

DOWNLOAD PDF PETER BURKE WHAT IS THE HISTORY OF KNOWLEDGE

Chapter 1 : Peter Burke (historian) - Wikipedia

This is an odd but useful book. From the title, one might expect it would provide a history of knowledge. But think again: it is a book about the history of knowledge, which means it is a book about the field of academics who would say, when asked, that they work on the history of knowledge.

My review from the Wikipedia Signpost: From Gutenberg to Diderot. The key word is social: In this sense the book is a firm rejection of the "great man" historiography of the 19th century in favor of overarching cultural trends. This is appropriate in the age of Wikipedia. Jimmy Wales and Larry Sanger are mentioned, but what is important is not their personal innovations but the institution they created that allows thousands of others to innovate and disseminate knowledge. Burke divides his book into three large sections. The first describes the processes and institutions developed for gathering, analyzing, disseminating, and employing knowledge, beginning with the great scientific expeditions of the 18th and 19th century, ravenously acquiring artifacts and scientific and cultural knowledge like it was imperial plunder, and in many ways it was. The amounts of material accumulated are still staggering, even from the perspective of the computer age. How do we gather it? The professionalization of scholarship and the development of systems of fieldwork and surveying. How do we organize it? How do we spread it? How do we use it? The development of more and more sophisticated ways of retrieving information and putting it to use in new ways, for business and industry, government, and warfare. The second section, "The Price of Progress", describes what was lost along the way. Much of this was lost in a tangible way: Other knowledge was deliberately discarded: Burke also discusses more intangible losses, like the loss of interdisciplinary and generalist knowledge and expertise as knowledge production became more professionalized and specialized, as disciplines and sub-disciplines were created and split off from one another, like psychology from philosophy or the splitting of natural history into geology, botany, and zoology. The final section provides three thematic frameworks for examining the previous sections. The first is geographical, both literal and social. On the small scale, Burke discusses the rise of grouping together of scholars in institutions like universities and the subgroups that arise, like the Chicago School, a movement in sociology that arose at the University of Chicago in the 20s and 30s. On a larger scale, Burke discusses knowledge as a nationalistic movement and the institutions and projects that arose from that drive. On the most macro scale of all, Burke discusses the rise of the idea of "The Commonwealth of Learning" and what makes it to the center and what gets pushed to the fringes. The second framework is sociological contexts that scholars operate in, the demands and constraints of economics and politics, and the issues of gender, class, and nationality. The third is chronological, examining discrete fifty-year periods from the "reform of knowledge" to "the age of reflexivities" to the present. Of most interest to readers here is the discussion of Wikipedia. Despite its mention in the title, substantial discussion of Wikipedia is limited to about one and a half pages towards the end of his coverage of "the age of reflexivities", though given the broad scope of this work, Wikipedia receives a lengthier treatment than almost all other specific institutions mentioned in the book. In this work, Wikipedia seems to be used mostly as a convenient historical bookend and Burke misses several opportunities to integrate discussion of Wikipedia into larger historical trends he discusses. For example, in his discussion of "amateur scholars" Burke fails to link Wikipedia to previous efforts to draw on the efforts of an amateur collective, such as the Oxford English Dictionary, which was compiled with the assistance of hundreds of non-professional volunteers. Overall, it is an ambitious, fascinating, and exhaustive catalog of years of knowledge, though it may be a bit dry to those not already interested in the topic. Burke limits himself to the Western world, which may frustrate some readers, but includes parts of the Western world that are often overlooked in such broad survey works, like Scandinavia and Latin America. Burke excels at outlining broad trends in a comprehensible way, at broadening the scope of understanding of knowledge production to worlds beyond academia, and describing the interconnectedness between those worlds.

DOWNLOAD PDF PETER BURKE WHAT IS THE HISTORY OF KNOWLEDGE

Chapter 2 : A Social History of Knowledge: From Gutenberg to Diderot - Peter Burke - Google Books

Here is the full text of Peter Burke's seminar on 'Writing The Social History of Knowledge', given in the History Department of Birkbeck College, University of London, on 2nd November. We also provide links to our earlier interview with Peter on the TCS Blog, to the podcast and written text of.

