

Entities, structures and changes in science

Abstract. I argue that pessimistic meta-induction (PMI) seems to point an ontological priority of the relations over the objects of the scientific theories of the kind suggested by French and Ladyman (French and Ladyman 2003). My strategy will involve a critical examination of epistemic structural realism (ESR) and historical case-study: the prediction of Zeeman's effect in Lorentz's theory of electron.

Introduction

The following is intended to take a stand in the debate on Structural Realism in favour of Ontic Structural Realism (OSR) as recently defended in French and Ladyman (2003). In particular I argue that pessimistic meta-induction (PMI) seems to point an ontological priority of the relations over the objects of the scientific theories. My strategy will involve a critical examination of epistemic structural realism (ESR) and historical case-study: the prediction of Zeeman's effect in Lorentz's theory of electron.

Access denied. Epistemic views on Structural realism.

The aim of ESR is achieving a realist position that brings together no miracle argument (NMA) and pessimistic meta-induction (PMI), providing a realist answer to historical changes in the science. As far as the theoretical level is considered, theories undergo a series of changes. Even if taken with some qualification, theory change is the report of a series of historical facts. In the history of science we have an impressive list of entities once effective and useful for the scientific enterprise and successively replaced (Laudan, 1981), therefore success is not a sufficient ground to believe in entities. In other terms PMI seems reasonable simply because these changes prevent us to conclude that such entities really exist, no matter the level of empirical success that the theory has achieved. Nonetheless, even the success of science cannot be denied, in particular when the predictivity of theories is considered. If we can predict phenomena somehow not taken into account when the theory has been formulated, then it is plausible to consider the theory approximately true (Worrall, 1989, p.102). Otherwise the novel prediction seems miraculous, indeed. The advocate of ESR argues that both the points can be addressed if we take PMI as expressing a limit on our capability to know reality. This limit does not apply to the whole abstract level of the theory.

The analysis of the history of electromagnetism provides matter for a qualified distinction. Although the notion of ether is abandoned in the shift between the two frameworks, Fresnel's equations can be retrieved within Maxwell's electromagnetic theory. This seems to provide evidence in favour of the idea that the shift does not involve the equations, the structural elements of the non empirical part of the theory (Worrall, 1989, 117). Then, even if we have to concede to the antirealist on the entities, we can be realist about the formal features of theories and the predictivity of physics finds a non-miraculous account:

"[...]Fresnel completely misidentified the *nature* of the light, but nevertheless it is no miracle that his theory enjoyed the *empirical predictive success* that it did; it is no miracle because Fresnel's theory, as science later saw it, attributed to light the right *structure*." (Worrall, 1989, 117; second italics mine)

Prima facie, it seems that we can explain the success of science as well as its deep changes observing that theories attribute to the world a *structure*, represented in the case of physics by the mathematical device, and a *nature*, represented by the entities.

Let us see where this distinction leads us. The reference to the predictive success of Fresnel's theory, insists on the correctness of the representation of the structure of light provided by the equations. We cannot know if the hypothetical entities of our theories do exist or not, but "these equations express relations, and *if the equations remains true, it is because the relations preserve their reality*"(Worrall, 1989, 118; italics mine). Therefore the occurrence of the equations in different frames depends upon their truth. Hence, for the claim to make sense, the structure cannot be merely *a formal device*. The equations represent *something in the world*, they express a physical content and are committed to the existence of the relations they represent. It can be the case that what a theory tell us about the entities in terms of their fundamental properties corresponds to reality but establishing this goes beyond the power of our knowledge.

Psillos noticed that as far as the distinction is epistemically grounded there seems to be a problem for ESR. The problem, as Psillos put it, corresponds to establish what exactly we can know about reality i.e. what features the structure. He explores three possible ways in which the distinction can be formulated and consequently the content of our knowledge captured:

"(A) We can know everything but the individuals that instantiate a definite structure; or

(B) We can know everything but the individuals and their first order properties; or

(C) We can know everything except individuals, their first order properties and their relations."

