



LUND UNIVERSITY

Developing the History of Knowledge

Östling, Johan; Larsson Heidenblad, David; Nilsson Hammar, Anna

Published in:
Forms of Knowledge

2020

Document Version:
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Östling, J., Larsson Heidenblad, D., & Nilsson Hammar, A. (2020). Developing the History of Knowledge. In J. Östling, D. Larsson Heidenblad, & A. Nilsson Hammar (Eds.), *Forms of Knowledge: Developing the History of Knowledge* (pp. 9–26). Nordic Academic Press.

Total number of authors:
3

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

INTRODUCTION

Developing the history of knowledge

Johan Östling, David Larsson Heidenblad & Anna Nilsson Hammar

The history of knowledge is under rapid development. In the past few years, the number of scholars working in the field has multiplied. While German and Swiss *Wissensgeschichte* emerged in the early 2000s, it has only been in the late 2010s that the field has become a truly international and multilingual endeavour.¹ Judging by the diversity of conferences, initiatives, and new specialized book series and journals, the future for the history of knowledge looks bright. It promises to be one of the most dynamic fields of historical scholarship in the 2020s.²

Crucial to these developments is the formation of new research clusters and centres. The present volume, *Forms of Knowledge*, highlights the activities at one such hub: Lund University in Sweden. In doing so, we engage in the international discussions on the history of knowledge and demonstrate the field's potential to enrich historical scholarship. We have decided to focus our volume on *forms* of knowledge, which emanates from a joint commitment to a programmatically broad and fundamentally historical conceptualization of knowledge.³ As Sven Dupré and Geert Somsen argue, the history of knowledge should not be seen as 'a mere expansion of the history of science'.⁴ Whereas science and scholarship certainly are of great interest, they do not necessarily reside at the core of our inquiry. For us, the history of knowledge is first and foremost a social, political, and cultural history.

This understanding of the field has been particularly fruitful at the level of social interaction in the Lund hub. The term 'knowledge' serves as an umbrella term, bringing together researchers with different back-

grounds and research interests in a joint conversation. The concept of knowledge has proved to be both suitably vague and sufficiently interesting to unite researchers who are grappling with different periods, sources, and phenomena. However, questions about which the central concepts are, how we should comprehend them, and which methodologies we ought to apply, remain answered in different ways by different researchers.

The rapid growth of the history of knowledge, at Lund University as elsewhere, has sparked a debate about whether the field provides anything substantially new. 'Do we need a new term for something many of us have already been doing, for years and years?' Suzanne Marchand asks in a recent assessment of the advantages and disadvantages of *Wissensgeschichte*.⁵ However, in reflecting on the field, Staffan Bergwik points out that new scholarly labels and umbrella terms tend to give a field its epistemological power, enabling collaborations and new undertakings. Moreover, they offer professional opportunities for younger scholars, their supposed novelty catching the eye of funding bodies. The inherent tension between high aspirations and the actual ability to provide new and original perspectives are, as Bergwik stresses, typical of new fields.⁶

Hampus Östh Gustafsson makes a similar argument when he underscores that naming and labelling, while they may seem to be merely rhetorical constructs, nonetheless have real consequences for academic life and scholarly production. Hence, Östh Gustafsson insists, historians of knowledge must reflect on the genesis of their own field and the forms it takes.⁷ In doing so, we must observe the tenet that knowledge is rarely truly original or new, for it is a continuous process that is locally and historically situated. However, what are the implications of this theoretical stance? As historians of knowledge, how can we take stock of the formation of our own field?

One consequence, which we would like to emphasize, is that our work, like that of past scholars, is a collective and communicative practice. It is a temporary and contingent labelling of research interests that makes them relevant points of discussion both in and beyond established scholarly communities. While each individual effort and its scholarly results must meet certain criteria—among which novelty and conceptual

rigour are essential—it is hardly reasonable to hold an entire research field to these standards. The formation of a research area should not be confused with its individual research projects or programmes.

Against this background, we do not see it as a problem that the history of knowledge builds on a variety of research traditions and methodologies. What, though, does the field actually provide? The simple answer is that it is a community of academics who want to explore the historical conditions of the production and circulation of knowledge, not only with their traditional disciplinary peers, but with colleagues in other branches of the humanities and beyond. In an era of increasing specialization, the formation of an integrative cluster such as the history of knowledge serves a purpose.⁸

This volume manifests some of the scholarly consequences of these developments. But how did the history of knowledge become established in Lund? Why did this particular research initiative develop into a hub of collaborative scholarship? And what are its distinguishing features?

