

2009

PREPRINT 371

Larrie D. Ferreiro

**The Aristotelian Heritage in Early Naval
Architecture, from the Venetian Arsenal
to the French Navy, 1500-1700**

**THE ARISTOTELIAN HERITAGE IN EARLY NAVAL
ARCHITECTURE, FROM THE VENETIAN ARSENAL TO THE
FRENCH NAVY, 1500–1700**

ABSTRACT

Naval architecture has been at the center of some of the earliest studies of rational mechanics investigated during the Scientific Revolution, but until recently has received scant attention from scholars. In particular, there has been little exploration of the Aristotelian roots of the mechanics of naval architecture. For example, several investigations of oared galley design in the Venetian Arsenal during the 1500s were derived directly from study of the Aristotelian treatise *Mechanical Problems*. This treatise, along with Aristotle's conception of buoyancy, became the basis for further work on naval architecture by Renaissance and Jesuit mathematicians during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The culmination of this Aristotelian heritage is found in the works of the French navy professor Paul Hoste who developed the first synthetic works of naval architecture at the end of the seventeenth century, just as Newtonian mechanics began its ascent towards wider acceptance.

1. INTRODUCTION

Naval architecture has played a small but strategically vital role in the development of rational mechanics, yet until lately it has received scant attention from historians. Recent works on the development of naval architecture during the Scientific Revolution have focused on its origins in Archimedes' theorems for displacement and stability.¹ Yet some of the first theoretical problems in naval architecture, systematically analyzing important mechanisms such as rowing, the action of sails and buoyancy, actually appeared more than a century earlier in the works of the school of Aristotle. When a series of Latin translations were made during the sixteenth century of the Aristotelian treatise *Mechanical Problems*, many of these concepts were analyzed and even directly employed by scientists working in the late Renaissance and the beginnings of the Scientific Revolution. By the end of the seventeenth century these theories were being applied across the full range of ship problems; but by then Archimedes' theories had begun to displace Aristotle, leading to the modern system of naval architecture.

¹ See for example: Horst Nowacki, "Archimedes and Ship Stability", in *Proceedings of the Euroconference on "Passenger Ship Design, Operation and Safety"*, edited by Apostolos Papanikolaou and Kostas Spyrou (Athens: NTU, 2001); reprinted as MPIWG Preprint 198 (Berlin, Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, 2002); and Horst Nowacki and Larrie Ferreiro, "Historical Roots of the Theory of Hydrostatic Stability of Ships", in *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on the Stability of Ships and Ocean Vehicles*, edited by Luis Pérez Rojas (Madrid: ETSIN 2003, pp. 1–30); reprinted as MPIWG Preprint 237 (Berlin, Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, 2003).

2. THE ORGINS OF ARISTOTELIAN NAVAL ARCHITECTURE IN THE *MECHANICAL PROBLEMS*, c. 300 BC– c. 15 BC

In none of the known writings of Aristotle (384 BC–322 BC) did he deal with mechanics *per se*, in the sense of the application of physical principles to machines, but rather he discussed the more general principles of causality and change. In his *Physics*, for example, Aristotle described physical change as being proportional to the “power” of an agent of change multiplied by the time of the change; but this concept was not merely applicable to mechanical elements such as a change of position, but also to changes of state (weight) or chemistry (heating).² The application of these general mathematical principles to the specific subject of mechanics was made in the short treatise *Mechanical Problems* (also called *Mechanical Questions*, *Questions of Mechanics* or *Mechanica*) apparently written after his death by a member of his Peripatetic school, circa 300 BC. Although the authorship of the work remains in dispute, it is usually described as “Aristotelian” or “pseudo-Aristotelian”.³ *Mechanical Problems* was in fact a textbook of 35 practical problems in the form of short questions followed by extensive answers, describing how specific devices or techniques allow a greater force to be overcome by a lesser one by application of the principle of the lever.⁴ Of these problems, four were

² Aristotle, *Physics*, trans. Robin Waterfield (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); VII 5, 249b7 – 250a25 at pp. 182–183; Edward Hussey, “Aristotle’s Mathematical Physics: A Reconstruction” in *Aristotle’s Physics: A Collection of Essays*, ed. Lindsay Judson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991) pp. 213–242, at pp 215–216.

³ Aristotle, *Minor Works*, trans. Walter S. Hett (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963) pp. vii–viii. A recent study by Thomas Winter argues that *Mechanical Problems* was authored by Archytas; see Thomas Nelson Winter. *The Mechanical Problems in the Corpus of Aristotle* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 2007), <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/classicsfacpub/68>, accessed March 2009.

⁴ Peter Damerow, et al., “Mechanical Knowledge and Pompeian Balances”, in *Homo Faber: Studies on Nature, Technology and Science at the Time of Pompeii*, eds. Jürgen Renn and Giuseppe Castagnetti (Rome: “L’Erma” di Bretschneider, 2002), pp. 93–108, at p. 94.

directly concerned with issues of naval architecture: two with rowing by oars; one with steering by rudder; and one with the interaction of the sail and mast.

Mechanical Problems began with a discussion of the lever, declaring that its first principle is based on the circle, on the grounds that the line of the circumference moves backwards and forwards simultaneously, thereby accounting for the movement of the opposite ends of a lever. The first three problems in the treatise establish the basic theory of the lever, derived from Aristotle's argument in *Physics* that physical change is a function of the "power of change" multiplied by the time of the change. In *Mechanical Problems*, the law of the lever was expressed as a dynamic proportion, the product of the weight and speed being equal on either side of a fulcrum (using modern algebraic formulation, force and velocity are equal: $Fv = fV$).⁵ This is in contrast to the modern, statical concept of the lever, first rigorously elucidated by Archimedes of Syracuse (*c.* 287 BC – *c.* 212 BC) in his *Equilibrium of Planes*, that the products of the force times length are equal ($Fl = fL$) on either side of a fulcrum.⁶ A comparison of the two is shown in Figure 1.

⁵ Aristotle, *Mechanical Problems* 848b – 850b (in *Minor Works*, pp. 330–355). The employment of the circle as the fundamental principle of mechanics is explored in Christiane Vilain, "Circular and Rectilinear Motion in the *Mechanica*", in *Mechanics and Natural Philosophy before the Scientific Revolution*, ed. Walter Roy Laird and Sophie Roux (Dordrecht, Springer 2008) pp. 149–172.

⁶ Archimedes and Thomas Little Heath, *The Works of Archimedes* (New York: Dover Publications, 2002), pp. 238–239.




Figure 1

Lever laws in the Aristotelian *Mechanics* and Archimedes' *Equilibrium of Planes*

This principle of the lever formed the basis for the questions discussed in *Mechanical Problems*, including the four concerned with naval architecture, as follows:⁷

4) Q: Why do the rowers in the middle of the ship (i.e., amidships) contribute the most to its movement? A: The oar acts a lever with the thole-pin (i.e., oarlock) as the fulcrum, the moving weight (the rower) is on the inside of the ship, and the moved weight (the sea) is on the outside. Since the ship is widest at the middle, more of the oar is on the inside, so the movement of the oar against the thole-pin causes the pin (and therefore the ship) to move forward the greatest distance.

5) Q: How can the rudder, which is small and at the end of the ship, move the entire vessel so easily with a short tiller and the strength of just one man? A: As with the oar, the tiller is the lever, and the rudder pushes against the sea. Because it is at the end of the ship, the rudder can move faster and thus cause the ship to turn. (There is then a further explanation of why an oar does not rotate precisely around the thole-pin, but rather at a

⁷ Aristotle, *Mechanical Problems* 850b – 851b (in *Minor Works*, pp. 355–361); Thomas Little Heath, *Mathematics in Aristotle* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949) pp. 237–239.

point further away from the rower, because the ship moves forward a greater distance than the oar moves backwards, thus displaces the fulcrum.)

