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The Editor’s Horizon

Michael R. Hill, EDITOR

THIS SUPPLEMENT is published in conjunction with the Interim Meeting of the International Sociological Association, Research Committee on the History of Sociology (RCHS) in Torun, Poland, June 1-4, 2000. As many of my colleagues from the United States travel to Europe this summer for the interim meeting in the historic city of Torun, it seems especially appropriate to recall the trans-Atlantic educational adventures of one of our American sociological pioneers.

George Elliott Howard (1849-1928), president of the American Sociological Society in 1917, was one of those American scholars who recognized the value of European training at a time when opportunities for advanced study in the United States were limited or nonexistent, depending on one’s field of interest. Howard, who enrolled in university studies in Munich during 1876-78, joined the ranks of several notable social scientists who took similar treks: William Graham Sumner traveled to Göttingen and Oxford after graduating from Yale College in 1863, Albion W. Small went to Berlin and Leipzig in 1879-81, Florence Kelley entered the University of Zurich in 1883, William I. Thomas studied in Berlin and Göttingen in 1888-89, George Herbert Mead traveled to Leipzig and Berlin in 1888-91, W.E.B. DuBois studied in Berlin during 1892-94, Charles R. Henderson completed a degree at Leipzig in 1901, and Robert E. Park finished his degree at Heidelberg in 1904, to list only a few names well-known to American sociologists. For discussion of this phenomenon, see Thwing (1928). The present paper examines the dates of George E. Howard’s studies in Germany and France.

It is a great pleasure, and an extraordinary privilege, to return to Europe for another interim meeting of RCHS. Copies of this special supplement are being made available in Torun prior to the formal release of the Summer issue (Vol. 2, No. 1) of SOCIOLOGICAL ORIGINS. To our hosts in Torun, I extend—along with all of my colleagues—our most hearty thanks and congratulations.

REFERENCE

Presented at the Interim Meeting of the International Sociological Association Research Committee on the History of Sociology (RCHS) in Torun, Poland, June 1-4, 2000, in a session on archives organized by Jennifer Platt. An earlier version of this paper was presented in a Theory Study Group Colloquium, Department of Sociology, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, on April 27, 2000. I thank the Study Group members for the opportunity to discuss these ideas.

The specifically philosophical intricacies involved here are numerous and sometimes tortuous. Historical sociologists entering this debate will profit from carefully reviewing Florian Znaniecki’s (1919) erudite monograph on *Cultural Reality*. Znaniecki engages these issues at length and concludes that “social reality” is philosophically complex. So it is, and this conclusion can also be reached from starting points other than those adopted by Znaniecki.
that Charlotte Perkins Gilman, an early American sociologist, was deeply racist because Gilman (1892) employed the color yellow as a descriptor in her didactic, semi-autobiographical short-story, “The Yellow Wall-Paper.” Equally incredible, to my mind, was the recent assertion by a visiting sociologist, Andrew Billingsley, during a formal colloquium at the University of Nebraska in the Department of Sociology to the effect that the former African-American slaves in the United States freed themselves with no help whatsoever from any white people. Others are now making sweeping, unfounded claims about the sexual orientations and practices of the resident sociologists at Chicago’s Hull House—Jane Addams, in particular (Richards 1993; Russell 1994), and rely on caprice, innuendo, and wishful thinking rather than empirical data.¹ In these examples, reality and inconvenient facts are glibly and recklessly ignored, and the person who dares call for careful auditing of historical reality runs the considerable risk of being labeled intolerant, homophobic, or racist. Conversely, and equally astounding, a steady stream of books today continues to present the history of sociology as a solely male preserve, ignoring the well-documented contributions of scores of women to sociology, and those of us who insist on unbiased presentation and review of the historical record in this case risk being labeled neurotic, tenditious, and shrill. For me, quite frankly, this situation clearly has “an air of unreality,” and, to echo William James, I too feel “weird” defending what to me seems such an obvious proposition: that we must take reality seriously (Hirst 1967: 78).

