

# **Groping Toward Linear Regression Analysis: Newton's Analysis of Hipparchus' Equinox Observations**

Ari Belenkiy

Mathematics Department, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, 52900 ISRAEL

and

Eduardo Vila Echagüe

IBM-Chile, Santiago, CHILE

**Abstract.** In 1700, Newton, in designing a new universal calendar contained in the manuscripts known as Yahuda MS 24 from Jewish National and University Library at Jerusalem and analyzed in our recent article in *Notes & Records Royal Society* (59 (3), Sept 2005, pp. 223-54), attempted to compute the length of the tropical year using the ancient equinox observations reported by a famous Greek astronomer Hipparchus of Rhodes, ten in number. Though Newton had a very thin sample of data, he obtained a tropical year only a few seconds longer than the correct length. The reason lies in Newton's application of a technique similar to modern *regression analysis*. Actually he wrote down the first of two so-called "normal equations" known from the OLS (Ordinary Least Square) method. Newton also had a vague understanding of *qualitative* variables. This paper concludes by discussing open historico-astronomical problems related to the inclination of the Earth's axis of rotation. In particular, ignorance about the long-range variation in inclination and nutation of the axis is likely responsible for the wide variety in the lengths of the tropical year assigned by different 17<sup>th</sup> century astronomers – the problem that led Newton to Hipparchus and to an "embryonic" regression analysis.

**Key words:** linear regression analysis, ordinary least squares; qualitative variables, proper motion of the apogee; obliquity of Ecliptic; nutation of the Earth's axis

## **Introduction: 17<sup>th</sup> Century Challenge**

In 1750, the German astronomer Johann Tobias Mayer (1723-1762) studied the libration of the moon and obtained a system of 27 linear equations with just three unknowns. He boldly proceeded to average different groups of equations and arrived at a set of three, solving them in a standard way. In the *History of Statistics* Stephan Stigler announces this event as the beginning of linear regression analysis.<sup>1</sup> This date must be moved back by exactly fifty years. In 1700, Isaac Newton not only carried

out similar averaging, but he also anticipated two other distinctive artifacts of modern regression analysis: qualitative variables and unbiased estimators.

In our recent paper, “History of One Defeat,”<sup>2</sup> we described how in February-April 1700 Newton constructed his civil (solar) and ecclesiastical (lunar) calendars. For the former Newton tried to find its major benchmark, the length of the tropical year which was uncertain in his time within some 30 seconds or even a minute. In three consecutive drafts Newton wrote down three different values: 1) 365d 5h 48 min and 45s; 2) 365d 5h 48m and 48 s; and 3) 365d 5h 48min and 57 s.

Looking at the following table with tropical years given by seventeenth century astronomers,<sup>3</sup> one can see dispersion in the range of +/-30s:

365d 5h 48min 45.5s	– Tycho Brahe ( <i>Astronomiae instaurata progymnasmata</i> , 1602)
365d 5h 48min 57.6s	– Johannes Kepler ( <i>Tabulae Rudolphinae</i> , 1627)
365d 5h 49min 4.5s	– Ismael Boulliau ( <i>Astronomia Philolaica</i> , 1645)
365d 5h 48min 40s	– Fr. [Giovanni] Riccioli ( <i>Almagestum Novum</i> , 1651)
365d 5h 48min 8s	– Thomas Streete ( <i>Astronomia Carolina</i> , 1661)
365d 5h 49min 4.4s	– Vincent Wing ( <i>Astronomia Britannica</i> , 1669)
365d 5h 48min 34.5s	– Edmond Halley ( <i>Tabulae Astronomia</i> , 1719?). <sup>4</sup>
365d 5h 49min	– Jeremy Horrox ( <i>Horroxian Opera</i> , 1673) <sup>5</sup>
365d 5h 49min 1s	– Thomas Streete ( <i>Astronomia Carolina</i> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> ed., 1710)

Desiring to reduce the uncertainty in tropical year, which amounted to one minute, Newton faced the fact that the contemporary science lacked a reliable theory for equinoctial motion. The 1<sup>st</sup> edition of Principia<sup>6</sup> explained this motion only qualitatively, not quantitatively. Exact measurements of celestial objects much depended on technical characteristics of the instruments. Newton’s close associates, Edmund Halley and Astronomer Royal John Flamsteed, were able to measure sun’s position up to 5".<sup>7</sup> Because of aberration, nutation and refraction the actual error in single observation must be doubled to 10".<sup>8</sup> Since at least two observations were needed to find sun’s transit over the latitude the cumulative error was at least 14". After, say, linear interpolation it drops to 7". Comparison of the positions of two neighboring equinoxes brings error back to 10". Since sun’s daily motion in latitude is 24', the 10" accuracy was tantamount to an error of 10 minutes.<sup>9</sup> Even using

Flamsteed's observations for 20 years, from 1680 to 1700, would not reduce the error below half a minute. Since the use of contemporary observations alone could not suffice him, Newton had to look for different tools.

### **Three Kinds of Sampling**

The three values for the tropical year which Newton wrote down suggest the following scenario.

#### **a. "Pick one arbitrary value from the sample"**

In the "History of One Defeat" we suggested that writing the first draft, with a tropical year of 365d 5h 48min and 45s, Newton first picked up an arbitrary book from the shelf, which happens to be that of Tycho. This conjecture seemed problematic, since Newton did not own any book by Tycho, except possibly the one on comets. Still, the conjecture was positively confirmed by later examination of the other books owned by Newton. *Institutionum Astronomicarum Libri Duo*, written by Nicolas Mercator in 1676, contained Tycho's (and Kepler's) tables in the appendix and it was an easy matter to deduce the length of the year from them.

This approach can be thought of as a "statistical sampling" from random distribution where the first, a randomly chosen value, was taken as an estimator.

#### **b. "Take a sample and make an average"**

The origin of the second value, with 365d 5h 48min and 48s, is unclear as well, and we hypothesized it could have come from Vincent Wing or Thomas Streete, whose books at that time were unavailable to us. This hypothesis was not confirmed after studying books by both authors.<sup>10</sup> As a matter of fact, we did not succeed in finding any book by any astronomer with that tropical year.

Here we advance a new hypothesis. Newton's second statistical idea could have been to take a sample and average the results – i.e., *average the final values of several major astronomers*. Taking just the trio of Tycho, Kepler, and Riccioli, he could get an average very close to 48s. Since Kepler was not found in Newton's personal library, he could have picked up it from the same book by Mercator. Still later, in a

matter of several days or weeks, Newton rejected this value as well! It might not have seemed quite *kosher* for him due to the following reason.

Practically all of the seventeenth century astronomers found the tropical year by indirect procedures, like comparing contemporary observations with those of ancient astronomers and making different assumptions about their ancient mistakes. There were two different techniques involved: one, indirect, compared longitudes of a star at two different epochs; another compared daytime of the sun's crossing the equinox. For example, Vincent Wing compared equinox observations by al-Battani (c. 882) and Ishmael Boulliau (c. 1640); Thomas Streete compared observations of Spica by Tycho (1600) with those of Timocharis (c. 300 BC) and, in parallel, with medieval Persian tables (c. 1115). There were already strong suspicions about the reliability of many ancient observations (see the last section) and there were no consistent criteria for how to choose between right and wrong. On the top of this, in averaging over the final values of several astronomers, there was the danger that different sets of observations could receive greater weight than others. These could have been the reasons that Newton intuitively rejected this approach (if, indeed, he ever considered using it) and looked for another way to compute the tropical year.

### c. Regression Analysis

For the third value, 365d 5h 48min and 57s, Newton “documented” his steps with two pages of intricate computations. Here he used quite a different statistical approach: instead of averaging the final values of several different astronomers, he chose to *average the observations of just one* – Hipparchus of Rhodes (see Image 1 in Appendix 1) – and compare the result with a reliable contemporary observation. His idea was that for a time span of 1850 years, the thirds of arc of the equinoctial speed must accumulate to arc-minutes, which are easy to detect. Therefore he added to the set of ten observations of Hipparchus a sun's position from the 1681 tables prepared by John Flamsteed, Astronomer Royal.