6) Q: Why does a sail attached to a higher yardarm push a ship faster than if the same sail were attached to a lower yardarm? A: The base of the mast is the fulcrum, so the higher the yardarm, the more rapidly it can move for a given force.

7) Q: Why, when running before the wind, do sailors take in sail at the stern and let it out at the bow? A: More sail at the bow turns the ship away from the wind, and less sail at the stern allows the rudder push against the sea.

Thus, the mathematical mechanics of Aristotle and his followers were aimed at describing, in a qualitative sense, the laws of proportionality behind the actions of certain simple machines; for the problems in question, the proportion between force and speed across a lever.⁸ The *Mechanical Problems* became known to the Romans through the *Ten Books on Architecture* of Vitruvius (c. 80 BC – c. 15 BC) who also incorporated the naval architectural questions in his explanations of machines.⁹ It should be noted that these analyses were qualitative in nature, and did not provide measurable, quantitative explanations for the physical processes of how a ship moves under oar and sail.

⁸ Hussey, “Aristotle’s Mathematical Physics”, pp. 215–220, 240–241.

⁹ Marcus Vitruvius Pollio, *The Ten Books on Architecture*, trans. Morris H. Morgan (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914) p. 292.

3. THE VENETIAN ARSENAL AND THE APPLICATION OF *MECHANICAL PROBLEMS* TO PRACTICAL NAVAL ARCHITECTURE, 1517–1593

The rediscovery of the text of the *Mechanical Problems* at the dawn of the Scientific Revolution sparked at least two attempts within the Venetian Arsenal to directly apply its lessons to the design of oared vessels. *Mechanical Problems* appears to have been unknown to European scholars throughout the Middle Ages.¹⁰ It was included in the works of Aristotle that were typeset and published by the Venetian printer Aldus Manutius from 1495–1498, part of a renaissance of Greek learning that quickly spread through Europe.¹¹ In 1517, the Venetian scholar and humanist Vettor Fausto was the first to translate the treatise into Latin, although he did so without any commentary.¹² Fausto (1480 – c.1551) was a professor of Greek at the Scuola Grande di San Marco, which was not a school in the modern sense of the word, but more of a meeting-place for both secular and religious activities. He was one of a growing number of Venetian scholars at the beginning of the sixteenth century to examine ancient military texts in order to assist in the defense of the territory against their erstwhile Ottoman enemies. At that time, the backbone of Venice’s navy was the trireme galley, a long, light ram-bowed warship with three banks of oars, which was mass-produced at the sprawling Arsenal dockyard to the east of the main square of San Marco. During his tenure at the Scuola, Fausto had carefully examined Greek and Roman texts concerning naval warfare with oared ships, as

¹⁰ For an examination of the development of mechanics from the Middle Ages through the Renaissance, see especially Walter Roy Laird, “The Scope of Renaissance Mechanics”, *Osiris* 1986, 2/2 pp. 43–68; and his Introduction to *The Unfinished Mechanics of Giuseppe Moletti* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000) pp. 6–18.

¹¹ Stillman Drake, “The Pseudo-Aristotelian *Questions of Mechanics* in Renaissance Culture”, in his *Essays on Galileo and the History and Philosophy of Science* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000) pp. 131–169, at p. 133.

well as speaking with Venetian shipbuilders and ship masters, and mariners from many other ports who came to the great city on the Adriatic. He came to the conclusion that the Venetian trireme, which had one oarsman per oar, could be improved by adding a second rower to each of the top two banks of oars, which was a common practice in Greece after the end of the Peloponnesian wars in 404 BC. In August 1525 Fausto presented to the Senate his model of a quinquereme, a 5-oarsman-per-tier galley, which he argued would be more effective than the trireme.¹³

(It is here necessary to clarify some often-confusing terms. A *trireme*—*triere* in Greek—is generally considered to be a ship with three vertically-arranged banks of oars for every tier, or column of oars, along the side of the galley, normally with one oarsman pulling each oar. The top oarsman was seated the furthest outboard, and the bottom two were progressively further inboard. Modern research, using full-scale vessels as well as virtual prototypes, has demonstrated that three banks of oars are the maximum number that can be effectively arranged within a vertical tier. Thus, the term *quinquereme* did not refer to the number of oars but rather the number of oarsman per tier; two each on the top two tiers, and a single rower on the bottom.)¹⁴

¹² Vettor Fausto, *Aristotelis Mechanica, Victoris Fausti industria in pristinum habitum restituta ac latinitate donata* (Paris: Jodocus Badius, 1517). Fausto's first name is sometimes spelled "Vettore" or given as "Victor" or "Victoris".

¹³ The story of Vettor Fausto and his development of the quinquereme is derived from: Frederic Chapin Lane, *Venetian Ships and Shipbuilders of the Renaissance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1934; reprint New York: Arno Press, 1979), pp. 64–71; Ennio Concina, *L'Arsenale della Repubblica di Venezia*: (Milan: Electa, 1984) pp. 108–134; Concina, *Navis: L'umanesimo sul mare, 1470–1740* (Turin: Giulio Einaudi, 1990), pp. 70–90.

¹⁴ See John S. Morrison and Robert Gardiner (eds.), *The Age of the Galley: Mediterranean Oared Vessels Since Pre-Classical Times* (London: Conway Maritime Press, 2004) for a general overview of oared vessels; and John S. Morrison, John F. Coates and N. Boris Rankov, *The Athenian Trireme: the history and reconstruction of an ancient Greek warship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) for a detailed explanation of the construction and mechanics of rowing multi-tiered oared vessels.

Fausto was not a shipbuilder, so there was naturally a considerable uneasiness within the Senate to spend the money and manpower on building a full-sized version of his model, which would be both longer and wider than a standard trireme. However, since the only unknown was his proposed arrangement of oarsmen, they voted him funds to build a land-based model of his concept. When this showed that the oarsmen could row together reasonably well, he was voted additional funds for material and allowed the use of an Arsenal dock to build a full-sized quinquereme, which was completed in April 1529. It won a race against a lighter trireme, though it was harder to maneuver. The concept was not immediately accepted, but over the course of several decades the Arsenal built a number of quinqueremes, which continued to be in service for the next forty years. Indeed, a Fausto quinquereme was originally the flagship of Marcantonio Colonna, the Italian admiral who later fought at the battle of Lepanto, before it was struck by lightning and burned in October 1570 (a year before the battle) at Kotor in modern-day Montenegro.¹⁵

The link between Fausto's quinquereme and his translation of *Mechanical Problems* is at best conjectural, but there is enough evidence to plausibly infer that he was at least inspired by the ancient work to re-imagine how a galley could be improved. Problem 4, it will be recalled, asked: "Why do the rowers in the middle of the ship contribute the most to its movement?" The answer, according to the author who undoubtedly saw many war