A Social History of Knowledge. University of Leicester Citation: From Gutenberg to Diderot , should produce an answer. The indeterminacy identified by Stein is constitutional. The subject-matter is nebulous. Any subject-matter is too vast for historical comprehension, always containing more information than can be represented, but here form and content are far from being clearly distinguished. The perspective is ambiguous. What links these antinomies the personal and the pan-optic, visible specialization and the hitherto invisible big picture, the particular and the general? Ultimately, then, the social history of knowledge reveals itself as a technology for information management. Hence, the contribution this Social History makes to knowledge is administrative and managerial a synthesis of the available information about knowledge as a social practice. It employs two opposite but complementary structural schemes: The static sociological categorizations identify types of social-cognitive behaviour. Thus the nominal structure created by these categorizations integrates various types of socially defined, cognitive behaviour into a comprehensive totality. Social history is thus an information-management system based on static nominal classifications operating as historical constants. It describes practices e. At the same time, these information-management categories calibrate the dynamics of knowledge production since their performance at any moment in reality evinces mutation. Though the comprehensive structure that manages knowledge in socio-historical terms is static, each practice in each category is inherently dynamic. Change too is, apparently, another constant a constant trend. The coordination of these historical trends operating through socio-cognitive constants integral to a comprehensive structural framework makes up the social history of knowledge. This sameness crucially defines this Social History. Essentially it describes itself. Since the knowledge practices, disciplines, and institutions are in themselves already historically organized and already use socio-historical methods, this Social History actually portrays itself as a history of histories, as a history of historical processes. Accordingly it plays down the internal, logical mutation of academic disciplines according to successive thought-styles, paradigm shifts, or discourse-types, in order to stress historical trends, principally by means of the numerous chronologies that inflect its narrative: Hence, it is all the same: It is all the same: It thus recognizes and legitimizes any employment of knowledge, indifferent to its implications for human species-essential interests. Its function is redundant. Thus basing the argument on the principle of identity, adopting a priori an affirmative stance that is, a social historian endorsing continuing trends in the social history of knowledge automatically precludes any differing evaluation. Surely though the argument cannot be so self-absorbed as to ignore those aspects of its socio-historical scheme where a critical evaluation is indispensable and which a comprehensive overview ought uniquely to discern? The knowledge being described socio-historically is actually technical knowledge, information-management technology knowledge in its already recognized, established, dominant form cf. The pan-optic overview has a blind-spot. Philosophy is more or less excluded. It cannot, it seems, be a form of knowledge. Evidently without social or historical value it simply does not figure as development. But, reflecting on the exponential growth of academic-technical knowledge the social historian finds both overwhelming and enthralling, these philosophers have radical and legitimate misgivings about its overall cultural effects. Social history evidently goes with whatever goes socially. But how to describe the process being described? How can anyone tell it is normal if it is just the way it is? Social history dodges this challenge. What have this academic effort and the capital resources that sustain it to show for themselves? Here too socio-historical comprehension seems myopic. It has for good or ill transformed the background of human existence. But it has patently failed to remove engrained social and existential inequalities either locally or globally. So given that knowledge still is advanced through business, war,

