human visibility, or in historical anthropology, which collects Simmel's reflections on the mimesis he observed in its typical manifestations of modern and metropolitan life.

It is precisely on the analyses of the new urban lifestyles that the editors' concluding observations focus, situating Simmel between Weber's nostalgic *Entzauberung der Welt* and the irony of Blumenberg's *Zivilisationskritik*. On the basis of Gregor Fitzi's recent studies (*The Challenge of Modernity*, New York, Routledge, 2019), they attribute to Simmel an ambivalent and complex vision of the city that cannot be reduced either to Romantic anti-capitalism nor to an anticipation of the Frankfurt school's critical theory. The city is not only the place of the discolouration (*Entfärbung*) of the world but also a site of liberation, one able to give rise to colourful individual forms, such as the "Virzuletto" (*Grülpchen*), the protagonist of the very short "Fable of Colour," (published in Italian in C. Portioli, G. Fitzi, *Georg Simmel e l'estetica sociale*, Milano-Udine, Mimesis, 2006, pp. 289-290), which provides the collection with a light and witty conclusion.

MILOŠ BROĆIĆ, DANIEL SILVER

Miloš Broćić, Daniel Silver, "The Influence of Simmel on American Sociology since 1975", *Annual Review of Sociology*, (*forthcoming*).

Our forthcoming article in the *Annual Review of Sociology,* "The Influence of Simmel on American Sociology since 1975," revisits questions Donald Levine, Ellwood Carter, and Eleanor Miller Gorman posed nearly fifty years ago when they published the last major review of Simmel's influence on American sociology. At the time, Simmel's position in the discipline could still be described as marginal. Levine et al. (1976a, p. 813) noted that while Simmel was

"the only European scholar who had a palpable influence on sociology in the United States throughout the course of the 20th century", he was still less widely discussed than the likes of Marx, Durkheim, or Weber. Since then, Simmel's stature in the discipline has grown, deepened, and diversified. Simmel is arguably *the* classical reference point for the field of network analysis, which rapidly grew in scope and stature in the decades after Levine et. al. review (Scott & Carrington, 2011). Symbolic interactionism also consolidated as a distinct orientation with its own journals and classical texts during this period, often turning to Simmel to articulate an interactionist approach to social life, and as a foundational precursor to Erving Goffman and Herbert Blumer (Rock, 1979; Low, 2008). New English translations of his works (see Kemple, 2012) have also paved the way for novel appropriations of Simmel in economic sociology and in the sociology of culture.

Despite progress, however, scholars still struggle to make sense of what a "Simmelian" point of view entails. Simmel has been variously described as "the classical sociologist most deeply committed to relational theorizing" (Emirbayer, 1997, p. 288), a "post-modernist at the height of modernism" (Weinstein & Weinstein, 1989, p. 57), and even "the father of quantitative sociology" (Blau, 1977a, p. 26). Though such divergent perspectives strike one as fundamentally incompatible, contradictions are commonplace in Simmel's legacy. A broadly shared interpretation of his work and disciplinary position remains elusive.

Our article addresses this enduring question by adopting a novel approach. We chart the evolving directions of Simmelian sociology by combining traditional scholarship with computational methods, assessing what these trajectories look like in practice. We compiled all cited references to Simmel since 1976 in the top 47 US sociological journals to generate a network of citations identifying the major constellations of Simmel research, and the key texts, translations, and authors at their center. We found several clusters exhibiting coherent sub-disciplinary conversations: symbolic interactionism, social networks, culture, urban sociology, conflict,

organizational theory, and economic sociology. While Simmelian concepts of form, interaction, and dualism bring these together, his use fluctuates within and across clusters. Simmel thrives on multivocality as intellectual entrepreneurs find in his work a perpetual resource for advancing their own claims. As such, Simmelian sociology moves in tandem with the various 'turns' of American sociology, anchoring continuity through change.

This is apparent in his uptake in urban sociology and conflict studies. Simmel's early integration in both fields was assimilated into the dominant functionalist paradigm. In urban sociology, Simmel's portrait of the city as a site of nervous energies and hyperstimulation spoke to functionalist concerns over disintegration, with researchers using Simmel to understand alienation in urban contexts (Wirth, 1938). Coser's (1956) landmark *Functions of Social Conflict*, likewise, drew on Simmel's conflict-cohesion dualism to elaborate the latent integrative functions of conflict. As the discipline moved away from functionalism, however, scholars continued drawing on Simmel but shifted to the formal aspects of his thought instead. Urban sociologists began examining city life as a constellation of network linkages rather than an organic whole (Granovetter, 1973; Wellman, 1979; Wellman & Wortley, 1990), while political sociologists moved to more formal understandings of conflict, measuring polarization by the extent of cross-cutting ties (DiMaggio *et al.*, 1996; Baldassarri & Gelman, 2008).

This shift was advanced by the work of Peter Blau (1977b), whose structuralist interpretation of Simmel in organizational theory primed him to play an important role in social network analysis. For network theorists, a strong interpretation of Simmel's distinction between form and content became foundational, as researchers subsumed culture under social relations, and used Simmel's geometric metaphors (dyads, triads, circles, webs etc.) as templates for developing their own methods (Scott & Carrington, 2011). His formalism offered a counterpoint to Parsonian norms-based sociology and the methodological individualism of rational-choice theorists. Simmel's influence was also at the core of seminal

works in networks analysis, particularly scholarship on brokerage and duality (White, Boorman & Breiger, 1976; Burt, 1992).

