ongoing debate. While rejecting simplistic social Darwinism, his writings reveal an implicit evolutionary logic underlying broader cultural transformations. Across multiple works, Weber modeled cultural change through the interplay between charismatic innovation and institutional order. This paper argues Weber provides a sophisticated model of cultural evolution by elucidating the relationship between these two forces. The aim is to demonstrate how framing Weber's dichotomy in evolutionary terms offers novel insight into his nuanced vision of social change.

Keywords: Weber; evolution; charisma; institution; adaptation; exaptation

DOI: 10.14712/23363525.2024.3

Introduction

Max Weber's complex relationship to evolutionary thinking has been a subject of ongoing scholarly debate. While he rejected simplistic applications of Darwinian principles to social phenomena, his insights remain highly fruitful when interpreted through an evolutionary lens. This is especially evident in the description of the birth of modern capitalism. Max Weber's writings on modern capitalism reveal an implicit evolutionary logic, despite his skepticism of simplistic social Darwinism [Runciman 2001]. Weber explains how capitalism operates through processes of variation, selection, and retention to shape economic institutions and actor orientations over time. According to him, capitalism introduces continuous dynamism and uncertainty into economic life, requiring flexibility and adaptation from actors [Weber 2012: 19; Runciman 2001; Kollár 2021]. This generates variation in economic practices and business models as entrepreneurs constantly experiment with new solutions. Capitalism also selects between these variable models and strategies based on profitability and efficiency criteria. Approaches that extract greater returns spread and are retained, while unprofitable ones dwindle away. Weber argues the competitive pressures of capitalism mould economic mentalities towards greater rationalization [Nau 2005]. Calculative, systematic approaches to commerce and organization tend to succeed, while traditional modes of business decline [Weber 2012]. So, individuals who do not conform to capitalist rationality norms are excluded from the economic arena [Weber 2012: 19; Kollár 2021]. This "breeding" of subjects amenable to capitalism reflects evolutionary principles of adaptation and selection.

* Dávid Kollár, Budapest Metropolitan University, Budapest infopark sétány 1. E-mail: kollaardavid@gmail.com

As can be seen from this brief reconstruction, Weber found evolutionary – selectionist – logic to be particularly well suited to describing stable systems such as capitalism. Weber’s primary criticism of these approaches was that in his interpretation they failed to capture the nature of cultural change [Kollár 2021].

In Weber’s view, cultural innovation stems primarily from charismatic individuals. Charismatic agency is a significant source of novelty and variation that can transform institutionalized orders. As for example Eisenstadt [1968] explains, Weber viewed charismatic individuals such as Luther and Calvin as the cultural driving force behind the emergence of modern capitalism. Weber has explored the dynamic interactions between charisma and the institutions [Mommssen 1989] that sustain it in countless other areas. In his political sociology, Weber demonstrated how charismatic rulers emerge during times of crisis to use their extraordinary authority to reshape existing institutions, only to see their novel orientation institutionalised over time into routine bureaucracy.

While the dialectic between charismatic innovation and institutional transformation is central to Weber’s theoretical framework, scholars have not yet substantively examined this relationship through an evolutionary lens. The current paper seeks to address this gap by translating Weber’s vision into key evolutionary notions. Framing Weber’s insights this way allows us to see how Weber provides a complex, non-linear model of social change as charismatic variations interact with institutional environments.

In line with this, the paper proceeds as follows: It first outlines cultural evolution as an organism-centric process driven by innovation from individuals’ unique mental spaces. It connects this to Weber’s concept of charismatic agency as the source of novelty and variation. The paper then discusses how Weber sees order and institutions as providing stability through complexity reduction, aligning this with the notion of status function networks. Finally, the study undertakes to describe the co-evolutionary relationship between charisma and the institutional order through the concepts of adaptation and exaptation.