(Psillos, S., (2001) p S19)

Considered in particular Poincare's quotation, it seems to me that ESR is committed to something close to case B, I will justify and qualify this claim in a while. I generally agree with Psillos that if ESR corresponds to C there is no difference with a form of Russellian (or Maxwellian) structuralism which in turns can hardly be considered a form of realism. Now let us see Psillos argument on this option. Psillos concludes that if ESR corresponds to (B) the difference with standard realism would be only of degree since ESR would amount to "Carnapian relation description [...] (that) describe an object as that which stands in certain relations to other objects [...]Although a relation description do not entail *unique property description* they do offer some information about an object, because, generally, they entail *some* of its properties" (Psillos, 2001 S20, first italics mine). The

general conclusion Psillos draws is that there is no natural epistemic cut between relational and first order properties. In other terms if we believe in the structure we have no reasons to doubt of the entity and its properties because they form an epistemic continuum. But do they really form a continuum even in this sense? Let us assume that ESR corresponds to claim that only the relational description captured by the equations of the theory is a reliable theoretical element. A relation description do not entail a unique property description, therefore it can be multiply realized, i.e. it defines a class of *realizers* that can deeply differ one from each other in terms of fundamental properties, but in this case the continuum between structure and entity seems broken. Multiple realizability involves an ignorance in principle that standard realism cannot accept¹, but this feature seems to fit nicely with the agnosticism towards the entity and its properties wanted by the advocate of ESR. It can be the case, for instance that from relational description of electromagnetic forces we can infer properties like the mass or the charge of the electron. But the whole point of PMI is that there is nonetheless room to doubt if the properties and the entity have been replaced so frequently in the past. In other terms, which electron is the bearer of the values of mass and charge we inferred? The classical electron? The quantum electron? The classical particle of Lorentz or the spinning quantum-relativistic point mass of Dirac? Notice that one aspect of the theory-change issue in the case of electron is that not all the properties of these “electrons” are compatible one with each other. This last observation recalls the original aim of ESR, i.e. to individuate a theoretical feature resisting through the changes. At this point the characterizations provided in (B) needs some modification. To address PMI realistically on the basis of the structure as a stable element of our knowledge, involves a conception of structures as *independent* from the entities and their properties. Our knowledge of the structure remains stable despite the entities and their properties change, therefore the knowledge of the structure concerns relational, extrinsic properties, properties that are not intrinsic to the entities. In a while I shall introduce a more rigorous definition of what is meant here for intrinsic/extrinsic distinction, but let me stress a consequence of this independence. If the content of the equations are existing extrinsic properties and relations, then the novel prediction of a theory must find an explanation in the relational content of the theory itself, otherwise it turns out to be inexplicable why we keep retrieving the same equations in each different framework dealing with the same class of phenomena to which the original prediction belonged. The historical case introduced in the next section is concerned exactly with this requirement. I will show that in the case of the prediction of the Zeeman effect performed in the framework of Lorentz’s theory of electron an intrinsic property of the electron, namely its character of a rigid body is essential to perform the

¹ David Lewis in (1970) argues against multiple realizability as an unacceptable feature for standard realism in the case of Ramseyfication.

prediction. An intrinsic property, by the way, that does not feature in successive theories of the electron.

Let us conclude introducing a definition of intrinsic to spell out the distinction intrinsic /extrinsic. In the following I borrow the definition provided by Rae Langton and David Lewis in their 1998 joint paper. The definition does not capture the whole class of intrinsic properties, rather it focuses the so called basic ones, I will not address here the related issues. What is important for us is that with some qualification the definition provides a useful characterization of what should and what should not feature in the structure for ESR to make sense.

The basic intrinsic properties are those properties that (1) are independent from accompaniment or loneliness; (2) not disjunctive properties; (3) not negations of disjunctive properties. (Langton & Lewis, in Lewis, 1999, 120)

It is helpful to see this definition on the background of duplication. A property is intrinsic if it can never differ between two perfect duplicates. More intuitively, but with the abovementioned qualifications, a property is certainly intrinsic if an object has the property no matter if there is nothing else or other things in the world apart from it. A *purely extrinsic* or relational property at this point is a property that a thing has “solely in virtues of how accompanying things, and its external relation to these accompanying things, are”(Lewis, 2001, 384.)

As far as I can see being a classical particle or a rigid body is an intrinsic property.

Let us come to the contribution of the historical case.

§.2. Predicted interferences

An old Faraday idea

From 1891 to 1897, Pieter Zeeman carried a series of experiments in Leyden under the supervision of both Kamerlingh Onnes and Lorentz. In particular, he was looking for an interference between the electromagnetic field and the frequency of the light.