¹⁵ Niccolò Capponi, *Victory of the West: The Great Christian-Muslim Clash at the Battle of Lepanto* (Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, 2007), pp. 147, 152. A letter in the Florence archives from Cosimo Bartoli, Venice ambassador to Florence, dated 15 June 1570, noted that Colonna's quinquereme had been

galleys, was that since the ship was wider amidships, more of the oar was inside the ship. (It is here necessary to point out that the all the oars of a Greek galley were of about equal length and arranged to form a straight line outside the ship, so the oars at amidships were longer inboard than the ones at the narrower bow and stern.)¹⁶ The “lever law” here assumes that the paddle entering the sea is fixed, so the fulcrum (thole-pin) moves forward, pushing the ship forward. Fausto’s insight was to connect this law with the ancient use of multiple oarsmen on each oar, which would be achievable by lengthening the inboard reach of the oars, requiring a widening of the ship overall. In other words, the benefit from using the *Mechanical Problems* was in the arrangement of oarsmen to provide the greatest mechanical advantage on each oar, rather than depending solely on the greater number of oarsmen. Fausto did not state any of this explicitly in his proposal to the Senate, but late in his life he remarked that “having taken on the text of *Mechanical Problems* for translation... it had enriched the design of every splendid machine”. A contemporary of Fausto, Alessandro Zorzi, wrote some thirty years after Fausto’s death that “the thing does not consist in the number of people, but rather how much of the oar is within the galley, and how easy it is to row that oar; for as much as the inside and outside of the oar are the same length from the fulcrum, the easier it will be to lever the largest weight.”¹⁷

In 1545, after two decades of working on his quinquereme and other projects, Fausto had begun revising his translation of *Mechanical Problems* with additional commentary based

built by Fausto some thirty years earlier, but had never before been in the water (cited by Alberto Guglielmotti in *Marcantonio Colonna alla battaglia di Lepanto* (Florence: Felice Le Monnier, 1862) p. 25)

¹⁶ Morrison et al., *The Athenian Trireme*, pp. 137–138.

¹⁷ Concina, *Navis*, pp. 80–81, 166.

on his experiences, and including drawings of various inventions. Colleagues who viewed this now-lost manuscript asserted that it would have contributed greatly to the architectural discipline; however, he died before he could complete it.¹⁸

The Venetian Arsenal was also the site of a second attempt to directly apply Aristotelian mechanics to naval architecture, though with quite different results. The great Italian mathematician and astronomer Galileo Galilei (1564–1642) had settled in Venice in 1592, and was immediately fascinated by the workings of the great shipyard. The admiration was mutual, for soon after his arrival, one of the Commissioners of the Arsenal, Giacomo Contarini (1536–1595), wrote him asking for advice on the placement of oars in a galley. Contarini was no mere bureaucrat; a skilled observer, he had carefully documented the manner of laying out and constructing galleys in two manuscripts that circulated widely within the Arsenal.¹⁹ Contarini and his Venetian colleagues were, at the time, attempting to build a more maneuverable fleet after the great victory at Lepanto in 1571, in order to meet the renascent threat from the Ottoman Empire. Contarini's question concerning the optimal position of oars and rowers for propulsion and maneuverability caused Galileo to reflect upon the *Mechanical Problems*, in much the way Fausto had done long before his birth. But his reading of the work led him to a completely opposite conclusion: instead of placing more of the oar inside the vessel, as Fausto evidently did, Galileo wrote back to Contarini suggesting that the inboard reach, where the rowers sit, should be as *short* as possible, in order to move the vessel with

¹⁸ Enino Concina, "Humanism on the Sea", in *Mediterranean Cities: Historical Perspectives*, ed. Irad Malkin and Robert L. Hohlfelder (Towata, NJ: Frank Cass, 1988), pp. 159–165, at p. 162.

¹⁹ Giacomo Contarini, *Arte de far Vasselli*, ca. 1590 and *Del fabricar galere*, 1592; Archivio Di Stato Di Venezia: Archivio proprio Contarini b.19 and b.25.

greater force. Harkening back to Figure 1, Galileo was insisting that Aristotle's lever law, $Fv = fV$, applies in this case, corresponding to a ship moving across a solid surface with the oars acting as stilts; the force applied to a shorter inboard reach translates to a faster movement of the oar blade through the water.

Contarini's response to Galileo, written just a few days later, made it clear that the scientist had not given careful thought to the practical aspects of Aristotelian mechanics, and in fact this letter seems to have provided Galileo a catalyst for a complete reexamination of the subject. The length and position of the oars have to be balanced, Contarini explained, not only with regard to the limited human force of the rowers, but also due to the structural limits of the oars themselves. A much longer oar on the outside would break under the loading; and for it to be structurally resistant, the thickness would have to increase so much that an oarsmen would no longer be able to move it. This response by Contarini caused Galileo to reconsider his conception of mechanics and begin examining the strength of materials. The results of this research would only be published in his famous *Two New Sciences* some forty years later, where he complimented the Arsenal workers on their expertise and analysis in the field of mechanics.²⁰

²⁰ For an examination of the correspondence between Galileo and Contarini on the position of oars and Galileo's subsequent foray into the strength of materials, see Jürgen Renn and Matteo Valleriani, *Galileo and the Challenge of the Arsenal* (Berlin: Max Planck Institute for the History of Science Preprint 179, 2001; reprinted in *Nuncius*, XVI/ 2, 2001, pp. 481–503). For other Aristotelian influences on Galilean mechanics, see William A. Wallace, *Galileo, the Jesuits and the Medieval Aristotle* (Brookfield, VT: Variorum, 1991) pp. 368–378.

4. FURTHER ANALYSIS OF *MECHANICAL PROBLEMS* IN LATE RENAISSANCE MECHANICS, 1531–1669

About the time Fausto was building his quinqueremes in Venice, a Portuguese mathematician named Pedro Nunes (1502–1578) was reinterpreting Aristotle’s works. As a young professor and cosmographer at the University of Lisbon, he was principally concerned with navigation, which at the time incorporated aspects of shipbuilding and maneuver. Around 1531 he began using Fausto’s translation of *Mechanical Problems* in his teachings, but quickly found flaws in the assumptions related to the oar problems. Specifically, Nunes argued that the rowing motion involved not one but two types of motion: the linear one of the ship, assumed by the original author; but also, overlaid on that, the circular motion of the oar around the thole-pin. Using a series of geometrical arguments, Nunes refuted the assertion made in *Mechanical Problems* that the thole-pin acts as the fulcrum of the lever, which according to its author enabled the ship to move further forward than the oar blade moves backward; rather, he stated, the blade of the oar in the water is the actual pivot point (note that Nunes’ assertion is actually fairly close to modern theories of rowing).²¹ Although justifiably proud of his rigorous analysis, he did not publish his findings until thirty years later in 1566. Nunes’ results were reproduced almost integrally by Henri de Monantheuil (1536–1606) in his own 1599 commentary on

²¹ Pedro Nunes, “In Problema mechanicum Aristotelis de motu nauigii ex remis Annotatio una”, in *Petri Nonii Salaciensis Opera* (Basil: Ex Officina Henricpetrina, 1566). Nunes’ work is extensively analyzed by Henrique de Sousa Leitão in *O Comentário de Pedro Nunes à Navegação a Remos* (Lisbon: Edições Culturais da Marinha, 2002) and “Pedro Nunes and the Aristotlean Mechanical Problems”, in *Petri Nonii Salaciensis Opera: Proceedings of the International Conference Lisbon-Coimbra 24–25 May 2002*, ed. Luís Trabucho de Campos, Henrique de Sousa Leitão and João Filipe Querió (Lisbon: Universidad de Lisboa, 2003) pp. 141–182.

