

6/6

When Cardinal Bellarmine wrote Foscarini in 1615 referencing Galileo's heliocentric model he states that Foscarini and Galileo were speaking "suppositionally and not absolutely." This means that Bellarmino believed that they should limit themselves to believing heliocentrism as a hypothesis used merely to make predictions and help create an accurate calendar. In other words, this is just a hypothetical situation providing instrumentalist views to be used to predict and know for certain when Easter and other important holidays would come around each year, based on the equinox. It was not, however, to be taken as a realist point of view. The Church recognized that Copernicus and Galileo were the best at making predictions but they believed that it happened supposedly. Bellarmine believed that Galileo's ideas did make the heliocentric model a little more appealing because it did not require the use of epicycles or eccentrics. However, while the theory did not require these troubling things it still defied and was inconsistent with Aristotelian physics. Bellarmine explained that it was not only a problem within the Church but also a problem with scholastic philosophers. Because it is inconsistent with physics at the time and offered no replacement as well as not offering any evidence as to why, it must simply be a hypothetical phenomenon. The distinction between instrumental and realist, or suppositionally and not absolutely, gave the proponents of heliocentric motion a chance to continue their research as long as it remained a hypothetical situation used only to calculate predictions. However, as soon as they posed it as a real phenomenon (without any conclusive evidence that was proved through scientific explanation) it was labeled as heresy because of what scripture said and how the church leaders interpreted it.

Good

Good

Yup

Not quite sure what this means...

Good

Once Galileo used his telescopes to see further than anyone ever had he observed things that helped further the popularity of a heliocentric model by poking holes in Aristotelian physics. These observations included the craters found on the moon, the "ears" on Saturn, and Jupiter's moons. Basic Aristotelian physics said that giant rocky bodies couldn't revolve around something else. Because everyone knew that the moon revolved around Earth, once the craters on the moon were discovered it proved that a rocky body could indeed revolve around something. In addition, Saturn's "ears" proved that it was not a perfectly spherical heavenly body, another blow for Aristotelian physics. Also, one of the largest inconsistencies with their idea of physics was when the moons of Jupiter were discovered. This proved that not everything in space moves around the Earth. A supporter of Geocentrism would most likely resort to evidence found in scripture or the worldview that was widely held that the heliocentric model completely undermines.

Good

Possibly, though there are other options, e.g. the Tychonic model

The observations seem very convincing, however, I know for a fact that the universe actually is heliocentric. I do not know how I would respond to an idea that contradicts everything that I thought was true my whole life especially when there is little evidence and no one can tell me why it happens, only that it does. I believe that Galileo's observations provided evidence but not sufficient evidence to switch models.

Good points