Lorentz, in the same period, was after a unified theory of matter, light and electromagnetism. But Zeeman's interest referred to Faraday's old project based on the observation that a magnetic field modifies the way in which light is propagated and reflected and therefore it is very likely to modify its frequency. Faraday attempted unsuccessfully to detect such an interference. According to Zeeman that failure depended on the low quality of Faraday's equipments and in his notebooks he observes that “it might worth while to try the experiment again with the *excellent auxiliaries of spectroscopy equipment of the present time*, [...]” (Kox, 1997, 140, italics mine)

Notice that when he started his experiments, the available theories suggested that the interference was not detectable at all.

At the fall of 1896 the assumption of Zeeman turned out to be right. A widening in the spectral lines of the light of Sodium emitted in a magnetic field was detected. Lorentz predicted that widening depended on a splitting of the spectral lines. The splitting was observed in a successive phase. The theoretical explanation was based on mechanical application of the Lorentz's Force. Before getting in to the details of experiments and related predictions, let us explore the general picture of these phenomena peculiar to Lorentz's theory.

The Dutch synthesis: charged particles within Maxwell's electromagnetism

Theoretical physics at the moment in which the new phenomenology appeared was concerned with an account of the relation between ether and matter. Maxwell's electromagnetic theory was dramatically successful but nevertheless incapable to account for phenomena like optical dispersion, the magneto-optical effects discovered by Kerr and Faraday, the high transparency of metal sheets to light and the electrolysis. All of this required a clear understanding of the microstructure of matter, electricity, magnetism and light, possibly a unifying theory. Maxwell's electromagnetism was silent on this issue². Precisely these concerns inspired Lorentz's *memoir* of 1892, the contribution in which the Lorentz's force was formulated (see Lorentz, 1892). The framework was based on a dualist ontology designed combining the ontological independence of the charge from the ether, with the idea that any electromagnetic phenomenon is a form of disturbance in a medium³. The resulting picture represented the common microphysical structure of matter, electromagnetism and light in terms of the dynamic of charged particles perturbing the ether. Their electric charge aside, particles were classical rigid bodies. Maxwell's framework became the theory of ether and the electromagnetic processes had to obey to maxwellian constrains. *The charged particles were supposed to be the only kind of matter interacting with the ether*, and since the interactions were essentially electric in nature, the medium itself was completely stationary. Further, the framework embedded a notion of local time and the first formulation of Lorentz's transformations.

The theory was presented as a combination of six hypotheses from which the fundamental laws were derived. It is worth exploring these hypotheses because they provide a description of the properties of ether and charged particles thus giving a clear clue of the kind of picture Lorentz had in mind .

i). "Charged particles have inertial mass and weight. The charged particles are in part mechanical bodies to which the laws of motion apply[...]"⁴(McCormmach, R., 1970. 459).

² For the problems left open by Maxwell theory see: Buchwald, J.,1985, "From Maxwell to microphysics", The University of Chicago Press, Chicago. In particular in the case Lorentz/Lamor Darrigol, O., "The electron theories of Larmor and Lorentz: a comparative study.", *Hist. Stud. Phys. Biol. Sci.*, 24, 1994 p. 265-336 and D'Agostino, S., (1973) "L'elettrodinamica di Lorentz sino alla soglia della teoria della Relatività di Einstein"; *Physica*, 15, 260

³ See Arabatzis, T., "The Zeeman Effect and The Discovery of the Electron" in Buchwald, J.Z., and Warwick, A.,(2001) *Histories of The Electron. The birth of Microphysics*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. p 176.

⁴ Here and in the following passages I'm quoting Lorentz's memoir in the translation offered in McCormmach, R., 1970.

ii). “[...]Theory identifies potential energy of an electromagnetic system with its electric energy, which is, in electromagnetic units,

$$2\pi[(f^2+g^2+h^2)d\tau \quad (1)$$

where f, g, h , is the dielectric displacement at each point of the ether. The dielectric displacement satisfies

$$(\delta f/\delta x)+(\delta g/\delta y)+(\delta h/\delta z)=0 \quad (2)$$

outside the charged particle, and

$$(\delta f/\delta x)+(\delta g/\delta y)+(\delta h/\delta z)=\rho \quad (3)$$

inside, where ρ is the density of electric charge.” (McCormach, 1970, 464)

