

Pasteur, Lister and Koch: from antiseptic intervention to germ proof

Juan Segurola

Core question

How did nineteenth-century microbiology connect microorganisms with fermentation, infection and specific diseases strongly enough to support antiseptics and experimental causal proof?

Historical and evolutionary context

Microscopes had revealed microorganisms long before medicine could assign them reliable causal roles. Vaccination, Semmelweis's hand-cleaning intervention and Snow's cholera studies showed that disease could be prevented through changes in exposure before a mature germ theory existed. Mid- and late-nineteenth-century laboratory microbiology connected these intervention patterns to experimentally manipulated organisms.

What could communities know before this transition?

Clinicians could observe contagion, epidemic patterns and wound infection; microscopists could see microbial life; brewers and food producers understood fermentation empirically. The limitation was linking a particular microorganism to a reproducible process or disease while distinguishing contamination, association and causation.

What changed?

Pasteur linked microorganisms to specific transformations

Between 1857 and 1860, Pasteur's work on fermentation challenged accounts that treated fermentation and putrefaction as purely chemical self-decomposition. Experiments on microbial growth, contamination and heat helped establish that living microorganisms could drive specific transformations and that exposure could be experimentally controlled.

Lister converted microbial reasoning into surgical intervention

Joseph Lister drew on Pasteur's work to develop antiseptic surgical procedures using carbolic acid, publishing his antiseptic principle in 1867. The central epistemic move was intervention: if wound infection depended on contaminating organisms, changing the surgical environment should change outcomes.

Koch strengthened organism-disease linkage

Robert Koch's work on anthrax in 1876, tuberculosis in 1882 and cholera in 1883–1884 used staining, culture and animal-inoculation methods to strengthen links between particular organisms and particular diseases. The later textbook phrase “Koch's postulates” compresses a more complicated historical development, but the broader change was real: causal claims about infectious disease became tied to isolation, cultivation, reproduction of disease under controlled conditions and re-identification.

Why could this capability emerge?

Improved microscopy, culture media, staining, laboratory glassware, animal experimentation and institutional bacteriology made microorganisms manipulable objects. Hospital practice supplied urgent problems, while fermentation industries and public health connected laboratory findings to practical consequences.

What later forms of knowledge did it enable?

Germ theory enabled bacteriology, aseptic surgery, targeted sanitation, laboratory diagnosis and later antimicrobial therapy. It also supplied a framework in which population epidemiology and laboratory causation could constrain one another.

New limits and risks

Not every infection satisfies a simple one-organism-one-disease scheme. Asymptomatic carriage, polymicrobial disease, viruses, host susceptibility and microbiomes complicate

classical causal criteria. Laboratory success also expanded animal experimentation and institutional authority, creating ethical questions about permissible methods and unequal access to resulting interventions.

What changed in the architecture of knowledge?

Disease causation acquired a **manipulable microbial layer**. Invisible agents could be cultured, transferred, stained and linked experimentally to pathological processes, turning infection control from empirical precaution into a mechanism-informed programme.

Loss, exclusion and uncertainty

Pasteur, Lister and Koch did not create germ theory alone. Semmelweis, Snow, Agostino Bassi, Casimir Davaine, Ferdinand Cohn, laboratory assistants, nurses and many others contributed evidence and practice. “Koch's postulates” should not be described as a single immutable checklist authored in one moment. The historical chain from antiseptics to bacteriology was overlapping and contested.

Dependency map

- RETROSPECTIVE ← PIO-011 Fermentation, preservation and accumulated empirical knowledge
- INDIRECT ← PIO-052 Microscopy, cells and microorganisms
- INDIRECT ← PIO-058 From variolation to vaccination
- INDIRECT ← PIO-065 Semmelweis, Snow and evidence from patterns
- DIRECT → PIO-081 Antibiotics and experimental control of infection
- INDIRECT → PIO-085 Randomised trials and statistical inference

References

1. Pasteur, L. *Études sur le vin*. Paris (1866).
2. Lister, J. “On the Antiseptic Principle in the Practice of Surgery.” *British Medical Journal* 2, 246–248 (1867). DOI: 10.1136/bmj.2.351.246.
3. Gradmann, C. *Laboratory Disease: Robert Koch's Medical Bacteriology*. Johns Hopkins University Press (2009).
4. Lepenos, T. et al. “Louis Pasteur (1822–1895), Ignaz Semmelweis (1818–1865), Joseph Lister (1827–1912) and the Link Between Their Works Toward the Development of Antisepsis: A Narrative Review.” *Cureus* 16(6), e62543 (2024). DOI: 10.7759/cureus.62543.
5. Gradmann, C. “A spirit of scientific rigour: Koch's postulates in twentieth-century medicine.” *Microbes and Infection* 16(11), 885–892 (2014). DOI: 10.1016/j.micinf.2014.08.012.