

BRK-003 · Life becomes open to physicochemical explanation

BRK · Conceptual Breaks

Juan Segurola · All Rights Reserved

The decisive question was sometimes smaller than “What is life?” Could a particular transformation associated with living cells still occur when the cells were broken apart? If it could, an explanation that required the continuous activity of an intact organism would no longer be necessary for that transformation.

Cell-free fermentation made this question experimentally concrete. Its importance was not that it produced life from non-life or supplied a complete theory of organisms. It separated a chemical activity from one proposed condition of that activity, opening the process to a different set of experiments.

1. Different vital claims face different tests

“Vitalism” can hide several claims: that an organic substance cannot be synthesized outside an organism; that a reaction requires living cells; that the organization of an organism requires a distinctive explanatory principle; or that physical and chemical descriptions cannot exhaust everything important about life. One successful operation cannot refute all these propositions at once.

Wöhler’s synthesis of urea in 1828 challenged a restriction on the production of an organic compound. It did not by itself show that fermentation could proceed without intact yeast, that development was fully understood, or that all forms of vital explanation vanished immediately. Buchner’s later account places the synthesis in the background of disputes over fermentation, while describing those disputes as continuing. [1]

The historical lesson is not to diminish synthesis. It is to identify exactly which dependence an experiment removes. Making a molecule outside an organism and reproducing a cellular transformation outside intact cells are related achievements, but they answer different questions.

2. Yeast could be alive without life being the immediate mechanism

Recognizing yeast as living material was important. It connected fermentation to organized biological agents rather than treating the visible deposit as an irrelevant by-product. But establishing that living yeast normally performs a transformation does not establish that the intact living state is indispensable to the chemical step.

Buchner's 1907 Nobel lecture recounts both the cellular account and proposals that a chemical agent within the cells could cause fermentation. He identifies Moritz Traube's enzyme proposal and discusses unsuccessful attempts to separate a fermenting agent from yeast. The alternatives were therefore already more varied than a contest between people who believed in life and people who believed in chemistry. [1]

A negative extraction experiment was ambiguous. It might show that no separable activity existed, or that the procedure destroyed, diluted or failed to release the relevant components. Interpreting failure required attention to the preparation itself. The same operation used to reveal a mechanism could disable it.

3. The preparation changes what can be tested

Buchner describes grinding yeast with quartz sand and diatomite, then using pressure to obtain expressed juice. The procedure aimed to release cell contents rapidly while avoiding harsh

solvents and excessive heating. He credits discussions with Hans Buchner and practical contributions by Martin Hahn, including the use of diatomite and a hydraulic press. [1]

These details are not incidental laboratory decoration. A claim about cell-free activity depends on how cells were disrupted, what remained in the liquid and whether the activity survived the manipulation. A theory became testable through a preparation that separated components while retaining a measurable function.

In the resulting system, sugar could be fermented by the expressed preparation. The important separation was between intact cellular life and the capacity of cell-derived material to carry out the transformation. The preparation did not cease to have a biological history merely because the cells had been disrupted. [1]

This limits the inference. “Cell-free” does not mean “made from no biological components,” and it does not imply that the extract is a single purified molecule. The result shows that the ongoing integrity of whole yeast cells is unnecessary under the tested conditions. Identifying every participating component is a further task.

4. A chemical explanation becomes a program

Once activity can be followed outside intact cells, experimenters can vary the preparation, separate fractions, change concentrations and test whether adding one fraction restores activity lost from another. Instead of attributing the process to the organism as an indivisible agent, they can investigate dependencies within the reaction system.

Buchner’s lecture discusses subsequent work on components needed for fermentation, including the restoration of activity by additions of boiled juice. The boiling step did not simply destroy

everything relevant: the distinction between components with different heat sensitivities became informative. The lecture also reports the importance of phosphate in the developing analysis. [1]

The conceptual gain is the ability to ask discriminating questions. If fraction *A* loses activity and the combination $A + B$ restores it, that constrains what each fraction can contain and do. It does not automatically prove that *B* is the only missing factor or that *A* contains only one enzyme. The inference grows through further separations and controls.

This is a change in explanatory access. The chemical process can be manipulated as a system of interacting components. The word “enzyme” is then the start of an investigation into mechanism, not a substitute for that investigation.

5. The historical witness is not a neutral verdict on every opponent

A Nobel lecture is valuable testimony from a participant, but it is also a retrospective presentation of an achievement. Buchner’s descriptions of earlier disputes, priority and the significance of his result should not be converted uncritically into a complete map of what every chemist or physiologist believed.

His own narrative helps resist the simplest triumphal story. It records earlier grinding attempts, competing enzyme proposals, technical improvements and collaborators. It also quotes Pasteur as distinguishing what his experiments established from questions about the intrinsic chemical cause that remained unresolved. [1]

The contrast is therefore not between an irrational old world and a suddenly chemical new one. Different investigators had different explanatory commitments, and experimental preparations

changed which of those commitments could be tested. A successful new result could displace a specific necessity claim without resolving the wider philosophical question of organization.

6. What remained unexplained

An extract that ferments does not thereby grow, reproduce, maintain a boundary or coordinate an entire organism. Explaining a reaction outside a cell is compatible with the continued importance of cellular organization for regulating that reaction in a living system.

The rupture made certain special vital agencies unnecessary for particular operations. It did not make biological organization unnecessary, and it did not prove that knowing a list of ingredients is enough to reconstruct all the activities of life.

The enduring change was methodological as well as conceptual: functions once tied to the intact organism could be separated, measured and partly reconstituted. The new questions concerned which components were sufficient for which activities, under which conditions, and how those activities were organized inside living cells.

Related reading

BRK Article 007, “Giant molecules become a chemical possibility,” examines how chemical explanations expanded without requiring a new kind of bond outside ordinary chemistry.

References

- [1] Buchner, E. “Cell-free fermentation.” Nobel Lecture, 11 December 1907. Especially printed pages 103–111 and the later discussion of co-enzyme and phosphate. <https://www.nobelprize.org/uploads/2018/06/buchner-lecture.pdf>