Triangulorum planorum et sphaericorum praxis arithmetica — Editorial footnotes (draft)

Tycho Brahe (1546–1601). Drafted editorial footnotes for review before publication. Each note is keyed to its anchor in the **manuscript-grade complete edition —** the collated output that retains the per-batch/page scaffolding the anchors reference (produced by `ms`). The reading in the main text is **preserved as printed/transcribed** and is not altered by these notes. The note text below is a **draft —** review and edit before publication.

The notes are classified as follows:

- **Category B — source compositor error.** A printing, compositor, or scribal error in the source itself (a wrong letter or digit, a dropped or doubled word, a non-resolving citation). The likely intended reading is noted, but the main text preserves exactly what is printed.
- **Category C — author/source anomaly.** An anomaly originating with the author or the source rather than the typesetting (a factual or geographic slip, a misattribution, an internal inconsistency, or a deliberate but unusual feature). Recorded as written.
- **Missing-source lacuna.** A point where source text is missing, damaged, or illegible. The note states what should stand at the gap and points to an alternate witness where one is known.

#	Anchor	Cat.	Item
1	batch_003 / p.5	C	Title page: Dreyer's reading of the two dates, and his denial that the hand is Tycho's
2	batch_004 / p.7	lacuna	p. 7: marginal word and one figure label not fully read on this copy; Dreyer omits the word
3	batch_007 / p.13	B	p. 13 margin: NOM written for NON
4	batch_018 / p.35	C	supplementum where a complement is expected (pp. 35, 40, 42)
5	batch_019 / p.37	C	Dogma VII: no halving named, and no sum identified as 'first'
6	batch_020 / p.40	C	Dogma VIII: angle ACD 'found earlier', but no step finds it
7	batch_022 / p.43	C	Dogma IX, case III: 'add' with the whole sine, a verbless clause, and an ending in 'complementum'

1. batch_003 / p.5 — *Category C — author/source anomaly*

The page does not say what the marginal date 13 Cal. Xbris 1595 refers to. Dreyer (Opera Omnia I, pp. 315–316) takes the date under the name, Calend. Januar. 1591, as that of an exemplar and the 1595 date as that of this copy, and places the composition of the work in 1583 or 1584. He also denies, against Studnička's preface to the 1886 facsimile, that the hand is Tycho's: it lacks Tycho's abbreviations, its M is not his, and the name written on the title differs from his signature. He gives the codex as Prague lat. 2761. The facsimile itself settles none of this; the manuscript is not available in images.

2. batch_004 / p.7 — *Missing-source lacuna*

This marginal item could not be fully read on the facsimile. A blind second reading and a full-resolution crop show a short word opening si, not struck through (as the first reading had supposed), with a crossed sign beneath it; the rest of the word is unread, and sinum is only a possibility suggested by its position against per totum. Dreyer's edition does not print the word, so this copy is at present its only available witness, and the manuscript cannot be consulted in images. One of the six labels of the figure on the same page was likewise not settled by the second reading.

3. batch_007 / p.13 — *Category B — source compositor error*

The marginal caption writes NOM, and a blind second reading of the leaf confirms the M. The same caption at Dogma VI of the spherical triangles (p. 35) writes NON RECTAN= / GULI, which is the sense required here (”non-right-angled triangles”). Preserved as written, with the correction in the bracket.

4. batch_018 / p.35 — *Category C — author/source anomaly*

The leaf writes supplementum here, three lines after complementum maioris in the same operation. The same word recurs at Dogma VIII, step IV (p. 40: ”the supplement of the greater, BC”, where step I of that dogma has complementum maioris) and at Dogma IX (p. 42: ”add the lesser side and the supplement of the greater”). Every occurrence was read as supplementum in both readings of the leaf, and Dreyer prints it without comment, so it is not a misreading. A check of the operations by the present editors suggests the comparison should run on the complement; that check is not evidence for any letter, and the word is kept as written in all three places.

5. batch_019 / p.37 — *Category C — author/source anomaly*

As written, this operation names no halving before found quantity I, and no earlier step is called the first sum: the only additions before it are of the lesser angle and the complement, and of the sines. The page nonetheless calls the operation similar to the previous one, which does halve. Both readings of the leaf agree, and the words stand in Dreyer. Compare his judgement, given in the note at the end of the operation, that the solution is false.

6. batch_020 / p.40 — *Category C — author/source anomaly*

The leaf writes ACD prius invento, ”ACD, found earlier”, but no step of this dogma as written finds angle ACD: steps I to IV give AD, DC, BC and

BD. The angle could be had from the right triangle CAD, but the operation does not say so. Both readings of the leaf agree. Kept as written.

7. batch_022 / p.43 — *Category C — author/source anomaly*

Case III is irregular in three ways on the leaf. (1) It writes adde, ”add”, with integrum sinum. When the opposite side is exactly 90°, the sine of its complement is zero and found quantity III equals found quantity I, so the main rule on p. 42, which multiplies found quantity III by the whole and divides by found quantity II, would lead one to expect a multiplication here. This is the editors' reasoning, not a reading. (2) The clause latus vero oppositum 90ta præcise has no verb of its own; ”is” is supplied in the English. (3) The case ends in complementum, ”the complement”, where the main rule ends in the sine of the complement. The word Aliter:, ”in another way”, stands at the end of the case's last line, and the leaf does not show whether it closes case III or opens case IV. Both readings of the leaf agree, and all is kept as written.