

Where Did Kepler's Stars Come From?

A chat, its corrections, and an evidence-bound answer about the star catalogue of the Tabulae Rudolphinae

Gerd Graßhoff 

Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Deutsches Museum
gerd.grasshoff@hu-berlin.de

2026-10-08

ABSTRACT

SKETCH — to be written last, from the measured results. Planned content: a regular chat about the origin of the star catalogue of Kepler's Tabulae Rudolphinae (1627) gives a fluent history in which the decisive propositions are unsupported; only the questioner's objections move it, and each move replaces one unsupported claim by another. We decompose the three turns of a real chat into a ledger of propositions, unfold the question "how did Kepler obtain the data for his star catalogue and how did he compute the tabulated values?" into subgoals, build the evidence space (Kepler's *Gesammelte Werke*, Tycho Brahe's *Opera omnia*, the secondary literature in the collection), filter it per subgoal with Famulus Evidence Filter, and answer each subgoal with loci, reasoning and a verdict. The chat's claims are then judged one by one: validated, not validated, or refuted by evidence.

KEYWORDS Kepler · Tycho Brahe · Tabulae Rudolphinae · star catalogue · large language models · evidence-bound answers · justification

1 The question and the thesis

To write (W10). The question G0: **How did Kepler obtain the data for the star catalogue of the Tabulae Rudolphinae, and how did he compute the tabulated values?** Why it is a good test: the catalogue is a table with a numeric ground truth in two editions (Tycho's catalogues in Dreyer's *Opera omnia*, Kepler's in KGW X); its origin is stated, with different reach, by the author himself (headings, Praecepta, letters), by the editors (Hammer's *Nachbericht*, Dreyer's annotations), and by the secondary literature.

Thesis, in three parts:

1. A regular chat answer to G0 is a fluent narrative whose decisive propositions have no registered ground; several are wrong, and the chat does not mark which.
2. The answer improves only where the questioner objects. The questioner has to know the answer to force it; each correction introduces new unsupported propositions (authority drift: an encyclopaedia, then specialist web pages, then an untranslated "own words of Kepler").
3. An evidence-bound answer reverses the order: the evidence space is determined first, filtered per subgoal, and every proposition of the answer names the loci it follows from. Where the space holds no ground the answer says so ("not validated"), which is not the same as "false".

2 The case: a chat in three turns

To write (W10), from `source/grok-chat.md`. Turn by turn: what was asked, what was answered, what changed. The transcript is reproduced in Section 12.

- **Turn 1** asks for the history and chronology of Kepler's work on the tables. The answer gives a chronology and, under *Means*, "Brahe's ... observations ..., supplemented by Kepler's own".
- **Turn 2** objects: "Kepler did not add 200 stellar positions from his own observations. He could not handle observations, nor had he the instruments." The chat concedes at once and now cites "more than 400 stars from Ptolemy and Johann Bayer".

- **Turn 3** demands evidence and names the Almagest’s systematic error. The chat withdraws the “400”, introduces Tycho’s ~1,004-star manuscript catalogue, a *Secunda Classis* with a “translation” of Kepler’s description, a *Tertia Classis* from Keyser and de Houtman, and closes that no star-by-star list is given in the literature it consulted.

Note for the text: the questioner’s premises are claims too (U2-02, U2-03 in the ledger) and are judged by the same standard (Q11).

3 The claim ledger

Data: `data/claims.yaml` (W3, built); verdict columns filled in W9; table generated into `_claim-ledger.qmd`. Each turn is decomposed into propositions with a role (core / side), a kind (number, provenance, method, chronology, quotation, attribution, appraisal), the support the chat offers (a web domain, a quotation, none), its course through the turns (asserted, conceded, retracted, replaced) and the subgoal that decides it.

4 The dynamics of correction

To measure from the ledger (W9): propositions per turn; share retracted only when the questioner objected; share newly introduced without a ground; internal inconsistencies within one turn (T2: “~228 beyond Brahe’s 777” next to “more than 400 from Ptolemy and Bayer”); the supports cited per turn.

