



PALGRAVE STUDIES IN
THE HISTORY
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Galileo and the *Almagest*, c.1589–1592

How Ptolemaic Astronomy Influenced Galileo's Early Writings on Motion

Ivan Malara

palgrave
macmillan



NIC. COPERNICUS

Stefan

Palgrave Studies in the History of Science and Technology

Series Editors

Roger D. Launius, Auburn, AL, USA
James Rodger Fleming, Centre Hall, PA, USA

Designed to bridge the gap between the history of science and the history of technology, this series publishes the best new work by promising and accomplished authors in both areas. In particular, it offers historical perspectives on issues of current and ongoing concern, provides international and global perspectives on scientific issues, and encourages productive communication between historians and practicing scientists.

Ivan Malara

Galileo
and the *Almagest*,
c.1589–1592

How Ptolemaic Astronomy Influenced Galileo's
Early Writings on Motion

palgrave
macmillan

Ivan Malara
Department of Philosophy
University of Milan
Milan, Italy

ISSN 2730-972X

ISSN 2730-9738 (electronic)

Palgrave Studies in the History of Science and Technology

ISBN 978-3-031-70613-4

ISBN 978-3-031-70614-1 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-70614-1>

This research was funded by the Department of Philosophy “Piero Martinetti” of the University of Milan under the Project “Departments of Excellence 2023–2027” awarded by the Ministry of University and Research (MUR).

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2024

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover illustration: © Darkves/Getty Images

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

If disposing of this product, please recycle the paper.

... nihil est enim in historia pura et inlustri brevitate dulcissimum.

(Cicero, Brutus, 262)

To my parents and brother

PREFACE

This book came into existence almost by chance. Its three principal Chapters (2–4) were originally conceived and written as separate articles intended for publication in distinct journals. In their fundamental aspects, they took shape in a span of less than a year, from November 2022 to September 2023. For the sake of convenience, I presented them collectively for the scrutiny of my initial and patient readers. It was their counsel that prompted me to publish all three under a unified title. They urged me to embark on a less commonly traversed path today, leading to the publication of a first monograph not tethered to my doctoral thesis. Despite grappling with numerous uncertainties, I decided to heed their advice. This decision entailed appending a substantive introduction to the subject matter, rectifying errors and oversights in the existing content, expanding the bibliography comprehensively, and concluding with some general observations regarding the scope and limitations of my study. Indeed, this was the course I undertook. Naturally, the final outcome, however it may be evaluated, rests solely on my shoulders.

While I could not draw upon an extensive research project akin to a doctoral thesis, the central figure of this book, Galileo Galilei, has been the focus of my research since my undergraduate years. The University of Milan afforded me the opportunity to continue my studies on Galileo, concentrating on a challenging yet underexplored theme concerning the methodologies employed by the Pisan scientist in the study of one of antiquity’s most renowned scientific works: Claudius Ptolemy’s *Almagest*.

Fortunately, Ptolemy boasts a rich research tradition and a substantial body of literature. Additionally, a tool accessible to all greatly facilitated my work—the database resulting from the PAL project (*Ptolemaeus Arabus et Latinus*: <https://ptolemaeus.badw.de/start>), overseen by the Bavarian Academy of Sciences (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften). Without this invaluable resource, locating and studying the sources for my research within such a brief timeframe would have been an insurmountable challenge. The efforts of the team led by Dag Nikolaus Hasse proved indispensable to me in the past year and a half, as essential as the online archive *Galileo//thek@* of the Galileo Museum (<https://www.museogalileo.it/it/biblioteca-e-istituto-di-ricerca/progetti/teche/827-galileo-theka.html>) has been since the beginning of my studies.

These two databases, in conjunction with various other resources, have provided me with optimal conditions for conducting my research. Nowadays, consulting primary sources is considerably more accessible than it was three decades ago, making it a responsibility to do so. In this book, I have chosen to prioritize the voices of the sources, both in the main text (in translation) and in footnotes (in the original language). The overarching objective of this book is to allow the sources to speak for themselves, enabling them to mutually illuminate each other and thereby restoring a meaning that might otherwise be lost. While this objective is undoubtedly challenging, I would consider myself gratified if I were able to achieve it even in part.