Aristotle, and in 1615 by Giuseppe Biancani (1566–1624) in his *Aristotelis loca mathematica*.²²

The Italian mathematician and writer Bernardino Baldi (1553–1617) was the next to elaborate on *Mechanical Problems*, beginning his commentary in the 1580s, though it was only published posthumously in 1621. Using different geometrical principles, Baldi also argued – as did Nunes – that the blade within the ocean is the fulcrum of the oar, not the thole-pin. He then spent a considerable amount of time on Question 5 regarding the action of the rudder. He apparently performed an experiment using a pontoon fixed by a rope in a flowing river, in order to determine the course a ship would take when the rudder was put over. He then analyzed Question 6 (regarding the height of the mast), arguing that it is the same type of fulcrum as a claw-hammer; the higher the mast, the more it pulls the stern up and the faster the ship goes. Baldi argued that constructors cleverly place the mast forward of amidships in order to give it a greater lever arm, so as to drive the ship faster.²³

In 1627, the Italian theologian Giovanni di Guevara (1561–1641), a friend of Galileo, published one of the most thorough commentaries on *Mechanical Problems*, in which he argued that mechanics was less a natural philosophy than an man-made one, and was

²² Henri de Monantheuil, *Aristotelis Mechanica* (Paris: Ieremiam Perier, 1599) pp. 82–90; Giuseppe Biancani, *Aristotelis loca mathematica ex universes ipsius operibus collecta et explicate* (Bologna: Bartholomaeum Cochium, 1615) pp. 159–168. Biancani actually copied Nunes' results verbatim, stating that the Portuguese mathematician had developed the “finest, most accurate and most meritorious” explanation of the Aristotelian problems (p. 162).

²³ Bernardino Baldi, *In mechanica Aristotelis problemata exercitationes* (Mainz: Viduae Ioannis Albini, 1621) pp. 60–76. Baldi's work is analyzed by Ludwig Rank in *Die Theorie des Segelns in ihrer Entwicklung: Geschichte eines Problems der nautischen Mechanik* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1984) pp. 33–35.

therefore a fundamentally mathematical discipline.²⁴ He extensively covered the problems of naval architecture in 30 dense and well-illustrated pages, explicitly basing his analysis on the works of Nunes and Baldi. Of particular interest is Guevara's analysis of Question 7, on the effect of the forward and after parts of the sail on the ship's maneuvering. In Guevara's view, a lateen sail (a triangular sail with the highest part aft of the mast) would tend to billow out before the wind, causing a change in the angle of incidence to the wind between the forward part and the after part of the sail. Guevara argued that the after part of the sail would, like an open bag, capture more wind (in modern terms, the pressure point of the sail moves aft), thereby interfering more with the rudder; hence sailors will take in the after part of the sail first to improve maneuverability.²⁵ The "wind bag" model of the sail was further extended by the Jesuit mathematician Honoré Fabri (1607–1688), in his monumental *Physica* published in 1669. Fabri, drawing on the analysis of Guevara, argued that a sail transfers its energy to the ship because it is pliable and holds the wind; if it were flat then the wind would bounce off it. For the sails to hold the wind, however, they must be porous like a bird's wing, which he assumed let air through the feathers in order to fly.²⁶

²⁴ Giovanni di Guevara, *In Aristotelis mechanicas commentarii: una cum additionibus quibusdam ab eandem materiam pertinentibus* (Rome: Mascardus, 1627) p. 5.

²⁵ *ibid.*, pp. 90–129. Guevara's work is analyzed by Rank in *Die Theorie des Segelns*, pp. 72–75.

²⁶ Honoré Fabri, *Physica, id est, scientia rerum corporearum*, 4 vol. (Lyon: Laurent Anisson, 1669) vol. 3 pp. 471–472. Fabri's work is analyzed by Rank in *Die Theorie des Segelns* pp. 74–76. This "wind bag" model of the sail was further expanded by Johann and Jakob Bernoulli in the 1690s, and in the mid-1700s by Leonhard Euler; the model remained current through the early 1900s, when aerodynamic theory became systematically applied to sail design (see Julián Simón Calero, *The Genesis of Fluid Mechanics, 1640–1780* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2008) pp. 254–264).

5. ARISTOTLE AND THE PROBLEM OF BUOYANCY IN LATE RENAISSANCE AND JESUIT MECHANICS, 1611–1673

Although *Mechanical Problems* proved to be the principal focus for the efforts of natural philosophers examining naval architecture during the late Renaissance and early part of the Scientific Revolution, they also wrestled with another “maritime” aspect of the Aristotelian corpus that was at odds with observed facts; the problem of buoyancy, specifically the rationale for why a solid body floats in water. Aristotle had argued that the properties of floating and sinking were due to the relative weight of the material in each medium, as well as the shape of the body. In *De Caelo (On the Heavens)*, he extensively discussed the concepts of lightness and heaviness of objects; and in a final chapter, he briefly stated the reasons why an object floats upon water:

In air, for instance, a talent’s weight of wood [about 26 kg] is heavier than a mina of lead [about 0.4 kg] but in water the wood is lighter... the reason why broad things keep their place is because they cover so wide a surface and the greater quantity is less easily disrupted. Bodies of the opposite shape sink down because they occupy so little of the surface, which is therefore easily parted.²⁷

In conflict with Aristotle’s explanation was the principle developed by Archimedes: an object will float if it displaces a volume of water equal to or greater than its weight. Although many scientists—and even some shipbuilders—had long since adopted Archimedes’ model, the debate between these two theories was still so contentious that in

the year 1611 Galileo found himself refuting Aristotle's "shape theory" in favor of a more Archimedean explanation involving the density of floating bodies, over the course of a now-famous three-day discussion of the matter which he recorded in *Discourse on Floating Bodies* (1612).²⁸

This discourse, along with the well-known elucidations of Archimedes' hydrostatic principles by Simon Stevin and Blaise Pascal, helped to fundamentally shift scientific sentiment away from Aristotle and towards Archimedes during the mid-seventeenth century.²⁹ However, Aristotle still held sway in the philosophy of the Jesuit academies, which were arguably the most influential educational system in Europe at the time. The Jesuit curriculum outlined in the *Ratio Studiorum*, the plan of studies employed by its network of schools across Europe and around the world, leaned heavily on Aristotelian writings in the fields of mathematics and mechanics, including *Physics*, *De Caelo* and *Mechanical Problems*. The study of mechanics as a "mixed science" (i.e., combining principles of both "pure" mathematics and "practical" physics") included collisions, fluids, hydrostatics and the motion of bodies in resisting media, all of which found a home in the nascent field of naval architecture.

²⁷ Aristotle, *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, ed. Jonathan Barnes (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 312–313a, at pp. 402–405.

²⁸ See Stillman Drake, *Cause, Experiment and Science: A Galilean Dialogue Incorporating a New English Translation of Galileo's "Bodies That Stay atop Water, or Move in It"* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981); and Paolo Palmieri, "The Cognitive Development of Galileo's Theory of Buoyancy", *Archive for the History of Exact Sciences* 59 (2005), pp. 189–222.

²⁹ Simon Stevin, *Beghinselen des Waterwichts* (Leyden: C. Plantijn, 1586) and Blaise Pascal, *Traité de l'équilibre des liqueurs, et de la pesanteur de la masse de l'air* (Paris: Guillaume Desprez, 1663).

Honoré Fabri (mentioned above) was not the first Jesuit to extend Aristotelian mechanics into the realm of naval architecture, nor was it unusual that a Catholic priest, ostensibly focused on matters of theology, be so deeply immersed in such secular concerns. Jesuit professors were at the forefront of commenting and expanding upon these works, often writing conflicting interpretations that fueled free and lively debates both inside and outside the Jesuit community.³⁰ Starting in 1623, several Jesuit colleges in France began teaching hydrography, a subject that included navigation and piloting as well as ship design and construction. The first major work on the subject, *Hydrographie contenant la théorie et la pratique de toutes les parties de la navigation*, written in 1643 by the Jesuit mathematics professor at La Flèche and Clermont, Georges Fournier (1595–1652), included a substantial discourse on naval architecture.³¹

However, the Jesuit curriculum continued to place Aristotle on a pedestal, and he would not be easily dislodged. For example, when Georges Fournier attempted to explain why a ship floats in *Hydrographie*, he continued to mix Archimedean principles (i.e., correctly asserting that the displacement of a ship equals the weight of the water that it pushes

³⁰ William A. Wallace, *Galileo and his Sources: The Heritage of the Collegio Romano in Galileo's Science* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. 202–209; James G. Lennox, “Aristotle, Galileo and ‘Mixed Sciences’”, in *Reinterpreting Galileo*, ed. William A. Wallace (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1986), pp. 29–51; Marcus Hellyer, *Catholic Physics: Jesuit Natural Philosophy in Early Modern Germany* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005), pp. 83–84, 119–122; Domenico Bertoloni Meli, *Thinking with Objects: The Transformation of Mechanics in the Seventeenth Century* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), pp. 6–7.