Interestingly, a “new” debate over “realism” surfaced recently in the American Journal of Sociology. In surmise, Craig Calhoun (1998: 846) notes, “Sociologists seem doomed to fight the methodenstreit again and again.” Indeed, this same turf was vigorously contested a full quarter century ago when I was a graduate student in geography and deeply involved in such issues (e.g., Hill 1973, 1977, 1980a, b, 1981; Hill and Roemer 1977). Self-styled nomothetic geographers (e.g., Harvey 1969; Amedeo and Golledge 1975) read heated, philosophical ultimatums to their idiographic colleagues. The result was sometimes acutely painful, but healthy in the long run. However, the ultimately critical, philosophically sophisticated, consensus-building outcome (e.g., Harvey 1973, 1982, 1989; Abler, Marcus, and Olson 1992) was far more open, innovative and inclusive than the arid, scientific program the nomothetic true-believers had earlier in mind. Thus, it is mildly amusing and somewhat piquant to see these old theory wars trotted out anew and dressed up in

¹ For discussion of the documentary evidence relevant to this issue, see Deegan (1996).

philosophical high dudgeon in the pages of AJS. A major party to this debate, Margaret Somers (1998: 727) deserves special credit for making a useful distinction between “theoretical realism,” which she rejects—along with the central tenets of rational choice theory—as hopelessly abstract, on the one hand, and what she dubs “realism for the rest of us,” on the other.

Whatever version of realism one adopts, it should, of course, be obvious that posit ing empirical reality is a very different matter than knowing with certainty how that reality was in fact constituted, especially when the reality we seek to describe lies often in the relatively distant past. Knowing, understanding and interpreting past reality, whatever it was, and however constituted, are deeply problematic, methodologically and epistemologically, but this does not excuse us from an obligation to confront our methodological and epistemological difficulties (Hill 1984). As sociologists, we cannot divorce our interpretations from historical reality, and we are obliged to estimate the extent to which our explications of sociological history rest upon the bedrock of sound logic and verifiable facts. It must be our charge, as empiricists at work in archives and libraries, to nail down as much historical reality as we can. As sociologists and social scientists, we are enjoined to move cautiously, empirically, intersubjectively, and comprehensively.

Ecologically and situationally, we operate in a world of physical and biological constraints, as did the people whose lives and activities we study archivally. I take these constraints as real and consequential. In so doing, we purchase important conceptual leverage for delimiting, for any given moment, the niche or boundaries of possible actions by embodied humans, and we need not apologize for raising epistemological issues when pressed to do so. Elsewhere (Hill 1984), in a paper that subsequently generated an unexpected amount of comment (Horowitz 1989, 1993, 1996; Hill 1996), I decried the tendency of sociologists to dwell on epistemological issues to the exclusion of discussions of values and ideology. I still hold to that argument. Simultaneously, I never asserted that we ought to dispense with epistemological considerations, only that they should not be unduly privileged or rendered exempt from reasoned critique.

The contingencies of human embodiment and the “space-time geography” (Giddens 1985; Hägerstrand 1975, 1978, 1982; Parkes and Thrift 1980; Pred 1977, 1978, 1981a, b) of sociological history present researchable empirical horizons. Anthony Giddens (1985: 266) usefully summarizes these issues under the rubric of “time-geographic reality.”1 In sum, the real world empirical

---

1 The “five facets of ‘time-geographic reality’ express the material axes of human existence” and include: (1) the human body is indivisible, (2) human life is finite, (3) humans have limited capacity to do more than one task at a time, (4) movement in space is movement in time, and (5) no two people can occupy the same physical space at the same time (Giddens 1985: 266).
contingencies of embodied human existence dictate that we must, at any given moment, be located spatially at some very real place—and, by extension, not at some other place. This time-geographic reality is an anchor on which to ground researchable questions.\(^1\) Take, for example, the Schwendingers’ (1974: 495) remarkable description of Edward A. Ross’ spatial and temporal location during the period following his abrupt dismissal from Stanford University in December 1900:

Ross left Stanford and after a few years elsewhere ultimately received a position at the University of Wisconsin. [Emphasis added].