The history of knowledge at Lund University

History of knowledge in Lund took shape in the later 2010s. If one is to seek its origin, it is reasonable to begin in Berlin. In 2014, Johan Östling was a visiting researcher at Lorraine Daston's department at the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science in the German capital. It was a stimulating environment that had attracted many of the world's leading historians of science over the years. Östling's stay happened to overlap with Erling Sandmo's, a professor of history in Oslo, who was also a visiting fellow at the same institute. Both appreciated the intellectual vitality that they encountered, but, being historians by training, they sometimes also felt a sense of estrangement in a milieu that tended to focus strongly on the actors and institutions of the natural sciences. Casting about for alternative approaches, they came across what in German had started to be called *Wissensgeschichte*—‘the history of knowledge’. It had a foothold in Berlin, but was developing more explicitly at the Center ‘History of Knowledge’ in Zurich. Could this serve as inspiration for a history of knowledge that was rooted in historical scholarship but at

the same time open to influences from other disciplines? Sandmo and Östling asked themselves.

Once home, they decided to develop the history of knowledge further. The first step was to invite three postdoctoral researchers to be part of the project: David Larsson Heidenblad and Anna Nilsson Hammar in Lund, and Kari H. Nordberg in Oslo. Between 2014 and 2016, we published articles, applied for research funding, attended conferences, and discussed what the history of knowledge might mean. Although the work was conducted on a small scale and the large research grants failed to materialize, the intellectual and infrastructural foundations for the history of knowledge in the Nordic countries were laid here.

We were keen to widen our circle and make an original contribution to international scholarship, and therefore in August 2016 arranged a workshop on the circulation of knowledge as a theoretical framework and analytical tool. More than twenty researchers participated, and at the workshop we launched a Nordic network devoted to the history of knowledge, and with it a digital platform (newhistoryofknowledge.com). The discussions at the workshop resulted in an edited volume, published in early 2018 as *Circulation of Knowledge*, which met with considerable interest in the form of reviews and invitations to present our research in various parts of the world.⁹

Lund was, together with Oslo, the most important node in the Nordic network at this stage, and would be where the history of knowledge would grow most significantly in the years to come. Lund had a relatively large group of postdoctoral researchers, thanks in part to the National Graduate School in Historical Studies, and several early career scholars were curious about what the history of knowledge could mean and how it could enhance their own research. One of the strengths of the Department of History in Lund has long been cultural history: in the 2000s, much of the research at the department was focussed on representations, discourses, narratives, or experiences, whether the subject was lifeworlds in the early modern period or memories of the Holocaust. This legacy has left its mark on the kind of history of knowledge that has developed at Lund University.¹⁰

Starting in 2017, the history of knowledge initiative at the Department of History was put on a more formal footing, while at the same time expanding in terms of people and projects. At time of writing, the core group consists of a dozen researchers in the discipline of history. Östling has received funding for a five-year programme on the circulation of humanist knowledge in the post-war period, as part of which two postdoctoral researchers have been recruited: Anton Jansson and Ragni Svensson. The group also includes three early modern projects led by Anna Nilsson Hammar, Kajsa Brilkman, and Erik Bodenstein, all funded by the Swedish Research Council. David Larsson Heidenblad and Björn Lundberg are working in several projects on post-war environmental history and economic history from the point of view of the history of knowledge. In 2018, Karolina Enquist Källgren was recruited as a postdoctoral fellow in the history of knowledge, and is currently exploring interwar epistemology. In the autumn of 2019, Martin Ericsson received funding from the Swedish Research Council to analyse the production and circulation of racial knowledge in Sweden in the mid-twentieth century. There are three doctoral students—Lise Groesmeyer, Karl Haikola, and Anton Öhman—who are researching various aspects of the history of knowledge in the twentieth century. In addition, several other scholars of history and adjacent disciplines are affiliated with the research cluster, some of whom have contributed to the present book.