Cultural Evolution and Charisma

When discussing theories of cultural evolution, it is important to briefly review the differences between biological and cultural evolution. Biological evolution represents a change in the genetic composition of a given population, a process consisting of random variation followed by “selective extinction” [Nánay 2000: 7]. In biological evolution, the emergence of new patterns is due to endogenous genetic mutations that occur in “individual” organisms, from which natural selection selects those changes that provide an evolutionary advantage. Cultural evolutionary models focus on the variation and selection of phenotypes, which are acquired traits [Smith – Szathmáry 1999]. The mutation of a particular phenotype occurs at the individual level, from which cultural selection chooses the most suitable movements.

The first question that arises is what exactly is the role of “individuals” in cultural evolution? In biological evolution, variation corresponds to random genetic mutation in which individual organisms play no real role. Change is merely a whim of nature. A number of theories of cultural evolution are based on similar “gene-centred” assumptions [Dawkins 1989; Dennett 1996]. According to these, organisms are merely carriers of various substrate-neutral algorithms (memes), mutations are nothing more than the much lower

fidelity of information transmission [Nanay 2014], the carrier itself plays no role in the process of cultural evolution. In other words, it does not matter whether a particular substrate-neutral algorithm infects Jane's or John's brain, it is not the carrier that matters, but the meme itself.

Although attacks also occur from the genetic point of view of biological evolution [Kampis 1999: 25–43], they become decisive within the paradigm of cultural evolution. Unlike biological evolution, where the genetic makeup of individuals remains relatively constant, cultural evolution exhibits a high degree of variability among individuals. Although genetic structure explicitly captures the particularities of a species, phenotypic memetic structures do not fully encompass human culture. Labradorship is encoded in the genetic makeup of every Labrador, but Hungarian culture is not ingrained in the minds of all Hungarians. In cultural evolution, individuals have a specific memetic constellation in which cultural fragments are organized based on their biographical characteristics [cf. Kollár 2019a: 9–13]. The memetic complex acts as a multi-agent system in individuals' minds and continuously changes through socialization and complex decision-making situations. Information not only changes during inheritance but also adapts to environmental challenges and creates new patterns through linguistic communication. Therefore, organism-centric explanations appear more useful for the model of cultural evolution [cf. Kampis 1999]. According to them, the sum of an organism's properties or its mental space components cannot be equivalent to the emergent organism or its emergent mental space. Emergent properties arise not only from individual sub-properties, but also from the arrangement and connection structure of these properties. This model implies that cultural evolution's variability, responsible for adaptive cultural change, results from continuous interaction between an individual's mental space and environmental conditions, rather than "random mutations". Individual innovations, or mutations, are the discharges of the agent's mental structure when presented with a specific problem. In contrast to "blind" biological evolution, cultural evolution is teleological to some extent. It responds to specific exogenous challenges by providing an endogenous response from particular individuals. This response is formed by the interaction between the agent and the environment.

If we accept this model, the main source of cultural evolution is the "mutation" or innovation potential of each individual [cf. Deffner – Kandler 2019: 1–2]. The emergence of new patterns can be linked to the individual organism's own patterns, in which their internal essence structure is manifested.

The organism-centric model of cultural evolution is consistent with Weber's innovation sociology. Weber posits that innovations originate from individuals who create new patterns in their actions through their unique worldview and endogenous spiritual structure (*i*). According to Weber's approach, innovations are specific expressions of personality, in which individual subjectively intended intellectual elements are enforced. This is based on Weber's anthropological image, which suggests that rational actions are oriented by irrational dispositions [Weber 2019: 79–89]. In other words, humans are not rational in the classical economics sense, but rather rationalizing beings. This statement is supported by the conceptual separation of subjective and objective rationality [Brubaker 1984: 53–55].