³¹ Georges Fournier, *Hydrographie, contenant la theorie et la pratique de toutes les parties de la navigation* (Paris: Michel Soly, 1643; Jean Dupuis, 1667; reprint Grenoble : Edition des 4 Seigneurs, 1973). On Fournier, see Michel Vergé-Franceschi, *Marine et Education sous l’Ancien Régime* (Paris : CNRS, 1991) pp. 210–211; and Antonella Romano, “Teaching Mathematics in Jesuit Schools”, in *The Jesuits II: Cultures, Sciences and the Arts, 1540–1773*, ed. John W. O’Malley et al. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006) pp. 355–370, at pp. 362–364.

aside) with such Aristotelian concepts as there being a difference in the weight of material according to the medium it inhabits:

There is a difference in the weight of the parts that are in the water and those in the air...the same piece [of the ship] may be partly in water and partly in air, and the part in the water weights less. ...For all these reasons and others, I conclude that it is *moralement impossible* [impossible by rational standards] to be able to precisely determine and give general practice by which one can know the force which would support a vessel. Also, I know of no mathematician who has attempted this, even none who has proposed the question.³²

Nevertheless, at the same time Fournier was explaining in scholarly terms why the displacement of ships could *not* be measured, naval constructors across the English Channel, unencumbered by Jesuit philosophies, were in fact routinely doing just that. Anthony Deane, in the best-known example, applied the principles of Archimedes to paper drawings of hull curves (such drawings were then coming into vogue in England, but were still almost unknown in France) to graphically calculate a warship's immersed volume, displacement and draft in order to ensure that gunports would be sufficiently high above the waterline so they would not flood while under sail.³³ This was a very practical calculation that required only rudimentary arithmetic; but as yet, this did not

³² Fournier, *Hydrographie* pp. 608–609, 612–614.

³³ Anthony Deane (ed. Brian Lavery), *Deane's Doctrine of Naval Architecture 1670* (London: Conway Maritime Press, 1981), pp. 7–20.

represent an attempt to extend Archimedes' mathematical principles into an overall science of ship design.

6. THE APOGEE OF ARISTOTELIAN NAVAL ARCHITECTURE IN THE FRENCH NAVY AND THE WORKS OF PAUL HOSTE, 1685–1700

The first tentative ventures into developing a science of ship design based on mathematical theories occurred during the reign of Louis XIV, when the moribund French navy, under the ministry of Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619–1683), was rebuilt to compete with the powerful English navy. Colbert, who famously created the Paris Academy of Sciences to bolster French commerce and policy, also turned to science as a way to make every French ship better than its English counterpart. Colbert and his successors sponsored scientific research on naval architecture, including a famous series of experiments conducted in the Grand Canal at Versailles to test mathematically-based shipbuilding theories.³⁴ At the same time, a series of schools were created to professionalize the naval officers who would man the warships. The Ecoles des Gardes de la Marine (cadet academies) were established in the dockyards of Rochefort, Brest and Toulon, incorporating practical training in gunnery and fencing with theoretical instruction in mathematics, fortifications and hydrography, with instruction by Jesuit professors.

One such professor was Paul Hoste (1652–1700), a mathematician born on May 19, 1652 in Pont-de-Veyle in Bresse, about 400 km south of Paris. He attended the Jesuit college in the town, and was admitted into a Jesuit seminary around 1669 at age 17. In 1685 at

³⁴ Larrie D. Ferreiro, *Ships and Science: The Birth of Naval Architecture in the Scientific Revolution, 1600–1800* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2007) pp. 51–112.

age 33, he was appointed as professor of mathematics and hydrography at the newly-formed Ecole des Gardes de la Marine in Toulon. While there, he met Admiral Anne-Hilarion de Cotentin, comte de Tourville (1642–1701), with whom he would later serve as chaplain.³⁵ Tourville took a keen interest in Hoste's scientific and mathematical ideas, and sponsored a series of experiments to confirm Hoste's concept that a ship having a hemispherical bow and stern would be faster than a conventional hull form. Though the model tests were inconclusive, Tourville encouraged Hoste to continue with his research on mathematics, which the Jesuit soon applied to the principles of naval warfare.³⁶

As chaplain aboard Tourville's ships, Hoste witnessed naval warfare first-hand, including the battle of La Hogue in 1692 where he survived the burning and sinking of the flagship *Soleil Royale*. In 1697 Hoste collaborated with Tourville to produce a groundbreaking and widely-read book on naval tactics, *L'Art des Armées Navales*, which combined the admiral's fighting instructions with the neat geometry of the mathematics professor.

Appended to the text was a shorter work on naval architecture, *Théorie de la construction des vaisseaux*, where at Tourville's express orders, he elaborated on his mechanical theories of ship design and performance. Yet these published ideas were incomplete, for he was working on the manuscript of a second book, titled *Architecture navale*, when he died prematurely on February 23, 1700, not quite 48 years of age.³⁷

³⁵ Louis-Gabriel Michaud, *Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne* (Paris: Desplaces, 1854–1865), vol. 20 pp. 28–29.

³⁶ Paul Hoste published a mathematics textbook *Recueil des traités de mathématique* (Lyon: Anisson) in 1692.

³⁷ Paul Hoste, *L'Art des Armées Navales ou Traité des Evolutions Navales*, appended with *Théorie de la construction des vaisseaux* (Lyon: Anisson and Posuel, 1697); Paul Hoste, *Architecture navale, ou pratique de la construction des vaisseaux*, copied by Jean Baptiste Thioly (Service Historique de la Marine à Vincennes, cote SHM ms.138, 1714).

Taken together, *Théorie de la construction des vaisseaux* and *Architecture navalle* represent the apogee of the Aristotelian heritage in early naval architecture. They were the first synthetic works on the subject, linking ship theory with practical shipbuilding (for example, directly relating the effects of fluid resistance on hull form; Hoste argued that since spheres and hemispheres had the lowest surface-area-to-volume ratio of any solid, they had the least resistance, which is why his ship models had round ends).³⁸ At the same time, these works combined the mechanics of both Aristotle and Archimedes to explain and quantify the behavior of ships.³⁹ Hoste's analyses of ship theory were a complete departure from his predecessors, for two reasons: first, instead of providing mere "handwaving arguments", he developed mathematical equations which could be analyzed to give direct numerical results; and second, rather than limiting himself to discourses on rowing and the position of oars based on the *Mechanical Problems*, he analyzed the problems of sailing warships, which were now the main concern for modern navies.⁴⁰ For example, in 1664 the 54-gun *Lune* had broken apart and foundered just off Toulon with the loss of over 500 men, a disaster later (incorrectly) blamed on loss of

³⁸ Hoste, *Théorie de la construction des vaisseaux*, pp. 8, 12–13, 23–28, 41–45; and *Architecture navalle*, pp. 11–12.

