

Lavoisier and quantitative chemical transformation

Juan Segurola

Core question

How did Lavoisier make balance measurements, controlled accounting of matter and systematic nomenclature into a new architecture for chemical explanation?

Historical and evolutionary context

Eighteenth-century chemistry possessed rich practical knowledge of salts, gases, metals, combustion and laboratory operations, but chemical language and theory were fragmented. Phlogiston theory provided one influential framework for combustion. The challenge was not simply to replace one word with another; it was to reorganise chemical transformation around measurement, composition and a new nomenclature.

What could communities know before this transition?

Before Lavoisier, eighteenth-century chemistry possessed sophisticated laboratory practice, pneumatic chemistry, affinity concepts and the phlogiston framework. What was missing was a consistently quantitative accounting system that linked precise mass measurements, gas chemistry, combustion and a reorganised nomenclature.

What changed?

The balance as an epistemic instrument

Antoine-Laurent Lavoisier made systematic weighing central to chemical reasoning. In experiments on calcination, combustion and gases, he treated changes in mass as constraints on explanation. Closed or carefully controlled systems made it possible to compare inputs and outputs quantitatively.

Lavoisier did not “discover conservation of mass” from nothing; quantitative weighing had predecessors and his own formulations developed over time. His importance lies in integrating gravimetric accounting into a broad chemical programme.

Oxygen and combustion

During the 1770s, work by Joseph Priestley, Carl Wilhelm Scheele and others expanded knowledge of distinct airs. Lavoisier interpreted combustion and calcination as combination with a component of air that he named oxygen, rejecting phlogiston. Priority cannot be reduced to a single hero: experimental substances, apparatus and observations circulated among several investigators, while Lavoisier's distinctive contribution was theoretical and quantitative reorganisation.

The oxygen theory explained why metals gained mass when calcined and connected combustion, respiration and acid chemistry, though not all of Lavoisier's oxygen claims proved correct.

Nomenclature and simple substances

The 1787 chemical nomenclature developed with Guyton de Morveau, Berthollet and Fourcroy attempted to align names with composition. Lavoisier's *Traité élémentaire de chimie* (1789) presented a list of “simple substances” operationally defined as materials not yet decomposed by available methods.

This was a methodological innovation: elementarity became revisable in light of analytical capability rather than a purely metaphysical claim. Some entries in Lavoisier's list, such as light and caloric, were later rejected, showing that the architecture was productive without being final.

Revolution and continuity

Calling this episode the “Chemical Revolution” is useful if it does not erase continuity. Laboratory techniques, pneumatic chemistry, metallurgy and pharmacy supplied much of the empirical base. The revolution consisted in a new network of concepts, measurements and

language that made results easier to compare and equations of transformation easier to audit.

Why could this capability emerge?

Pneumatic chemistry, increasingly accurate balances, sealed apparatus and a community able to reproduce quantitative experiments made mass accounting powerful. Lavoisier's programme also depended on collaborators, translators, illustrators and rival chemists whose work supplied observations and alternative interpretations.

What later forms of knowledge did it enable?

Quantitative chemical accounting enabled stoichiometry, atomic combination, electrochemistry and later thermochemistry. Lavoisier's element list was provisional, but the discipline increasingly demanded that chemical transformations close materially and linguistically.

New limits and risks

Quantitative mass accounting strengthened chemistry, but measurement and nomenclature could also make provisional assumptions look more settled than they were. Lavoisier's rejection of phlogiston was transformative, yet his element list still included entities later abandoned, such as caloric and light, and his theory that oxygen was the universal principle of acidity proved false. The episode shows that disciplined measurement can sharply improve a science while its explanatory categories remain revisable.

What changed in the architecture of knowledge?

Chemical reactions became **mass-balanced transformations among compositionally defined substances**. Measurement and nomenclature reinforced one another: the balance constrained claims, while standard names allowed those constraints to travel across laboratories.

Loss, exclusion and uncertainty

Lavoisier's prominence can obscure Marie-Anne Paulze Lavoisier's work as collaborator, translator and illustrator, and the prior discovery of oxygen by Carl Wilhelm Scheele as well as Priestley's independent experiments. Revolutionary nomenclature increased clarity but also displaced older vocabularies and can make chemical change look cleaner in retrospect than it was in practice.

Dependency map

- INDIRECT ← PIO-015 Weights, measures and standards
- INDIRECT ← PIO-051 Academies, journals and the public experiment
- DIRECT → PIO-062 Dalton, atoms and chemical combination
- INDIRECT → PIO-063 Thermodynamics and energy accounting
- INDIRECT → PIO-071 Mendeleev and periodic organisation

References

1. Lavoisier, A.-L. *Traité élémentaire de chimie*. Paris (1789).
2. Donovan, A. "Lavoisier and the Origins of Modern Chemistry." *Osiris* 4, 214–231 (1988). DOI: 10.1086/368679.
3. Beretta, M. "Lavoisier and the History of Chemistry." *Ambix* 71(2), 209–224 (2024). DOI: 10.1080/00026980.2024.2324618.
4. Holmes, F. L. *Lavoisier and the Chemistry of Life: An Exploration of Scientific Creativity*. University of Wisconsin Press (1985).