Newton had an edition of *Almagest* in his library<sup>11</sup> with both Greek and Latin texts, edited by John Wallis, wherein Ptolemy quoted Hipparchus' autumnal equinoxes in years 162-159-158 BC and 147-146-143 BC and the vernal equinoxes in 146-135-128 BC.<sup>12</sup> Because two trios of Hipparchus' autumnal equinox observations are

inconsistent, Newton applied a statistical approach similar to modern *linear regression analysis*. How successful was he?

Newton arrived at the length of the tropical year, 365d 5h 48min and 57s. How good the value is depends on the point of view, or rather on the units of time with which we express the tropical year. Newton was not aware with the fact that the tropical year and the mean day are changing with time. Taking the unit of time to be the ephemeris second, related to the tropical year 1900, the tropical year varies according to formula  $(31556925.9747 - 0.530T)se$ , where  $se$  is ephemeris second defined for 1900 and  $T$  is number of centuries since 1900.<sup>13</sup> This formula gives 365d 5h 48min and 57 $se$  for Hipparchus' time, 160-130 BC, and 10 $se$  less for Newton's own time, 1700. The average value between the two lies at 365d 5h 48min and 52 $se$ . With that, Newton seems to make just a 5 $se$  mistake.

But, of course, neither Newton nor Hipparchus measured the length of the year in ephemeris seconds but rather in the seconds of their time, “mean seconds,” computed as  $(1/24) \cdot 3600$  of the mean day. Dividing the above formula for the tropical year by the length of the mean day  $(86400 + 0.0015T)se$ , we computed the tropical year for years 1700 AD and 160 BC expressed in “mean seconds.” The results are – for 1700: 365d 5h 48m and 48.1s, while for 160 BC: 365d 5h 49m and 08.2s. The average of both lengths is: 365d 5h 48m and 58.2s – quite close to Newton's value.

### The Ordinary Least Squares Method

Regression analysis aims at the approximation of a set of points  $(X_n, Y_n)$  on the plain (“data”) by a single straight line:  $Y = \alpha + \beta X$ . Note that if  $\beta$  here is zero, this leads to a horizontal line  $Y = \alpha$ , where the “best”  $\alpha$  is an average  $(\bar{Y})$  of  $Y_n$ ; it gives the least “variance”  $\sum_n (Y_n - a)^2$  among all possible  $a$ 's.<sup>14</sup> The general case requires both coefficients be non-zero. The best known method is OLS (Ordinary Least Squares), which finds first the differences (“residuals”) between the data and the regression line and then searches for the “best” pair of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  - the one that minimizes the total sum of squares of the residuals,  $\sum_n (Y_n - a - bX_n)^2$ .<sup>15</sup>

The Ordinary Least Squares method was not known to Newton. Its discovery comes from A.M. Legendre (1805) and C.F. Gauss (1809).<sup>16</sup> An explanation of why the OLS is the ‘most effective’ within a general probability framework was made by Gauss (1823) and later by A. Markov (1912).<sup>17</sup> Here is the Gauss-Markov **Theorem** applied to the motion of the equinoxes:

- 1) Assume X-Y reference system, where X – Julian years and Y – local daytime. For every set of observed data  $\{X_n, Y_n\}$ , the OLS method claims that there is a unique line  $Y = \alpha + \beta' \cdot X$  such that the sum of the squared distances from every point to this line is minimal.<sup>18</sup> If  $Y_n$  is daytime of the equinox at Julian year  $X_n$ , then coefficient  $\beta'$  represents deficiency of the tropical year vs. the Julian year.
- 2) Assume that the data  $\{X_n, Y_n\}$  were scattered around a certain line randomly, with zero mean and equal deviation. Then above  $\beta'$  is the *best linear unbiased* estimator of the length of the year. The “best” means that  $\beta'$  is the *most effective*, or has the *least variance*.

It is obvious that  $\beta$  must be negative; today it is estimated to be about  $-11\frac{1}{4}$  min. It is clear that 4-year Julian cycle posit a difficulty due to a leap day. To circumvent the difficulty one must either “move” all the equinoxes to the neighboring Julian years divisible by 4 or to introduce an additional variable which takes care of the position of the year within the 4-year cycle. Newton would choose the first option while we, due to availability of a computer, chose the second.


Because two different groups of data – the autumnal and vernal equinoxes – are difficult to compare in one regression, one can proceed differently. It is possible to make an OLS test for every individual group:  $Y = \alpha + \beta X$ , and then average two  $\beta$ 's. The preferable method, however, is to introduce a so-called *qualitative* (or “dummy”) variable<sup>19</sup> D (a new column in the table with just entry 0 for vernal and 1 for autumnal group) and look either for regression:

$$Y = \alpha + \delta D + \beta X \quad (1)$$

or for regression:

$$Y = \alpha + \beta X + \varepsilon X D. \quad (2)$$

Graphically, this means to look for a plane that approximates all of the data best, in the same, the ‘least squares’ sense. In the first case, data is located along two parallel lines  $D=0$  and  $D=1$ , while in the second case, data is located on two intersecting lines:  $D=0$  and diagonal  $D=X$ . In the first case, the parameter related to the tropical year is  $\beta$ , while in the second case these are two parameters:  $\beta$  and  $\epsilon$ .



**Fig. 1a,b. Approximation of Two Inhomogeneous Sets of Data in 3-Dimensional Space by a Plane**

The first method (Fig 1a) implicitly assumes that along  $D=0$  and  $D=1$ , the plane has the same  $\beta$ , or, equivalently, that the speed of both equinoxes – vernal and autumnal – is the same. Besides,  $D$  has the meaning of a (constant) distance between vernal and autumnal equinoxes. This could be questioned, since the apside line moves with respect to the equinoxes, though its proper speed is four times slower than that of the equinoxes. The second method (Fig 1b) is free from the latter assumption. Besides, it allows deducing the length of the year from two coefficients, as an average:  $\beta + \epsilon/2$ .

Since qualitative ( $D$ ) variables appeared only in the 20<sup>th</sup> century with the development of multivariable regression analysis, it would be unfair to demand from the 18<sup>th</sup> century statistician anything similar. One would rather expect Newton to perform (1) separately for  $D=0$  and  $D=1$  cases, or rather find coefficients  $\beta'$  for two groups separately and then averaging them in some fashion.

Performing OLS regression (1) for Hipparchus’ data for all three cases separately and using an additional variable *Position* [within the 4-year cycle], we get a very poor estimate for the tropical year (see Regression 1 in Appendix 2). The general case (with the second, dummy variable) gives  $\beta' = -0.609$ , while  $D=1$  (autumnal) case gives

$\beta' = -0.692$  and  $D=0$  (vernal) case gives  $\beta' = -0.625$ . Regression of the full set reduces the Julian year by 36 minutes, the autumnal set – by c. 42min and vernal set – by c. 37.5min, so the average of two latter would reduce Julian year by c. 40min. This would bring the tropical year to 365d 5h 20min, which is obviously too small.<sup>20</sup>

As we said, Newton could have been uncomfortable working with two variables and likely invented a way to keep from introducing the variable *Position*. This would be to move all the equinoxes to the neighboring years if their Position was different from the rest. Most equinoxes have *Position* = 2 modulo 4, like those of 162, 158, 146 BC. It is clear where to move years 159, 147 and 143 BC to 158, 146 and 142 BC correspondingly, adding 6 hours to the time of equinox. The year 128 could be problematic, since it is possible to move it either earlier or later. To resolve the uncertainty, Newton could have split this observation in two: in 130 and 126 BC moving the time of the equinoxes by 12 hours up. Performing OLS regression for this data (see Regression 2 in Appendix 2), we unexpectedly got a better  $\beta' = -0.142$  (8.5min) for vernal equinoxes, but again a poor one for autumnal:  $\beta' = -0.733$  (44min). The average would bring the deficiency to 26min. The general model with variable D also performed poorly:  $\beta' = -0.439$  (27min). In both cases the tropical year appears to be c. 365d 5h 34min, which is too small by all standards.

The weakness of the straightforward application of OLS for finding the length of the tropical year is obvious: the sample of ten observations is too thin. By another word, Hipparchus' sample alone is not very conclusive. This could be cured if several contemporary observations were included in the sample – or at least one. This was Newton's general idea.