DOWNLOAD PDF PETER BURKE WHAT IS THE HISTORY OF KNOWLEDGE

imperialism, and political authority pp. Actually, as an academic book about the social history of its own self-knowledge p. Back to 2 cf. Karl Mannheim, *Essays on the sociology of Knowledge* Abingdon, , pp. Back to 3 cf. Whitehead, *The Concept of Nature*, p. Back to 5 Mannheim, *Essays*, p. Back to 6 Reinhart Koselleck, *Vergangene Zukunft. Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten* Frankfurt am Main, , pp. Back to 7 Theodor W. Back to 8 Mannheim, *Essays*, pp. Back to 9 cf. *The Hidden Agenda of Modernity* Chicago, , p. Back to 13 Paul Virilio, *La bombe informatique* Paris, , pp. Back to 16 Gertrude Stein, *What are Masterpieces?* New York, , pp. Back to 17 June Peter Burke Posted: As a social historian I am not in the business of endorsing anything. Chapter five specifically warned readers of the dangers of a triumphal narrative of the progress of knowledge. The book concentrates on academic knowledge simply because that is the kind of knowledge or cluster of knowledges with which I am rather unevenly familiar. In any case, it does not treat academic knowledges in isolation, but discusses their interaction with the practical knowledges of artisans, merchants, diplomats and others. There is more than one kind of social history of knowledge, but my social history, at any rate, has been written by a social historian for other social historians and any general readers who might find it interesting. As for my views on knowledge management, Dr Davies seems to have missed my citation of Thorsten Veblen pp. I would have welcomed an engagement with my actual arguments, whether in the form of counter-examples or that of alternative interpretations of the trends I discussed. Instead, Dr Davies discusses a different book, the philosophical or critical history that he would have liked me to have written or would like to write himself. Such a book might well be interesting, but it would not be a social history of knowledge and it was not the book supposedly under review.

DOWNLOAD PDF PETER BURKE WHAT IS THE HISTORY OF KNOWLEDGE

Chapter 3 : Review of Peter Burke, "What is the History of Knowledge" | Rens Bod - www.nxgvision.com

What is the history of knowledge? This engaging and accessible introduction explains what is distinctive about the new field of the history of knowledge (or, as some scholars say, 'knowledges in the plural') and how it differs from the history of science, intellectual history, the sociology of knowledge or from cultural history.

In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: Joan Judge What is the History of Knowledge? Cambridge, Polity Press, Peter Burke is a master of the historiographical overview. From the Encyclopedia to Wikipedia, Cambridge, In the s when he began to work on the two-volume study, Burke was relatively alone in his interest in the history of knowledge. Burke traces the genealogy of this rich and complex field to two kinds of history: Both of these vital fields have taken productive cultural turns in recent decades. The history of the book is no longer exclusively concerned with publishing statistics, or the economies and geographies of production but also with readership, the appropriation of meaning, the materiality of media, and the cognitive interaction between text and image. The history of science has similarly moved from histories of great scientists to the examination of scientific institutions, such as specialized societies; scientific practices including experiment and observation; and scientific spaces such as the laboratory and the botanical garden. The history of knowledge further intersects with a number of other fields including the sociology of knowledge and certain streams of anthropology. This includes several different kinds of knowledge we are relatively familiar with such as pure and applied, abstract and concrete, explicit and implicit. He charts the increasing attention in the field to the validity of local or Indigenous knowledges and their contributions to knowledge produced by imperial powers both in the colonies and in the metropolises. He emphasizes that states ignore local knowledge at their peril, and that scientific methods have often developed out of less formal everyday practices such as observation, description, and classification. In terms of temporality, Burke argues that understanding past knowledge systems does not necessitate the assertion that they are equally effective in understanding the world. Rather it requires relating past attitudes or beliefs to the standards of verification that ruled the cultures of their time: Finally, Burke asserts that histories of knowledge need to include what is generally considered to be its opposite: It is critical for historians to understand obstacles to knowledge, conflicts between knowledges, lost knowledges, and the collective rejections of certain kinds of knowledge. Regimes of ignorance can have much to teach us not only about what is not known in certain places or times but about the relationship between knowledge and power. Burke must be lauded for attempting to write a global history of knowledge. Inevitably, however, he falls short when making claims about histories that are not within his realm of expertise. His treatment of different conceptions of knowledge signaled by a range of terms in Greek and Latin falls flat when he comes to China. In addition to zhi knowledge which really should be zhishi and shixue knowhow, which he mentions, there are a plethora of terms including changshi common knowledge , xuwen learning , mijue secret know-how , and famen Buddhist enlightenment , which would have greatly nuanced his discussion.

DOWNLOAD PDF PETER BURKE WHAT IS THE HISTORY OF KNOWLEDGE

Chapter 4 : A Social History of Knowledge. Volume II: From the Encyclopedia to Wikipedia | Reviews in History

Personal Access. If you have access to this journal as a benefit of membership in the sponsoring organization, log in through the member link in the right column.