Objective rationality (objective Richtigkeitsrationalität) consists of logically deducible statements that are true in all possible worlds. Examples include mathematical arguments, such as the statement $2 + 2 = 4$, and physical laws, which do not depend on the

observer's preferences. In contrast, subjective rationality is not based on general laws but on the individual's specific perspective. Weber's model emphasises the intentional nature of human rationality. Actions are considered intentional when the agent, possessing certain opinions (information), wishes to achieve certain goals [Dennett 1996, 1998]. Intentional actions are partly rational since the agent desires to achieve certain goals through specific beliefs. However, agents can be considered irrational due to two reasons: 1) lack of sufficient information to act objectively and 2) actions driven by irrational beliefs and desires, typically values, that cannot be objectively grounded. Weber argues that these individual value constellations solidify in a series of ultimate decisions, in which the individual chooses their own fate, meaning the purpose of their activity and existence [Weber 1949: 18; Hidas 2018: 197]. The core of personality, which may seem irrational, acts as a filter that allows the individual to perceive the world authentically. According to this model, individuals serve as a representation system in which the style of the original representations [Danto 1981: 206; Kollár – Kollár 2022; Bordács – Kollár – Sinkovits 2003] determines the specific endogenous structure of their views and desires [Weber 1967: 305]. According to Weber, cultural changes always begin with individuals. These individuals recreate maladaptive world conditions through their specific representations.

Weber's concept system identifies the charismatic agent as the purest embodiment of the world transformer character. This agent operates within the terrain of charismatic rule (charismatische Herrschaft). The term "charisma" originates from the ancient Greek language and means "divinely inspired gift" [Yukl 1993]. In the New Testament context, the term refers to divine gifts that enable recipients to perform extraordinary actions [Conger et al. 1997]. According to the Protestant interpretation, charisma is seen as a force that opposes the institutional rigidity of Christian doctrine and its division into the world [Hidas 2018]. Weber adopted this concept of charisma and incorporated it into his sociological categories of domination [Nur 1998: 21].

In this conceptual system, charisma is defined as an exceptional characteristic of a person or object. It allows for the categorical separation of everyday and non-everyday phenomena, similar to the division of the transcendent/immanent or the sacred/profane [Miskolczi – Kollár 2018]. "The main feature of charisma – and at the same time Weber's original idea – is the person's unusual ability to break what exists and start a radically new one" [Hidas 2018]. "The book is written, but I say unto you" using this New Testament phrase in a sloganized fashion captures the concept of charisma and charismatic person.

Charisma in this context is defined as the creative power of history [Weber 1980: 658], whereby individuals, by exploiting their creative capacity, put world-turning events in motion. According to this model, great historical transformations [DiTomaso 1993: 260] always start from individuals who, through their specific qualifications, break through the empty shell of the existing order. Charisma is conceived as a means of creation and is opposed to impersonal forces. "Pure" charisma embodies the essential internal structure of the autonomous agent, through which the agent renews social reality from within [Hidas 2018].

The dynamics of cultural evolution depend on an individual's innovative capacity, as presented in the previous section. However, one of the main features of innovations is that they are essentially "costly". Innovations bring both the possibility of failure and the excitement of triumph over world-changing events. However, continuously reinventing

