



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Nature and history : towards a hermeneutic philosophy of historiography of science

Bouterse, Jeroen

Citation

Bouterse, J. (2016, February 25). *Nature and history : towards a hermeneutic philosophy of historiography of science*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/38041>

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/1887/38041>

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

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/38041> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Bouterse, Jeroen

Title: Nature and history : towards a hermeneutic philosophy of historiography of science

Issue Date: 2016-02-25

Nature and History

Towards a Hermeneutic Philosophy of Historiography of Science

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 donderdag 25 februari 2016
klokke 11.15 uur

door
Jeroen Bouterse
geboren te Rotterdam
in 1988

Promotor: Prof. Em. Dr. E.P. Bos

Co-promotor: dr. J.W. McAllister

Promotiecommissie:

Prof. dr. H.W. van den Doel, decaan

Professor Dimitri Ginev, University of Sofia “St. Kliment Ohridski”

Prof. dr. H.G.M. Jorink

Professor Vasso Kindi, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

Prof. dr. B.G. Sundholm

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



Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek

Contents

Contents	1
Acknowledgments	5
Chapter 1: Introduction	7
1.1 The World in History of Science	7
1.2 History of Science and the Sciences	7
1.3 A Bridge between Two Cultures?	10
1.4 Science and Its Past	12
1.5 Outline of this Thesis	14
Chapter 2: Contingentism and Inevitabilism in History of Science	17
2.1 The Question	17
2.2 Contingency and Indeterminacy	18
2.3 Contingency as Path-Dependent Historical Possibility	20
2.4 Contingency, Historical Explanation, and the World	23
2.4 The Special Position of History of Science	25
2.6 Conclusions	28
Chapter 3: Whig History and Anachronism in History of Science	29
3.1 Whose Nature?	29
3.2 Whig History According to Butterfield	30
3.3 Causal and Conceptual Anachronism	31
3.4 Progress and Scientific Exceptionalism	36
3.5 Selection and Presentism	38
3.6 Avoiding Anachronism in a Changing Present	41
3.7 Conclusions	42
Chapter 4: Roads to the Inevitable? Nature, Thought, and Society	43
4.1 Candidates for the Great Explainer	43
4.2 Nature-Based Inevitabilism	44
4.2.1 Irresistible Nature: Steven Weinberg and the Teaching Machine	44

4.2.2 Nature and Rationality I: Max Weber and the Hermeneutic Function of Rationality	47
4.2.3 Nature and Rationality II: Robert Merton and the Normative Structure of Science	51
4.3 The Logic of Ideas.....	53
4.3.1 The Early Decades of the Journal of the History of Ideas	53
4.3.2 Alexandre Koyré's Intellectualist Inevitabilism	58
4.4 The Final Stage of Society	64
4.4.1 Some Preliminary Considerations on Marxism	64
4.4.2 Boris Hessen and the Inevitability of Newtonianism.....	66
4.4.2 John Desmond Bernal and Objective Science-Not-From-the-Skies	69
4.5 Conclusions	71
Chapter 5: Leaving Nature Out	73
5.1 The 'No Nature'-principle	73
5.2 David Bloor's Realism	74
5.2.1 Introduction	74
5.2.2 The First Argument: Underdetermination.....	75
5.2.3 The Second Argument: Nature Dropping Out.....	77
5.2.4 The Third Argument: The Social Determination of Classification	79
5.2.5 The Third Argument Continued: Meaning Finitism and Social Pattern Matching	81
5.2.6 Bloor on the Hermeneutic Circle.....	84
5.3 Harry Collins' Relativism	86
5.3.1 Introduction	86
5.3.2 The Fourth Argument, Step 1: Methodological Relativism	86
5.3.3 Is Nature 'Quite Another Matter'? Ernest Gellner on Social and Biological Kinship	89
5.3.4 The Fourth Argument, Step 2: The Circularity Argument	91
5.4 Karin Knorr-Cetina's Constructivism	94
5.4.1 The Fifth Argument: Science Constituting Natural Facts	94
5.4.2 Fabrication and Adaptation.....	96