From *i*) and *ii*) the potential energy of an electromagnetic field is defined as electric energy and this turns to be related to the dielectric displacement in the ether. The dielectric displacement must satisfy (3) i.e. a condition on the conservation of the density of charge at any point of the displacement. Notice that this suggest a deep interplay between the mechanical and electrical features of the theory since the conservation of charge density is “localized” in the particle. Broadly speaking the charge carrier plays the fundamental role in the picture and the charge carrier is a mechanical entity. Here the ether, location of the electric interaction, is completely characterized in term of electric energy. This corresponds to attributing to the ether only electrical interactions with charged particles.

iii) “charged particles behave like rigid bodies; moreover, each point of a particle preserves the same value of ρ , whatever its motion”

iv) defines as follows “the total electric current

$\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}$ as $\mathbf{u}=\rho\xi+(\delta f/\delta t)$, $\mathbf{v}=\rho\eta+(\delta g/\delta t)$, $\mathbf{w}=\rho\zeta+(\delta h/\delta t)$, where ζ, η, ξ , is the velocity of a given point of a charged particle” (McCormach, R., 1970 p.464)

[$\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}$, are the vectors of the total current].

Before to move on to the laws of the theory, let me emphasizes some peculiarities.

First of all, the *i*) and *iii*) define the particle as a rigid body with mass and weight equipped with an electric charge whose density has to remain constant during motion. These mechanical properties will turn out to be crucial in the analysis of the Zeeman effect.

Further, the above four hypotheses provide an immediate element of continuity with Maxwell’s theory since they allow to retrieve the notion of currents as incompressible fluids. The incompressibility of currents was obtained in that framework, treating the currents as the result of a strain in the ether surrounding the conductor⁵(Darrigol, 1994, 285). In the new theory the currents

⁵ See Darrigol,O (1994) p. 285

are due to the motion of charged particles whose charge density is conserved during the motion thus are incompressible.

Let's come back to the hypotheses.

v) defines the kinetic energy of the system in terms of magnetic energy and states that it depends upon the total current.

vi) states that:

“ the location of each point of the ether participating in the electromagnetic motions of the system is determined by the positions of all of the charged particles and by the values of f , g , h at all points in the ether”. (McCormmach, R., 1970, p. 465)

Adding to this assumptions D'Alembert' Law it is possible to derive the equations of motion in the ether. Let us come to the most important contribution of the theory the equations of the Lorentz's Force:

in the following , V is the speed of light, f , g and h describe the dielectric displacement at each point in the ether, ζ , η , ξ , is the velocity of a given point of a charged particle, and α , β , γ , represent the magnetic force

$$\begin{aligned} X &= 4\pi V^2 \int \rho f d\tau + \int \rho (\eta\gamma - \zeta\beta) d\tau \\ Y &= 4\pi V^2 \int \rho g d\tau + \int \rho (\zeta\alpha - \xi\gamma) d\tau \\ Z &= 4\pi V^2 \int \rho h d\tau + \int \rho (\xi\beta - \eta\alpha) d\tau \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Lorentz derived these equations mechanically, they described the force acting on a particle whose density charge is ρ moving in the ether. In particular the first integral on the right side represents the electrostatic force whereas the second integral expresses the force acting on single particle moving through the ether. It is interesting to notice that Lorentz could derive Fresnel coefficients from his system of equations (see McCormmach,1970, p. 465-467)

The mechanical approach not only seems to provide a reasonable basis for the searched unification but from the very beginning saves all the preceding relevant results.

Let us examine the kind of explanation performed by this framework in the case of Zeeman's discovery.

The interference detected

In the fall of 1896 Zeeman put a piece of asbestos soaked with common salt and exposed to the flame between the arms of a Rumkorf magnet. A Rowland grate provided the analysis of the line spectra. He described as follows what he was able to detect:

“If the current was put on, the two D-lines [the D-spectral lines] were distinctly widened. If the current was cut off, they return to their original position. The appearing and disappearing of the widening was simultaneous with the putting on and off the current.”(Zeeman, P,1897, 227)

So, the first outcome was a widening in the lines of the light emitted by the sodium. It is important to observe that no splitting of the lines was found at this stage. Zeeman himself informed Lorentz of the outcome and hence reported officially the result to the faculty. Two days later Lorentz communicated his account. His model resolved the broadening of the lines in a more complex pattern of splitting and described accurately the structure of each line. In this sense the explanation was namely a prediction of an unobserved phenomenon.