We are to believe, apparently, that Ross embarked upon an indefinite hegira in some undefined land. In fact, Ross spent five productive years in Lincoln as Nebraska’s first Professor of Sociology, years that Ross (1936: 87-100) described fully and fondly in his autobiography, years that Bruce Keith (1988) and myself (Hill 1999) have documented as Ross’ most intellectually significant. Five years is a long time. The Schwendingers should have asked: Where was Ross?, and What did he do there?

Real, empirically researchable contingencies apply also to collectivities of sociologists, and are exemplified by the existential reality of our gathering here in Torun. The congregation of bodies of scholars at particular places and times to present papers, exchange ideas, and make new professional acquaintances necessarily results in situations about which we can ask straightforward questions. For Example: Did Max Weber (1906) attend and present a paper at the 1904 Congress of Arts and Science in St. Louis? Did Charlotte Perkins Gilman (1907) attend and offer her critiques of Charles Horton Cooley at the first annual meeting of the American Sociological Society in Providence, Rhode Island, in 1906? Did Roscoe Pound not only attend but also organize the inaugural meeting of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology in Chicago in 1909 (American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology 1909)? Yes—in all three cases—they really did these things. These and essentially countless similar events and activities, crucial to our understanding of the history of sociology, either happened or did not happen. As researchable questions, such inquiries are epistemologically unproblematic. Gathering acceptable documentation is, of course, another matter. Our methodological

---

\(^1\) Doreen Massey (1999: 11) recently observed, in response to an address by Immanuel Wallerstein during the 1998 ISA World Congress of Sociology in Montréal: “It is very easy to argue that we should ‘take space seriously.’ Everybody says it these days. There has indeed, it is rumoured, been something called ‘the spatial turn.’ The rhetoric is everywhere; the content is more elusive.” Massey argues for a consideration of “multiple realities,” but here we must be careful with our terms. The fundamental constraints are everywhere the same.
move, at this juncture, involves presenting intersubjectively verifiable trace evidence as to whether these events happened or did not happen, and, further, making judgments concerning the conclusiveness of the evidence presented.

The reality of basic human constraints, simple, mundane, and typically unremarkable as they sound at first, are important epistemologically because they can sometimes help us to decide that given historical potentialities were either possible, likely, improbable, or impossible. The types of constraint I have in mind are of the variety by which we commonly say: “A person cannot be in two places at the same time,” or “It takes a certain amount of time to walk from London to Glasgow,” or “If we grant that a person studied in Munich for nine months in a given year, it leaves him or her—in that same year—only three months, at most, to study elsewhere at another school.” To explicate the epistemological utility of such constraints, constraints that I take to be real—and that have meaning only if I understand them to be real, the remainder of this paper is devoted to what I call here: “the space-time geography of George Elliott Howard’s European education.”

WHEN DID GEORGE ELLIOTT HOWARD STUDY IN PARIS?

By way of preliminary introduction to those of you who are not Nebraskans, permit me to note that George Elliott Howard (1849-1928) was a pioneering American sociologist who taught primarily at Nebraska and Stanford Universities, and, briefly, at the University of Chicago. His magnum opus, a three volume study on the History of Matrimonial Institutions (Howard 1904) was a major influence on divorce law reform in the United States (“Dean Pound Tells of Divorce Congress—Dr. Howard’s Work” 1906: 1; Ball 1988) and established the Nebraska tradition of research on marriage and family that continues to the present day. In sum, he was, as Arthur Todd (1929: 693) noted in the American Journal of Sociology, “. . . one of those great foundation stones of American social science, of the same large caliber as Sumner, Ward, . . . and Small.” Widely admired by his
colleagues, Howard was elected president of the American Sociological Society for 1917. Todd (1929: 693) erred, however, in stating that Howard, “founded no new school, contributed no new system of sociology, did no heaven-storming stunts to gain the ears of men . . . .” Howard’s legacy is remarkable and profound.