5.5 Conclusions	97
Chapter 6: Bruno Latour and the Co-Fabrication of Nature and Society	99
6.1 Another Kind of Constructivism	99
6.2 Kayaking over Bridging.....	99
6.2.1 Two Banks, One River	99
6.2.2 Behind the Two Cultures	101
6.2.3 Initial Problems	102
6.3 The Construction of Real Things	104
6.3.1 Collapsing Nature and Its Representation.....	104
6.3.2 Science and Technology	106
6.3.3 Adding Actors	107
6.4 The Inexplicable Development of Networks.....	108
6.4.1 Which Napoleon?.....	108
6.4.2 Tracing Networks.....	110
6.5 When Are Electrons and Microbes Anachronisms?	112
6.5.1 Conceptual Anachronisms as Causal Anachronisms.....	112
6.5.2 Relativizing Relativized Existence	114
6.6 Nature, Politics, and Critical Science Studies.....	117
6.7 Science and the World.....	121
6.8 Conclusion	124
Chapter 7: The Invisible Hand of Science	125
7.1 A Naturalistic Perspective	125
7.2 Invisible Hand Accounts.....	126
7.2.1 The Promise of Invisible Hands	126
7.2.2 An Economic Account: Alvin Goldman.....	128
7.2.3 Accuracy and the Resistance of the World: Bernard Williams.....	131
7.2.4 The Limits of Normative Invisible Hands Accounts	132
7.3 David Hull's Evolutionary Invisible Hand Account	134
7.3.1 Science as a Process.....	134
7.3.2 Selection Pressures and the World	136

7.3.3 Scientists as Agents	141
7.4 Adaptation, Realism, and the Necessity of Understanding	144
7.5 Conclusions	147
Chapter 8: An Exposition of Hermeneutic Philosophy of History of Science	149
8.1 The Problem of Understanding.....	149
8.2 Science and Tradition	149
8.2.1 Tradition and Transcendence	149
8.2.2 A Gadamerian Account of Tradition	153
8.3 Language and Lifeworld.....	155
8.4 Traditionality, Contingency, and Nature	158
8.4.1 Circling and Dialogue.....	158
8.4.2 Contingency and the History of Science	162
8.5 The Hermeneutical Position of History of Science	163
8.5.1 General Thesis	163
8.5.2 The Limits of Historicity	165
8.5.3 An Illustrative Example	167
8.6 Four Possible Objections	169
8.6.1 Introduction	169
8.6.2 Playing the Stranger.....	171
8.6.3 Following a Tradition	172
8.6.4 Neo-Whiggism	175
8.6.5 Criticism and Relevance: Some Historiographical Examples	177
Conclusion: Nature in History	183
References.....	188
Samenvatting in het Nederlands	209
Curriculum Vitae	217

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I want to thank my supervisor, James McAllister, for his patient advice, constructive and extremely perceptive criticism, and for the enormously helpful (and exciting) discussions I was allowed to have with him on this thesis. I also thank my promotor, Bert Bos, and my colleagues and fellow PhD students at the Institute for Philosophy at Leiden University, for all the stimulating conversations we have had over the years. I cannot name everyone, but I want to thank Victor Gijssbers, Jouni Kuukkanen, and Bart Karstens especially, for providing me with food for thought in the process of writing this thesis.

A few others have commented on parts of this thesis or on the arguments expounded in it. I want to thank Irene van de Beld for continuing to challenge my interpretation of Weber, Herman Paul for liberally making time for several inspiring conversations, Floris Cohen for his ever too generous feedback and support, and Giel Visser for his Socratic ability to allow others to make sense of what they think.

An inextricable part of the intellectual and social environment that made it possible for me to keep working on this thesis, are those (PhD) students and scholars connected to the Descartes Centre in Utrecht and to the Huizinga Institute, all of whom are not just examples of brilliant scholarship, but also happen to be wonderfully nice people. The same is true of the (sometimes overlapping) circles of participants I have met at the Woudschoten conferences on history of science, at the *Making of the Humanities* ('III') conference in Rome, at the 2015 Philosophy of Science conference in Dubrovnik, and at the Huizinga 'promovendicongressen' in Rolduc. I would like to name especially Rens Bod, Frans van Lunteren, Floris Solleveld, and my 'Shells and Pebbles' partners.

Finally, the people whose close presence in my life kept me and this project going: my friends and family, my mother, father, and brother – I can't thank you enough. And Tabitha, meeting you was one of the luckiest contingencies of my life; thank you for being part of it.

I dedicate this thesis to my grandparents, who were still alive when I started it, making me sorely aware of the irreversibility of historical time.