Galileo's *De motu antiquiora*, the source from which the study presented here originated, has been fully translated into English by Raymond Fredette. His translation is readily available online as part of the extensive collection in the ECHO database of the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science (https://echo.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/content/scientific_revolution/galileo). In this book, I carried out all translations from *De motu antiquiora*, always keeping a close eye on Fredette's translation. All the other translations from Latin and Italian texts are my own, unless stated otherwise.

Milan, Italy

Ivan Malara

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have helped me with my research, making this book possible. I thank Eileen Reeves and A. Mark Smith for their careful reading of early drafts. I am also grateful to Riccardo Bellé, Sven Dupré, Jacqueline Feke, David Juste, Salvatore Ricciardo, and Matteo Valleriani for their assistance and encouragement. I deeply appreciate the support from the Philosophy Library at the University of Milan and the Library of the Galileo Museum in Florence.

Thanks to the participants of the “Peurbachian” seminar, organized by Richard L. Kremer and Razieh S. Mousavi, for our enriching meetings. Special thanks to the CeSIM (*Centro per la Storia Intellettuale del Medioevo*) group in Milan, and especially to Luigi Campi, for fostering informal yet thought-provoking discussions about our works in progress. Consulting with colleagues like David Del Bianco, Michele Meroni, and Luigi Valletta has greatly contributed to the improvement of this book.

Finally, I extend my gratitude to Luca Bianchi, Michele Camerota, Franco Giudice, Niccolò Guicciardini, and Maarten Van Dyck for their guidance. Above all, I thank Elio Nenci for his unwavering support and mentorship.

Also, I am grateful in advance to everyone who approaches this book with a critical mindset. I am indeed deeply convinced that history exists within a boundary that historians continuously corroborate and redefine through well-founded arguments and critiques. This form of constructivism requires the collaboration of multiple trained minds and serves as the most effective means to avoid both historical denialism and mythologies rooted in political ideologies or personal beliefs.

CONTENTS

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| | <i>Research and Methodology</i> | 4 |
| | <i>The Almagest and Galileo’s De Motu Antiquiora</i> | 12 |
| | <i>Groundwork</i> | 27 |
| 2 | Why a Commentary? | 29 |
| | <i>The Need for a Commentary on the Almagest: Barozzi and Clavius</i> | 32 |
| | <i>The Importance of Theon’s Commentary on the Almagest: Biancani</i> | 42 |
| | <i>A Latin Translation of Theon’s Commentary on the Almagest: Teofilo</i> | 49 |
| | <i>Knowledge of Theon’s Commentary on the Almagest at Pisa: Buonamici and Mazzoni</i> | 52 |
| | <i>Conclusion</i> | 55 |
| 3 | Disentangling the Ptolemaic from the Aristotelian | 57 |
| | <i>Challenging Aristotle Through Mathematics: “The Divine Ptolemy and the Most Divine Archimedes”</i> | 61 |
| | <i>Experiencing The Earth’s Central Position in the World</i> | 64 |
| | <i>Geocentric and Geostatic Reasons</i> | 69 |
| | <i>Why Is the Earth in the Center of the World? Aristotelian and Non-Aristotelian Interpretations of Ptolemy</i> | 73 |
| | <i>Galileo’s Non-Aristotelian Ptolemaic Cosmology</i> | 82 |
| | <i>Conclusion</i> | 87 |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 4 | Galileo as a Commentator on <i>Almagest</i> I.3 | 91 |
| | <i>The Standard Interpretation</i> | 93 |
| | <i>Theon's Interpretation</i> | 97 |
| | <i>Galileo's Critical Approach to Alm. I.3</i> | 104 |
| | <i>Theon's Commentary and Galileo's Study of the Almagest</i> | 110 |
| | <i>Conclusion</i> | 113 |
| 5 | Concluding Remarks | 119 |
| | Bibliography | 129 |
| | Index | 147 |

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Ivan Malara is a post-doctoral fellow at the University of Milan, Italy. His current research focuses on Galileo Galilei's reception of Ptolemy, with a general interest in exploring the intricate tapestry of sources that may have influenced Galileo's work.