Arguably, though we lack time to develop these issues here, Howard: (1) provided a major template for institutional analyses in sociology; (2) shaped a humane, socially responsible, and politically activist tradition adopted by many practicing sociologists; and, (3) through his immediate and unwavering defiance of David Starr Jordan during the so-called “Ross affair” at Stanford in 1900/1901, generated, with Ross, the public, pivotal event that led to the founding of the American Association of University Professors and the establishment of tenure in American universities. The latter incident was clearly no “stunt,” but Howard’s courageous action at a crucial moment when his academic rights were put to the test—and the resulting forced ouster of Howard from Stanford—if not “heaven-storming,” at least shook the scholarly and intellectual world in America to its very foundations. It would be a pleasure here to delve more deeply into Howard’s biography, but I bring Howard to your attention only for a narrow and specific purpose—to provide a worked example of how taking reality seriously allows us to reach a tentative conclusion concerning a crucial period in Howard’s education, i.e., his studies in Europe.

The Published Biographical Sketches

When I became intrigued, during the mid-1980s, by Howard’s sociological accomplishments, I first resorted to the standard biographical sources, the local and national editions of “Who’s Who,” and they told me, in sum, that after Howard earned the A.B. degree at the University of Nebraska in 1876, he spent the next two years in Europe studying history and Roman law in Germany and France.

{1} For example, the entry in the 1928 Who’s Who in Lincoln reported that Howard’s education included:

student history and Roman law, Munich and Paris, 1876-78.
(“Howard, George Elliott” 1928: 120).

---

1 These examples are identified by numbers in braces to facilitate discussion during the oral presentation of this paper.
Similarly, the entry in the 1943 edition of *Who Was Who in America*, reported that Howard, after completing the A.B. degree at the University of Nebraska, became a:

student [in] history and Roman law [at] Munich and Paris, 1876-78
(“Howard, George Elliott” 1943: 593).

Since Howard probably approved the above statements for publication, I initially took them at face value. The “Paris and Munich” litany was frequently repeated in biographical sketches published during and after Howard’s life. Pertinent examples include:

3} A brief, 1892, mention in the “Personal Notes” section of the *Annals* of the American Academy of Politic and Social Science:

From 1876 to 1879 he [Howard] studied history and Roman law at the Universities of Munich and Paris . . . . (“Personal Notes” 1892: 539).

4} An anonymous sketch—based, presumably, on data provided by Howard—in the 1904 edition of *The Twentieth Century Biographical Dictionary of Notable Americans*, Vol. 5, noted that Howard:

studied constitutional history and Roman jurisprudence in the universities of Munich and Paris, 1876-78. (“Howard, George Elliott” 1904: not paginated).

5} Another anonymous article, in the October, 1907, *University Journal* (an alumni publication of the University of Nebraska), also likely prepared with Howard’s input, stated that Howard:

received the first A.B. degree given by this University, in 1876. He immediately went to Europe, spending two years at the Universities of Munich, Vienna, and Paris in the study of history. Returning to Nebraska he became Instructor in English and History . . . . (“Dr. George Elliott Howard,” 1907: 2).

This is the only account that mentions study in Vienna.

6} In a subsequent campus publication, *The Nebraska Alumnus*, the following appears in 1926, very near the end of Howard’s life:
He [Howard] then took additional graduate training in student history and Roman law at Munich and Paris. (“Familiar Campus Characters—Dr. George E. Howard” 1926: 334).

After Howard’s death, in 1928, his European education was again reported by various authors in the following ways:

{7} In late 1928, Emory S. Bogardus (1928: 11), in an editorial note prefacing Melvin J. Vincent’s memorial article on Howard in Sociology and Social Research, observed that Howard’s:

academic training included graduate studies at Munich and Paris.

{8} Harlean James (1928: 186), Executive Secretary of the American Civic Association, in a memorial article, recalled:

A great figure in the academic fields of sociology, history, and political science, Dr. Howard was noted as teacher, research worker, and author, for which vocations he had fitted himself by extensive postgraduate studies in the seminars of Paris and Munich.

