



Universiteit
Leiden

The Netherlands

Pluralism within Parameters : towards a mature evaluative historiography of science

Karstens, B.

Citation

Karstens, B. (2015, November 18). *Pluralism within Parameters : towards a mature evaluative historiography of science*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/36396>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/36396>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Pluralism within Parameters

**Towards a Mature Evaluative
Historiography of Science**

Bart Karstens

Vormgeving: Tibor den Held (www.tk305.com)

Gedrukt en gebonden door GVO Drukkers en Vormgevers.

PLURALISM WITHIN PARAMETERS

Towards a Mature Evaluative
Historiography of Science

Academisch proefschrift ter verkrijging
van de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit
Leiden op gezag van Rector Magnificus
prof. mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker volgens besluit
van het College voor Promoties te
verdedigen op woensdag 18 november 2015
klokke 16.15 uur

door

Bart Karstens

Geboren te Zierikzee in 1975

Promotor: Prof.em. dr. E. P. Bos
Co-promotor: Dr. J. W. McAllister

Promotiecommissie: Prof.dr. H. W. van den Doel (decaan)
Univ.-Prof. dr. M. Kusch (Universität Wien)
Prof. dr. F. H. van Lunteren (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)
Prof. dr. J. Schickore (Indiana University)
Prof. dr. B. G. Sundholm

This work is part of the research programme “Philosophical Foundations of the Historiography of Science” (project number 360-20-220), which is financed by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO)



Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek

Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	3
INTRODUCTION.....	5
1. THE PROBLEM	5
2. OVERVIEW OF INDIVIDUAL CHAPTERS	7
3. REVOLUTION?.....	11
CHAPTER 1 THE DECLINE OF EVALUATIVE HISTORIOGRAPHY	13
1. INTRODUCTION.....	13
2. AIMS OF THE FIELD IN THE FIRST PHASE OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION	13
3. CHALLENGES TO THE PROFESSION.....	20
4. CHANGES TO THE PROFESSION	25
5. A PECULIAR PROCESS OF MATURATION	30
6. ARGUMENTS AGAINST EVALUATIVE HISTORIOGRAPHY	33
7. TWO SORTS OF ARGUMENT: DESIRABILITY AND POSSIBILITY	45
8. THE GAINS OF EVALUATIVE HISTORIOGRAPHY	46
CHAPTER 2 THE PRINCIPLE OF SYMMETRY	52
1. SYMMETRIES AND ASYMMETRIES IN APPROACHES TO PAST SCIENCE	52
2. THE STRONG PROGRAMME	55
3. 'REFUTATIONS' OF THE STRONG PROGRAMME	63
4. THE STRONG PROGRAMME: UNDESIRABLE CONSEQUENCES FOR HISTORIOGRAPHY OF SCIENCE.....	67
5. GENERALIZED SYMMETRY: POSTHUMANISM	71
6. POSTHUMANISM: ATTRACTIONS AND DIFFICULTIES	80
7. A PROPOSAL: NEW RELATIONALISM	84
CHAPTER 3 THE PRINCIPLE OF CHARITY AND HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION	88
1. MODERN HISTORICAL AWARENESS AND THE HERMENEUTIC TRADITION.....	88
2. INTRODUCTION TO THE PRINCIPLE OF CHARITY.....	90
3. CHARITY OR HUMANITY?.....	97
4. EXAMPLES OF CHARITABLE INTERPRETATION IN SCIENCE STUDIES	102
5. TOWARDS A WEIGHTED PRINCIPLE OF CHARITY FOR HISTORIOGRAPHY OF SCIENCE.....	115

CHAPTER 4 TOWARDS A PROPER CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE NOTION OF ERROR	121
1. INTRODUCTION	121
2. THE 'ERRORS AS OBSTACLES' APPROACH AND ITS SHORTCOMINGS	123
3. THE 'ERRORS AS FAILURES' APPROACH AND ITS SHORTCOMINGS	135
4. TOWARDS A PROPER THEORY OF ERROR.....	143
5. CONCLUSION	159
CHAPTER 5 DISARMING THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST EVALUATIVE HISTORIOGRAPHY	162
1. THE CLUSTER OF POSSIBILITY ARGUMENTS.....	162
2. THE CLUSTER OF DESIRABILITY ARGUMENTS	167
3. COMMON ASSUMPTIONS OF THE TWO MAJOR PROJECTS IN THE SCIENCE STUDIES	171
CHAPTER 6 EXTENDED NATURALISM	176
1. THE SEARCH FOR A GOLDEN MEAN	176
2. NORMATIVE NATURALISM	180
3. EVOLUTIONARY EPISTEMOLOGY	188
4. TOWARDS A SUITABLE FORM OF EXTENDED NATURALISM.....	199
CHAPTER 7 A PLATFORM FOR EVALUATIVE HISTORIOGRAPHY	204
1. THE CONSTITUENTS OF THE PLATFORM	204
2. APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF SCIENCE AND THE PURSUIT OF VIRTUES	208
3. THE VIRTUE APPROACH APPLIED TO THE STUDY OF PAST SCIENCE	215
4. THE HISTORY OF SCIENCE AS A COLLECTION OF RESEARCH PROGRAMMES	230
5. ANACHRONISMS AND THE USE OF PRESENT-DAY SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE.....	251
6. CONCLUSION	260
CONCLUSION	262
1. THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST EVALUATIVE HISTORIOGRAPHY DISARMED	262
2. NOVEL CONCEPTS AND PERSPECTIVES.....	264
3. A RESEARCH PROGRAMME FOR THE HISTORY OF SCIENCE.....	268
BIBLIOGRAPHY	269
SAMENVATTING IN HET NEDERLANDS	291
CURRICULUM VITAE	303