ABBREVIATIONS

BB Bernardino Baldi, *De le vite de matematici* (trascrizione), vol. II, Boncompagni 156 (cat. 1862), 65 (cat. 1892), Albani 619 (?). Available online: <https://echo.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/ECHOdocuView?url=/mpiwg/online/permanent/library/470S7R08/pageimg&start=1&pnp=1&mode=imagepath>.

EN Galileo Galilei, *Opere*. National Edition, ed. by Antonio Favaro, 20 vols. Firenze: Barbèra, 1890–1909.

ENA Galileo Galilei, *Opere*. Appendix to the National Edition, ed. by M. Camerota et al., 4 vols. Firenze: Giunti Editore, 2013–2019.

GBT Giovanni Battista Teofilo's Latin translation of Theon's commentary on the *Almagest*. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 7263. Available online: <https://ptolemaeus.badw.de/ms/113/175/1r>.

LIST OF FIGURES

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| Fig. 2.1 | Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Latin 7263, f. 391. (Courtesy of the BnF) | 52 |
| Fig. 4.1 | Illustration from Schreckenfuchs' notes on the <i>Almagest</i> (see Ptolemy 1551). In English, the Latin passage appended to it reads as follows: “The reason why stars appear larger in the east and west [i.e., at the horizon] than they do in the middle of the sky [i.e. at the zenith] is none other than the exhalation of vapors. These vapors scatter the rays of our vision, preventing us from seeing the stars at the same size as they actually are. Ptolemy proves this, drawing a similarity from objects cast into water: the deeper they sink, the larger they appear. This does not mean they are larger in water than outside of it, but rather that the rays of our vision are scattered in water. This will be clearer in the following illustration” | 98 |
| Fig. 4.2 | Illustration from Barozzi's <i>Cosmographia</i> (Barozzi 1585, p. 18) | 99 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| Fig. 4.3 | The first diagram on the left is from the Greek <i>editio princeps</i> of the <i>Almagest</i> (Ptolemy & Theon 1538, p. 10 of Theon's commentary), while the second one on the right is from Della Porta's Latin translation of it (Ptolemy & Theon 1605, p. 19; Della Porta 2000, p. 31). According to Theon, drawing upon (pseudo-)Archimedes' work on catoptrics, when observed outside of water, the sizes of AB and GD are perceived to be identical because they are viewed under the same angle GED (see the diagram on the right). However, when these are submerged in water, with ZH representing the surface of the water, they appear larger. Due to refraction, AB will appear as LM, while GD as OP (see Smith 2003, pp. 104–107) | 99 |
| Fig. 4.4 | Top portion of a page from the <i>editio princeps</i> of Theon's commentary on the <i>Almagest</i> (Ptolemy & Theon 1538, p. 11 of Theon's commentary) | 100 |
| Fig. 4.5 | Diagram from Della Porta's Latin translation of Theon's commentary on the <i>Almagest</i> (Ptolemy & Theon 1605, p. 20; Della Porta 2000, p. 32) | 101 |
| Fig. 4.6 | Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Ms. Acq. e doni 694, f. 15r. Used with permission from the Italian Ministry of Culture. Further reproduction by any means is prohibited | 102 |
| Fig. 4.7 | Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 719, f. 15r. (Courtesy of the BSB) | 103 |
| Fig. 4.8 | Diagram from Mauri's <i>Considerations</i> (Mauri 1606, f. 24v) | 111 |
| Fig. 5.1 | Comparison of the <i>theoricae</i> of the Moon by Reinhold (on the left) and Mauri (on the right) | 126 |