

Microscopy, cells and microorganisms

Juan Seguro

Core question

How did microscopy create a new observational domain, and why did seeing cells and microorganisms not by itself produce cell theory or germ theory?

Historical and evolutionary context

Many biological structures are smaller than unaided vision can resolve. Before reliable microscopes, investigators could dissect organs, compare gross anatomy and infer hidden processes, but they could not routinely inspect cells, capillaries, spermatozoa, protozoa or bacteria. The microscope changed the scale at which biological claims could be made, but its epistemic importance was not automatic. Early observers had to learn which visual features belonged to specimens, which came from preparation, and which were optical artefacts.

What could communities know before this transition?

Before compound and simple microscopes, anatomy and natural history were constrained largely to unaided vision or low magnification. Lenses existed, but there was no stable observational culture for treating microscopic structures as a new evidential domain with its own artefacts, preparation techniques and interpretive risks.

What changed?

From lenses to a new observational domain

Robert Hooke's *Micrographia* (1665) made magnified structures public through carefully prepared images and descriptions. His observation of cork popularised the term “cell”, although the empty compartments he saw were plant cell walls, not the modern living-cell concept. Hooke's achievement was therefore not the discovery of cell theory. It was the establishment of a persuasive visual programme in which magnified objects could be described, illustrated and publicly compared.

Antonie van Leeuwenhoek used small, high-quality single-lens microscopes to reach greater magnifications. His letters to the Royal Society reported spermatozoa, red blood cells and, in 1676-1677, “little animals” in water and infusions. The 1677 publication of his observations opened a world of microscopic life to public scrutiny. Verification was initially difficult because few observers possessed comparable instruments or skill. The Royal Society therefore used repeated correspondence, witnesses and attempts at replication to establish confidence.

Cells did not immediately produce cell theory

The existence of microscopic compartments did not by itself imply that all living organisms were built from cells. That generalisation emerged much later. Schleiden argued in 1838 that plants were composed of cells; Schwann extended a cellular framework to animals in 1839. Their formulations included mistaken ideas about cell formation, but they shifted biology toward a common structural unit. Virchow's mid-nineteenth-century insistence that cells arise from pre-existing cells further reorganised pathology and development.

This long interval is crucial. Instruments can reveal objects decades or centuries before a stable explanatory framework exists. Microscopy expanded the evidence space; cell theory reorganised that evidence into a general biological architecture.

Microorganisms and causal caution

Leeuwenhoek observed microorganisms, but seeing microorganisms was not the same as establishing germ theory. For almost two centuries, microscopic organisms coexisted with competing explanations of fermentation, putrefaction and disease. Later work by Pasteur, Koch and others connected particular microorganisms to causal processes using cultures, interventions and experimental controls. PIO therefore separates the discovery of microscopic life from the later causal proof of germ-mediated disease.

What changed in practice

Microscopy created new epistemic labour: lens making, illumination, specimen preparation, staining, drawing and interpretation. It also produced new artefacts. A damaged specimen or aberrant lens could generate a persuasive but false image. Trust therefore depended increasingly on calibration, comparison among observers and reproducible preparation methods.

The microscope also altered medical authority. By the nineteenth century, tissues and cells could be used to classify normal and pathological states at scales inaccessible to the naked eye. This did not eliminate bedside observation or anatomy; it nested them inside a new hierarchy of scales.

Why could this capability emerge?

Improved glassworking, lens grinding, specimen preparation, illustration and print made magnified observations increasingly shareable. The decisive capability was not a lens alone but a system joining instrument, preparation, skilled observation, drawing, description and comparison.

What later forms of knowledge did it enable?

Microscopy made cell theory, histology, microbiology and later germ theory possible by turning sub-visible structures into persistent scientific objects. It also forced investigators to learn that instruments can create artefacts and that seeing an entity does not by itself establish its causal role.

New limits and risks

Early microscopy increased access to otherwise invisible structures but made observation dependent on lens quality, illumination, specimen preparation and the observer's ability to distinguish structure from optical or preparation artefact. Because few investigators possessed comparable instruments or tacit skills, replication could be difficult, and apparent visual agreement did not by itself establish biological function or causation. The later histories of cell theory and germ theory therefore required controlled comparison, improved preparation and causal experiments beyond simply seeing microscopic entities.

What changed in the architecture of knowledge?

Observation became **instrument-mediated across scale**. The biological world was no longer restricted to structures visible to unaided senses. A new class of entities became stable enough to enter explanation, taxonomy and eventually causal intervention.

Loss, exclusion and uncertainty

The canonical narrative centres Hooke and Leeuwenhoek, but microscopy depended on lens makers, specimen preparers, illustrators and tacit craft. Leeuwenhoek deliberately kept aspects of his lens-making technique private, reminding us that an apparently public observation could still rest on inaccessible skill. Early microscopy also generated artefacts that later observers had to learn to recognise.

Dependency map

- DIRECT ← PIO-043 Glass, lenses and the extension of vision
- INDIRECT ← PIO-045 Vesalius and anatomical observation
- INDIRECT ← PIO-036 Hippocratic, Galenic, Ayurvedic and Islamic medicine: systematic clinical knowledge
- INDIRECT → PIO-069 Pasteur, Lister and Koch: from antiseptic intervention to germ proof
- INDIRECT → PIO-087 DNA and molecular heredity

References

1. Hooke, R. *Micrographia*. London (1665). DOI: 10.5962/bhl.title.904.
2. van Leeuwenhoek, A. "Observations ... concerning little animals ..." *Philosophical Transactions* 12, 821-831 (1677). DOI: 10.1098/rstl.1677.0003.
3. Lane, N. "The unseen world: reflections on Leeuwenhoek (1677) 'Concerning little animals'." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* 370, 20140344 (2015). DOI: 10.1098/rstb.2014.0344.
4. Schwann, T. *Mikroskopische Untersuchungen über die Übereinstimmung in der Struktur und dem Wachsthum der Thiere und Pflanzen*. Berlin (1839).