FN-Optiklabor-Instrumente-EN-v0.1-2026-05-17

Research Note — Optical Instruments (Telescope & Microscope)

Author: Thomas Schüller · forschung@tschueller.com · ORCID 0009-0003-9799-6747 **Affiliation:** privately funded, no institutional affiliation **Licence:** CC BY 4.0 · **Version:** 0.1 · **Date:** 2026-05-17 **Strand:** FORSCHUNG / Höhlengleichnis-Optiklabor / 12 Instruments **Tool:** ORGANON · **Document type:** Research note (Template v1.0) **Status:** completed test with documented assessment

---

1. Thesis

Modules 05 (Lenses) and 10 (Mirrors) provided the optical building blocks. Module 12 assembles them into **instruments** — telescope and microscope — and tests the intuitive assumption "magnification is arbitrarily scalable; more lens power = more magnification". This assumption proves doubly too short: **first, magnification is not the only criterion (the same magnification can be achieved with different construction, image orientation and length); second — and decisively — diffraction sets a hard limit: beyond the "useful magnification" an instrument shows no new detail, only larger diffraction discs ("empty magnification").** Module 12 thereby brings together lenses (05), mirrors (10) and diffraction (03) and turns diffraction from a marginal phenomenon into the fundamental barrier of every optical instrument.

2. Assumptions

1. Ray optics for magnification (geometrical optics), wave optics for the resolution limit.
2. Thin lenses (paraxial approximation from Module 05).
3. Telescope: object at infinity (parallel ray bundles); angular magnification.
4. Microscope: object near the front focal point of the objective; two-stage magnification with reference viewing distance 250 mm.
5. Diffraction limit per Rayleigh (telescope) or Abbe (microscope), monochromatic light 550 nm.
6. Ideal optics without aberrations (the aberrations from Module 05/10 would additionally limit real performance).

3. Mathematical model

M1 — "magnification arbitrarily scalable": An instrument is better the more it magnifies; with stronger lenses magnification can be increased without limit.

M2 — telescope (angular magnification): For objective focal length f_{Obj} and eyepiece focal length f_{Ok}:

$$ V = \frac{f_{\text{Obj}}}{f_{\text{Ok}}}. $$

- **Keplerian** (two converging lenses, $f_{\text{Ok}} > 0$): inverted image, length $L = f_{\text{Obj}} + f_{\text{Ok}}$.
- **Galilean** (diverging eyepiece, $f_{\text{Ok}} < 0$): upright image, length $L = f_{\text{Obj}} - |f_{\text{Ok}}|$ (shorter).

M3 — microscope (two-stage): total magnification as product:

$$ V_{\text{total}} = V_{\text{Obj}} \cdot V_{\text{Ok}} = \frac{t}{f_{\text{Obj}}} \cdot \frac{s_0}{f_{\text{Ok}}}, $$

with optical tube length t and reference viewing distance $s_0 = 250$ mm.

M4 — diffraction limit: Resolution is limited.

- **Telescope (Rayleigh):** smallest resolvable angle $\theta_{\min} = 1.22\,\lambda / D$ (D = objective diameter).
- **Microscope (Abbe):** smallest resolvable distance $d_{\min} = \lambda / (2\,\text{NA})$ (NA = numerical aperture).
- **Useful magnification:** $V_{\text{useful}} \approx 500\text{–}1000 \cdot \text{NA}$. Beyond: empty magnification.

Symbol	Meaning	Unit
V	magnification	—
$f_{\text{Obj}}, f_{\text{Ok}}$	focal lengths objective/eyepiece	mm
L	length	mm
t	optical tube length	mm
s_0	reference viewing distance (250 mm)	mm
$\theta_{\min}$	angular resolution	rad
$d_{\min}$	spatial resolution	nm
NA	numerical aperture	—

4. Parameters

Three scenarios:

Scenario	Setup
A telescope	$f_{\text{Obj}} = 1000$ mm, $f_{\text{Ok}} = 25$ mm; Keplerian vs. Galilean
B microscope	three configurations weak/medium/strong; $t = 160$ mm, $s_0 = 250$ mm
C diffraction limit	microscope NA = 0.25/0.65/1.4; telescope D = 60/200/1000 mm; $\lambda = 550$ nm

Tolerance set in advance: $\varepsilon = 1\%$ for magnification and resolution comparison.

5. Prediction

Scenario	Expectation
A	same magnification, but different image orientation/length → M1 insufficient
B	total magnification = product of stages (M1 appears to hold)
C	resolution diffraction-limited; magnification beyond ~1000·NA yields no detail → M1 refuted

6. Falsification criterion

M1 ("magnification arbitrarily scalable") is refuted if **any** holds: - Two instruments with the same magnification differ essentially (construction, image orientation) — magnification is not the only criterion. - There exists a magnification beyond which no new detail becomes visible (empty magnification) — diffraction sets a limit.