### **Newton's Linear Regression Model**

There are two remarkable insights on Newton's part: separation of qualitatively different observations and choice of the estimator with several good properties.


#### **1. Estimator**

Newton could not have computed an "honest" average time of the equinoxes at the "honest" average year since the latter would be a fraction. Therefore he applied the



following procedure (see Image 2 in Appendix 1). First he arranged Hipparchus' "raw data" in a column (column 2). Next he chose two "anchor" observations: Sept 27, 0:00, 158 BC for the autumnal group and March 23, 12:00, 135 BC for the vernal group (both in Alexandrian local time). Taking "anchors" as given he linearly extrapolated, for every group separately, the time of day when the rest of the equinoxes had to occur assuming a Horrobian year of 365d 5h 49min is correct (column 1). These are two "regression lines," though chosen somewhat arbitrarily, with a "Horrobian" slope  $\beta = -11$  min.

Next Newton found (column 3) how far Hipparchus' equinoxes ("raw data") lie off the regression lines: -5h 16min for 162, +11min for 159, 0 for 158, +3h 59min for 147, 3h 48min for 146 and +9h 15min for 143 BC in the autumnal group; -29min for 146, 0 for 135 and -1h 17min for 128 BC in the vernal group. These are the "residuals" ( $\hat{u}_n$ , see Fig. 2).




**Fig. 2.** Dots represent ten Hipparchus' equinoxes: six autumnal equinoxes of 162, 159, 158, 147, 146, 143 BC (black dots) and four vernal equinoxes of 146 (two), 135 and 128 BC (grey dots). Choosing two *anchor* equinoxes of 158 and 135 BC Newton made first two regression lines with "Horrobian" slope  $\beta = -11$  min.

The OLS method suggests finding the *best regression line* by minimizing the sum of squares of the residuals. Newton did not proceed this way - he simply averaged the residuals (separately for each group) finding how far off the arbitrarily chosen by him "regression line" passes from the "average point"  $(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})$ , though the latter was not available to him since it is unclear how to define the "average year"  $(\bar{X})$ . The result was +2h 5min<sup>21</sup> for the equinoxes in the autumnal group and -35.3min in the vernal (two marginal marks in column 3).

Newton chose the right strategy not at once. First he decided to move all sample up – each group by its average (column 4) - but on realizing that this is a wrong move he crossed the column and moved both regression lines down by the respected average (column 5). This is equivalent to the imposition on the regression line the first of the two of the so-called “normal equations,” both of which are tantamount to the OLS regression.<sup>22</sup> The first normal equation is tantamount to the condition that the regression line must pass the point  $(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})$ .

Next Newton converted Alexandrian local time into Greenwich local time by adding 2h 15min to the former values<sup>23</sup> (column 6). In particular, the “anchor” equinoxes moved to Sept 26, 21:55, 158 BC and March 23, 12:35, 135 BC (19:40 and 10:20 Greenwich local time). At this point Newton by unclear reason changed the second (vernal) “anchor” to March 23, 20:36, 146 BC (18:21 Greenwich local time).

In summary, he placed two new points on the graph: A  $(\bar{X}_A, \bar{Y}_A)$  and V  $(\bar{X}_V, \bar{Y}_V)$ , which are the *averages* over  $X_n$  (years) and  $Y_n$  (daytime of equinoxes) for autumnal and vernal equinoxes correspondingly, and two new regression lines (see Fig. 3).<sup>24</sup>




**Fig. 3.** Newton changed anchor equinox of 135 BC to 146 BC. Moving both first regression lines (solid) by the average distances between them and the raw data, Newton made two second regression lines (dashed) through average points A and V with the same Horrobian slope  $\beta = -11$  min.

Next Newton computed the mean sun’s longitude for both dates using Flamsteed’s 1681 tables. In contrast, taking from the latter the solar apogee’s position, he chose for the apogee’s motion the value of the precession of the equinoxes. The image 3 in Appendix 1 allows tracing his steps one by one. Newton started working with the

anchor equinox of 158 BC. He computed the sun's mean longitude and apogee at Sept 26, 19:40, 158 BC, but suddenly realized that he was using apparent time instead of mean time. The difference, the so-called "equation of time," was 7min 14s, and he had to diminish both positions by 18" before proceeding to the finding the "equation of center" and the sun's true longitude. He repeated his computations to arrive finally at +21' 9" off 180° for sun's position at Hipparchus' autumnal equinox's time.

For the vernal equinox of March 23, 10:20, 146BC, Newton did the reduction from apparent to mean time first, subtracting the "equation of time" (7min 14s) from 18h 21min to obtain 18h 13.7min. He then computed the sun's true longitude, getting a (wrong) position at +18' 31" off 0°. At this point he noticed his mistake. Near the two equinoxes, vernal and autumnal, the equation of time has the same absolute value but different signs! So Newton repeated the calculation again, this time adding 7min 14s to 18h 21min and arriving at 18h 28.3min. A finally computed sun's position of at Hipparchus' vernal equinox's time was by -13' 50.5" off 0°.

Flamsteed's 1681 tables gave Newton a contemporary position. Though Yahuda 24D displays the sun's position 9s 7°55'51" for 1 AD, noon, Newton surely computed it backward from Flamsteed's 1681 data. However in the process of computation Newton corrected mean sun's position by -20" and the solar apogee's position by 35'. These are corrections communicated to him by Flamsteed in the late 1690s.<sup>25</sup> Therefore his base point most likely was December 31, noon, 1700.



**Fig. 4. Final arrangement of two regression lines via Flamsteed's equinoxes.**

Taking the latter moment as  $X=0$  coordinate, it is equivalent to fixing  $\alpha=0$  in the linear regression model (see Fig. 4). With that, Newton's estimator essentially is<sup>26</sup>

$$\beta^\dagger = \frac{\bar{Y}}{\bar{X}}. \quad (3)$$

This is a well-known estimator in the field of regression analysis: it suggests drawing a line through two most remarkable points,  $(0,0)$  and  $(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})$ . Actually, it is the simplest solution and historically must be discovered first, earlier than a sophisticated OLS estimator. From this point of view our paper just establishes "historical justice."

## 2. Bias of estimator $\beta^\dagger$


The problem with estimator  $\beta^\dagger$  is that it might be biased if  $\alpha \neq 0$ . But certainly Newton had serious reasons to consider  $\alpha = 0$ ! As we pointed earlier, Flamsteed's uncertainty about the position of the equinox were within 10min of the true place, while the positions of Hipparchian equinoxes were as far as 5 or 9 hours off!<sup>27</sup> Therefore the former observation could be considered as "precise."

## 3. Effectiveness of estimator $\beta^\dagger$

This brings another issue to the forefront – *heteroscedasticity*, unequal variation of errors for different observations. When this is the case, Gauss-Markov theorem cannot claim that estimator  $\beta^\dagger$  is *less efficient* than the OLS estimator  $\beta$ .<sup>28</sup> Therefore choosing  $\beta^\dagger$  Newton intuitively escaped this pitfall, as well.

## 4. Newton's Algorithm

Computed from Flamsteed's 1681 table and Kepler's equation, the sun's position AH on Sept 26, 21:55, 158 BC was off the  $180^\circ$  mark by  $+21'9''$ , while the sun's position VH on March 23, 20:36, 146 BC was off  $0^\circ$  mark by  $-13'50\frac{1}{2}''$  (see Image 3 in Appendix 1).



**Fig. 5. Newton's Solution for the Asymmetrical Positions of Hipparchian Equinoxes**

Therefore, Newton found the *asymmetry* of  $34'59\frac{1}{2}''$  in the motion of two equinoxes. One would expect Newton to divide it in half, to  $17'29\frac{3}{4}''$ , and claim that this is the accumulated difference with true equinox motion. However, it would be unclear whether one should add or subtract the last value! Newton did not even consider a solution in which both equinoxes, autumnal and vernal, move with different speeds. Instead, he seems tacitly assumed that both equinoxes move with the same speed, but  $0^\circ$  mark in Hipparchus' time was displaced by  $17'29\frac{3}{4}''$  (see Fig.5)! Newton's premise could be that the Hipparchian ring was *biased*, i.e. inclined down by  $17'29\frac{3}{4}''$  from its correct position. We will see further that - if our assumption is right - this guess was not only qualitatively correct, but also almost precise quantitatively.