³⁹ Hoste was by no means the first to combine elements of both Aristotle and Archimedes in a synthetic model of mechanics. Giovanni di Guevara, in his 1627 *In Aristotelis mechanicas commentarii*, combined Aristotle's observations on the nature and properties of the circle, with other relating to center of gravity as developed by Archimedes and others (Wallace, *Galileo and his Sources*, p. 209).

⁴⁰ This is not to say that the problems of rowing were completely abandoned by mathematicians after the Aristotelian problems fell out of vogue. For example, in 1749 Leonhard Euler devoted a long and complex chapter in his magisterial work *Scientia navalis* to the analysis of rowing and the action of oarsmen, using more analytical methods that accounted for mechanical forces and material strength of the oars, and the limits of mechanical power that can be generated by individual oarsmen (Leonhard Euler, *Scientia Navalis, seu tractatus de construendis ac dirigendis navibus pars prior complectens theoriam universam de situ ac motu corporum aquae innatantium* (Saint Petersburg: Saint Petersburg Academy of Sciences, 1749), Pars Secunda Caput VII, "De actione remorum", pp. 291–352).

stability. Paul Hoste used this catastrophe to introduce his discourse on the theory of ship design, stating “there is no greater fault than a vessel which cannot carry sail”.⁴¹

Hoste’s examination of ship stability, the “ability to carry sail”, demonstrates the sublime mix of Aristotelian and Archimedean mathematics that marked his entire corpus. He began by explaining, like Anthony Deane before him, the importance of calculating the displacement of a ship to ensure that the gunports sufficiently high above the water. He then demonstrated just how far the Jesuit curriculum had advanced since the time of Fournier, when instead of complaining that it was *morement impossible* to calculate displacement, he actually provided several methods to do so, all based on the same solid understanding of Archimedean principles as Deane: moreover, Hoste not only explained how graphically to calculate the volume and displacement of a ship based on drawings, but also provided methods to calculate the volume and displacement of actual ships by measuring them from the outside.⁴²

Hoste went on to explain that the moment (he used the term “force”) the ship must have in order to properly carry sail, is that which it needs to resist the sail overturning moment. He defined this moment as the the product of the the wind-on-sail force times the speed of the mast rotation – in other words, he employed Aristotle’s lever law ($Fv = fV$), rather than Archimedes’ lever law ($Fl = fL$). He went on to state in direct mathematical terms how to determine the stability of the ship:

⁴¹ Hoste, *Théorie de la construction des vaisseaux*, p. 46.

⁴² *ibid.*, p. 48; Hoste, *Architecture navalle*, pp. 1–10.

If one knows the center of gravity of the vessel, one easily can find the force it has to carry sail, which is nothing less than the product of the weight of the vessel times the distance of the centers [of weight and displacement].⁴³

Or, in modern terms:

$$\text{righting moment} = \Delta (\text{BG})$$

where

Δ = displacement (weight) of ship

B = center of displacement

G = center of gravity

BG = distance from B to G

Although he did not provide a theoretical means for determining this “force to carry sail”, he did furnish a procedure that could empirically demonstrate this—the inclining experiment, which tangibly demonstrates stability by measuring the effect of a weight hung over the side. Hoste asserted that, by measuring the angle of inclination of the ship due to suspending a weight M from a boom at a certain height, that the “force to carry sail” can be determined.⁴⁴ In Hoste’s geometry using Figure 2, the center of displacement B is the fulcrum, so that:

$$\text{inclining moment} = \text{righting moment}$$

$$M \times \text{BF} = \Delta \times \text{BA}$$

⁴³ Hoste, *Théorie de la construction des vaisseaux*, pp. 49, 54.

⁴⁴ *ibid.*, pp. 55–59.

7. CONCLUSION: THE DOWNFALL OF ARISTOTELIAN MECHANICS AND THE RISE OF NEWTONIAN NAVAL ARCHITECTURE, 1727–1746

Paul Hoste's works were the first true synthesis of naval architecture that treated the ship as a complete system, and would remain the only such work for almost half a century. Although they were enormously influential, they were already obsolete when written, for they appeared just as Isaac Newton's *Principia Mathematica* (1687) was starting to find acceptance. It was an awkward era, when mathematicians and scientists attempted to somehow fuse old and new concepts, as did Hoste when he combined Aristotle and Archimedes to explain ship stability. This combination of two disparate theories at first led the French hydrographer Pierre Bouguer (1698–1758) astray when he wrote a prize-winning treatise for the Paris Academy of Sciences on the masting of ships in 1727. To explain ship stability – a critical concept of naval architecture that was still poorly understood—he invoked Hoste's "force to carrying sail", which was founded on Aristotelian precepts of the lever, while at the same time mixing in Archimedean lever laws to explain the shift in buoyancy when a ship heels over. This combination of Aristotelian and Archimedean mechanics proved unsuccessful in providing a meaningful theory of ship stability.⁴⁵

In 1746, however, Bouguer published his breakthrough work *Traité du navire* in which he cast aside the Aristotelian tradition, developing a complete synthesis of ship theory based solely on the mechanics of Archimedes and the mathematics of Isaac Newton, providing a set of tools that allowed naval constructors to predict how their ships would

⁴⁵ Pierre Bouguer, *De la mâture des vaisseaux* (Paris: Claude Jombert, 1728) pp. 24–25.

float and sail. Among the most durable concepts was his development of a complete theory of stability using a concept known as the metacenter, which remains the basis for modern stability theory. But perhaps something of Aristotle yet remains, for Bouguer also provided us with the practical method for verifying stability: the inclining experiment, little changed from Hoste's first elucidation, which modern naval architects across the globe routinely use to verify that a ship is safe and ready to sail.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ Pierre Bouguer, *Traité du Navire, de sa Construction, et de ses Mouvements* (Paris: Claude Jombert, 1746), pp. 199–324. For a complete survey of the development of ship stability theory, see Ferreiro, *Ships and Science* pp. 157–257.

REFERENCES

- Archimedes and Thomas Little Heath. *The Works of Archimedes* (New York: Dover Publications, 2002)
- Aristotle. *Minor Works*, trans. Walter S. Hett (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963)
- Aristotle. *Physics*, trans. Robin Waterfield (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)
- Aristotle. *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, ed. Jonathan Barnes (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984)
- Baldi, Bernardino. *In mechanica Aristotelis problemata exercitationes* (Mainz: Viduae Ioannis Albini, 1621)
- Biancani, Giuseppe. *Aristotelis loca mathematica ex universes ipsius operibus collecta et explicata* (Bologna: Bartholomaeum Cochium, 1615)
- Bouguer, Pierre. *De la mâture des vaisseaux* (Paris: Claude Jombert, 1728)
- Bouguer, Pierre. *Traité du Navire, de sa Construction, et de ses Mouvemens* (Paris: Claude Jombert, 1746)
- Euler, Leonhard. *Scientia Navalis, seu tractatus de construendis ac dirigendis navibus pars prior complectens theoriam universam de situ ac motu corporum aquae innatantium* (Saint Petersburg: Saint Petersburg Academy of Sciences, 1749)
- Capponi, Niccolò. *Victory of the West: The Great Christian-Muslim Clash at the Battle of Lepanto* (Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, 2007)
- Concina, Ennio. *L'Arsenale della Repubblica di Venezia*: (Milan: Electa, 1984)
- Concina, Ennio. "Humanism on the Sea", in *Mediterranean Cities: Historical Perspectives*, ed. Irad Malkin and Robert L. Hohlfelder (Towata, NJ: Frank Cass, 1988), pp. 159–165
- Concina, Ennio. *Navis: L'umanesimo sul mare, 1470–1740* (Turin : Giulio Einaudi, 1990)
- Contarini, Giacomo. *Arte de far Vasselli* (Archivio Di Stato Di Venezia: Archivio proprio Contarini b.19, ca. 1590)
- Contarini, Giacomo. *Del fabricar galere* (Archivio Di Stato Di Venezia: Archivio proprio Contarini b.25, ca. 1592)