In order to foster interest in the history of knowledge, a monthly seminar series was set up in Lund in 2017. Under the leadership of Östling, Larsson Heidenblad, and Nilsson Hammar, invited guests from anthropology, philosophy, the history of science, and the history of education among many disciplines have led discussions about the problems and potential of the history of knowledge. The seminars have become a gathering place where researchers from different historical fields—history, the history of science and ideas, the history of the book, media history etcetera—can meet regularly. In a recent article, Maria Simonsen and Laura Skouvig have underlined the importance of this interdisciplinary forum, and the fruitful discussions and collaborations it has prompted.¹¹ As a way of further developing and consolidating the

history of knowledge at Lund University, moreover, we have offered courses in all three cycles of the university system—the BA, MA, and doctoral levels—in various settings.¹²

The Lund Centre for the History of Knowledge (LUCK) at the Lund University Department of History, founded in March 2020, aims to further inspire and develop this scholarly expertise. LUCK is home to a range of projects, publications, seminar series, a visiting fellowship programme, and Nordic and international networks, bringing together researchers from many disciplines to explore new forms of collaboration.

What are the scholarly consequences of all these developments? What are the ramifications of a new, expansive, interdisciplinary endeavour? Has it changed the conversation and sparked new undertakings? In what follows, we will elaborate on these issues by looking at two distinguishing features of the history of knowledge intervention at the local level: its manifest capacity to *integrate* various strands of existing scholarship into a shared venture; and its emerging capacity to *generate* new and original lines of research.¹³

Developing integrative and generative capacities

The history of knowledge endeavour has attracted growing interest, especially among early career researchers. Over the last five years, it has brought together a growing number of scholars with highly diverse research interests. Early modern theological tracts; crop failures in the eighteenth century; the promotion of racial knowledge by the UNESCO; the internal workings of Wikipedia: whatever the field of study, the history of knowledge has something to offer. Simone Lässig's proposition that knowledge can be regarded as a 'phenomenon that touches on almost every sphere of human life' and therefore can be 'used as a lens' in a wide array of historical scholarship would seem to hold true.¹⁴ Without shifting focus, scholars have been able to draw on and add to ongoing discussions in the history of knowledge.

Moreover, the history of knowledge endeavour has succeeded in bridging the chronological divides between scholars. Scholarly discussions about interdisciplinary and integrative approaches do not typically

focus on epochal divides, yet, in practice, chronological boundaries are often just as divisive, if not more so, than thematic, theoretical, geographic, and subdisciplinary boundaries. Hence, we want to stress the fruitfulness of a deliberately interchronological approach. In our experience, this has been especially important for the development of a dynamic research hub, which challenges chronological parochialism.

Historians of knowledge have been reluctant to impose programmatic definitions of key concepts such as ‘knowledge’, ‘circulation’, and ‘society’. This is, we maintain, a direct consequence of the fields’ integrative and interchronological character. There are no one-size-fits-all definitions that are useful for everyone—historians cannot study the sixteenth century and the 1960s in the same way—and so practitioners apply the analytical concepts in different, and sometimes contradictory, ways. Yet, the scholarly conversation has not broken down. On the contrary, productive disagreements have become a distinguishing feature of the history of knowledge. As Simonsen and Skouvig have argued, rather than try to define knowledge, there is a need for a pragmatic conceptualization. It behoves researchers to sharpen their arguments, be precise, and remain alert to their own particular standpoint and its confines.¹⁵

The core questions cannot be given definite answers—none of a trans-historical character, at any rate—yet they are undoubtedly productive, as they help us explore the many roles that various forms of knowledge have had in past societies. The research group at Lund seeks to enable and foster this larger scholarly conversation. This integrative capacity is demonstrably one of the greatest merits of the field. However, the generative capacity of the history of knowledge is also under development.

Crucial to this emerging quality is a programmatically broad research agenda, with strong roots in social, political, and cultural history. While the discussions in Lund are certainly inspired by recent developments in neighbouring fields, the majority of scholars involved are trained as general historians. Hence, we would argue that it is vital that the history of knowledge strives to invigorate the discipline of history, and build upon its disciplinary tradition. To this end, the present volume is a conscious effort to demonstrate that the history of knowledge is concerned

with many different forms of knowledge, and that it seeks to strengthen our understanding of historical societies and larger processes.

