

Much of the focus in this volume is on the English-speaking world. Ever since Thomas Glick's *The Comparative Reception of Darwin* was published in 1974, however, the Darwinian Revolution has often been depicted as a global intellectual earthquake, from China and Latin America to Russia and Japan. Sarah Qidwai tackles the heroic task of reviewing this vast literature, including a fascinating discussion of her research into the Islamic contexts of South Asia. As she points out, for the purposes of a wider global history, the framework of the 'Darwinian Revolution' is too narrowly centred on Darwin – who was less read than many other authors – and on conceptual frameworks developed in the West.

Qidwai's injunction ties in with Jonathan Hodge's argument (referenced elsewhere in the volume) that a Darwin-centred 'revolution' works badly as a historical category even in its supposed heartlands. If we are to have a decentred account that does not pre-judge the victory of one party, discussions of the so-called Darwinian Revolution – and indeed of concepts such as 'the history of evolution' – will need replacing by broader frameworks centred on origins, species and cosmologies. Thankfully, this collection is not another debate about whether the notion of a 'Darwinian Revolution' is vital to the survival of Western civilization, or alternatively should be dropped from the historical lexicon. Instead, it reveals the extraordinary diversity of uses to which the concept has been put since Darwin famously proclaimed the *Origin of Species* as the opening shot in 'a considerable revolution in natural history'.

doi:10.1017/S0007087423000882

CORRIGENDUM

Ian Hesketh (ed.), *Imagining the Darwinian Revolution* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2022. Pp. 352. ISBN 978-0-822-94708-0. \$55.00 (hardcover). – CORRIGENDUM

James A. Secord

10.1017/S0007087423000882. Published online by Cambridge University Press, 4 December 2023

The author apologises for the inclusion of two errors in the above article.

In this article, the author refers to the 'University of Brisbane' which is incorrect and instead should be the 'University of Queensland'. The author also refers to 'Jamie Freeman' which is incorrect, and the correct name should be 'Jamie Freestone'.

doi:10.1017/S0007087423001085