- Damerow, Peter, Jürgen Renn, Simone Rieger and Paul Weinig, “Mechanical Knowledge and Pompeian Balances”, in *Homo Faber: Studies on Nature, Technology and Science at the Time of Pompeii*, eds. Jürgen Renn and Giuseppe Castagnetti (Rome: “L’Erma” di Bretschneider, 2002), pp. 93–108
- Deane, Anthony (ed. Brian Lavery). *Deane’s Doctrine of Naval Architecture 1670* (London: Conway Maritime Press, 1981)
- Drake, Stillman. *Cause, Experiment and Science: A Galilean Dialogue Incorporating a New English Translation of Galileo’s “Bodies That Stay atop Water, or Move in It”* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).
- Drake, Stillman. “The Pseudo-Aristotelian *Questions of Mechanics* in Renaissance Culture”, in *Essays on Galileo and the History and Philosophy of Science*, ed. Stillman Drake (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000) pp. 131–169
- Fabri, Honoré. *Physica, id est, scientia rerum corporearum*, 4 vol. (Lyon: Laurent Anisson, 1669)
- Fausto, Vettor. *Aristotelis Mechanica, Victoris Fausti industria in pristinum habitum restituta ac latinitate donata* (Paris: Jodocus Badius, 1517)
- Ferreiro, Larrie D. *Ships and Science: The Birth of Naval Architecture in the Scientific Revolution, 1600–1800* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2007)
- Fournier, Georges. *Hydrographie, contenant la theorie et la pratique de toutes les parties de la navigation* (Paris: Michel Soly, 1643; Jean Dupuis, 1667; reprint Grenoble: Edition des 4 Seigneurs, 1973)
- Guevara, Giovanni di. *In Aristotelis mechanicas commentarii: una cum additionibus quibusdam ab eandem materiam pertinentibus* (Rome: Mascardus, 1627)
- Guglielmotti, Alberto. *Marcantonio Colonna alla battaglia di Lepanto* (Florence: Felice Le Monnier, 1862)
- Heath, Thomas Little. *Mathematics in Aristotle* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949)
- Hellyer, Marcus. *Catholic Physics: Jesuit Natural Philosophy in Early Modern Germany* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005)
- Hoste, Paul. *Recueil des traités de mathématique* (Lyon: Anisson, 1692)
- Hoste, Paul. *L’Art des Armées Navales ou Traité des Evolutions Navales*, appended with *Théorie de la construction des vaisseaux* (Lyon: Anisson and Posuel, 1697)
- Hoste, Paul. *Architecture navalle, ou pratique de la construction des vaisseaux*, copied by Jean Baptiste Thioly (Service Historique de la Marine à Vincennes, cote SHM ms.138, 1714)

- Hussey, Edward. "Aristotle's Mathematical Physics: A Reconstruction" in *Aristotle's Physics: A Collection of Essays*, ed. Lindsay Judson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991) pp. 213–242.
- Laird, Walter Roy. "The Scope of Renaissance Mechanics", *Osiris* 1986, 2/2 pp. 43–68
- Laird, Walter Roy. *The Unfinished Mechanics of Giuseppe Moletti* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000)
- Lane, Frederic Chapin. *Venetian Ships and Shipbuilders of the Renaissance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1934; reprint New York: Arno Press, 1979)
- Lennox, James G. "Aristotle, Galileo and 'Mixed Sciences'", in *Reinterpreting Galileo*, ed. William A. Wallace (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1986)
- Meli, Domenico Bertoloni. *Thinking with Objects: The Transformation of Mechanics in the Seventeenth Century* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006)
- Michaud, Louis-Gabriel. *Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne* (Paris: Desplaces, 1854–1865)
- Monantheuil, Henri de. *Aristotelis Mechanica* (Paris: Ieremiam Perier, 1599)
- Morrison, John S. and Robert Gardiner (eds.). *The Age of the Galley: Mediterranean Oared Vessels Since Pre-Classical Times* (London: Conway Maritime Press, 2004)
- Morrison, John S., John F. Coates and N. Boris Rankov. *The Athenian Trireme: the history and reconstruction of an ancient Greek warship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- Nowacki, Horst. "Archimedes and Ship Stability", in *Proceedings of the Euroconference on "Passenger Ship Design, Operation and Safety"*, edited by Apostolos Papanikolaou and Kostas Spyrou (Athens: NTU, 2001); reprinted as MPIWG Preprint 198 (Berlin, Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, 2002)
- Nowacki, Horst and Larrie Ferreiro. "Historical Roots of the Theory of Hydrostatic Stability of Ships", in *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on the Stability of Ships and Ocean Vehicles*, edited by Luis Pérez Rojas (Madrid: ETSIN 2003, pp. 1–30); reprinted as MPIWG Preprint 237 (Berlin, Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, 2003)
- Nunes, Pedro. "In Problema mechanicum Aristotelis de motu nauigii ex remis Annotatio una", in *Petri Nonii Salaciensis Opera* (Basil: Ex Officina Henricpetrina, 1566)
- Palmieri, Paolo. "The Cognitive Development of Galileo's Theory of Buoyancy", *Archive for the History of Exact Sciences* 59 (2005), pp. 189–222

- Pascal, Blaise. *Traité de l'équilibre des liqueurs, et de la pesanteur de la masse de l'air* (Paris: Guillaume Desprez, 1663)
- Rank, Ludwig. *Die Theorie des Segelns in ihrer Entwicklung: Geschichte eines Problems der nautischen Mechanik* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1984)
- Renn, Jürgen and Matteo Valleriani, *Galileo and the Challenge of the Arsenal* (Berlin: Max Planck Institute for the History of Science Preprint 179, 2001); reprinted in *Nuncius*, XVI/ 2, 2001, pp. 481–503
- Romano, Antonella. “Teaching Mathematics in Jesuit Schools”, in *The Jesuits II: Cultures, Sciences and the Arts, 1540–1773*, ed. John W. O’Malley et al. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006) pp. 355–370
- Simón Calero, Julián. *The Genesis of Fluid Mechanics, 1640–1780* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2008)
- Sousa Leitão, Henrique de. *O Comentário de Pedro Nunes à Navegação a Remos* (Lisbon: Edições Culturais da Marinha, 2002)
- Sousa Leitão, Henrique de. “Pedro Nunes and the Aristoteleian Mechanical Problems”, in *Petri Nonii Salaciensis Opera: Proceedings of the International Conference Lisbon-Coimbra 24–25 May 2002*, ed. Luís Trabucho de Campos, Henrique de Sousa Leitão and João Filipe Querió (Lisbon: Universidad de Lisboa, 2003) pp. 141–182
- Stevin, Simon. *Beghinselen des Waterwichts* (Leyden: C. Plantijn, 1586)
- Vergé-Franceschi, Michel. *Marine et Education sous l’Ancien Régime* (Paris : CNRS, 1991)
- Vilain, Christiane. “Circular and Rectilinear Motion in the *Mechanica*”, in *Mechanics and Natural Philosophy before the Scientific Revolution*, ed. Walter Roy Laird and Sophie Roux (Dordrecht, Spinger 2008) pp. 149–172
- Vitruvius Pollio, Marcus. *The Ten Books on Architecture*, trans. Morris H. Morgan (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914)
- Wallace, William A. *Galileo and his Sources: The Heritage of the Collegio Romano in Galileo’s Science* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984)
- Wallace, William A. *Galileo, the Jesuits and the Medieval Aristotle* (Brookfield, VT: Varorium, 1991)
- Winter, Thomas Nelson. *The Mechanical Problems in the Corpus of Aristotle* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 2007), <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/classicsfacpub/68>, accessed March 2009