To compensate for this *bias*, accumulated over 1850 years, Newton moved the  $0^\circ$ - $180^\circ$  line by  $17'29\frac{3}{4}''$  to the AN-VN line. Now both equinoxes appeared to be passing the new line by the same arc: AH passed AN by  $3'39\frac{1}{4}''$  while VH passed VN by  $3'39\frac{1}{4}''$ . The way to resolve the problem now was clear: to increase<sup>29</sup> the speed of the equinoxes by  $3'39\frac{1}{4}''$  divided by 1850 years or, equivalently, decrease the Horrolian year by 3 seconds:

$$3'39\frac{1}{4}'' \cdot 24 (s /'') / 1850 y = 3 s/y,<sup>30</sup>$$

where  $24 (s /'')$  is the inverse speed of the sun, i.e., the time the sun moves one arc-second.

In this way Newton found the length of the *annus equinoxialis* as 356d 5h 49m 57s.

Formally, **Newton's algorithm** was as follows:

0. Chose two “anchor” equinoxes: autumnal in year  $X_A$  and vernal in year  $X_V$ .

Define:  $\sigma = 24$  (s /") = inverse of the sun’s speed and  $T = (158 + 146)/2 + 1700 \cong 1850$ y.

1. Chose  $\beta_1 = \text{Horroxian year} - \text{Julian year} = 365\text{d } 5\text{h } 49\text{min} - 365\text{d } 6\text{h} = -11(\text{min} / \text{y})$ .

2. Compute an “average” time of the equinoxes  $\bar{Y}_A$  and  $\bar{Y}_V$  in the years  $X_A$  and  $X_V$ .

3. Using Flamsteed’s mean equinoxes  $Y_A^F$  and  $Y_V^F$  for year  $X_0 = 1700$  compute  $\beta_A$  and

$\beta_V$  by formula (3):  $\beta_A = \frac{\bar{Y}_A - Y_A^F}{X_A - X_A^F}$  and, similarly  $\beta_V = \frac{\bar{Y}_V - Y_V^F}{X_V - X_V^F}$ .

4. Find  $\beta_2 = \frac{\beta_A + \beta_V}{2}$ .

5. Return to step 2.

In step 3 Newton actually found  $\frac{T}{\sigma}\beta_A = \frac{T}{\sigma}\beta_1 - 21'09''$  and  $\frac{T}{\sigma}\beta_V = \frac{T}{\sigma}\beta_1 + 13'50.5''$ .

Summing these two quantities up in step 4 he obtained  $\beta_2 = \beta_1 - 3'39.25''\frac{\sigma}{T} = \beta_1 - 3s$ .

## 5. Iterations

This procedure seems intermittently iterative because of nonlinearities coming from the application of Kepler’s equation and the equation of time in computation of the “average” time of both equinoxes in Step 2. After correcting  $\beta$ , the non-linear terms must produce the second order corrections and the whole procedure must be repeated again. However, this procedure would converge very quickly, since nonlinearities mutually compensate for each other. For example, the *equation of center* for the autumnal equinox was  $-1^\circ 49' 55''$  while for the vernal  $+1^\circ 51' 15''$ . The same thing occurred with the *equation of time*:  $+7.3$  min near the vernal equinox and  $-7$ min 14s near the autumnal one. As a result, Newton did not bother to perform the second step of iteration.

## Further Remarks and Open Questions

### 1. Data Arrangement

The vernal equinox of March 23, 146 BC for which Hipparchus quoted two reports: one from Rhodes and one from Alexandria, at 18h and 23h, respectively, gave much trouble to later historians of science.<sup>31</sup> Newton considered both data as valid and

assumed the *average* value, 20:30h, as the time of the equinox. From the orthodox point of view, these two observations received ‘half weight’ compared with two other vernal equinoxes in 135 and 128 BC. But it is completely justifiable in this situation – otherwise one year, 146 BC, would become twice as important. Stigler writes:

Astronomers averaged measurements they considered to be equivalent, observations they felt were of equal intrinsic accuracy because measurements had been made by the same observer, at the same time, in the same place, with the same instrument and so forth. Exceptions, instances in which measurements not considered to be of equivalent accuracy were combined, were rare before 1750.<sup>32</sup>

As we have seen, such a rare event occurred as early as 1700. It could be that Roger Cotes, the editor of the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition of *Principia* who formulated a similar thought c. 1716,<sup>33</sup> learned it from his exchange of letters with Isaac Newton in 1712-13.

## 2. Asymmetry in Hipparchus’ Equinox Observations

We already suggested above that Newton, justifying 34'59½" asymmetry, silently implicated Hipparchus’ observational instrument, which could have been defective, resulting in the bias of different signs for spring and fall. In the twentieth century, while analyzing pre-Ptolemaic Greek observations (mainly those of Euctemon and Hipparchus), American astronomer Robert Newton confirmed Isaac Newton’s guess:

The errors in equinoxes, as we saw earlier, are probably dominated by systematic errors rather than random errors, and the errors at vernal and autumnal equinoxes have a strong tendency to be equal and opposite.<sup>34</sup>

The instrument could be the first suspect, according to Ptolemy’s record in *Almagest*:

instead of setting the instrument for a specific observation, it was set once for a long period of time; and the errors could have occurred unnoticed by some gradual displacement and been unnoticed over the period of time; and when we observed in Palaestra using bronze rings, which were supposed to be fixed in the plane of the equator, the distortion of their positioning, especially that of the larger and the older of the two, was apparent to such an extent that sometimes the direction of illumination of the concave surface in them shifted from one side to the other twice on the same equinoctial day.<sup>35</sup>

Kepler argued that the reason for seeing the equinox twice on the same day could have been either refraction (of solar rays in the air) or a fault of the instrument.<sup>36</sup> The

latter assumption implies that the Hipparchus' ring was not properly fixed in the plane of the equator! What could have been the reason?

The following argument belongs to Robert Newton. To find the moment of equinoxes ancient astronomers likely observed a moment when sun's altitude at meridian was equal to  $(90^\circ - \text{place's latitude})$ . Assume that Hipparchus assigned to the latitude of Rhodes a value 7' higher than the correct one. Then the autumnal equinox ought to occur about 7 hours later than the true moment, while the time for the vernal equinox is 7 hours earlier.<sup>37</sup>

The question is how Hipparchus could have made such a large error in the latitude of Rhodes. The answer could be the result of his alleged ignorance about long-periodic variation in the obliquity of the ecliptic, which is currently estimated at about  $1.6^\circ$  in course of about 20,000 years.<sup>38</sup> Ptolemy claims that Hipparchus used the obliquity's value  $23^\circ 51' 20''$  found by Eratosthenes c.210 BC. Modern estimates, however, show that in Hipparchus's time (134 BC) the obliquity was  $23^\circ 42' 40''$ ; or  $8'40''$  smaller.<sup>39</sup> We know that Hipparchus observed the summer 134 BC solstice and the standard error of his measurements was *at least* 2'.<sup>40</sup> The same error can be safely attributed to all his predecessors, Eratosthenes in particular. Then, due to the well-known formula:

$$\text{sun's altitude at the solstice} = 90^\circ - \text{latitude} + \text{obliquity of ecliptic},$$

the  $7' \pm 2'$  error in latitude, suggested by Robert Newton, might be just a reverse of the  $8'40'' \pm 2'$  error in obliquity.


In favor of this chain of events speaks a plain fact, noticed by Robert Newton: only Hipparchus' observation of the summer solstice in 134 BC is recorded -- but not the winter one! Therefore it is possible that Hipparchus did not perform independent observation of the sun's altitude at the winter solstice and, relying on Eratosthenes' value for obliquity, failed in obtaining a correct value for the latitude of Rhodes.

### 3. Proper Motion of the Apogee

It seems that Newton did not believe in the proper motion of the solar apogee since for its motion he used the same value as for the proper motion (precession) of the



equinoxes ( $1^{\circ}23'20''$  per century). This was somehow in odds with the contemporary view which can be summarized in Fig. 6.



