

Handbook for the Historiography of Science, ed. by Mauro L. Condé and Marlon Salomon, Springer Nature, Cham 2023, xx + 530 pp, DOI 10.1007/978-3-031-27510-4

Despite having a considerably longer history, the history of science only became an independent study in the 20th c. To date, a sizable amount of scholarship has been produced about the history of science in general and science historiography in particular. This book serves as an invaluable resource for scholars of the field.

The Handbook for the Historiography of Science is a work that combines the contributions of 33 researchers. The book comprises 633 pages and is divided into four main parts with a total of 28 chapters.

The first part of the book is dedicated to key figures central to the historiography of science. This section begins by telling the story of the history of science, starting with Pierre Duhem. The influence of the French tradition on the history of science is palpable in this regard. Fábio Rodrigo Leite's work, *Pierre Duhem: Between the Historiography of Science and Philosophy of History* (p. 3–27), is followed by studies on Alexandre Koyré, Gaston Bachelard, and Georges Canguilhem. Marlon Salomon, in his article *The Origins of Alexandre Koyré's History of Scientific Thought* (p. 29–47) highlights one of the main figures of the discipline of the history of science; Fábio Ferreira de Almeida, in a chapter titled *Gaston Bachelard and Historical Epistemology: A New Perspective for the History of Science in the Twentieth Century* (p. 48–61) emphasizes Bachelard's contributions; and Charles Wolfe and Giulia Gandolfi, in *The Case of Life in the Historiography of Modern Science: Canguilhem's 'Biophilosophy'* (p. 83–99), highlight Canguilhem's work. In this way, prominent figures in French scientific historiography are discussed and introduced.

The same is true of historians of science who discussed in their works the social contexts of science. For example, Daniele Cozzoli's article on *John Desmond Bernal and 'Bernalism'* (p. 101–120) and Condé's article on *Thomas Kuhn's Legacy for the Historiography of Science* (p. 121–144) discuss historians of science who have attempted to place the development of sciences within a social context. This section concludes with the following people discussed: Joseph Agassi, Steven Shapin, Ian Hacking, and Lorraine Daston.

The second section of the book focuses on concepts in the historiography of science. There are four essays on scientific revolutions, historical epistemology and its connection to Germany, French philosophy in the philosophy of science, and the influence of Bachelard on historical epistemology. The authors of the articles in this section, Yafeng Shan, Juan A. Queijo Olano, Antonio A.P. Videira, Jean-François Braunstein, and Enrico Castelli Gattinara, have clarified the concepts in the writing of the history of science. Yafeng Shan's article, *The Historiography of Scientific Revolutions: A Philosophical Reflection* (p. 257–274), examines the history and significance of the concept of scientific revolution in detail.

The third section begins with the early historiography of science. This part discusses the history of mathematics and explores more specialized topics. The chapters include: *On the Interpretations of the Cultural and Techno-Scientific Significance of Portuguese*

Navigations: A Historiographic Approach (p. 355–376) by João Príncipe and “*The Herodotus of Geometry*”: *Montucla and the Birth of a General Historiography of Science in the French Enlightenment* (p. 377–396) by Giorgio Matteoli which delve into the details of the history of science through specific cases. This section also elaborates on the historiography of science that developed in Europe in the late 19th c., using illustrative examples.

The fourth and final section of the book examines fields related to the historiography of science. The authors of the articles in this section have explored the relationships between the history of science and other disciplines. For example, Jaume Navarro and Kostas Tampakis’s article *Science, Religion, and the Creation of Historiographical Categories* (p. 503–522), Andrea Reichenberger’s *Historiography of Science and Gender* (p. 543–564), and Andrea Mara R.S. Vieira’s *Historiography of Science and the Relationship Between History and the History of Science* (p. 565–588) provide great examples of the connections between the history of science and other fields. Finally, it includes essays on the distinction between the historiography of science and the philosophy of history.

In conclusion, while the book provides a comprehensive and detailed exploration of the historiography of science, certain aspects could have been addressed more thoroughly. Although the first part of the book on historians of science is quite comprehensive, it omits one of the most important figures in the institutionalization of the field. George Sarton (1884–1956), who established the chair of the history of science at Harvard and founded key journals in the field, such as *Isis* and *Osiris*, should have been included in this section. Furthermore, the third section neglects to address specific issues. The historiography of science in Islamic civilizations could have been examined here. For example, the works of Aydın Sayılı (1913–1993) and Fuat Sezgin (1924–2018) could have been evaluated in this regard. While a work of this scale is bound to have minor shortcomings, these do not significantly affect its overall value.

Vural Başaran

University of Ankara, Türkiye
ORCID 0000-0002-2721-5234



Licencja/License CC BY 4.0

(creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

DOI 10.4467/0023589XKHNT.25.001.22794

***Nicolaus Copernicus in the Culture of Memory: Sedimentation of Knowledge*, red. Adam F. Kola i Wojciech Piasek, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Verlag, Getynga 2025, ss. 302, DOI 10.14220/9783737017794 (Open-Access-Publication, CC BY-NC 4.0)**

Książka ta jest pokłosiem obradującego we wrześniu 2023 r. w Toruniu Światowego Kongresu Kopernikańskiego, a właściwie – jednej z licznych sekcji Kongresu. Składa się na nią tuzin bardzo różnorodnych tematycznie rozdziałów, zebranych pod parasolem pojemnej kategorii „kultura pamięci”. Z punktu widzenia historyka nauki i astronomii, ukształtowanego w Instytucie Historii Nauki PAN, najbardziej interesujący ze względu na poruszane