MAX-PLANCK-INSTITUT FÜR WISSENSCHAFTSGESCHICHTE

Max Planck Institute for the History of Science

Preprints since 2007 (a full list can be found at our website)

- 323** Sandra Pravica **»Materialität« in der Naturwissenschaftsforschung. Eine bibliographische Übersicht**
- 324** Uljana Feest (ed.) **Historical Perspectives on *Erklären and Verstehen*: An Interdisciplinary Workshop**
- 325** Renate Tobies **Techno- und Wirtschaftsmathematik in der Glühlampen- und Elektronenröhrenforschung bei Osram und Telefunken.** Iris Runge (1888-1966) – "specialized in treating mathematical valve problems"
- 326** Horst Nowacki **Leonhard Euler and the Theory of Ships**
- 327** István M. Bodnár **Oenopides of Chius: A survey of the modern literature with a collection of the ancient testimonia**
- 328** Daniela Monaldi **The Indirect Observation of the Decay of Mesotrons. Italian Experiments on Cosmic Radiation, 1937–1943**
- 329** **Pascual Jordan (1902–1980).** Mainzer Symposium zum 100. Geburtstag
- 330** Horst-Heino v. Borzeszkowski & Renate Wahsner **Erkenntniskritische Betrachtungen zur Physik**
- 331** Fynn Ole Engler **Wissenschaftliche Philosophie und moderne Physik I.** Hans Reichenbach und Moritz Schlick über Naturgesetzlichkeit, Kausalität und Wahrscheinlichkeit im Zusammenhang mit der Relativitäts- und der Quantentheorie
- 332** Götz Neuneck und Michael Schaaf (Hrsg.) **Zur Geschichte der Pugwash-Bewegung in Deutschland.** Symposium der deutschen Pugwash-Gruppe im Harnack-Haus Berlin, 24. Februar 2006
- 333** Wolfgang Lefèvre (ed.) **Inside the Camera Obscura – Optics and Art under the Spell of the Projected Image**
- 334** Christof Windgätter **ZeitSchriften. Eine Revolution der Experimentalkultur im 19. Jahrhundert**
- 335** Albert Presas i Puig **The Scientific and Technological Relations between Spain and Germany during the first Franco period**
- 336** Albert Presas i Puig **The Dream of a Reactor: The DON Project. Methodological Reflections on a Technology Development Project in Franco's Spain**
- 337** Thomas Sturm **Why Did Kant Reject Physiological Explanations in His Anthropology?**
- 338** Horst Nowacki and Wolfgang Lefèvre (eds.) **Creating Shapes in Civil and Naval Architecture (Vols. I & II).** A Cross-Disciplinary Comparison
- 339** Sophia Vackimes & Konstanze Weltersbach (eds.) **Wandering Seminar on Scientific Objects**
- 340** Uljana Feest, Giora Hon, Hans-Jörg Rheinberger, Jutta Schickore, Friedrich Steinle (eds.) **Generating Experimental Knowledge**
- 341** Silvio R. Dahmen **Boltzmann and the art of flying**
- 342** Gerhard Herrgott **Wanderer-Fantasien. Franz Liszt und die Figuren des Begehrens**
- 343** Conference **A Cultural History of Heredity IV: Heredity in the Century of the Gene**
- 344** Karine Chemla **Canon and commentary in ancient China: An outlook based on mathematical sources**
- 345** Omar W. Nasim **Observations, Descriptions and Drawings of Nebulae: A Sketch.**

- 346** Julia Kursell (ed.) **Sounds of Science – Schall im Labor (1800–1930)**
- 347** Sophia Vackimes **The Genetically Engineered Body: A Cinematic Context**
- 348** Luigi Guerrini **The ‘Accademia dei Lincei’ and the New World.**
- 349** Jens Høyrup **Über den italienischen Hintergrund der Rechenmeister-Mathematik**
- 350** Christian Joas, Christoph Lehner, and Jürgen Renn (eds.) **HQ-1: Conference on the History of Quantum Physics (Vols. I & II)**
- 351** José M. Pacheco **Does more abstraction imply better understanding?**
("Apuntes de Mecánica Social", by Antonio Portuondo)
- 352** José Miguel Pacheco Castela, F. Javier Pérez-Fernández, Carlos O. Suárez Alemán **Following the steps of Spanish Mathematical Analysis: From Cauchy to Weierstrass between 1880 and 1914**
- 353** José Miguel Pacheco Castela, F. Javier Pérez-Fernández, Carlos O. Suárez Alemán **Infinitesimals in Spain: Antonio Portuondo’s *Ensayo sobre el Infinito***
- 354** Albert Presas i Puig **Reflections on a peripheral Paperclip Project: A technological innovation system in Spain based on the transfer of German technology**
- 355** Albert Presas i Puig **The Contribution of the History of Science and Social Studies to the Understanding of Scientific Dynamics: the Case of the Spanish Nuclear Energy Program**
- 356** Viola Balz, Alexander v. Schwerin, Heiko Stoff, Bettina Wahrig (eds.) **Precarious Matters / Prekäre Stoffe.** The History of Dangerous and Endangered Substances in the 19th and 20th Centuries
- 357** Florentina Badalanova Geller ***Qur’ān in vernacular.*** Folk Islam in the Balkans
- 358** Renate Wahsner & Horst-Heino v. Borzeszkowski **Die Naturwissenschaft und der philosophische Begriff des Geistes**
- 359** Jens Høyrup **Baroque Mind-set and New Science.** A Dialectic of Seventeenth-Century High Culture
- 360** Dieter Fick & Horst Kant **Walther Bothe’s contributions to the particle-wave dualism of light**
- 361** Albert Presas i Puig (ed.) **Who is Making Science? Scientists as Makers of Technical-Scientific Structures and Administrators of Science Policy**
- 362** Christof Windgätter **Zu den Akten – Verlags- und Wissenschaftsstrategien der Wiener Psychoanalyse (1919–1938)**
- 363** Jean Paul Gaudillière and Volker Hess (eds.) **Ways of Regulating: Therapeutic Agents between Plants, Shops and Consulting Rooms**
- 364** Angelo Baracca, Leopoldo Nuti, Jürgen Renn, Reiner Braun, Matteo Gerlini, Marilena Gala, and Albert Presas i Puig (eds.) **Nuclear Proliferation: History and Present Problems**
- 365** Viola van Beek **„Man lasse doch diese Dinge selber einmal sprechen“ – Experimentierkästen, Experimentalanleitungen und Erzählungen um 1900**
- 366** Julia Kursell (Hrsg.) **Physiologie des Klaviers.** Vorträge und Konzerte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Musik
- 367** Hubert Laitko **Strategen, Organisatoren, Kritiker, Dissidenten – Verhaltensmuster prominenter Naturwissenschaftler der DDR in den 50er und 60er Jahren des 20. Jahrhunderts**
- 368** Renate Wahsner & Horst-Heino v. Borzeszkowski **Naturwissenschaft und Weltbild**
- 369** Dieter Hoffmann, Hölke Rößler, Gerald Reuther **„Lachkabinett“ und „großes Fest“ der Physiker. Walter Grotrians „physikalischer Einakter“ zu Max Plancks 80. Geburtstag.**
- 370** Shaul Katzir **From academic physics to invention and industry: the course of Hermann Aron’s (1845–1913) career**