{9} In early 1929, Arthur James Todd (1929: 693-94), writing in the American Journal of Sociology, mused that:

Howard’s two years, chiefly in Munich and Paris, gave him a solid grasp on modern languages and profound knowledge, particularly in the fields of history, political science, and Roman law.

{10} Also in 1929, Joyce O. Hertzler (1979: 42), a former student of Edward A. Ross and a departmental colleague of Howard’s at Nebraska, described Howard in earlier years as:

a young man recently returned from his studies of Roman Law in Germany.

Hertzler’s is the only account that does not mention study in Paris, but then Hertzler’s account is rather casually researched (for example, he states that Howard held a professorial lectureship in sociology at the University of Chicago during 1903-4, but Howard’s one-year appointment was actually in history (Lang 1917: 60).
In 1932, Hutton Webster (1932: 277), a former Howard student at Stanford and a departmental colleague at Nebraska, wrote in the *American National Biography*, that Howard:

passed two years abroad, mainly in Munich and Paris, as a student of history and Roman law.

Arthur J. Todd (1932: 520) noted, in a biographical sketch in the *Encyclopædia of the Social Sciences*, that:

Through his studies in history, political science and Roman law in Munich and Paris, Howard became interested in social history, particularly in institutional history.

And, finally, the anonymous 1933 entry on Howard in the *National Cyclopædia of American Biography*, states that Howard:

spent two years studying history and Roman law at Munich and Paris . . . . (“Howard, George Elliott” 1933: 246).

The preponderance of published sketches, including those in which Howard’s concurrence is highly probable, mention Howard’s two years of advanced studies in Munich and Paris—with the two cities and their universities on equal footing. With time, I realized that the apparent 50/50 allocation of Howard’s time between Munich, on the one hand, and Paris, on the other, was illusory.

**Opening a “Window of Opportunity”**

You are now invited to consider the trace evidence for a series of real world constraints that I discovered in the course of subsequent archival and library research. First, I found that during his studies in Europe, Howard wrote a series of newspaper articles on his experiences abroad (Howard 1877a, b, c, d, 1877-78, 1878). Taken together, these articles comprise a lively and astute analysis of German education and culture and I am currently editing them for a book to be titled, tentatively: *By Book, Boot and Beerhall: The Autobiographical Observations of a Young Nebraskan in Germany, 1876-1878* (Hill in preparation). The point here, however, is that the articles describe activities extending over much more than a year’s time, the bulk of which took place in and around Munich. If Howard undertook graduate studies in Paris, I began to wonder, when did he have the time to do so, and for how long?
Figure 1 provides an initial, month-by-month time-line for Howard’s study in Europe.\(^1\) For this discussion, we set ourselves the task of defining or circumscribing the “window of opportunity” for Howard’s studies in France. The reasonable assumption is that Howard cannot be in Nebraska, Munich, and Paris at the same time. He must really be at one place rather than another. This is the fundamental epistemological point; Howard’s space-time location cannot be reduced to a postmodern issue of perspective or standpoint.

The first useful datum is Howard’s graduation from the University of Nebraska in 1876. Howard’s trip to Europe necessarily commenced sometime after that date, of this I am epistemologically confident. At the other end of the time-line, the standard biographical sources state that Howard began teaching at Nebraska in 1879, by which time he must necessarily have returned from Europe.

**Narrowing the “Window of Opportunity”**

The completion of this exercise relies for data on archival materials and newspaper reports to further narrow the “window of opportunity” for study in Paris. Local newspapers report that Howard gave an oration at the Nebraska graduation ceremonies in Lincoln on June 21, 1876. Thus, in Figure 2, we may strike out the first six months of 1876 as unavailable for study either in France or Germany.

I next moved to establish the date when Howard returned from Europe to Nebraska to began teaching. On June 11, 1879, the Nebraska Board of Regents resolved:

> that Mr. Howard be invited to continue as Tutor in Rhetoric, Engl. Lit. & History during the academic year ’79-80 and as Librarian for the year at $1200.00 salary.\(^2\)

I emphasize the word “continue” because it suggests an earlier, prior action, and I therefore looked further into the archival record. It turns out that the Board of Regents resolved on December 19, 1878:

> that George E. Howard be invited to the position of Tutor in this University for the remainder of the academic year . . . \(^3\)

\(^1\) Figures 1-6 follow at the end of the text.