5 Goal and unfolding

Data: `famulus-proof/eval/ziele/tabula-rudolphina.yaml` (W5). G0 and its subgoals:

id	subgoal	evidence kind
Q1	composition of the catalogue: classes, headings, entries per class	primary (KGW X tables)
Q2	Kepler’s own statements on the source of each class	primary (KGW X)
Q3	Tycho’s catalogues in the edition: printed 777, manuscript 1000; epoch, entries	primary (Opera omnia II, III)
Q4	collation: Kepler’s class I against Tycho’s 1000-star catalogue, entry by entry	primary, computed
Q5	epoch and precession: which epoch, which constants, how reduced	primary + recomputation
Q6	the second class: which stars, which source, which transformation	primary (+ Almagest if available)
Q7	the southern stars: which entries, which attribution	primary (KGW X)
Q8	correspondence: letters on the catalogue, Tycho’s data and the heirs, dated	primary (KGW XIII–XVIII)
Q9	working papers on fixed stars and on the computation	primary (KGW XX–XXI)

id	subgoal	evidence kind
Q10	editorial commentary (Hammer, Dreyer)	commentary
Q11	Kepler as observer of stellar positions (tests the questioner's premise)	primary, all KGW + Opera omnia

6 The evidence space

Data: *readiness reports (W4)*. Collections, volumes and their kinds of evidence, each with its justificatory reach:

- **Primary edited text.** KGW X (*Tabulae Rudolphinae*, ed. Hammer 1969, J. Kepler [1]); Tycho's Opera omnia (ed. Dreyer), in particular II (*Progymnasmata*, 777-star catalogue, T. Brahe [2]), III (the catalogue of 1000 stars, *Stellarum inerrantium restitutio*, T. Brahe [3]), and the observation volumes X–XIII with their star tables (T. Brahe [4]; T. Brahe [5]; T. Brahe [6]; T. Brahe [7]).
- **Editorial commentary.** Hammer's Nachbericht and Anmerkungen in KGW X; Dreyer's *Annotationes editoris*. A commentary sentence justifies only "the editor states that p"; it supports a claim about Kepler only together with the primary loci it cites.
- **Instruments.** KGW XXII (index), the letter register of KGW XIII–XVIII.
- **Secondary literature** in `kepler-sec`.

Also in the space, though not yet read as text: Ptolemy's star catalogue (*Almagest* VII 5 – VIII 1) in Toomer's translation (`greek-astronomy`, scans of 1984; only the first four or five pages of each document there are OCR'd although the collection reports itself search-ready; a pilot of the table pass on five catalogue pages, 2026-10-08, was paused and nothing of it is applied, so Verbunt and van Gent's machine-readable edition of the catalogue after Toomer [8] stands in for it), and Graßhoff's *History of Ptolemy's Star Catalogue* (1990) as 361 page images with a plain-text OCR layer of July 2026 but no page XML, in a collection (`assyrischeSammlung`) that is not search-ready. Heiberg's *Syntaxis* I covers Books I–VI only. Gaps: Opera omnia vol. XIV is missing; no Bayer *Uranometria* and no Grienberger 1612 were found (search of 2026-10-08).

Careful table OCR. The catalogues are tables; a cell read correctly but set one row off gives a star its neighbour's identification. The KGW X catalogue pages had been read in March/April 2026 as flat lines or not at all; Tycho's catalogue pages had their editorial Flamsteed/Bayer numbers shifted by one row. The tables were therefore re-read (2026-10-08) by two engines under a catalogue page class (Kimi K2.7 as producer, Gemini 3.8 Flash as second reader), placed on the page by Apple Vision's line geometry (row shifts corrected only where the moved grid verifies), compared cell by cell, and disputed cells decided by a three-voter arbiter on the enlarged row (signs: by comparison with exemplar rows of the same typeface). Every decision is stored beside the page (`page_NNN.grid.json`). *Numbers to report (W6): pages, cells, agreement, corrections, open cells.*

7 Filtering the evidence space

Data: `famulus-proof/reports/data/tabula-rudolphina/<qid>.json` (W6), `table_evidence-funnel.qmd`. Per subgoal: the whole space, each filter stage of Famulus Evidence Filter, the carriers that remain; counts and selectivity; undecided carriers kept for recall. A lexical seed over KGW (`data/evidence-seed-kepler-prim.json`: 446 sentences on 355 pages) shows why a filter is needed: most hits of *catalogus* are book-fair catalogues.

Table 1 Filtering the evidence space per subgoal (Famulus Evidence Filter, nine stages, given classification; KGW = kepler-prim, OO = braheOO). Goal file `eval/ziele/tabula-rudolphina.yaml`.

sub-goal	coll.	objects in the space	kept	vol-umes	kinds kept	ms
Q1	KGW	637,959	1,490	1	1,487 rows · 2 par. · 1 sent.	346
Q2	KGW	637,959	55	1	55 sent.	465
Q3	OO	293,238	5,153	13	5,101 rows · 52 sent.	334
Q4	KGW	637,959	1,487	1	1,487 rows	268
Q4	OO	293,238	1,903	2	1,903 rows	245
Q5	KGW	637,959	14	1	14 sent.	351
Q6	KGW	637,959	23	1	17 sent. · 6 rows	302
Q7	KGW	637,959	59	1	59 sent.	335
Q8	KGW	637,959	23	5	23 sent.	467
Q9	KGW	637,959	494	6	494 sent.	348
Q10	KGW	637,959	32	8	32 sent.	487
Q10	OO	293,238	3	2	3 sent.	403
Q11	KGW	637,959	143	20	143 sent.	413
Q11	OO	293,238	161	14	161 sent.	365