**Fig. 6. Ptolemaic System of the World. Later modified by Thabit al-Qurra to allow the apside line moving synchronously with the starry sky.**

Greeks considered the equinoxes as fixed, assuming that the starry sky moved. The solar apogee was also fixed because Ptolemy – falsely – claimed that all four seasons are of fixed length. The major discovery made by Arab astronomers – and traditionally ascribed to Thabit al-Qurra c. 829-32 AD – was that all four seasons were of varying length, and therefore, the solar apogee moves with respect to the equinoxes. Al-Qurra decided that it moves synchronously with the starry sky.<sup>41</sup>

According to some testimonies two hundred years later, az-Zarkali (eleventh century, Spain) or even al-Biruni (eleventh century, Middle East)<sup>42</sup> found that the apogee moves a bit more quickly than the starry sky.<sup>43</sup> As we have seen, Newton did not support this idea. The reason may be traced to his remark in the *Principia*, where he wrote, in reference to the planets: “The aphelia and the nodes don't move.”<sup>44</sup> He meant that the other planets and the comets produce negligible effects on the Earth. In contrast, John Flamsteed computed the apogee's motion as  $1^{\circ} 45'$  per century or  $1' 3''$  per year, the same as Kepler found almost a century earlier.<sup>45</sup>

Still, the true position of the apogee troubled Newton, and in the middle of his computations on the regression model Newton added  $35'$  correction to the apogee's

position suggested by Flamsteed's sometime in 1690s.<sup>46</sup> This addition did not change much: the final position of the apogee in 146-158 BC found by Newton (about 72°) is quite far from what Hipparchus claimed (65° 30').

Would Newton have believed Flamsteed in this matter, he would have placed the solar apogee at 65° 17' 32" in 158 BC and at 65° 29' 36" in 146 BC. With that, the solar anomaly, equation of center and true sun's position in 158 BC would be 116° 53' 32", -1° 44' 44", and 180° 26' 21", while in 146BC 292° 25' 17", 1° 46' 39", and 359° 41' 33". The asymmetry would be 44' 48", while correction to the Horrolian year 3'57" or 3.07s, slightly greater than that found earlier. This could be a reason for Newton's hesitation in choosing between 365d 5h 48min 57s and 365d 5h 48min 56s in the third draft.

Another remark is of some historical interest. Though contemporary astronomers would fix the starry sky (and/or apogee) in space, allowing the equinoxes to move, Newton's computation reveals that he held – at least for computational purposes – the older view and kept the equinoxes fixed, allowing the sky and apogee to move.

#### 4. Variations in obliquity of the ecliptic and the tropical year

The variation in the obliquity of the ecliptic can be a key element to explain the scattering of data in tropical years given by different astronomers. The problem was on the agenda of the day. Indeed, Flamsteed's older contemporary, Thomas Streete, in *Astronomia Carolina* (1661) wrote:


But the Equinoctial with the Poles thereof are fixed in the Earth and movable in the Heavens, as the Precession of the Equinox demonstrates: And the Inclination of the Equinoctial to the Ecliptick, or the distance of their poles is invariable and constant in all Ages, as by some select and more certain observations will easily appear.<sup>47</sup>

Further, Streete says that on comparing Tycho's observations of Spica in 1600 with those of Timocharis in 300 BC, one can get 50" for annual precession (which is the correct value). However, Streete is unhappy with Timocharis because of alleged refraction and further compares Tyconic observations with 1115 AD Persian tables<sup>48</sup> and obtains 48" for annual precession. He decides in favor of the latter:

We have also considered many other Observations Old and New; but in regard the more ancient Astronomers were destitute of conventional Instruments (as is

evident by the discrepancy of their observations and by their manifest error in the greatest declination of the sun) and because the error of 24' in declination amounts at least to one whole degree in Longitude; we have therefore (for want of better observations) made choice of some such applications of the Moon and Planets to Fixt stars (related by Ptolemy) as have most probability of truth, and comparing them with some other, limited the constant Annual Precession of the Equinox 48", the motion in 100 years 1° 20', and the whole revolution thereof in 27000 years.<sup>49</sup>

All-in-all: Streete obtained the wrong value for the tropical year because he assumed that the ancients had poor quality instruments and had erred in measuring the obliquity of the ecliptic. Streete's arithmetic is simple:  $24' = 1^\circ \cdot \sin(23^\circ 30')$  and therefore, a 24' error in inclination leads to 1° error in longitude (see Fig. 7).



**Fig. 7. Reconstruction of Streete's argument about Timocharis's observations**

The same logic implies that the 21' 20" error in inclination made by Timocharis (or Eratosthenes) led him to the 53.25' error in the longitude of Spica. Divided by 1900 years that had passed between Timocharis and Streete, this gives about 1.7" per year, which must be subtracted from the initial value for annual precession, 50", and makes the tropical year about 36s longer.

Streete was partially right: the Greeks, including Hipparchus, erred – but not as much as 24"! At worst, the maximum error was 8'40", as we showed above. This would lead to a 2.5 times smaller error, 0.7" for annual precession, if counted from Hipparchus' observations. This, in turn, leads to 16s difference in the tropical year.

## 5. Nutation

Another, comparatively short, 18-year-periodic variation of the obliquity of the ecliptic is due to the so-called *nutation* of the Earth's axis. It amounts to about 0.5" per year.<sup>50</sup> In Newton's time nutation was not yet a technical term; its introduction is generally attributed to James Bradley, in c. 1743.

The word itself appeared in a letter from Flamsteed to Newton dated June-July 1700. Flamsteed writes:

That the Earths Axis is not always inclined at the same Angle to the plane of the Ecliptik is a discovery wholly oweing to you and strongly proved in the 4<sup>th</sup> book of your Prin. Phil. Nat. Math. How much the alteration of this Angle or the Nutation of the Axis ought to be you have not yet shewed: and whether you have yet determined or no I know not.<sup>51</sup>

The difficulty with this statement is that Newton never pretended to know about nutation. The word ‘nutation’ comes from the Latin verb ‘nutare’ which means ‘to nod with your head.’ Newton uses twice that word, or rather the verb, in all three editions of *Principia*.<sup>52</sup> There he is referring to a very small, almost unnoticeable ‘nod’ of the Earth’s axis twice a year, because of the effect of the Sun. Newton did not associate nutation with the Moon. Analytical proof of nutation’s existence, based on Newton’s theory of gravitation, was demonstrated by d’Alambert in 1749.

Though there is strong indication that Flamsteed’s letter was never sent off, there is indication that part of it became known to Newton – a unique pair of corrections for the sun’s position (-10" and -20") that Flamsteed proposed in his letter appears both in Yahuda 24 D and in Newton’s unpublished manuscript at Cambridge.<sup>53</sup>

It is difficult to claim that the Astronomer Royal proved the empirical existence of nutation. From analysis of his 1700 letter it seems that Flamsteed observed this phenomena only for half a cycle, from 1689 till 1700, attributing -10" or -20" corrections in sun’s longitude to his 1681 tables due to errors in measurements. It seems he did not recognize its 18 year cycle, but nutation could confuse him about the length of the tropical year as well. So in time, when Newton used statistics to find the correct tropical year, Flamsteed searched for the reason behind the uncertainty.

## **6. Ptolemy’s Observations**

Thomas Streete emphasized another problem encountered by seventeenth century astronomers: they tried to compare their observations with those of the Greeks before Ptolemy – but only those they believed *likely* to be true.

Fortunately, Newton did not use Ptolemy's own 'observations,' thus avoiding a trap that caught many astronomers before him, especially those who tried to deduce the tropical year by comparing their equinox observations with those of Ptolemy. The major *loser* was al-Battani, who missed an opportunity to hit the Guinness Book of World Records by reporting the length of the year as 2.5 minutes less than the true one, due to the comparison of his 18 September 882 AD equinox observation, precise within one hour, with Ptolemy's fallacious 25 September 139 AD observation, misplaced by about 28 hours.<sup>54</sup>

Robert Newton popularized the idea that Jean-Baptiste-Joseph Delambre was the first, c. 1817-19, to notice a fallacy in Ptolemy's equinox observations. Delambre had not only discarded them as untrue, but could have been the first to prove that Ptolemy corrected the data to confirm his own model.<sup>55</sup>

According to Herbert Prinz (private communication), neither Delambre nor Robert Newton found anything new. In a letter to Euler written in 1753, J.T. Mayer had presented this fabrication theory more succinctly and no less convincingly than Robert Newton.<sup>56</sup> This is certainly true with respect to Mayer's analysis of Ptolemy's equinoxes. However, R. Newton still holds priority in discovering fallacies in Ptolemy's lunar observations.