\(^2\) Emphasis added, Regent’s Minutes, University Archives, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, p. 317).

Thus, as Howard was apparently teaching in Nebraska after December 1878, it appeared reasonable to strike out all of 1879 as unavailable for study abroad (Figure 3).

The monthly student publication, the *Hesperian Student*, gave me the next bit of information. In the October issue, 1876, it reported tersely: “G.E. Howard will leave for Germany the present month” (p. 25). Thus, in Figure 4, we can strike out July-October, 1876.

Howard’s archival record at the University of Nebraska fortunately includes a transcript of his studies at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich, documenting his enrollment and completion of courses during the winter 1876/77, summer 1877, and winter 1877/78 terms. The transcript is dated January 31, 1878, and thus provides a potential cut-off date for his Munich period. But when did Howard arrive in Munich? The answer was also in the archives. In a typescript history of the Department of Sociology, written by Howard circa 1927, he stated:

> After a stormy fourteen days passage in the steerage of a Rotterdam boat, I arrived in Munich, October, 1876; and presently I was registered in the University as a student in Roman Law (Howard 1988: 5).

Thus, Howard arrived in Munich in October, 1876, and directly began his studies, continuing until the end of January, 1878. The only opportunity for him to have traveled to France for any length of time during this period would have been the recess during the summer of 1877.

Howard’s newspaper articles, however, tell us that Howard spent his summer vacation in 1877 engaged in a hiking tour of the Austrian alps:

> On the 24th of August, accompanied by an American friend, I took the morning train in Munich for the famous and ancient city of Salzburg in Austria, which had been chosen as a starting point for a short pedestrian tour.

Howard spent several days in the Salzburg area and, according to his newspaper dispatches (Howard 1877d), he probably continued on to Vienna before returning to Munich to resume his studies. Thus, in Figure 5, we may strike out the remainder of 1876, all of 1877, and January 1878, leaving, at most, possibly ten or eleven months for concerted study in Paris.

My continued reading of the *Hesperian Student* resulted, however, in a further helpful item, published in October, 1878:

---

1 George E. Howard Papers, Box 1, University Archives, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
G.E. Howard ‘76, having spent two years touring and studying in Europe, has returned and accepted the position of Acting Professor of English Literature. (p. 455, emphasis added).

Howard was apparently back in Nebraska as early as October 1878. This prompted me to search the “City News” and “personals” columns in the Daily State Journal, the local newspaper, to see if additional notice was taken when Howard returned, and I was recently rewarded with this informative item, published on August 31, 1878:

Mr. Howard, a University student, well and favorably known in this city, returned from a two year’s tour through Europe, yesterday. He spent most of his time at the University of Munich, but managed to visit Italy, France, England, and Ireland. He returns in good health, and very much improved in appearance. (p. 4).

Thus, allowing two weeks for Howard’s ocean passage back to the United States, we have Howard departing Europe by at least mid-August if not earlier, Figure 6.

Since the Parisian universities traditionally closed during August, we are now left, at most, with a period of six months, February through July, 1878, for Howard’s studies in Paris. If the item in the Daily State Journal, quoted above, is accurate, Howard crammed considerable travel into those six months, including visits to Italy, England, and Ireland, as well as France. Howard’s (1877d) newspaper dispatchs suggest that his planned travel in Italy was reserved for this second summer in Europe, and that the recommended visit should take approximately three weeks. I have little doubt that Howard visited Paris, he may even have attended some lectures, and he probably spent more than a few days in university libraries and other repositories, but it is clear that he did not physically have the time available to complete anything comparable to his educational experiences in Germany. It may be possible, with additional research, to further delimit the temporal parameters of Howard’s sojourn in Paris, but that work lies in the future.