What, then, is the potential of the history of knowledge? While there are few uniting methodologies or theories, there is, as Martin Mulsow has pointed out, a convergence of the different directions on a 'general direction of travel'.¹⁶ It is fundamental to view knowledge as locally situated and to take its historicity and complexity into account, which helps carry the conversation forward. As a consequence, rather than knowledge per se, it is the conditions for knowledge production and circulation that are in the spotlight.

The discussions at Lund University have pinpointed four topics that have the potential to bridge differences in subject and time period. First, definitions. How do we define knowledge analytically and historically, and how does it relate to concepts such as information, news, beliefs, discourse, science, or culture? What kind of definition is useful to the historical inquiry? What conceptualizations do we need to be able to discuss pertinent issues across chronological divides?¹⁷ Second, social relevance. The question of how various forms of knowledge become important, be it in society at large or in people's everyday lives, is central. To some, this implies a shift of focus from academic institutions and towards the public production and circulation of knowledge; to others, the key issue is how knowledge is lived, practised, and routinized in everyday life.¹⁸ Third, infrastructure. What of the arenas for the production and circulation of knowledge? Here, we turn our attention to different media and the role they have played historically, highlighting the material, political, and intellectual conditions under which knowledge was produced and circulated.¹⁹ Fourth, agency. In the question of historical actors and their significance for the processes of production and circulation of knowledge, there exists a joint interest in broadening the range and types of knowledge actors.²⁰ These four strands are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but point to an open-ended inquiry into what the history of knowledge is and what it could become. They provide the basis for our deliberations, and stimulate a fertile discussion of knowledge phenomena in different historical settings.

In the present volume, we address all these issues in various ways. The first part of the book shows how the scope of history of knowledge inquiries can be expanded. The second part highlights vital theoretical and conceptual discussions in the field. The third part engages with the movement of knowledge and knowledge actors. Taken together, the essays demonstrate both the integrative and generative capacities of the history of knowledge.

Expanding the field

The first group of essays shows how the scope of inquiry can be expanded beyond the realms that are traditionally the focus of the history of science, the history of education, and intellectual history. However, it is not only an empirical or thematic extension. By analysing, for instance, religion, everyday practices, and contemporary online cultures as knowledge phenomena, new research questions and perspectives are generated that help the field as a whole to develop. At the same time, the contributors show how established scholarly directions—such as church history, economic history, cultural history, global history, or digital history—can be enriched by interacting with the history of knowledge.

Kajsa Brilkman introduces the concept of ‘confessional knowledge’ for the production, circulation, and practices of knowledge in the specific varieties of Christianity that emerged after the Reformation. Confessional knowledge can contribute to the history of knowledge by widening its scholarly range, and at the same time sharpens our understanding of the role of knowledge in the premodern world. Conversely, the history of knowledge can provide new perspectives on early modern confessions. In particular, Brilkman argues, the analytical concept of circulation fosters a more dynamic understanding of the production and communication of knowledge in early modern Lutheranism.

David Larsson Heidenblad calls for historians of knowledge to move beyond the study of science and scholarship to engage with how other forms of knowledge have permeated everyday life. Looking at how in recent decades an increasing number of people have found financial markets important, Larsson Heidenblad suggests that historians of know-

ledge are well equipped to analyse this phenomenon as a circulation of financial knowledge. To historians of knowledge, this particular form of knowledge is of general interest, as it has had a rather weak connection to formal education and academic institutions, despite its rapidly increasing social importance, and his essay thus raises the question of how credibility, legitimacy, and expertise are determined.

Peter K. Andersson discusses the feasibility of applying the term 'knowledge' in studies of microhistory or the history of everyday life. Using his grandmother's old recipe book as a case in point, he reflects on the role of knowledge in the world of a mid-twentieth-century housewife, and how knowledge relates to other things such as imagination, folklore, media, and information. The essay concludes by asserting the necessity of considering knowledge in conjunction with related factors, and questions the use of the word 'knowledge' instead of 'ideas' when shifting the focus to a non-academic world.

Joachim Östlund's essay draws on insights from global history to join the debate on the interaction and circulation of knowledge between 'the East' and 'the West'. Using the example of an Ottoman *sefâretname*, a travel and embassy account produced by a member of the imperial court in Istanbul on mission to Sweden in 1733, the essay discusses the complexities of tracing the routes and roots of knowledge in the Age of Tulips. To understand the making of the Ottoman North, Östlund argues that one must consider the part played by greater Swedish–Ottoman diplomatic contacts and the cultural impact of Greek Orthodox intellectuals at the Ottoman court. The Ottoman North should be understood as an imperial order of knowledge, based on cosmopolitanism and diplomacy, but still claiming to be the centre of the world.