Today, Simmel's formalism is widely understood to be championed by social network analysis. This was not always clear, however. The structuralist interpretation of Simmel's formalism in social networks is only one variant of his formalism (Silver & Brońić, 2019). Concurrent with the rise of networks research, sociologists from a very different leaning were also claiming Simmel's formalism. Symbolic interactionism, specifically, used Simmel to articulate phenomenological forms of perception that arise in interactional settings (Rock, 1979; Low, 2008). Researchers found analytical purchase in Simmelian concepts like social distance, as well as social types representing different modes of experiencing the world, such as the stranger, the adventurer, among others. Simmel's (2009[1908]) neo-Kantianism in "How is Society Possible" indeed anticipated many of symbolic interactionism's major themes, particularly the partial and fragmented nature of social interactions, and how the individual and society relate. While influential, this variant of Simmel's formalism found less purchase than the structuralist 'form of form' in networks research, with the quantitative bent of the latter better accommodating positivist currents in the discipline.

Most recently, the 'relational turn' in American sociology continues to signal Simmel's enduring multivocality (Emirbayer, 1997). Simmel's writings on trust, valuation, and cultural diffusion have offered scholars in burgeoning fields like economic sociology and sociology of culture perspective on the fluid and processual unfolding of social life. In doing so, they depart from more static conceptions of social structures, sometimes attributed to the formalist tradition (Erikson, 2013). Even recent work by network scholars exemplifies this shift, with network insights extended into cultural life by measuring interrelations in structures of belief rather than social relationships alone (Schultz & Breiger, 2010). Such developments were partly facilitated by new English translations of Simmel's work, especially *Philosophy of Money* in 1978 as well as essays

collected in *Individuality and Social Forms* (1971). The recent translation of *View of Life* (2010 [1918]) offers yet another path for future Simmel appropriation, highlighting the transcendent character of social life that sociologists are only beginning to tap into (Silver & Lee, 2012; Lee & Silver, 2012).

All in all, our review takes stock of these evolving directions in Simmel's legacy, consolidating the different strands of research since 1975, and closing with a discussion of opportunities for future areas of research. While we find divergent, even contradictory, readings of Simmel, it is clear his work continues to be a source of creative inspiration for scholars with different aims. His early integration in the field was marked by the discipline's functionalist orientation. With social network analysis departing from this paradigm, Simmel continued to anchor continuity through change, as his formalism offered theoretical foundational for work in this area. Most recently, Simmel's relationalism is appropriated as a corrective to the rigidity of structuralism in new areas of research. Overall, rather than a thorn in the side of a field that needs a fixed set of marching orders from above, the fact that Simmel is near impossible to pin down, that his ideas are always on the move, that he is a sociologist and more than a sociologist – this is a source of constant disciplinary growth and self-transformation, and critical self-reflection.

References

Baldassarri, D., & Gelman, A. (2008). Partisans without Constraint: Political Polarization and Trends in American Public Opinion. *American Journal of Sociology*, *114*(2), 408–446.

Blau, Peter M. (1977a). A Macrosociological Theory of Social Structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, *83*(1), 26–54.

Blau, Peter M. (1977b). *Inequality and heterogeneity: a primitive theory of social structure*. New York: Free Press.

Brońić, M., and Silver D. (2021). "The Influence of Simmel on American Sociology Since 1975." *Annual Review of Sociology* 47(1).

Burt, R. S. (1992). *Structural holes: the social structure of competition*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Coser, L. A. (1956). *The Functions of Social Conflict*. Routledge.

DiMaggio, P., Evans, J., & Bryson, B. (1996). Have American's Social Attitudes Become More Polarized? *American Journal of Sociology*, *102*(3), 690–755.

Emirbayer, M. (1997). Manifesto for a Relational Sociology 1. *American Journal of Sociology*, *103*(2), 281–317.

Erikson, E. (2013). Formalist and Relationalist Theory in Social Network Analysis. *Sociological Theory*, *31*(3), 219–242.

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, *78*(6), 1360–1380.

Kemple, T. M. (2012). A Chronology of Simmel's Works in English. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *29*(7/8), 317.

Lee, M., & Silver, D. (2012). Simmel's Law of the Individual and the Ethics of the Relational Self. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *29*(7–8), 124–145.

Levine, D. N., Carter E.B., & E.M. Gorman (1976a). Simmel's Influence on American Sociology. I. *American Journal of Sociology*, *81*(4), 813.

Levine, D. N., Carter E.B., & E.M. Gorman (1976b). Simmel's Influence on American Sociology. II. *American Journal of Sociology*, *81*(5), 1112.

Low, J. (2008). Structure, agency, and social reality in Blumerian symbolic interactionism: The influence of Georg Simmel. *Symbolic Interaction*, *31*(3), 325–343.

Rock, P. E. (1979). *The making of symbolic interactionism*. London: Macmillan.

Schultz, J., & Breiger, R. L. (2010). The strength of weak culture. *Poetics*, *38*(6), 610–624.

Scott, J., & Carrington, P. J. (2011). *The SAGE Handbook of Social Network Analysis*. SAGE.