Acknowledgements

Completing this dissertation has been a long and difficult journey. Naturally there are many people to thank, who helped me with guidance, advice, support and encouragement. Above all I must thank James McAllister, my direct supervisor, with whom I have had numerous meetings about the contents and form of the thesis and a host of other academic affairs. The work on the thesis benefited immensely from his outstanding scholarship and his perceptive comments and ideas. When I started out as a Ph.D. student, Bert Bos was Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy. He took a keen interest in our research project and I appreciate it very much that he has acted as my promoter, even after he became an emeritus of the Institute. In Leiden I benefited greatly from the cooperation with other scholars. In the narrowest circle, within the project, this was with the three J's. Next to James, both Jouni M. Kuukkanen and Jeroen Bouterse proved to be excellent 'partners' to cooperate with. I very much hope we will continue to work together in the future. In a wider circle there were the frequent interactions with other staff interested in the history and philosophy of science including Eric Schliesser, Göran Sundholm (whose favorite Brentano Defense I believe to have shot to ribbons, at least he still owes me a reply!), Marietje van der Schaar, Bruno Verbeek, Frans de Haas and Victor Gijbers. I learned a lot from pleasant exchanges of thought with all of them. At some point our interactions became organized in regular HPS meetings under the undisputed leadership of Victor. This proved to be an ideal platform to present and discuss draft papers and other forms of 'work in progress'. Outside this circle I very much appreciated the kind support offered by Lies Klumper, Karineke Sombroek, Carolyn de Greef and Jeroen van Rijen, where especially Lies always created a pleasant atmosphere at the Philosophy Institute. With Gerard Visser and Jan Sleutels I had amiable conversations about other areas of philosophy, not directly related to my dissertation work. Drawing the circle a little wider, the presence of other organizations in Leiden devoted to the history of science, such as the Boerhaave museum, the Teyler's chair in the history of science and the Lorentz Centre, helped me a lot. At the Lorentz Centre I was fortunate to take part in the workshop 'Error in the Sciences' in 2011, drawing all major experts on this topic to Leiden. Also in Leiden, the colloquium series 'Exploring New Vistas in Historiography of Science', always with enjoyable dinners afterwards, proved to be a great stimulation for my project. If we extend

the circle outside Leiden, I must mention opportunities for Ph.D. training offered by the Huizinga Institute and the NFWT, and next to this the Descartes Centre in Utrecht. After I completed my master's training in Utrecht good contacts remained and I was given the opportunity to present work on my dissertation at meetings of the Centre a number of times. Space is too limited to thank members of the Descartes Centre individually, but I want to make an exception for Floris Cohen, who is not only an inspiring author but also a stimulating and confidence building interlocutor. Other scholars in the circle outside Leiden, who helped me with concrete bits of advice and useful references to literature, were Ed Jonker, Diederick Raven, Theo F. Kuipers, Peter Galison and John Pickstone, who sadly passed away last year. I fondly remember the soirée in his garden in Manchester in 2013. I am now employed by the UvA and very fortunate to work together with outstanding colleagues like Jeroen van Dongen, Julia Kursell, Marijn Koolen, Rens Bod and Giuseppe Dari-Mattiacci. Especially Rens' never wavering enthusiasm and warm personality has been an important source of inspiration for me over the years. After drawing wider and wider circles I must return to the closest and most important circle of my life and thank my family. My parents, sister Irene and her partner Niels, Tibor and Marloes and Oscar and Ayşe from time to time had to listen to me rambling on with stories about my dissertation project and the challenges and peculiarities the academic world has to offer. They probably lost the trail of my thoughts on occasion, but were so kind not to show this. Finally, I thank Cili for many discussions on topics, sometimes strongly, but at other times more vaguely, related to the project. I learned a great deal from the comparisons we made between art and science, the history of art and the history of science, as well as the historiography of art and the historiography of science. Long live the spirit of universalism!