7. Competing models

- **K1 — arbitrary magnification (M1):** tested baseline model.
- **K2 — Keplerian telescope (M2):** astronomical, inverted image.
- **K3 — Galilean telescope (M2):** opera glass, upright image.
- **K4 — mirror telescope:** Newtonian, Cassegrain — uses concave mirror (Module 10) instead of objective lens, no chromatic aberration.
- **K5 — microscope (M3):** two-stage, transmitted/reflected light.
- **K6 — diffraction-limited optics (M4):** Abbe/Rayleigh as fundamental limit.
- **K7 — super-resolution:** STED, STORM, PALM — microscopy techniques that bypass the Abbe limit (Nobel Prize 2014); beyond the classical model.

8. Domain of failure

- **Real aberrations:** chromatic and spherical aberration (Module 05/10) additionally limit real performance; the model assumes ideal optics.
- **Atmosphere:** for telescopes, air turbulence ("seeing") often limits resolution more than diffraction — hence space telescopes and adaptive optics.
- **Very small aperture:** dominated by diffraction; very large aperture: dominated by aberrations and manufacturing errors.
- **Super-resolution techniques:** the Abbe limit applies to classical far-field microscopy; near-field and fluorescence tricks bypass it.
- **Non-visible light:** X-ray, electron, UV microscopy shift the limit (shorter wavelength → better resolution); electron microscopes use exactly this.

9. Simulation

Numerical evaluation in `instrumente_simulation.py`:

1. Telescope functions for Keplerian and Galilean: angular magnification, length, image orientation.
2. Microscope function: two-stage magnification from objective and eyepiece.
3. Diffraction limit: Rayleigh criterion (telescope) and Abbe limit (microscope); useful magnification.

4. Scenario A: Keplerian vs. Galilean at the same focal lengths.
5. Scenario B: three microscope configurations.
6. Scenario C: resolution and empty magnification for various NA or apertures.

Results in `instrumente_results.json`. Plot as `instrumente_szenen.svg` (four subplots: telescope types, microscope stages, Abbe resolution, useful vs. empty magnification).

10. Result

10.1 A telescope Keplerian vs. Galilean ($f_{\text{Obj}} = 1000$ mm, $f_{\text{Ok}} = 25$ mm)

Quantity	Keplerian	Galilean
Magnification	40×	40×
Eyepiece	converging ($f > 0$)	diverging ($f < 0$)
Image	inverted	upright
Length	1025 mm	975 mm
Assessment M1		**insufficient**

10.2 B microscope (two-stage)

Configuration	f_{Obj}	f_{Ok}	\(V_{\text{Ol
weak	16 mm	25 mm	10×
medium	4 mm	25 mm	40×
strong	1.8 mm	10 mm	89×
Assessment M1			

10.3 C diffraction limit ($\lambda = 550$ nm)

Microscope (Abbe):

NA	$d_{\min}$	useful magnification
0.25 (air)	1100 nm	125×–250×
0.65 (dry)	423 nm	325×–650×
1.4 (oil immersion)	196 nm	700×–1400×

Telescope (Rayleigh):

Aperture D	Angular resolution
60 mm (amateur)	2.31″
200 mm	0.69″
1000 mm	0.14″

Empty magnification: 1500× at NA = 0.65 lies far above the useful limit (650×) → no new detail.

Assessment M1: refuted.

Plot: `instrumente_szenen.svg`.

11. Assessment

M1 (“magnification arbitrarily scalable”) is refuted — on two levels.

Scenario A shows the first weakness of M1: magnification is not the only criterion. Keplerian and Galilean telescopes achieve exactly the same magnification (40×) but are fundamentally different. The Keplerian telescope (two converging lenses) delivers an inverted image and is somewhat longer at 1025 mm; this is unproblematic for astronomy (an inverted star remains a star) and gives a large field of view. The Galilean telescope (converging objective plus diverging eyepiece) delivers an upright image and is shorter at 975 mm — ideal for the opera glass and the first field glass, where upright images and compactness count. Historically, Galileo’s telescope of 1609 was exactly this type. The same number “40×” hides two completely different instruments — M1 is insufficient as a sole quality criterion.

Scenario B appears to confirm M1 at first: the microscope total magnification is the product of the two stages, and with stronger lenses (shorter focal lengths) one apparently reaches arbitrarily high values — the “strong” configuration computes to 2222×. This configuration is the bait: purely geometrically it works, and a naive observer would consider it better than the 400× variant.