the world from scratch is not only a daunting task but also an impossible one. Without stable foundations and well-defined structures, broadly speaking, the ever-flowing tide of history slips through our fingers. Thus, cultural evolution dynamics can be described as a sequential process in which complexity can be increased through reduction [Luhmann 2006]. In the context of cultural evolution, objectified structures enable the reduction of complexity. Tomasello argues that the evolutionary success of humans is based on cultural accumulation. “Some cultural traditions accumulate the modifications made by different individuals over time so that they become more complex, and a wider range of adaptive functions is encompassed” [Tomasello 2000: 37]. Cumulation, or the building of cultural traditions, can occur in two ways: firstly, through the transfer of information between individuals; and secondly, through the external anchoring of cultural traditions. In the latter case, cultural traditions are institutionalised based on collective intentionality, giving certain entities a status function. This follows the general form of “X counts as Y in context C” [Searle 1998: 129]. Institutional reality is constructed through collective beliefs and desires, which lead agents to assign functions to physical objects that do not inherently follow from their nature. This can be illustrated by the example of language, where voices produced by vocal cords have no inherent meaning. The sound series is created by assigning specific functions to individual sounds within a particular language community. This is similar to the concept of money, where a piece of paper holds value because it has been given a certain status by ourselves and others. The paper has no inherent value; its exchange value is derived not from its physical properties, but from the fact that a group of people has assigned it a particular exchange value [Searle 1998: 112–131]. The institutional reality is a complex system of status functions, built on increasingly complex assignment rules between individual functions. We can illuminate this complexity with a simple example: imagine Jane and John standing at the altar and getting married. In this (C1) context, the phrase “I do” (X1) constitutes the intention to enter into marriage (Y1). The “I do” sound sequence (X2) is an expression of will only among English speakers (C2). The “I do” (X3) sound in English can only be the “means” of marriage (Y3) if it is spoken in front of a priest (C3) who has the status function of performing the ritual [cf. Searle 1998: 130]. Additionally, the church has the status function of consecrating priests, which is necessary for a priest to perform the marriage ritual. This line can be enhanced infinitely, but each status function must follow the rule X counts as Y in context C. The stability and causal power of institutional reality are embodied in a complex network of status functions, which implies its particular complexity. By acknowledging and accepting the status functions that build up social reality, they become objective and capable of regulating individuals’ behaviour.

This complex system of status functions is not difficult to reconcile with the concept of social “order” (*Ordnung*) [Weber 2019: 108–116]. According to Weber, social action is governed by regularities that the actors themselves regard as valid. These regularities can be referred to by the collective term “order”, which can be explicitly expressed as the intellectual content of a particular social relationship: when action is aligned with the maxim (high average and approximate). These maxims – which can take the form of custom, convention or law [Weber 2019: 108] – also define the boundaries of social reality by regulating the course of social action. If a group of people considers the order (in Searle’s terms: a network of status functions) to be valid, then these people will typically act according to the regularities established by the order, i.e. the acceptance of a valid order – regular or

manifest – implies lawful, predictable behaviour. Through its ability to structure relationships between individuals, order reduces the degree of uncertainty that arises from the structure of social reality [cf. Györfy 2012: 414]. Overall, therefore, the cultural evolutionary “benefit” of order, which can also be called institutional reality, is a radical reduction in the complexity of reality, which is achieved by radically narrowing the field of possible actions, decisions and choices through rules [cf. Kollár 2019a]. The reduction of complexity can be achieved in two ways: implicitly and explicitly. In the implicit reduction of complexity, each of the actors follows certain habits or conventions that are not itemised [cf. Weber 2019: 111–115]. In position C, I have to act in a certain way, but in a large percentage of cases this does not happen as a “ministry”.

In contrast, the rules for reducing complexity are explicitly listed in position C, under the argument that I must act in a certain way (X). This is a “deterministic” assignment rule, as the relationship between input and output is clearly defined. For example, the author’s grandmother does not follow detailed recipes when making poppy seed roll at Christmas, but instead relies on specific implicit heuristics. The shape of the poppy seed roll and the ratio of filling to dough may vary slightly from time to time. BigMac serves as a paradigmatic example of action following itemized rules. The preparation of a BigMac is explicitly fixed, resulting in consistent taste and texture, and a constant proportion of meat, cakes, and buns [Ritzer 1998; Kollár 2019]. Therefore, the preparation of the Big Mac follows a deterministic process. When in position C, you must adhere to the assignment rule by acting in the X manner.

Weber argues that bureaucratic institutions embody a form of itemized order that regulates actors’ behaviour through explicit arguments. This is achieved within the terrain of bureaucratic rule (bürokratische Herrschaft) [Weber 2019: 343–350]. Bureaucratic systems are based on a radical reduction in the complexity of the world [Kollár 2019a]. The objective is to maximise performance by implementing algorithms that accurately and efficiently record input and output relationships, while excluding any operations not recorded in the pre-designated process [cf. Crozier 2010]. In this context, the agent acts as an impersonal instrument of order, rather than following its inner urges. It does not possess, but merely realises. According to Weber [2004: 134], the administrative ideal is impartiality, free from personal or emotional influence, arbitrariness, and unpredictability. It should be strongly formalistic, following rational rules without regard to respect of person. When these rules are lacking, the ideal official operates according to an objective outlook defined by effectiveness. The complexity of the world and the influence of external factors are reflected in the orderly mechanisms of a rational system [Kollár 2019b]. Bureaucratic systems do not take into account individual characteristics when implementing their processes. For bureaucratic administration, the social status, religious affiliation, and love life of the agent do not matter.

