Simmel Studies



Georg Simmel's "How Is Society Possible?": A Dialogue

Frank J. Lechner and Daniel Silver

Volume 26, Number 2, 2022

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1097517ar DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/1097517ar

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

Edizioni ETS

ISSN

1616-2552 (print) 2512-1022 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this document

Lechner, F. & Silver, D. (2022). Georg Simmel's "How Is Society Possible?": A Dialogue. Simmel Studies, 26(2), 9–9. https://doi.org/10.7202/1097517ar

© Frank J. Lechner and Daniel Silver, 2023



This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/



FRANK J. LECHNER AND DANIEL SILVER

Georg Simmel's "How Is Society Possible?": A Dialogue

How should we read and understand Georg Simmel's famous essay, "How Is Society Possible?" How and how well does Simmel answer his main question? What bearing, if any, does the essay have on the study of forms of interaction, in his own work or in modern scholarship? The exchange below addresses such questions in the form of an article, extended commentary, and response. With the support of the editors of Simmel Studies, we present the trio of items as a single unit to illustrate to fellow Simmel scholars the possibilities of divergent readings and critiques. The exchange began when Lechner sent a draft of his paper "How Is Society Possible?" to Silver, who responded with detailed comments. It occurred to us that rather than simply submitting a paper revised in light of those comments, or letting further revision occur behind the scenes through peer review, it might be worthwhile to make our contrasting views public as a stimulus to further reflection on a classic essay. Since we have both been inspired by the work and thought of the great Simmel scholar Donald Levine (who was Silver's Ph.D. advisor), we also offer this joint effort as an instance of the dialogical approach to theory he advocated.