Maria Karlsson's essay discusses how historical knowledge is formed and fares digitally, specifically on English-language Wikipedia. In 2005, the online encyclopaedia's article on the 1915 Armenian Genocide was temporarily shut down following a so-called edit war. The article and its behind-the-scenes discussion board offer a snapshot of the difficulties of writing controversial history while trying to adhere to Wikipedia's core characteristics of consensus, collective authorship, and a neutral point of view. The essay also discusses the similarities that connect the

traditional writing of history to its new, digital cousin—and the differences that separate them.

Examining key concepts

The essays in the second part of the book are contributions to the theoretical and conceptual discussions in the field, bringing to the fore the questions raised by integration with adjacent fields by explicitly drawing on the theoretical and methodological approaches found in other disciplines. At the same time, they provide a necessary depth to the discussion, an examination of central questions, and a problematization of knowledge as a historical phenomenon.

Laura Skouvig considers the central issue of defining what knowledge means as a way of defining what the history of knowledge is about. One way of doing this, she suggests, has been to delimit knowledge from the related concept of information. She presents the field of information history and how it is characterized by different understandings of information. Using an example from the Danish police archives, she shows that information history is a history of how a perceived need for information defined the need for certain representations of information such as tables, ledgers, reports, and verdicts. Moreover, Skouvig discusses how such information was formed, shaped, communicated, and circulated in and beyond institutions and systems. She thus argues that even though information history and the history of knowledge should take inspiration from each other, they also address different research areas.

Cecilia Riving's essay explores the concept of knowledge in early Swedish psychotherapy. When it comes to defining mental illness and its treatment, Riving argues, there has never been any consensus. The early twentieth century, however, stands out for its heated debates, when very different ways of conceptualizing mental illness evolved simultaneously. Riving examines how leading psychotherapists defined their method in opposition to other forms of treatment. What kind of knowledge did they consider relevant in the clinical encounter, and how did it differ from other forms of knowledge? Inspired by hermeneutical traditions,

she uses practical knowledge and Aristotelian *phronesis* as the key concepts with which to interpret the psychotherapist's role.

Björn Lundberg examines how the economist John Kenneth Galbraith employed the concept of 'conventional wisdom' in his 1958 publication *The Affluent Society* to justify a specific set of knowledge claims about life in modern industrial society. Galbraith used the term to explain why economists and other intellectuals held on to old truths and outdated beliefs. While he has never been regarded as a key theorist of knowledge, 'conventional wisdom' has become a standard term in everyday language and academic discourse alike. By studying the history of the term, Lundberg illustrates the relevance of bringing overlooked agents into the study of the circulation of knowledge.

Victoria Höög starts with the standpoints that the history of knowledge is a fresh approach and that it is too vague to define. She argues that the renewed theoretical interest in the temporal dimensions to history writing could enrich the history of knowledge. With temporality as her framework, inspired by Reinhart Koselleck, Höög revisits Condorcet's *Esquisse d'un tableau historique des progrès de l'esprit humain* (1794). Temporality applied as an interpretative, multilayered concept results in a view of Condorcet as a relentless advocate of liberty and justice, concerned with individual diversity, which can support a less mythical, negative account of the Enlightenment.

Karolina Enquist Källgren raises the fundamental question of the grounds on which historians can say they study one object of knowledge, given that the processes of knowledge circulation between contexts and locations are defined as processes of transformation and translation. Arguing against strong medium- and practice-based approaches, she theorizes that knowledge exists as an object of study in the tension between transformation in circulation and locatedness. Drawing on the case of the interaction between theology and quantum physics in the late 1920s, she proposes five concepts—form, origin, synthesis, coherence, and equivalence—as the methodological tools with which to identify objects of knowledge in circulation.