The characteristics of bureaucratic institutions are exemplified well in the modern factory environment. Work processes are broken down into discrete, repetitive tasks following strict technical specifications. Workers are assigned narrowly defined roles and must adhere rigidly to standardized operating protocols. Individual judgment or creativity is eliminated in favor of maximal efficiency and control. Weber [1968: 67] notes that the specialized work of trained craftsmen is either discontinued or limited to standardization and supervision functions. It is worth noting that the reduction of complexity in institutions

is not only evident in the economic sphere. Bureaucratic organization maximizes technical efficiency through such extreme simplification, but sacrifices human spontaneity.

Similarly, the Protestant ethic reduced religious devotion to orderly maxims regulating conduct. According to Weber, moral complexity was reduced to ascetic discipline and hard work. This ethical approach significantly limited the religious significance: The God of Calvinism required not just individual good deeds, but a lifetime of good deeds that were integrated into a cohesive system [*Eisenstadt 1968*]. The simplification of faith into systematic worldly behaviour mirrors the bureaucratic simplification of social complexities into technical routines. In both cases, individuality is subordinated to collective rules as complex human meanings are organized into orderly and predictable systems.

Innovation and Order; Adaptation and Exaptation

The presented argument suggests that cultural evolution is influenced by the interplay between charismatic innovation and institutional order. The institutional order can be interpreted as a network of status functions that captures individuals' attitudes towards themselves, each other, and the world. Meanwhile, individual charismatic innovations enable the renewal of maladaptive rules. Although much of the literature on Weber's work treats the concepts of charismatic innovation and bureaucratic order as opposing, our analysis reveals a coevolutionary relationship between these notions [*cf. Eisenstadt 1964; Mommsen 1989: 112*]. This can be illustrated by the example of language: The fundamental means of communication between individuals is facilitated by language. This involves associating specific concepts with individual sound patterns through established rules, which attribute status functions to physical or mental entities. It is in everyone's best interest to adhere to these rules, as without them, basic understanding would not be possible. Consider the scenario of attempting to communicate with a store clerk using an incomprehensible sound sequence such as "Xjahsjah jash!". The shop assistant would be shocked at best, not knowing that my "Xjahsjah jash!" is a reference to the English phrase "Give me a litre of milk". The stability of communication between people – the reduction of complexity – is facilitated by the collective adoption of linguistic rules. Language is therefore fundamentally characterised by a high degree of stability, but changes in the mental and physical environment or in the basic conditions of existence [*cf. Weber 1956: 399*] make the use of new concepts necessary. In this case, a given status function is modified along an existing allocation rule due to the nature of the mental or physical entity – horse-drawn carriage – or the agents use their creative capacities – creating new allocation rules on the narrow inductive path of existing allocation rules. According to this, the co-evolution of institutional (social) reality – resulting from the interaction of the triad of fixed order (allocation rules), agents (new language use) and environment (changing living conditions) – can take place in two ways. On the one hand, the new allocation was created by the agents through rules and, on the other hand, through the modification of existing status functions. The former, which builds on the charismatic capacity of agents, can be called innovation according to the current literature [*Fogarty 2018; Deffner – Kandler 2019*], while the latter, which aims at increasing the efficiency of fixed functions, can be called modification. Innovation typically belongs to agents, while modification typically belongs to fixed functions (i.e. institutions). We can shed light on the differences between

(charismatic) innovation and (bureaucratic) modification, and on the relationship between the two modes of operation, by using designer attitudes borrowed from evolutionary biology. I argue that (charismatic) innovation is a paradigmatic case of exaptive design strategy, whereas bureaucratic modification is based on adaptive design strategies.