Scenario C catches the bait and delivers the actual falsification finding: the **diffraction limit**. Resolution — the smallest still-separable detail spacing — is not determined by magnification but by the diffraction of light at the aperture. By the Abbe limit, $d_{\min} = \lambda/(2\,\text{NA})$: a dry objective (NA = 0.65) at 550 nm just resolves 423 nm, an oil-immersion objective (NA = 1.4) reaches 196 nm. The **useful magnification** lies at about 500–1000·NA — for the dry objective therefore at most ~650×. The 2222× from scenario B lie far above: they are **empty magnification**. The image gets larger but no new detail appears — one merely sees the diffraction discs inflated, the image becomes blurred and mushy. M1 (“more magnification = better”) is thereby clearly refuted: beyond the diffraction limit, additional magnification is useless.

The central methodological lesson: Module 12 brings together three earlier modules. The **lenses** (Module 05) are the building blocks, and their aberrations limit real performance. The **mirrors** (Module 10) are the alternative — mirror telescopes avoid chromatic aberration and are therefore used for the largest telescopes. And **diffraction** (Module 03), which there was a marginal phenomenon at the slit, becomes here the fundamental, insurmountable barrier of every classical optical instrument. The diffraction limit is the reason why light microscopy ends at about 200 nm, why electron microscopes (much shorter wavelength) became necessary, and why overcoming the Abbe limit through fluorescence tricks was worth the Nobel Prize in 2014.

Connection to previous modules: - **Module 05 Lenses:** the building blocks; real aberrations additionally limit. - **Module 10 Mirrors:** mirror telescopes as a chromatic-free alternative; the same imaging equation. - **Module 03 Single Slit/Diffraction:** diffraction turns here from a curiosity into the hard resolution limit. The Rayleigh criterion follows directly from the diffraction pattern of the circular aperture. - **Module 04 Camera model:** the same sharpness-diffraction tension; a camera lens is diffraction-limited at small aperture.

12. Next test

Module 13 Eye as a possible next step: the eye as an optical instrument — accommodation, resolution limit of the retina, refractive errors and their correction (glasses as thin lens, Module 05). Connects all of geometrical optics with perception (Cluster L).

Possible extension Module 12 v0.2: mirror telescopes in detail (Newtonian, Cassegrain, segmented mirror); adaptive optics against atmospheric seeing; super-resolution microscopy (STED/STORM) as overcoming the Abbe limit; electron microscope (matter waves, de Broglie).

Appendix A — Cross-references

- Practice explanation: `PRAXIS-Instrumente-EN.md` (follows)
- Companion paper: `BEGLEITPAPIER-Instrumente-EN.md` (follows)
- Tool: `ORGANON.html` (follows) — *Gr. ὄργανον, the instrument/tool*
- Code: `instrumente_simulation.py`
- Plot: `instrumente_szenen.svg`
- Result data: `instrumente_results.json`
- Predecessor modules: Module 05 Lenses, Module 10 Mirrors, Module 03 Diffraction
- Related modules: Module 04 Camera model

Appendix B — External stocktaking

- **Hecht (2017)** *Optics*, 5th ed. — optical instruments, diffraction limit.
- **Born & Wolf (1999)** *Principles of Optics* — Abbe theory, resolution.
- **Jenkins & White (2001)** *Fundamentals of Optics* — telescope, microscope.
- **Abbe (1873)** Contributions to the theory of the microscope. *Arch. Mikrosk. Anat.* 9:413.
- **Hell & Wichmann (1994)** STED microscopy — overcoming the Abbe limit.
- **PhET optics simulations** — didactic foundations.

What the workshop note adds: three scenarios in falsification format; the bringing-together of lenses (05), mirrors (10) and diffraction (03); the explicit bait-and-falsification structure (scenario B seduces, scenario C refutes); the concept of empty magnification as tangible falsification.

Appendix C — Sources

- Hecht, E. (2017). *Optics*, 5th ed. Pearson.
- Born, M.; Wolf, E. (1999). *Principles of Optics*, 7th ed. Cambridge University Press.
- Jenkins, F. A.; White, H. E. (2001). *Fundamentals of Optics*, 4th ed. McGraw-Hill.
- Abbe, E. (1873). Contributions to the theory of the microscope and microscopic perception. *Archiv für Mikroskopische Anatomie* 9:413–468.
- Hell, S. W.; Wichmann, J. (1994). Breaking the diffraction resolution limit by stimulated emission. *Optics Letters* 19:780.

Word count: ca. 1790 · Pages: 8 · Version 0.1 · 2026-05-17