Setting knowledge in motion

The third group of essays engages with knowledge actors and the movement of knowledge—spatially, chronologically, and socially—to show how media forms, infrastructure, and networks render circulation of knowledge possible, and how circulation processes potentially mould knowledge. Special importance is given to the public sphere and the historically shifting means of mass communication, from the pulpit of the eighteenth century to the newspapers and international magazines of the twentieth century. Together, the contributors demonstrate how perspectives and methodologies developed by scholars in the history of knowledge can inform other fields of inquiry, while at the same time contributing to ongoing discussions in the field about such key concepts as circulation.

Erik Bodenstein's essay centres on when, how, and why knowledge of a specific crop, the potato, began to circulate in early modern Sweden. He challenges the established chronologies by shifting focus from the introduction of the potato to its widespread adoption in the mid eighteenth century. He shows that the breakthrough was not the result of any linear or cumulative diffusion process; rather, it was the result of a particular knowledge network, which had long promoted the potato, finally gaining influence over important knowledge institutions, enabling them to mass-communicate their knowledge. In addition, these actors were successful in redefining the potato in terms of agriculture, crop failure, and food security.

Martin Ericsson examines how in the early 1950s the UNESCO launched an international project to reshape the public view on human races and racial difference. The goal was to promote racial equality and combat racism by replacing older, 'unscientific' knowledge about 'inferior' and 'superior' races with 'scientific' knowledge about racial differences. This essay analyses the reception and circulation in a Swedish national context of the new knowledge claims embodied by the UNESCO campaign. The analysis shows that important things can happen to knowledge when it crosses borders, and that controversial knowledge can be interpreted and circulated in different ways.

Maria Simonsen delves further by exploring UNESCO's position as one of the most influential knowledge-producing organizations in the post-war period. Only one part of its mission was on the political level, however; the cornerstone of the organization's work to promote peace and democratic values was its ability to communicate its mission with the world outside the usual political circles. One of the first steps in reaching a wider audience was the publication of the popular magazine *UNESCO Courier*, which was intended as its public voice. The essay addresses what happened to the organization's core ideas and ideals when they were set in motion.

Lise Groesmeyer investigates a case of intellectual infrastructure that often resides out of analytical sight: the world of facts in dictionaries and encyclopaedias. In the 1970s and 1980s, *Biographisches Handbuch der deutschsprachigen Emigration nach 1933/International Biographical Dictionary of Central European Émigrés 1933–1945* played a vital part in the use of the concept of 'acculturation' to reframe research into scholars forced to flee Nazism. The essay shows how sociopolitical concerns debated by German Jewish émigré organizations in the US from the mid-1960s became the driving force of a historical programme that included this *Handbuch*. Special attention is given to works of the co-editor, historian, and German émigré, Herbert A. Strauss, to establish acculturation as the appropriate category of analysis.

Karl Haikola engages with the concept public knowledge by discussing a recent work on public social science by the sociologists Tim Hallett, Orla Stapleton, and Michael Sauder. Their point is that, to the extent that social science findings circulate in the media, it tends to be either as *objects* or *interpretants*—either as news per se or as a means of making sense of other events or phenomena. The essay applies these two categories to the media reception of *Sverige i världen* (1978), a study of a future Sweden specifically designed to inform public debate. Haikola demonstrates that the report featured in the Swedish media in both forms: while predominantly being presented as news, it was also cited in discussions of global peace, democracy, and the shortcomings of centralized societies.

Where next?

The fifteen essays in this volume together add to the history of knowledge and give a flavour of the ongoing research activities at Lund University. However, the product of one research group always runs the risk of being narrow-minded, even self-gratulatory. In order to widen the perspective and avoid parochialism, we have invited two scholars with a background in the history of science and ideas at Stockholm University, Staffan Bergwik and Linn Holmberg, to critically comment on the volume in a reflection at the end of the book. The conversation continues.