To support this, it is important to briefly clarify the differences between exaptation and adaptation. According to Gould and Vrba's [1982] article entitled "Exaptation: The Missing Term in the Science of Form", both adaptation and exaptation are forms of aptation. Adaptation occurs when patterns of natural selection develop a given attribute or character for current use. The function of adaptation is to unfold historically as a process. According to them, there are two forms of exaptation: "(1) A character, previously shaped by natural selection for a particular function (an adaptation), is coopted for a new use – cooptation. (2) A character whose origin cannot be ascribed to the direct action of natural selection (a nonaptation), is coopted for a current use – cooptation" [Gould – Vrba 1982]. In the case of exaptation, we cannot speak of a function, but only of a consequence or effect, i.e. the use of a useful trait that has arisen without the intervention of natural selection. In contrast to adaptation, exaptation is not preceded by a process of design; it relies on the cooptation of non-aptive by-products or characters previously adapted to other roles. The famous biological example of exaptation is the panda's thumb, which is a thickened wrist bone that allows it to remove letters from bamboo sticks with astonishing skill [Gould 1980; Kollár – Kollár 2019]. The real, specialised panda thumb is not suitable for this task. So they use this exaptated, strange structure for eating. The famous exaptation used in engineering is the design of the tractor chassis [Kauffman 2000: 132]. The difficulty in making the first tractor was that the engine, which was necessarily large, could not stand up to the chassis they built, and the whole chassis collapsed under the weight of the engine. Frustrated, one of the engineers came up with the idea of using the rigid engine block as a chassis. The engine's stiffness is the result of its size, it had no function until it was realised that it was doing a great job, so the non-aptive by-product (the stiffness) became a useful feature, a real innovative property [Kollár – Kollár 2019]. According to the approach presented, exaptation is a new use of a previously non-functional structure or object "designed" for a different function, and adaptation is an endogenous response to an exogenous problem in which a previously existing function is even more effective, i.e. adaptive operations are responsible for improving the efficiency of already recorded algorithms. The (innovative) agent using an exaptive design strategy expands the horizon of the design space with possible implementations beyond the operational proximity of the functional operation. In this case, the new uses do not result from the inherent nature of the given function, but from the embodiment of the agent's specific (charismatic) worldview. In contrast, when applying the adaptive design strategy, the horizon of the design space is reduced to the possible implementations that can be developed in the context of functional operation, i.e. the functional efficiency of the given function inherent from functional operation to modifications [cf. Kollár 2019a].

The relationship between adaptive and exaptive design attitudes [cf. Winters 2019] – along with charismatic innovation and bureaucratic modification – is well illustrated by the emergence of modern capitalism which was driven by a combination of adaptive modifications to existing economic institutions as well as innovative exaptations of cultural values for new economic purposes.

Specifically, the Protestant work ethic represented a novel exaptation of religious attitudes to fit the needs of early capitalism. The notion of “calling” or vocation, which encouraged diligence, thrift, and dedication to one’s work as a spiritual duty, transformed the meaning of labor from drudgery into a holy calling. This repurposing of religious values for economic ends provided a new spiritual justification for profit-seeking, lending ethical legitimacy to the pursuit of wealth. By adapting economic activity to religious goals in this way, the Protestant ethic opened up new possibilities for unhindered capitalism to develop [cf. *Kollár 2021*]. At the same time, traditional economic institutions like merchant guilds and early joint-stock companies were being adaptively modified to better suit the emerging capitalist system. Improvements in double-entry bookkeeping allowed more precise accounting and tracking of investments. New business techniques like cost accounting enabled more rational calculation of profits. The joint-stock company itself was transformed through changes to voting rules, trading of shares, and business organization that specialized these institutions for capitalist enterprise. Therefore, the rise of modern capitalism was driven by both exaptive innovation, as religious values were creatively refashioned to provide ethical justification, and adaptive modification, as existing medieval institutions were refined to enable capitalism. The interplay between these two evolutionary mechanisms of change fueled the transition: exaptation expanded possibility spaces for profit-seeking while adaptation optimized efficiency within existing structures.

