## Revisiting Riccioli's free-fall calculations

hristopher Graney provides a fascinating description of Giovanni Battista Riccioli's meticulous 17th-century experiments on free fall (PHYSICS TODAY, September 2012, page 36). He notes that Riccioli's results, converted to modern units, provide an estimate of *g* that is systematically 5% smaller than the current accepted value. The discrepancy might well be attributed to uncertainty over the modern equivalent of Riccioli's unit of length, the Roman foot. However, one more insight can perhaps be wrung from the

As Christiaan Huygens reported in his classic 1673 *Horologium Oscillatorium*, published 22 years after Riccioli's *Almagestum*, the period of a pendulum of length l is  $T = 2\pi \sqrt{l/g}$ . Thereafter it is

Letters and commentary are encouraged and should be sent by email to ptletters@aip.org (using your surname as the Subject line), or by standard mail to Letters, Physics Today, American Center for Physics, One Physics Ellipse, College Park, MD 20740-3842. Please include your name, work affiliation, mailing address, email address, and daytime phone number on your letter and attachments. You can also contact us online at http://contact.physicstoday.org. We reserve the right to edit submissions.

an easy exercise to show that a plot of the distance fallen versus the square of the fall time in units of the pendulum half-period T/2 is a straight line of slope  $\pi^2l/2$ . That figure is independent of g and of the conversion to modern units.

Plotting Riccioli's data in that way reveals an accurate straight line from which one can deduce the pendulum length. The answer—with a generous error estimate—is  $l = 1.00 \pm 0.05$  Roman inches. As Graney notes, Riccioli himself reported the length to the center of the pendulum bob to be 1.15 inches. The 15% discrepancy—less than 4 mm—is plausibly excusable, though one might infer that Riccioli supposed his measurement was accurate to at least 0.05 inches (about 1 mm).

Unfortunately, the discrepancy is in the wrong direction to be attributed either to the distinction between the center of mass and the center of oscillation of a compound pendulum or to the fact, known to Riccioli, that large-amplitude pendulum swings are not quite isochronous. Nevertheless, the discrepancy is intrinsic to Riccioli's presented data and is not dependent on the disputed length of the Roman foot. One can only presume it reflects on the difficulty of subdividing a Roman foot into such fine equispaced divisions.

## Patrick Warren

(patrick.warren@unilever.com) Unilever R&D Port Sunlight Bebington, UK ■ The article by Christopher Graney about the free-fall experiments of Giovanni Battista Riccioli opens a fascinating window on the work of one of the first modern physicists and his approach to devising a standard clock, finding its limitations, and using it to better determine fundamental laws of nature

Not much has changed in the clock business since 1651. Unfortunately, the data on a falling clay ball, taken in painstaking detail by Riccioli and coworkers, is slightly misrepresented in Graney's figure 5. The time axis should be in units of seconds, not in pendulum strokes as stated. If taken seriously, the graph conveys that the ball would have fallen more than 250 Roman feet (about 75 m) in 4.5 strokes of the pendulum, less than 1 second (1 second corresponds to roughly 6 strokes of Riccioli's pendulum).

## Dietrich Leibfried

(dil@boulder.nist.gov) National Institute of Standards and Technology Boulder, Colorado

■ Graney replies: Patrick Warren and Dietrich Leibfried raise interesting points about errors—both in Giovanni Battista Riccioli's work and, unfortunately, in my article. In the latter case, Leibfried is certainly correct about the units on the axis. In fact, other PHYSICS TODAY readers have called my attention to a number of typographical errors re-