Notes

- 1 For the emergence of the field, see Johan Östling, David Larsson Heidenblad, Erling Sandmo, Anna Nilsson Hammar & Kari H. Nordberg, 'The History of Knowledge and the Circulation of Knowledge: An Introduction', in Johan Östling, Erling Sandmo, David Larsson Heidenblad, Anna Nilsson Hammar & Kari H. Nordberg (eds.), *Circulation of Knowledge: Explorations in the History of Knowledge* (Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2018); Martin Mulsow & Lorraine Daston, 'History of Knowledge', in Marek Tamm & Peter Burke (eds.), *Debating New Approaches to History* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019); Suzanne Marchand, 'How Much Knowledge is Worth Knowing? An American Intellectual Historian's Thoughts on the *Geschichte des Wissens*', *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 42/2–3 (2019); Sven Dupré & Geert Somsen, 'The History of Knowledge and the Future of Knowledge Societies', *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 42/2–3 (2019); Johan Östling, 'Circulation and Public Arenas of Knowledge', *History and Theory* (forthcoming).
- 2 Recently organized conferences include 'Learning by the Book: Manuals and Handbooks in the History of Knowledge', Princeton University, June 2018; 'Political Culture and the History of Knowledge: Actors, Institutions, Practices', German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., June 2019; '8th Gewina Woudschoten Meeting: Towards a History of Knowledge', Zeist, June 2019; 'The Future of the History of Knowledge', Härkeberga Castle, November 2019, and 'New Paradigms of History of Knowledge', Ca' Foscari University of Venice, December 2019. Two new academic book series dedicated to the history of knowledge were launched in 2019: 'Knowledge Societies in History' with Routledge (edited by Sven Dupré and Wijnand Mijnhardt) and 'Global Epistemics' with Rowman & Littlefield International (edited by Inanna Hamati-Ataya). *KNOW: A Journal on the Formation of Knowledge*, whose first issue was published in 2017,

has Shadi Bartsch-Zimmer as its lead editor and is the flagship publication of the Stevanovich Institute on the Formation of Knowledge at the University of Chicago. The *Journal for the History of Knowledge* (editors-in-chief: Sven Dupré and Geert Somsen) is affiliated with Gewina, the Belgian–Dutch Society for History of Science and Universities, and its first issue will appear in 2020. In addition, several other journals have decided to devote special issues or forum sections to various aspects of the history of knowledge, including *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, *Kulturstudier*, and forthcoming issues of *History and Theory*, *History of Humanities* and *Slagmark*.

- 3 The present volume is thus not an attempt in a systematic way to chart all possible forms of knowledge. As a notion, ‘forms of knowledge’ exists in anthropological, historical, pedagogical, philosophical and sociological scholarship with different meanings. For recent examples, see Nico Stehr & Reiner Grundmann (eds.), *Knowledge: Critical Concepts*, ii: *Knowledge and Society: Forms of Knowledge* (New York: Routledge, 2005) and Sheldon I. Pollock (ed.), *Forms of Knowledge in Early Modern Asia: Explorations in the Intellectual History of India and Tibet, 1500–1800* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011).
- 4 Dupré & Somsen, ‘The History of Knowledge’: 1.
- 5 Lorraine Daston, ‘The History of Science and the History of Knowledge’, *KNOW* 1/1 (2017); Marchand, ‘How Much Knowledge’: 11; Dupré & Somsen, ‘The History of Knowledge’.
- 6 Staffan Bergwik, ‘Kunskapshistoria: Nya insikter?’, *Scandia* 84/2 (2018).
- 7 Hampus Östh Gustafsson, ‘Kunskapshistoriens samtidsrelevans’, *Historisk tidskrift* 138/4 (2018).
- 8 For recent examples of empirical studies that have taken advantage of the history of knowledge, see Stephanie Zloch, Lars Müller & Simone Lässig (eds.), *Wissen in Bewegung: Migration und globale Verflechtungen in der Zeitgeschichte seit 1945* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2018); Elaine Leong, *Recipes and Everyday Knowledge: Medicine, Science, and the Household in Early Modern England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018); Johan Kärnfelt, Karl Grandin & Solveig Jülich (eds.), *Knowledge in Motion: The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences and the Making of Modern Society* (Gothenburg: Makadam, 2018); Bert De Munck & Antonella Romano (eds.), *Knowledge and the Early Modern City: A History of Entanglements* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019).
- 9 For examples from the Nordic discussion, see Bergwik, ‘Kunskapshistoria’, Östh Gustafsson, ‘Kunskapshistoriens samtidsrelevans’ and the reviews by Karolina Enquist Källgren, *Lychnos* (2018), Julia Dahlberg in *Historisk tidskrift för Finland* 103/4 (2018); Sharon Rider in *Historisk tidskrift* 139/2 (2019), and Christoffer Basse Eriksen in *H-Soz-Kult*, 29 October 2019, <https://www.hsozkult.de/publicationreview/page>.
- 10 For cultural history at the Department of History, Lund, see Birgitta Odén,