This example demonstrates how major social transformations often depend on a dialectical relationship between charismatic innovation, which disrupts old patterns, and adaptive optimization, which refines established institutions. The case of early capitalism highlights how new cultural values can open up possibilities for economic change while modifications to existing organizations help canalize those possibilities into new forms of order.

In line with this, the relationship between (charismatic) innovations and (bureaucratic) order and adaptive and exaptive design attitudes can be metaphorically represented as the complementary relation of the “solidified time islands” (which is functioning as a solid ground) in the “flow space” [*Kollár – Kollár 2020*]. The bureaucratic order is responsible for maintaining the reduced world’s stability through the fixed status functions and their possible modifications. Charismatic, innovative – based on exaptive horizon opening – operations that are organically linked to agents allow the domestication of phenomena that cannot be handled by existing functions.

Conclusion

This paper has examined Max Weber’s sociological insights through the lens of cultural evolution theory. Specifically, it has focused on translating Weber’s concepts of charismatic innovation and bureaucratic order into the evolutionary mechanisms of exaptation and adaptation. According to the results Weber viewed charismatic individuals as the primary source of novelty and variation in culture. They expand the realm of possibilities through the exaptive repurposing of existing traits and objects. In contrast, social institutions impose order by reducing complexity through status function networks. The stability of established organizations is optimized through adaptive modifications. Modern capitalism provides a good example of the dialectical relationship between the charismatic exaptation

of religious values that justify profit-seeking and the adaptive refinements that streamline economic institutions. In summary, Weber described a complex coevolutionary process between visionary innovation and structural continuity. Weber's key insight was that major cultural transformations depend on both exaptive disruptions to expand possibility and adaptive optimizations to stabilize social reality. This nuanced perspective continues to offer crucial lessons about managing modernity's tensions between dynamic creativity and rational organization. Weber demonstrated that cultural progress requires a delicate balance between charismatic novelty and institutional order.

Bibliography

- Bordács, Andrea – Kollár, József – Sinkovits, Péter [2003]. *Endre Tót*. Budapest: Új Művészet Alapítvány.
- Brubaker, Rogers [1984]. *The Limits of Rationality*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Conger, Jay Alden et al. [1997]. Measuring Charisma: Dimensionality and Validity of the Conger-Kanungo Scale of Charismatic Leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences* 14 (3): 290-302.
- Crozier, Michel [2010]. *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*. New York: Routledge.
- Danto, Coleman Arthur [1981]. *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Dawkins, Richard [1989]. *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Deffner, Dominik – Kandler, Anne [2019]. Trait specialization, innovation, and the evolution of culture in fluctuating environments. *Palgrave Commun* 5 (1).
- Dennett, Daniel Clement [1987]. *The intentional stance*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Dennett, Daniel Clement [1996]. *Darwin's Dangerous Idea*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- DiTomaso, Nancy [1993]. Weber's Social History and Etzioni's Structural Theory of Charisma in Organizations: Implications for Thinking about Charismatic Leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly* 4 (3/4): 257-275.
- Fogarty, Laurel [2018]. Cultural complexity and evolution in fluctuating environments. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* 373 (1743).
- Gould, Stephen Jay [1980]. *The Panda's Thumb*. New York: Norton.
- Gould, Stephen Jay – Vrba, S. Elisabeth [1982]. The Missing Term in the Science of Form. *Paleobiology* 8 (1): 4-15.
- Györfy, Dóra [2012]. Institutional confidence and the time line of decision-making. *Economic Review – monthly of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences* LIX (4): 412-425.
- Hidas, Zoltán [2004]. *Entzauberte Geschichte: Max Weber und die Krise des Historismus*. Frankfurt. Peter Lang Verlag.
- Hidas, Zoltán [2018]. *Törékeny értelmvilágaink – A világalakítás rendje és szabadsága*. Gondolat Kiadó.
- Kampis, György [1999]. Dennett and evolution. *Replika* (36).
- Kauffman, Stuart Alan [2000]. *Investigations*. Oxford University Press.
- Kauffman, Stuart Alan [2010]. *Reinventing The Sacred*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kollár, Dávid [2019a]. Rival Patterns of Standardization. *Culture and Society* 10 (2): 87-106.
- Kollár, Dávid [2019b]. *A society without causality*. BCE-TEAM.
- Kollár, Dávid [2021]. Max Weber and the chemistry of the Protestant ethic. *Social Science Information* 60 (4): 504-521.
- Kollár, Dávid – Kollár, József [2017]. Tulajdonságok nélküli társadalom [Society without qualities]. *Jel-kép* 2017 (3): 37-44
- Kollár, Dávid – Kollár, József [2020]. The Art Of Shipwrecking. *Dialogue and Universalism* 30 (1): 67-84.
- Kollár, Dávid – Kollár, József [2022]. Le style c'est l'homme même?. *Philosophy Today* 66 (4): 781-798.
- Kollár, József – Déri, Krisztina [2011]. *Vizen Jární*. Mentofaktúra.
- Koppl, Roger – Kauffman, Stuart Alan – Felin, Teppo – Longo, Giuseppe [2015]. Economics for a creative world. *Journal of Institutional Economics* 11 (1): 1-31.

