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Abstract

It is now generally accepted that both the conception and practices of natural enquiry in the Western tradition underwent a series of profound developments in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century—developments which have been variously characterized as a ‘second scientific revolution’ and, much more tellingly, as the ‘invention of science’. As several authors have argued, moreover, a crucial aspect of this change consisted in the distinctive audience relations of the new sciences. While eighteenth-century natural philosophy was distinguished by an audience relation in which, as William Whewell put it, ‘a large and popular circle of spectators and amateurs [felt] themselves nearly upon a level, in the value of their trials and speculations, with more profound thinkers’, the science which was invented in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century was, as Simon Schaffer has argued, marked by the ‘emergence of disciplined, trained cadres of research scientists’ clearly distinguished from a wider, exoteric public. Similarly, Jan Golinski argues that the ‘emergence of new instrumentation and a more consolidated social structure for the specialist community’ for early nineteenth-century chemistry was intimately connected with the transformation in the role of its public audience to a condition of relative passivity. These moves were underpinned by crucial epistemological and rhetorical shifts—from a logic of discovery, theoretically open to all, to a more restrictive notion of discovery as the preserve of scientific ‘genius’, and from an open-ended philosophy of ‘experience’ to a far more restrictive notion of disciplined ‘expertise’. Both of these moves were intended to do boundary work, restricting the community active in creating and validating scientific knowledge, and producing a passive public.
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Scientific Publishing and the Reading of Science in Nineteenth-Century Britain: A Historiographical Survey and Guide to Sources. Article, Jan 2001. This book examines the rise of the British empire and the various debates among historians of imperialism over the past two hundred years. It discusses why the empire is so attractive to historians, why there is so much debate and controversy surrounding the subject, and how different generations of historians have read the various episodes in the history of the empire often radically differently. The nineteenth century (when historians claimed to have emancipated themselves from literature and speculative philosophy) and reformers who self-consciously seek to revolutionize the profession. Nineteenth-century historical research, allowing for notable exceptions such as Jacob Burckhardt’s famous Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy, was strongly and narrowly oriented toward politics, the evolution of institutions, the role of political personalities, and the narration of discrete events—what the turn-of-the-century French scholar Paul Lacombe dubbed “l’histoire gvenementielle” (the “history of events”). In 1905 he formulated the basic principle of his orientation: “Modern historical science is...”

Although we are used to thinking of... Start by marking “Literature and Science in the Nineteenth Century: An Anthology” as Want to Read: Want to Read saving... Want to Read. Although we are used to thinking of science and the humanities as separate disciplines, in the nineteenth century this division was not recognized. As the scientist John Tyndall pointed out, not only were science and literature both striving to better “man’s estate,” they shared a common language and cultural heritage. The quest for “origins,” the nature of the relationship...