

Transversal: International Journal for the Historiography of Science, 2 (2017) 01-02

ISSN 2526-2270

www.historiographyofscience.org

© The Authors 2017 – This is an open access article

From the Editors

Historiography of Science: The Link between History and Philosophy in Understanding Science

Mauro L. Condé¹

Marlon Salomon²

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24117/2526-2270.2017.i2.01>

It is with great pleasure that we launch this second number of the *Transversal: International Journal for the historiography of Science* (June 2017 Edition). For this edition we have been able to count on the collaboration of 23 authors from 10 different countries and therefore believe we are on the right path to having a periodical that is as frontier-less as it could possibly be. This strong adherence of authors from different places also shows us that our editorial proposal has been well received by this international community of academics interested in the historiography of science; we are certainly very glad about that. We are well aware that the path of consolidation is a long one, but the first two numbers have strongly motivated us to forge ahead.

In seeking to foster research and academic exchanges in the historiography of science, narrating its history and critique, we have elected that our editorial focus should not only be on authors and themes but also on the different scientific disciplines and their specific historiographies. While the first two numbers have concentrated on authors who are important for the historiography of science, in the near future we will have dossiers on themes and disciplines that are equally worthy to be featured on the editorial agenda of the *Transversal: International Journal for the Historiography of Science*. Similarly, the articles section is open to receive collaborations that address historiographic perspectives of different disciplines and the most varied themes and authors.

Although it is considered to be a sub-discipline of history, the historiography of science is in fact a point of confluence of science, history and philosophy. It can undertake the important task of establishing the analysis and registration of the different narratives of the history of science but also, in a philosophical perspective, of questioning the parameters, outreach and possibilities of different historiographic models constructed by those historical narratives of science. Thus, the historiography of science is somewhat like a delta in which the waters of science, history and philosophy, and, albeit contemplated to a lesser extent in this tradition, those of the disciplines of sociology and anthropology, flow through together. In short, the historiography of science brings together bodies of knowledge that are quite distinct and that have equally distinct trajectories, but they interweave and imbricate to the point that their waters become almost indistinguishable from one another.

In that sense, the editorial stance of this periodical holds that, among the different and common concerns and interests present in science, history and philosophy, the historiography of science constitutes

¹ Mauro L. Condé is a Professor in the Department of History at the Federal University of Minas Gerais. Address: Av. Antônio Carlos, 6627 – Belo Horizonte – MG, 31.270-901, Brazil. Email: mauroconde@ufmg.br

² Marlon Salomon is a Professor in the Faculty of History at the Federal University of Goiás. Address: Av. Esperança, s/n, Campus Samambaia – Goiânia – GO, 74.690-90, Brazil. Email: marlonsalomon@ufg.br

a link that unites those fields of knowledge in an integrated manner. For some time now we have known of the need to imbricate history and philosophy to achieve an understanding of science. That has been imparted by authors like Ludwik Fleck, Georges Canguilhem and Imre Lakatos. To Fleck, “any theory of knowledge without historical or comparative studies will remain a mere hollow play of words, an imaginary epistemology (*Epistemologia imaginabilis*)” (Fleck 1979 [1935]). In 1966, Canguilhem stated that “without having recourse to epistemology, a theory of knowledge would be a meditation on emptiness and without any relation to the history of the sciences, an epistemology would be a perfectly superfluous double of the very science whose history it intended to discourse on” (Canguilhem 1983 [1966]). In turn, years later, inspired by Kant, Imre Lakatos asserted that “the philosophy of science without the history of science is empty; the history of science without the philosophy of science is blind” (Lakatos 1998). We are convinced that the historiography of science can be precisely that terrain of integration. In other words, even if the history of science and the philosophy of science in their aspects as distinct disciplines that address the same object but each with its own methodology, governed by different intentions – as Kuhn showed in his text on the History of Science and the Philosophy of Science (Kuhn 1977) – even if the final result of both bodies of knowledge, those of history as much as those of philosophy, are quite distinct from one another, it is still difficult to deny the vast terrain that they share in their historiographic preoccupations.

Indeed considering the historiography of science to be a sub-discipline of history seems to be more to meet the demands of our classificatory natures or academic policy that compartmentalizes everything into its departments. From the epistemological point of view, there is no reason not to associate the historiography of science as knowledge common to and shared by science, history and philosophy.

This edition honors the figure of Pierre Duhem, who is not only a classic example in the affirmation of the connections among science, history and philosophy but also a highly important figure for the historiography of science, especially in the light of his fruitful historiographic conception and his important archival discoveries which, it is well to remember, brought mediaeval science to life. Thus that erudite French intellectual cannot be left outside the scope of our editorial focus. We hereby pay homage to him and his rich legacy of thought.

We must also underscore the important editorial work undertaken by Fábio Rodrigo Leite and Jean-François Stoffel in the production of the dossier on Pierre Duhem. Were it not for the two organizers' profound knowledge of Duhem's works – allied to their tremendous capability in articulating an editorial process that involved authors, evaluators and editors – this special number would never have existed. Thus we register not only our acknowledgement of their labors but also our great debt of gratitude to them. Particularly, Fábio Leite for his leadership in this process.

Mauro L. Condé – UFMG
Marlon J. Salomon – UFG

References

- Canguilhem, Georges. 1983 [1966]. *Études d'histoire et de philosophie des sciences*. Paris: J. Vrin.
- Fleck, Ludwik. 1979 [1935]. *Genesis and development of a scientific fact*. Chicago: The university of Chicago press.
- Kuhn, Thomas. 1977. The relations between the history and the philosophy of science. In Kuhn, Thomas. *The essential tension*. Chicago; London: The university of Chicago press.
- Lakatos, Imre. 1970. History of science and its rational reconstruction. *Proceedings of the biennial meeting of the philosophy of science association*, Vol. 1970, pp. 91-136.