In our earlier paper, we conjectured that it was John Wallis who called Newton's attention to Ptolemy's observations.<sup>57</sup> Simon Cassidy (private communication) confirmed this guess, suggesting that Wallis could have learned this from Thomas Harriot's (1560-1621) work. Harriot calculated an "annus solaris" from Hipparchus' equinox observations (combined with Brahe's solar observations of the 1580s) and also ignored Ptolemy's supposed equinox observations.<sup>58</sup> Since Wallis was a promoter of Harriot's works, he should have been aware of this fact.

It would be interesting to trace the chain of people through history who have disbelieved Ptolemy. Tycho Brahe could be the first link in that chain.

## Epilogue.

We reiterate that Newton used an “embrionic” linear regression analysis – not only did he perform the averaging of a set of data, like Mayer later did, but he also distinguished between two inhomogenous sets of data and might even have thought of an optimal solution in terms of bias and effectiveness.

## Acknowledgements

Conversations with Herbert Prinz about J. T. Mayer and with Simon Cassidy about T. Harriot are acknowledged. Dennis Duke (Florida University) made available to us the books of the seventeenth century British astronomers. Joan Griffith (Annapolis, MD) looked at the style of the paper.

---

<sup>1</sup> S.M. Stigler. *The History of Statistics. The measurement of uncertainty before 1900*. Cambridge, MA and London, England: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 1986, pp. 16-25.

<sup>2</sup> A. Belenkiy and E. Vila Echagüe. “History of one defeat: Reform of the Julian calendar as envisaged by Isaac Newton.” *Notes & Records Roy. Soc.* **59** (3), Sept. 2005, pp. 223-254.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Annales de L’Observatoire de Bruxelles*, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Astrophysics Data System <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/full/seri/AnOBN/0001/0000230.000.html>. It must be used with care, however. Thomas Streete’s value (48min 8s) could be wrong – the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition of *Astronomia Carolina* (1709) gives 365 d 5h 49min and 1s. We did not find in the first edition (1687) of *Principia* any support for the value ascribed to John Flamsteed (48min 57.6s), but this is exactly the value that Newton used for his 1702 *Theory of the Moon’s Motion*. See N. Kollerstrom, *Newton’s 1702 Theory of the Moon’s Motion. A Computer Simulation*. <<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/sts/nk/newt-tmm/1702nwtm.zip>>.

<sup>4</sup> The value attributed to Halley (48min 34.5s) seems plausible before 1700, but not afterward.

<sup>5</sup> The Horroxian value of 365d 5h and 49min we deduced by us from Kollerstrom, “Flamsteed’s 1681 Horroxian Lunar Theory. A Computer Simulation.” <<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/sts/nk/zip/flam1.zip>>.

<sup>6</sup> Book 1, Cor. 20, Prop. LXVI.

<sup>7</sup> “Whereas Flamsteed and Halley were content with an apparent instrumental limit of 5 seconds of arc in their observations, Bradley succeeded in reading-off intervals of 1 second of arc.” Henry C. King, *The History of the Telescope*, Dover, 1979, p. 113.

<sup>8</sup> The refraction of light near the horizon was discussed by Newton and Flamsteed in extensive letter exchange in late 1694. *The Correspondence of Isaac Newton*, vol. IV, 1694-1709, edited by J.F. Scott. Cambridge Univ. Press 1967, pp. 28 and 49.

<sup>9</sup> We compared the time of the 1681 vernal and autumnal equinoxes from Kollerstrom's spreadsheet for Flamsteed and with modern formulas (Pierre Bretagnon and Jean-Louis Simon, *Planetary Programs and Tables from -4000 to +2800*. Willmann-Bell Inc., 1986.) The results are expressed in Gregorian

---

dates, Universal Time: Vernal equinox: Flamsteed: 19 Mar 1681, 23h 35min, Modern: 20 Mar 1681, 0h 0min. Autumnal equinox: Flamsteed: 22 Sep 1681 12h 09min, Modern: 22 Sep 1681, 12h 02min. (Delta T for 1681 was only 1 second.) The differences are 25 min and 7 min, correspondingly.

<sup>10</sup> We are grateful to Dennis Duke for generous supply of seventeenth century astronomy books.

<sup>11</sup> J.R. Harrison. *The Library of Isaac Newton*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1978, [#1357].

<sup>12</sup> Ptolemy's *Almagest*. Transl. and annotated by G.J. Toomer. Princeton Univ. Press, 1998, pp. 133-4.

<sup>13</sup> C. W. Allen, *Astrophysical Quantities*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Athlone Press, University of London 1973, p. 19.

<sup>14</sup> Galileo and Kepler seemed to intuit, though not actually grasp, this property. See Giora Hon, "Putting error to historical work: Error as tell-tale in the work of Kepler and Galileo." *Centaurus* 2004 (46), pp. 58-81.

<sup>15</sup> Ramanathan, *Introductory Econometrics*, p. 79, equation (3.2).

<sup>16</sup> See historical details in Stigler, *The History of Statistics*, pp. 11-15 and 139-146.

<sup>17</sup> The title has quite a history. The following account is from John Aldrich's article in Wikipedia. For some years previously, the term "Markoff theorem" had been in use. It was popularized by J. Neyman, who believed that this Russian contribution had been overlooked in the West – see his "On the Two Different Aspects of the Representative Method" (*Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, **97**, (1934), 558-625). The theorem is in chapter 7 of Markov's book, *Probability Theory*, translated into German as [\*Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung\*](#) (1912). However, R.L. Plackett (*Biometrika*, **36**, (1949), 149-157) pointed out that Markov had done no more than Gauss nearly a century before in his [\*Theoria combinationis observationum erroribus minimis obnoxiae\*](#) (*Theory of the combination of observations least subject to error*) (1821/3). (In the nineteenth century, the theorem was often referred to as "Gauss's second proof of the method of least squares" – the "first" being a Bayesian argument Gauss published in 1809 based on normal distribution.) Following Plackett, a few authors adopted the expression "Gauss theorem" but "Markov" was well entrenched and the compromise "Gauss-Markov theorem" has become standard.

<sup>18</sup> See, e.g., R. Ramanathan, *Introductory Econometrics with Applications*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed., South-Western, Thompson Learning, Mason OH, 2002, pp. 80-90.

<sup>19</sup> Ramanathan, *Introductory Econometrics*, pp. 290-303.

<sup>20</sup> *Position*'s coefficient was expected to be near 6 but its dispersion is too great for three cases: 4.1, 1.6 and 8 hours – which points to a poor stability of the method due to a small size of the sample.

<sup>21</sup> Newton made a mistake here. The correct value is 1h 59.5min. When adding up all the values to compute the average, instead of subtracting 5h 16min for year 162 BC, he subtracted 5 hours but added 16 minutes. The 32-min difference, divided by 6, leads to the 5-min difference in the average.

<sup>22</sup> Ramanathan, *Introductory Econometrics*, p. 81, equations (3.4) and (3.5). Newton did not find the second equation – actually, it would be superfluous here since he has only one free parameter,  $\beta$ .

<sup>23</sup> Here Newton made another mistake. Computing the Greenwich time for the 143 BC equinox, he added 3h 15min instead of 2h 15min. This slip of pen did not influence any conclusions.

<sup>24</sup> In truth, he could not have computed an "average of the years," since it would lead to a fraction.

<sup>25</sup> These two corrections also appeared in several Newton's manuscripts written in early 1700, see "History of one defeat," *Discussion* section and notes 34, 62, 63 there.

<sup>26</sup> See "History of one reform," note 29.

