

Academies, journals and the public experiment

Juan Segurola

Core question

How did academies and scientific journals turn local experiments and correspondence into a recurrent public record that distant investigators could inspect, contest and extend?

Historical and evolutionary context

By the middle of the seventeenth century, European natural philosophy already possessed universities, correspondence networks, printers and increasingly explicit programmes of method. What it still lacked was a robust infrastructure for making observations and experiments public in a form that distant investigators could inspect, repeat, challenge and extend. A private demonstration could persuade those present; a letter could circulate within a network; a book could stabilize a mature argument. None of these alone created a routine public record of ongoing inquiry.

The new academies and journals did not invent collective knowledge, nor did they instantly create modern peer review. Their importance was institutional: they made recurrent communication, witnessed experiment, priority claims and archived reports part of the machinery of knowing.

What could communities know before this transition?

Before academies and journals, scholars already used books, letters, universities, courts and patronage networks. What was missing was a durable serial mechanism for dating small units of inquiry, preserving priority, distributing observations quickly and exposing claims to recurrent scrutiny beyond a single locality.

What changed?

The Royal Society of London was chartered in 1662, building on meetings that had begun earlier in the Restoration period. The Académie Royale des Sciences followed in Paris in 1666. These institutions differed in patronage, organisation and relation to the state, but both created durable settings in which instruments, observations, demonstrations and correspondence could be evaluated collectively.

In 1665 two periodicals appeared within months of one another: the French *Journal des sçavans* and Henry Oldenburg's *Philosophical Transactions*. The latter was initially Oldenburg's enterprise rather than an official Royal Society journal. That distinction matters. Scientific periodical publishing emerged through negotiation among editors, institutions, printers, correspondents and readers; it was not born fully formed as the modern journal.

The key epistemic change was the **serial public record**. A report no longer had to wait for a full book. Observations could be dated, attributed, circulated and answered. Oldenburg's correspondence network converted geographically scattered observations into publishable items. The journal thereby connected private witnessing to a potentially wider community.

The public experiment

Robert Boyle and other members of the Royal Society helped make experimental witnessing into a social technology. Demonstrations before credible witnesses, careful descriptions of apparatus and publication of results all served to make claims travel beyond the room in which they were produced. Replication remained difficult: instruments varied, tacit skills were hard to describe, and many reports could not be reproduced from text alone. Still, the aspiration changed. A claim increasingly gained authority by becoming inspectable by people other than its maker.

This was not yet anonymous peer review. Editorial judgement, correspondence, institutional reputation and public discussion overlapped. The modern referee system developed much later and unevenly. Treating 1665 as the sudden invention of modern peer review would therefore be anachronistic.

Why could this capability emerge?

Printing, expanding postal systems, correspondence networks, instrument-making, state and court patronage, and the growth of communities committed to public demonstration all converged in the seventeenth century. Boyle's *New Experiments Physico-Mechanicall* (1660) also exemplified the new ambition to make experimental circumstances describable and discussable beyond the room in which they occurred.

The result was not a single European invention detached from wider exchange. Reports in early journals depended on observations, specimens, navigational information and correspondence from many regions. Colonial and commercial networks expanded what European institutions could collect while also embedding knowledge production in unequal systems of extraction.

What later forms of knowledge did it enable?

Serial publication enabled priority disputes to be documented, observations to accumulate rapidly and later syntheses to work from dated fragments. It also provided infrastructure for microscopy, astronomy, mechanics, vaccination and the expanding culture of experimental replication.

New limits and risks

Publication introduced new exclusions. Membership, language, geography, gender, class and patronage shaped who could be heard. A printed report could create priority without fairly representing technicians, artisans, Indigenous informants or colonial intermediaries who made the observation possible. Journals also created incentives for speed and priority disputes.

Institutional publication could standardise claims, but it could also standardise blind spots. Publicity was therefore not identical with openness.

What changed in the architecture of knowledge?

Knowledge acquired a durable **communication layer** between local experiment and future synthesis. Journals made inquiry more cumulative because they preserved dated fragments that later investigators could compare. Academies made criticism recurrent rather than exceptional. The unit of scientific memory became not only the book or theorem, but also the report, letter, table, observation and experimental note.

Loss, exclusion and uncertainty

The public record made some contributors visible and others easier to erase. Technicians, instrument makers, illustrators, colonial intermediaries and Indigenous informants often entered publications only indirectly or anonymously. European journals also depended on imperial and commercial networks whose asymmetries shaped what could be collected and whose testimony counted as authoritative.

Dependency map

- INDIRECT ← PIO-041 Medieval universities and organised disputation
- DIRECT ← PIO-044 Renaissance humanism, perspective and printing
- DIRECT ← PIO-050 Bacon, Descartes and explicit method
- PARALLEL ← PIO-037 East Asian printing and knowledge multiplication
- RETROSPECTIVE ← PIO-014 Cuneiform accounting, writing and external memory
- INDIRECT → PIO-053 Newton, mechanics and universal gravitation
- INDIRECT → PIO-058 From variolation to vaccination
- INDIRECT → PIO-073 Public literacy, newspapers and scientific debate

References

1. Moxham, N. J. "Fit for print: developing an institutional model of scientific periodical publishing in England, 1665–ca. 1714." *Notes and Records of the Royal Society* 69(3), 241–260 (2015). DOI: 10.1098/rsnr.2015.0035.
2. Fyfe, A., Moxham, N., McDougall-Waters, J. & Røstvik, C. M. *A History of Scientific Journals: Publishing at the Royal Society, 1665–2015*. UCL Press (2022). DOI: 10.14324/111.9781800082328.
3. Oldenburg, H. "Epistle Dedicatory." *Philosophical Transactions* 1, i–ii (1665). DOI: 10.1098/rstl.1665.0001.
4. Shapin, S. & Schaffer, S. *Leviathan and the Air-Pump*. Princeton University Press (1985).