In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: Joan Judge What is the History of Knowledge? Cambridge, Polity Press, Peter Burke is a master of the historiographical overview. From the Encyclopedia to Wikipedia, Cambridge, In the s when he began to work on the two-volume study, Burke was relatively alone in his interest in the history of knowledge. Burke traces the genealogy of this rich and complex field to two kinds of history: Both of these vital fields have taken productive cultural turns in recent decades. The history of the book is no longer exclusively concerned with publishing statistics, or the economies and geographies of production but also with readership, the appropriation of meaning, the materiality of media, and the cognitive interaction between text and image. The history of science has similarly moved from histories of great scientists to the examination of scientific institutions, such as specialized societies; scientific practices including experiment and observation; and scientific spaces such as the laboratory and the botanical garden. The history of knowledge further intersects with a number of other fields including the sociology of knowledge and certain streams of anthropology. This includes several different kinds of knowledge we are relatively familiar with such as pure and applied, abstract and concrete, explicit and implicit. He charts the increasing attention in the field to the validity of local or Indigenous knowledges and their contributions to knowledge produced by imperial powers both in the colonies and in the metropolises. He emphasizes that states ignore local knowledge at their peril, and that scientific methods have often developed out of less formal everyday practices such as observation, description, and classification. In terms of temporality, Burke argues that understanding past knowledge systems does not necessitate the assertion that they are equally effective in understanding the world. Rather it requires relating past attitudes or beliefs to the standards of verification that ruled the cultures of their time: Finally, Burke asserts that histories of knowledge need to include what is generally considered to be its opposite: It is critical for historians to understand obstacles to knowledge, conflicts between knowledges, lost knowledges, and the collective rejections of certain kinds of knowledge. Regimes of ignorance can have much to teach us not only about what is not known in certain places or times but about the relationship between knowledge and power. Burke must be lauded for attempting to write a global history of knowledge. Inevitably, however, he falls short when making claims about histories that are not within his realm of expertise. His treatment of different conceptions of knowledge signaled by a range of terms in Greek and Latin falls flat when he comes to China. In addition to zhi knowledge which really should be zhishi and shixue knowhow, which he mentions, there are a plethora of terms including changshi common knowledge , xuewen learning , mijue secret know-how , and famen Buddhist enlightenment , which would have greatly nuanced his discussion. You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

Chapter 5 : What is the History of Knowledge? - Peter Burke - Bok () | Bokus

What is the history of knowledge? This engaging and accessible introduction explains what is distinctive about the new field of the history of knowledge (or, as some scholars say, knowledges in the plural) and how it differs from the history of science, intellectual history, the sociology of knowledge or from cultural history.

Chapter 6 : UPNE - Exiles and Expatriates in the History of Knowledge, A– Peter Burke

Peter Burke is a master of the historiographical overview. This recent book is a pared down version of his two-volume A Social History of Knowledge (I: From Gutenberg to Diderot, Cambridge, ; II: From the Encyclopedia to Wikipedia, Cambridge,). In the s when he began to work on the two.

DOWNLOAD PDF PETER BURKE WHAT IS THE HISTORY OF KNOWLEDGE

Chapter 7 : A Social History of Knowledge, Volume 2: From the Encyclopaedia to Wikipedia by Peter Burke

Professor Peter Burke in Ulick Peter Burke [1] (born in Stanmore, England) is a British historian and professor. He was born to a Roman Catholic father and Jewish mother (who later converted to Roman Catholicism).

Chapter 8 : What Is the History of Knowledge? - Peter Burke - bÃ¼cker () | Adlibris Bokhandel

The history of knowledge is flourishing. Exciting conferences are being arranged, new institutional arrangements are emerging, and a whole range of fresh studies are being published.

Chapter 9 : What is the History of Knowledge? â€“ Peter Burke â€“ Bok | Akademibokhandeln

What is the history of knowledge? This engaging and accessible introduction explains what is distinctive about the new field of the history of knowledge (or, as some scholars say, 'knowledges in the plural') and how it differs from the history of science, intellectual history, the sociology of.