CONCLUSION: LESSONS FROM HOWARD’S GERMAN EXPERIENCES

However long Howard spent in Paris, it becomes increasingly clear, when we consult the archival record, that it was Germany that made an especially lasting impression on Howard. The earliest known archival account of his

---

1 Howard’s linguistic skills apparently included a reading knowledge of French, as the myriad French works in his bibliographic reference syllabi on the French revolution (Howard 1900, 1902, 1903) amply suggest.
European travels, from Howard’s hand, is a 1915 letter, written in reply to an inquiring student at the University of Chicago, in which Howard states:

After taking the B.A. degree in an old-time “classic” course, I studied two years in Germany and France, chiefly in the University of Munich, 1876-1878. Here I took a thorough course in Roman law, supplemented by a study of the history of German jurisprudence. This gave me an idea of the great relative value of juridical institutions as being the constant, most enduring results of social struggle, of historical progress.¹

Howard wrote further, circa 1927, in his then unpublished history of the Nebraska Department of Sociology:

How can I best tell what the German university did for me? As I examine the outstanding events of a half-century of subsequent professional life, I find that my two years in Europe were the seminal period of my methods and ideals. Then was born my ideal of scholarship. Then was revealed more clearly the possibilities of the trained human mind. Then I learned the meaning of thoroughness; and perceived that scientific truth can only be drawn from original sources through unstinted research. (Howard 1988: 5-6).

In the latter retrospective account, written the year before his death, there is no mention of France or Paris; Howard wrote only of the German university system and its virtues. Fittingly, we have come full circle. To refine our understanding of the spatial and temporal dimensions of Howard’s European studies we have turned to the archives, to the documentary evidence, and there we discover Howard’s deep respect for Forschung [research] and Quellen [sources]. Howard (1988: 6) reminisced:

I do not recall that I ever heard the term “research” and “source” in my undergraduate textbook recitation years. Now in every course [in Germany] they were the shibboleth of scholarship. With what reverence they were uttered by the professor. So powerfully were they impressed on my mind that Forschung and Quellen played fantastic gambols in my dreams.

Unfortunately, assessing the full impact and intellectual consequences of Howard’s German training falls outside the purview of the present paper.

¹ Howard to J.W. Hoover, March 8, 1915, George Elliott Howard Papers, Box 21 (Addendum), Folder 8, University Archives, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
Permit me to say only that I think Howard’s respect for methodical research and accurate use of sources was not misplaced.

My purpose here has been to demonstrate, via a worked example, that, as sociologists in the archives, we can, epistemologically, take the world and its contingencies as real and consequential. I am, of course, obliged to add (parenthetically) that it is possible that Howard never went to Europe, that the documents and trace evidence relevant to Howard’s studies in Germany comprise an elaborate Goffmanian “fabrication” in which I have been “contained” (Goffman 1974: 83-123; 156-200), but I doubt it. At the epistemological level, I am comfortable in offering my analysis of Howard’s adventures in Munich as what George Herbert Mead (1899) called a “working hypothesis” (Deegan 1987), to be accepted pragmatically until such time as we discover additional data with which to reject, improve, or reshape it.
Figure 1.

1876 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/ Graduates <<< Sometime in 1876 >>> ??

1877 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/

1878 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/

1879 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/ <<< Begins teaching >>> ?? sometime in 1879

Figure 2.

1876 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/ Graduates June 21

1877 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/

1878 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/

1879 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/ <<< Reportedly begins teaching >>> ?? sometime in 1879
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^ Graduates
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1877 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/

1878 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/
^ Appointed to Teach Nebr

1879 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/

Figure 4.

1876 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/
^ Departs for Germany

1877 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/

1878 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/
^ Appointed to Teach Nebr

1879 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/
Figure 5.
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Enrolls
Munich

1877 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/

Salzburg Summer
Vacation

1878 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/

^         ^
Completes Appointed to
Munich Studies  Teach Nebr

1879 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/

Figure 6.

1876 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/

1877 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/

1878 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/

^     ^
<<France, Etc.>> Last Date Can
Completes Munich Studies  Depart Europe

1879 /Jan/Feb/Mar/Apr/May/Jun/Jly/Aug/Sep/Oct/Nov/Dec/
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