<sup>27</sup> R.R. Newton, *Crime of Claudius Ptolemy*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins Univ., 1978, chapter 5.2, made the claim that the ancient Greek observations, by Hipparchus in particular, have a standard deviation of 7½ hours!

<sup>28</sup> "History of One Defeat", note 29, and Ramanathan, *op. cit.*, pp. 123-24.

<sup>29</sup> Remember – he computed backwards.

<sup>30</sup> Newton's computation was a bit more involved (see the upper right part of Image 3 in Appendix 2). He first approximated  $3'39\frac{1}{4}"$  to  $220"$ , and then expressed the correction as  $220" \cdot 24(s"/) / 1850 \text{ y}$ . Then he divided the numerator and denominator by 110, to obtain:  $48s / 16 \frac{9}{11} \text{ y}$ , which he further approximated to 3s.

<sup>31</sup> *Ptolemy's Almagest, op. cit.*, p. 133, n.8.

<sup>32</sup> Stigler, *The History of Statistics.*, p. 16.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> R. Newton, *Crime*, p. 83.

<sup>35</sup> *Ptolemy's Almagest, op. cit.*, p. 134.

<sup>36</sup> J. Kepler, *Optics*. Paralipomena to Witelo and Optical Part of Astronomy. Tr. by W. H. Donahue. Green Lion Press, Santa Fe, New Mexico 2000, p. 157-8.

<sup>37</sup> R. Newton, *Crime*, pp. 99-100. The average daily change in altitude for a season is  $23^{\circ}30' / 93 = \frac{1}{4}^{\circ}$ , but the changes are not uniform – the sun moves faster near the equinoxes.

<sup>38</sup> See J. Meeus., *Astronomical Algorithms*, Richmond, Va: Willmann-Bell, Inc, 1991, pp. 135-6. Inclination of Earth's axis of rotation was a maximum ( $24^{\circ}14'07"$ ) c. 7530 BC and minimum ( $22^{\circ}36'41"$ ) at c. 12030 AD.

<sup>39</sup> Modern estimate for 135 BC, year of Hipparchus' observation of a summer solstice.

<sup>40</sup> This is precision that R. Newton, *Crime*, p. 89, assigned to Ptolemy's quadrant.

<sup>41</sup> Thabit ben Qurra. 'On the Solar Year,' transl. and com. by O. Neugebauer. *Proc. Amer. Phil. Soc.* 106 (3), June 1962, pp. 264-89.

<sup>42</sup> Hartner W. and Schramm M., "Al-Biruni and the Theory of the Solar Apogee" in: *Scientific Change*. Edited by A. C. Crombie. Heinemann, London, 1961.

<sup>43</sup> This is the reason for introducing the anomalistic year vs. sidereal year, with 4 minutes difference.

<sup>44</sup> "Orbium Aphelia et Nodi quiescunt". *Principia Mathematica*, Book 3, Proposition XIV, Theorem XIV, all editions.

<sup>45</sup> See Kepler. *Epitome Astronomiae Copernicanae*, Liber VI, in *Johanni Kepleri Opera Omnia*, Vol. VI, p. 434, Ch. Frisch, Frankfurt 1866.

<sup>46</sup> Wilson, C. "Predictive Astronomy in the Century after Kepler," *General History of Astronomy* (Cambridge, 1989), vol. 2A, p. 192: in 'comparing his observations between 1679 and 1690, Flamsteed found a correction of 35' for his earlier apogee's position.'



---

<sup>47</sup> We were able to consult only the 2<sup>nd</sup> (1710) edition of *Astronomia Carolina* (p. 44), which is declared to be ‘corrected’ compared with the 1<sup>st</sup> (1661). We changed ‘Æ’ for ‘E’ in all places.

<sup>48</sup> Likely of Omar Khayam.

<sup>49</sup> *Astronomia Carolina*, p. 44. We placed 48” instead of the incorrect 41” – as Isaac Newton did when he dog-eared Streeet’s book. See remark in Harrison, *Library*, pp. 245-6.

<sup>50</sup> See Meeus, *op.cit.*, pp. 131-35.

<sup>51</sup> *The Correspondence of John Flamsteed, the First Astronomer Royal*, vol. 2. Compiled and edited by L. Murdin and F. Willmoth. Bristol and Philadelphia: Institute of Physics Publishing 1997, p. 829.

<sup>52</sup> Proposition XXI, Theorem XVIII of Book III.

<sup>53</sup> Called by us MSS “U” in “History of One Defeat.” See note 22 above.

<sup>54</sup> See Al-Battānī, Muhammad ibn Dschabir. *Opus Astronomicum*. Transl. and comment. by C.A. Nallino. Georg Olms Verlag: Hildesheim-NY 1977 (in Latin), pp. 209-210. Not accidentally, Halley was keenly interested in al-Battani’s work and methods, see *ibid*. Halley published a paper in *Phil Trans*, 17 (1691-3), 913, with corrections of the solar and lunar positions found in the Latin translation of al-Battani by Plato of Tivoli.

<sup>55</sup> R. Newton, *Crime*, p. 93.

<sup>56</sup> It had appeared in English in 1971 in E.G. Forbes, *The Euler-Mayer Correspondence*. That is, six years before Robert Newton published his *Crime* in 1977. The subtitle of the collection is “A new perspective on eighteenth-century advances in the lunar theory” and, indeed, lunar theory is what the letters are about. The one in question was in response to an idea of Euler’s that the ether could act as a brake on the planets, with the inevitable mechanical consequences. Mayer died young, at age 42, and this could be the reason his observations were not published in due time. (All information is courtesy of Herbert Prinz.)

<sup>57</sup> “History of one defeat”, note 28.

<sup>58</sup> BM MS ADD. 6788 – Thomas Harriot, *Mathematical Papers* . Folios 438, 440 etc.

Appendix 1. Yahuda MS 24 D

Dies respective		Observations		Hipparchian	
Anno				Temp. apper	Temp. m. i
Periodi 3	Ante	Alexandria		yranoici	yranoia
Salippi	Consta				-11
17	162	Sept 27 sub occas. ☉	27. 3. 44		
20	159	Sept 27 sub ort. ☉	26. 15. 44		
21	158	Sept 27 in ips. merid.	26. 21. 44		
32	147	Sept. 26 media nocte	26. 9. 44		
33	146	Sept 27 mane	26. 19. 44		
33	146	Mar 24 mane et ibid.	23. 15. 44		
		kara diei gla	23. 20. 44		
36	143	Sept. 26 vesp.	26. 3. 44		
43	135	Mar 23 circa med. nocte	23. 9. 44		
49	128	Mar 23 sub occas. ☉	23. 3. 44		

Image 1: The set of ten Hipparchian equinoxes as described by Ptolemy.

		26. 9. 14	26. 8. 29	Temp. apper Alexandria	Temp. apper yranoia	Temp. apper yranoia
162	Sept. 27. 00. 44	27. 00. 0	-0. 5. 16	27. 8. 5	26. 22. 39	26. 20. 24
159	Sept 26. 18. 44	26. 18. 0	+0. 11	26. 20. 5	26. 16. 6	26. 13. 51
158	Sept. 27. 00. 00	27. 00. 0	+0. 00	27. 2. 5	26. 21. 55	26. 19. 40
147	Sept. 26. 15. 59	26. 12. 0	+3. 59	26. 14. 5	26. 13. 54	26. 11. 39
146	Sept. 26. 21. 48	26. 18. 0	+3. 48	26. 20. 5	26. 19. 43	26. 17. 28
143	Sept. 26. 15. 15	26. 00. 0	+9. 15	26. 8. 5	26. 13. 10	26. 9. 55
135	Mar 23. 20. 1	23. 20. 30	+12. 29 (2. 5)		23. 20. 36	23. 18. 21
			-0. 24			
128	Mar 23. 12. 0	23. 12. 0	-0. 0		23. 12. 35	23. 10. 20
			-1. 17			
			31-1. 46 (35 1/2)		23. 5. 18	23. 3. 3

Image 2: The same set of ten equinoxes (“raw data”) arranged below Image 1, in the 2<sup>nd</sup> column. In the 1<sup>st</sup> column two “regression lines”: Sept 27, 158 BC and March 23, 135 BC chosen as two anchor equinoxes and time of the rest of the equinoxes is computed assuming Horroxxian year (365d 5h 49min) is correct. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> column: “residuals” between the “raw data” and “regression lines” and their sum: 12h 29min for autumnal set, -1h 46min for vernal set; the average residuals are 2h 5min and -35min 40s, respectively. The 4<sup>th</sup> column is crossed out. In the 5<sup>th</sup> column two new regression lines: shift of the time of the autumnal set from the 1<sup>st</sup> column down by 2h 5min and vernal set up by 35min 40s. In the 6<sup>th</sup> column: shift of all times from Alexandrian local time to Greenwich local time.