- Miskolczi, Bernadett – Kollár, Dávid [2018]. *Personalized God – Religion and Modernization*. BCE-TEAM.
- Mommsen, Wolfgang Justin [1989]. *The Political and Social Theory of Max Weber*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Nanay, Bence [2000]. *Elme és evolúció*. Kávé Kiadó.
- Nanay, Bence [2014]. Cultural replication and microbial evolution. In: Pleh, Csaba – Csibra, Gergely – Richerson, Peter (eds.). *Naturalistic Approaches to Culture*. Budapest: Akadémiai, pp. 122–135.
- Ritzer, George [1998]. *The McDonaldization Thesis: Explorations and Extensions*. London: SAGE.
- Schumpeter, Joseph Alois [1975]. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York: Harper.
- Searl, John [1998]. *Mind, Language and Society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Shackle, George – Lennox, Sharman [1955]. *Uncertainty in Economics and Other Reflections*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, John Maynard – Szathmáry, Eörs [1999]. *The Origins of Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tomasello, Michael [2000]. *The Cultural Origins of Human Cognition*. Harvard University Press.
- Weber, Max [1946]. Science as a vocation. In: Gerth, Hans Heinrich – Mills, Charles Wright (eds.). *From Max Weber: essays in sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 129–156.
- Weber, Max [1949]. *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.
- Weber, Max [1956]. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*. 4th ed. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Weber, Max [1967]. *Ancient Judaism*. New York: The Free Press.
- Weber, Max [1980]. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Grundriss der verstehenden Soziologie*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- Weber, Max [2004]. *The Essential Weber*. New York: Routledge.
- Weber, Max [2004b]. Science as Vocation. In: Owen, David – Strong, B. Tracy (eds.). *The Vocation Lectures*. Hackett Publishing Company.
- Weber, Max [2012]. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Routledge.
- Weber, Max [2019]. *Economy and society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Winters, James [2019]. Escaping optimization traps: the role of cultural adaptation and cultural exaptation in facilitating open-ended cumulative dynamics. *Palgrave Communication* 5.
- Yukl, Gary [1993]. A Retrospective of Robert House's "1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership" and Recent Revisions. *The Leadership Quarterly* 4 (3–4): 367–373.

Dávid Kollár is a sociologist, poet, art critic and PhD candidate at Pázmány Péter Catholic University. He is a founding member of the Applied Ontology Research Group at the University of Pécs, and lecturer at the Budapest Metropolitan University and Pázmány Péter Catholic University. His main research interests are social theory, complex systems, social philosophy and values research.