The analysis of the pattern of interference

The model provided is based on the Lorentz Force but the notation below is due to the new vectorial formulation that Lorentz obtained for (5) by the end of 1895:

$$\mathbf{K} = e(\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{v}\mathbf{H}/c)(I)$$

Where \mathbf{H} and \mathbf{E} are respectively the magnetic and electric field and e and ν are charge and mass of the particle (See Lorentz, 1895).

Let z be the direction of the field \mathbf{H} , those are the equation of motion of a charged particle rotating around the centre of the atom once a magnetic field is applied

$$m [(d^2x)/d(t^2)] = -kx + [(eH)/C] [(dy)/(dt)] \quad (6)$$

$$m [(d^2y)/d(t^2)] = -ky - [(eH)/C] [(dx)/(dt)] \quad (7)$$

$$m [(d^2z)/d(t^2)] = -kz \quad (8)$$

The general solution of the last equation is:

$$z = a \cos(\omega_0 t + p) \quad (9)$$

with a and p constants and the value of frequency $\omega_0 = 2\pi(k/m)^{-2}$

At this point is possible to derive two solutions for each (6) and (7) by means of which two more values of frequency are obtained :

$$\omega_1^2 = \omega_0^2 + [(eH)/(mC)] \omega_1$$

$$\omega_2^2 = \omega_0^2 + [(eH)/(mC)] \omega_2$$

ω_0 is the unaltered frequency since z is both the direction of the light and the direction of the field H. From the mechanical point of view, the model treats the electron as an harmonic oscillator, this is what is expressed in the equation (6), (7), (8) -if we ignore the electromagnetic terms added in the extreme right side in (6) and (7)- once a magnetic field is applied, the particle experiences a Lorentz force and the period of its motion is altered according to the relations expressed by the electromagnetic terms, i.e. a rigid body moving of harmonic motion to which is applied a force. More generally the idea is that the electric ion is responsible for light emission. It has an oscillatory motion with arbitrary direction in space. This motion can be resolved in three oscillatory components of the same frequency: a linear oscillation and two circular oscillations, the two circular being one clockwise and the other anticlockwise. When a magnetic field is applied because of Lorentz's force acting on the ion we have two different outcomes both depending upon the direction of the detection.

a) If the direction of the field is parallel to the direction of motion of the particles we have the pattern of splitting described above: two lines one broader than the other since the component in the direction of the field remains unaltered. The two lines observed together are wider than the line in absence of the field, i.e. precisely Zeeman's first observation.

b) If the direction of the field is perpendicular to the direction of the motion of the particle a "triplet" is supposed to be detected. The pattern of interference has to involve the three component, with three plane polarized lines. The middle component has to have a direction parallel to the field and the other components have to maintain a direction perpendicular to the field.

This is exactly what Zeeman detected in a further experience with the blue line of Cadmium, and this was not the only result (see Kox, 1997).

The ratio e/m of the electron

Once the model had allowed to calculate the alteration in the frequencies, the terms in the system of equation above where all corresponding to known values and therefore extracting the ratio e/m of the particle was just a matter of calculation: "If the change of the period is represented by δT , then [$\delta(1/T)$ being = $-\delta T/T^2$] the positive or negative change of T is given by:

$$\delta T = (H/4\pi)(e/m)T^2 \quad (3) \quad [...].$$

If δT is measured during the experiment, and H and T are known, the ratio e/m of the electron may be determined by the aid of formula (3)"[...] "From the measured widening by means of the equation (3) the ratio e/m may now be deduced. It thus appears that e/m is of the order of magnitude 10^7 [emu/g]" (Zeeman, 1913, 33). Interestingly, the expectations were not towards a

new constituent of matter but rather it was expected to find evidence in favour of the assumption that the charged particle was a Faraday's ion, to reach a broad unification of the field area (Kox, 1997, 142)

Notice that the value of e/m is interpreted in strict relation with the notion of particle as rigid body since it is taken to provide an estimate of the size of the particle.

Some conclusive remarks

This story has an interesting and complex follow-up that I cannot discuss here in detail. What is worth noticing is that, generalizing this result, Larmor few months later this discovery, derived his precession formula:

$$P = (2/3) (e^2 a^2 / c^3)$$

Where a is the acceleration of the electron, e is the charge and c is the velocity of light. This formula is a relation that gives, in the case of Zeeman's interferences, the amount of energy released by an electron subjected to acceleration. This relation is still derived today in the quantum theories and is extremely important to study nuclear magnetic resonance See (Warwick, 1993, 56-57).