8 Justified answers per subgoal

To write (W7, W8). For each subgoal: loci (Latin with English translation, machine-checked against the OCR), the reasoning, recomputations, verdict.

i First primary loci (checked on the facsimile, 2026-10-08; register `data/belege.yaml`)

- KGW X Tab. S. 138 (1627 pagination 118): the heading of the *Tertia Classis* names its source. The figures come “Ex BAYERI verò Tabulis et Manuscriptis ultimis”, put “in numeros et chartam” by Jacob Bartsch and sent “nuper mihi Augusta Ulmam”; Bayer, Kepler reports, credits the constellations to Vespucci, Corsali and Pedro de Medina and their first correction to “Petrus Theodori” (B-TR-138).
- KGW X Tab. S. 133: for stars of Sagittarius Kepler took distances that Tycho had noted by hand at Regiomontanus’ observation of 19 June 1465, “Secundum harum differentiam à Ptolemaicis accommodavi et reliquarum Sagittarij longitudes ex PTOLEMAEO” (B-TR-133).
- KGW X Tab. S. 141: “Hactenus Bartschianus Catalogus. Finis Catalogi Fixarum” (B-TR-141).

No verdict on the chat’s claims is drawn here; that is task W9.

i Probe, not yet a result: what the editor states (Q10, commentary only)

KGW X, Nachbericht S. 42–43 (scan page_458–459), states in German that Kepler divides his catalogue into three classes: first Brahe’s list of 1000 fixed stars with longitudes and latitudes computed for 1600 (citing Brahe, Op. om. III, 344–373); second more than 200 stars drawn from Ptolemy’s catalogue, reduced to 1600 by taking over the corrections of nearby stars in Tycho’s catalogue; third 136 southern stars whose numbers Kepler, “wie er Tab. S. 118 sagt”, received in Ulm from Jakob Bartsch, who had them from Johann Bayer.

This is commentary-level evidence: it justifies “Hammer states that ...”, and it names the primary loci (Tab. S. 118, Tab. S. 130, Op. om. III 344–373) that must be read before any of it is asserted about Kepler. One detail to check against the facsimile: the range given for the first class (“Tab. 105–114”).

9 Chat and evidence, claim by claim

Generated from the ledger with verdicts (W9). Validated / not validated / refuted, with loci. A false premise makes an argument unsound and withdraws its justification; it does not make its conclusion false.

10 Limits

To write. Table OCR residue (open cells), missing volumes and sources, LLM-proposed relevance labels awaiting owner confirmation, the chat as a single specimen.

11 Conclusion: a reusable challenge

To write. The goal, the query set and the evidence space as a benchmark for evidence-bound answers.

12 Appendix: the transcript

Included from `source/grok-chat.md` (verbatim, with the provenance header).

13 Appendix: query set and Schemakarte

Generated from `famulus-proof/eval/ziele/tabula-rudolphina.yaml` and the karten.

Bibliography

- [1] J. Kepler, *Tabulae Rudolphinae*, vol. 10. in Johannes Kepler Gesammelte Werke, vol. 10. München: C. H. Beck’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1969.
- [2] T. Brahe, *Tychonis Brahe Dani Scripta astronomica, tomus II*. Hauniae: In libraria Gyldendaliana, 1915.
- [3] T. Brahe, *Tychonis Brahe Dani Opera omnia, tomus III*. Hauniae: In libraria Gyldendaliana, 1916.
- [4] T. Brahe, *Tychonis Brahe Dani Opera omnia, tomus X*. Hauniae: In libraria Gyldendaliana, 1923.
- [5] T. Brahe, *Tychonis Brahe Dani Opera omnia, tomus XI*. Hauniae: In libraria Gyldendaliana, 1924.
- [6] T. Brahe, *Tychonis Brahe Dani Opera omnia, tomus XII*. Hauniae: In libraria Gyldendaliana, 1925.
- [7] T. Brahe, *Tychonis Brahe Dani Opera omnia, tomus XIII*. Hauniae: In libraria Gyldendaliana, 1926.
- [8] F. Verbunt and R. H. van Gent, “The star catalogues of Ptolemaios and Ulugh Beg,” *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, vol. 544, p. A31, 2012.