$\begin{array}{r} 11.29.45.40 \text{ An. con.} \\ 59.8 \\ \hline 00.00.44.48 \text{ An. Bill.} \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} -160. 9. 6. 43. 15. \\ + 14. 11. 29. 36. 45. \\ \hline \text{Mar 23. 2. 20. 49. 23} \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} 2. 11. 53. 20 \\ 11. 40 \\ \hline 2. 12. 5. 11 \\ \hline \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{r} 1 \quad 9. 7. 55. 51 \\ -100 - 0. 0. 49. 10 \\ -60 \quad 27. 6 \\ \hline 0. 1. 12. 16 \\ 9. 6. 43. 35 \\ \hline 9. 6. 43. 15 \\ + 2 \quad 11. 29. 31. 20 \\ \hline \text{met md} \quad 9. 6. 14. 35 \\ \hline \text{sep 25} \quad 8. 25. 8. 20 \\ 19 \quad +0. 49 \\ 17 \quad 1. 38 \\ \hline \text{met md} \quad 6. 2. 11. 22 \\ \text{Anom md} \quad 3. 20. 15. 45 \\ \hline -7. 14 \text{ sept} \\ \text{met md} \quad 0. 2. 11. 4 \\ \text{Anom.} \quad 3. 20. 15. 27 \\ \hline \text{Eq. center} \quad -1. 49. 55 \\ \hline \text{O} \quad 0. 0. 21. 9 \\ \hline 21. 9 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} + 35 \\ \hline 2. 13. 31. 40 \\ -1. 23. 20 \\ \hline 2. 13. 20 \\ 2. 11. 18. 20 \\ \hline 2. 11. 53. 20 \\ + 1. 40 \\ \hline 2. 11. 55. 00 \\ 2. 11. 55. 37 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} 18. 40 \\ \hline 44. 21 \\ 39. 52 \\ \hline 11. 28. 27. 36 \text{ met md} \\ 9. 16. 22. 25 \text{ Anom} \\ + 1. 50. 55 \\ \hline 00. 00. 48. 31 \text{ O} \\ \hline -160 \quad 9. 6. 43. 15 \\ + 14 \text{ an} \quad 11. 29. 36. 45 \\ \hline \text{Mar 23} \quad 2. 20. 49. 23 \\ \hline 18. 40 \\ 28. 30 \\ \hline 1. 10 \\ \hline 11. 27. 54. 54 \text{ met md} \\ 9. 15. 49. 43 \text{ Anom} \\ + 1. 51. 15. 5 \\ \hline 11. 29. 46. 9. 5 \\ \hline -13. 50. 5 \\ 7. 18. 5 \\ \hline 3. 39. 5 \end{array}$
		$\begin{array}{l} 1850) 220 \frac{1}{4} \\ \underline{160} 48 \\ \text{Anus secund} 365.54 \\ \text{Anus equinoctialis} \\ \text{Differ} 365 \frac{1}{4} - 11 \frac{1}{20} \end{array}$

**Image 3:** Correction of Horrobian year (365d 5h and 49min).

The 1<sup>st</sup> column: computation of sun's position at "average" time of Hipparchian autumnal equinox. In the first three lines computation of sun's motion for an average Julian year: 44' 48" *modulo* 360°. Belated correction -20" for mean sun's tabulated position. Finding mean sun's position in Sept 158 BC at 6sign 2° 11' 22". Subtracting solar apogee's position from the 2<sup>nd</sup> column. Belated correction -18" for the equation of time. Mean anomaly: 3sign 20° 15' 27". Equation of center: -1° 49' 55". Final position: 6sign 0° 21' 9".

The 2<sup>nd</sup> column: finding position of sun's apogee for Sept 158 BC at 2sign 11° 55' 37". Above the column: a later correction 35' for solar apogee's tabulated position.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> column: computation of sun's position at "average" time of Hipparchian vernal equinox. A double line in the middle separates the first stage with wrong equation of time from the second stage. Sun's mean position on March 146 BC: 11sign 27° 54' 54". Mean anomaly: 9sign 15° 49' 43". Equation of center: 1° 51' 15½". Final position: 11sign 29° 46' 9½" or -13° 50½". At the end, taking difference with the final result in the 1<sup>st</sup> column, arriving at 7° 18½" and dividing it by two: 3° 39¼".

The 4<sup>th</sup> column: finding the position of solar apogee for March 146 BC at 2s 12° 5' 11".

In the right-hand margin: computation of the correction of Horrobian year: 3° 39¼" is converted to 220". Multiplication by sun's inverse speed of 24"/s and division by 1850 years. Arrival at 3s and reduction of Horrobian year by 3s to 365d 5h 48m and 57s.

## Appendix 2. OLS Regression for the Set of Ten Hipparchian Equinoxes

### Regression 1

**Table 1**

Equinox	Autumnal	Year	Position
18.00	0	146	2
23.00	0	146	2
12.00	0	135	1
6.00	0	128	0
30.00	1	162	2
18.00	1	159	1
24.00	1	158	2
12.00	1	147	1
18.00	1	146	2
6.00	1	143	1

Equinox = time of Hipparchian equinoxes in hours

Autumnal = Dummy variable D which checks whether equinox is autumnal (1) or vernal (0)

Year = Julian year BC

Position = position of the year within 4-year cycle (responsible for a 6-hour jump every year)

### Results

#### 1. Coefficients in the General model (1)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-74.966	25.894		-2.895	.028
	autumnal	-6.166	3.251	-.408	-1.896	.107
	year	.609	.200	.828	3.047	.023
	position	4.163	2.295	.373	1.814	.120

a Dependent Variable: equinox

#### 2. Coefficients for Vernal equinoxes only

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-74.000	263.842		-.280	.826
	year	.625	2.073	.751	.302	.814
	position	1.625	19.152	.211	.085	.946

a Dependent Variable: equinox

### 3. Coefficients for Autumnal equinoxes only

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-99.692	16.800		-5.934	.010
	year	.692	.115	.658	6.000	.009
	position	8.077	1.700	.521	4.752	.018

a Dependent Variable: equinox

The coefficient before variable *Year* gives required coefficient  $\beta$

In all three cases  $\beta$  is close to 0.7 = 42min (while the true value must be close to 11min)

The coefficient before *Position* must be close to 6

## Regression 2

**Table 2** (One vernal equinox of 128 BC split into two: 126 and 130 BC)

Corrected Equinox	Autumnal	Corrected Year
18.00	0	146
23.00	0	146
18.00	0	134
18.00	0	130
18.00	0	126
30.00	1	162
24.00	1	158
24.00	1	158
18.00	1	146
18.00	1	146
12.00	1	142

### Coefficients (General model with D)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-40.895	17.199		-2.378	.045
	cor_year	.439	.126	1.065	3.495	.008
	autumnal	-4.850	2.792	-.529	-1.737	.121

a Dependent Variable: cor\_equi

**Coefficients (Vernal equinoxes only)**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.302	15.568		-.019	.986
	cor_year	.142	.114	.583	1.242	.302

a Dependent Variable: cor\_equi

**Coefficients (Autumnal Equinoxes only)**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-90.349	15.016		-6.017	.004
	cor_year	.733	.099	.966	7.425	.002

a Dependent Variable: cor\_equi

The coefficient before variable *Cor\_Year* gives coefficient  $\beta$

For set of vernal equinoxes:  $\beta = 8.5\text{min}$

For set of autumnal equinoxes:  $\beta = 44\text{min}$

For general model (D is present):  $\beta = 27\text{min}$