From every point of view this case meets the requirements that the advocate of ESR wants. We deal with a theory that provides a strong prediction that eventually delivers to the successive theories stable theoretical contents. Nonetheless the epistemic role of some intrinsic property seems unavoidable. It seems that neither Psillos nor Worrall are right. It seems that realism is still in trouble with theory-change. But let us observe the role played by some of the relations mentioned in this historical case. The Lorentz framework retrieves the incompressibility of currents of Maxwell's theory and Fresnel's equations. It seems that the new electron is designed to meet both empirical needs – accounting for Kerr effect, Faraday effect, electrolysis, high transparency of metal sheet- and precise theoretical relations secured by the preceding successful science. The properties of the classical particles meet all the requirements and their design is impressively powerful and effective from the epistemic point of view. Further the role they play in allowing the prediction prevent us to dispense with them epistemically. There is nothing we do not know about them. Nonetheless they will disappear in further theories and therefore they seems to be essentially theory-dependent. On the other side relations can hardly be taken less than realistically since they are both independent from the framework in which they are achieved and epistemically effective. It seems that a “form of realism adequate to the physics needs to be construed on the basis of an alternative ontology which replaces the notions of objects (...) with that of structure in some form.” (French and Ladyman, 2003, 37)

Acknowledgements

I am in debt with Steven French for comments, patient suggestions and clarifying discussions without his contribution some the problem would still be there. Further improvement is due to illuminating conversations with Juha Saatsy and Sara Lombardi. Thanks to Mauro Dorato and Joseph Melia. for suggestions and observations on earlier versions of this piece that helped me a lot to develop it.

References

- Arabatzis, Theodore., “The Zeeman Effect and The Discovery of the Electron” in Buchwald, J.Z., and Warwick, A.,(2001) *Histories of The Electron. The birth of Microphysics*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. p 176.
- Buchwald, John.,1985, “*From Maxwell to microphysics*”, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago
- Darrigol, Olivier., (1994) “The electron theories of Larmor and Lorentz: a comparative study.”, *Hist. Stud. Phys. Biol. Sci.*, 24, p. 265-336
- D’Agostino, Salvo, (1973) “L’elettrodinamica di Lorentz sino alla soglia della teoria della Relatività di Einstein”, *Physis*, 15: 260
- French, Steven & Ladyman, James, (2003) “Remodelling Structural Realism: Quantum Physics and the Metaphysics of Structure” *Synthese*, 136: 31-56
- Kox, A.J. “The discovery of Electron: the Zeeman effect.” *Eur.Jou. Phys.* 1997, 18.
- Langton, R., & Lewis, D., (1998) “Defining Intrinsic” *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 58. Republished in D. Lewis, *Papers in Metaphysic and Epistemology*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999
- Laudan, Larry, (1981) “A refutation of convergent realism” *Philosophy of Science* 48: 19-49.
- Lewis D (1970) “How to define theoretical terms” *Jou.Phil.* 67: 427-446
- Lewis, D., (2001) “Redefining intrinsic”, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 53: 381-391.
- Lorentz, H. A., “La théorie électromagnétique de Maxwell et son application aux corps mouvants” in *Collected Papers Vol. 2*
- Lorentz, Hendrick, Antoon, “Versuch Einer Theorie der Electricischen und Optischen Erscheinungen in Bewetgen Körpern”, 1895. In *Collected Papers*, vol.5, Leiden, 1936.
- McCormmach, Russell., “H A. Lorentz and the electromagnetic view of nature”, *Isis*, vol .61, 1970.
- Psillos, Stathis, (2001) “Is structural realism possible?”, *Philosophy of Science* 68, (*Proceedings*): S13-S24
- Warwick, Andrew, “Frequency, theorem, and formula: remembering Joseph Larmor in electromagnetic theory”, *Notes to the Royal Society of London* 47: 49-60
- Worral, John (1989)“Structural realism: the best of both worlds?” *Dialectica* 43: 99-124
- Zeeman, Peeter (1897),“On the influence of magnetism on the nature of the light emitted by a substance”, *Philosophical Magazine* 43: 226-239
- Zeeman, Peeter., 1913, *Researches in Magneto-optics: with special references to the magnetic resolution of spectrum lines* McMillan, London