- 'Gurevitjs undran', in Johan Dietsch et al. (eds.), *Historia mot strömmen: Kultur och konflikt i det moderna Europa* (Stockholm: Carlsson, 2007); Eva Österberg, 'Kultur, kvinnor och historia: Mitt liv som forskare', in Kirsti Niskanen & Christina Florin (eds.), *Föregångarna: Kvinnliga professorer om liv, makt och vetenskap* (Stockholm: SNS förlag, 2010); Johan Östling & David Larsson Heidenblad, 'From Cultural History to the History of Knowledge', *History of Knowledge*, 1 September 2019, <https://historyofknowledge.net/2017/06/08/from-cultural-history-to-the-history-of-knowledge/>.
- 11 Maria Simonsen & Laura Skouvig, 'Videnshistorie: Nye veje i historieviden-skaberne', *temp* 10/19 (2019).
 - 12 Andrés Brink Pinto & David Larsson Heidenblad, 'Vad vill vi att studenterna ska kunna göra? Avtäckningsmodellen i praktiken', in Hege Markussen & Katarina Mårtensson (eds.), *Proceedings från Humanistiska och teologiska fakulteternas pedagogiska inspirationskonferens 2018* (Lund: Mediatryck, 2020).
 - 13 For a similar argument see Johan Östling & David Larsson Heidenblad, 'Fulfilling the Promise of the History of Knowledge: Key Approaches for the 2020s', *Journal for the History of Knowledge* 1/1 (forthcoming, 2020).
 - 14 Simone Lässig, 'The History of Knowledge and the Expansion of the Historical Research Agenda', *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute* 59 (2016): 44.
 - 15 Simonsen & Skouvig, 'Videnshistorie': 24.
 - 16 Mulsow, 'History of Knowledge': 159.
 - 17 See, for instance, the essays in the section 'Examining key concepts' in this volume.
 - 18 Johan Östling & David Larsson Heidenblad, 'Cirkulation—ett kunskapshistoriskt nyckelbegrepp', *Historisk tidskrift* 137/2 (2017); Anna Nilsson Hammar, 'Theoria, Praxis and Poiesis: Theoretical Considerations on the Circulation of Knowledge in Everyday Life', in Östling et al. (eds.), *Circulation of Knowledge*.
 - 19 See, for example, Kajsa Brillman, 'The Circulation of Knowledge in Translations and Compilations: A Sixteenth-Century Example', in Östling et al. (eds.), *Circulation of Knowledge*; Erik Bodenstein, 'Political Knowledge in Public Circulation: The Case of Subsidies in Eighteenth-Century Sweden', in Östling et al. (eds.), *Circulation of Knowledge*; Johan Östling, 'En kunskapsarena och dess aktörer: Under strecket och kunskaps-cirkulation i 1960-talets offentlighet', *Historisk tidskrift* 140/1 (2020); Östling, 'Circulation and Public Arenas of Knowledge'; Ragni Svensson, 'Scandinavian Book Cafes as Knowledge Arenas of the New Left', in Johan Östling, Niklas Olsen & David Larsson Heidenblad (eds.), *Histories of Knowledge in Postwar Scandinavia: Actors, Arenas, and Aspirations* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, forthcoming 2020); Anton Jansson, 'The City, the Church, and the 1960s: On Secularization Theory and the Swedish Translation of Harvey Cox's *The Secular City*', in Östling, Olsen & Larsson Heidenblad (eds.), *Histories of Knowledge*.

- 20 See, for example, David Larsson Heidenblad, 'Mapping a New History of the Ecological Turn: The Circulation of Environmental Knowledge in Sweden 1967', *Environment and History* 24/2 (2018); David Larsson Heidenblad, 'Överlevnadsdebattörerna: Hans Palmstierna, Karl-Erik Fichtelius och miljöfrågornas genombrott i 1960-talets Sverige', in Fredrik Norén & Emil Stjernholm (eds.), *Efterkrigstidens samhällskontakter* (Lund: Mediehistoriskt arkiv, 2019); Björn Lundberg, 'The Galbraithian Moment: Affluence and Critique of Growth in Scandinavia 1958–72', in Östling, Olsen & Larsson Heidenblad (eds.), *Histories of Knowledge*.