Chapter 2
The Coherence of Substances

Let us remember that we are dealing with infinities and indivisibles, both of which transcend our finite understanding . . .

—Galileo Galilei

2.1 Introduction

After having introduced the subject of scaling, specifically whether structures or machines can be built of arbitrarily large size while retaining the same resistance to fracture, Galileo continues the First Day of his Dialogues by inquiring about the source of strength of various materials. In what follows, Salviati, Sagredo and Simplicio discuss two possible reasons why material might cohere, or stick together. What are these two reasons? Are there any other possibilities? Their discussion quickly turns to the possibility of atoms, a topic brimming with seeming paradoxes, and the source of ancient philosophical disagreements dating at least as far back as Aristotle and Democritus—disagreements which persisted up to and beyond the time of Galileo.

2.2 Reading


2.2.1 First Day, Continued

Salv. A truly ingenious device! I feel, however, that for a complete explanation other considerations might well enter; yet I must not now digress upon this particular topic since you are waiting to hear what I think about the breaking strength of other materials which, unlike ropes and most woods, do not show a filamentous structure. The coherence of these bodies is, in my estimation, produced by other causes which may be grouped under two heads. One is that much-talked-of repugnance which nature exhibits towards a vacuum;
but this horror of a vacuum not being sufficient, it is necessary to introduce another cause in the form of a gluey or viscous substance which binds firmly together the component parts of the body.

First I shall speak of the vacuum, demonstrating by definite experiment the quality and quantity of its force \([\textit{virtù}]\). If you take two highly polished and smooth plates of marble, metal, or glass and place them face to face, one will slide over the other with the greatest ease, showing conclusively that there is nothing of a viscous nature between them. But when you attempt to separate them and keep them at a constant distance apart, you find the plates exhibit such a repugnance to separation that the upper one will carry the lower one with it and keep it lifted indefinitely, even when the latter is big and heavy.

This experiment shows the aversion of nature for empty space, even during the brief moment required for the outside air to rush in and fill up the region between the two plates. It is also observed that if two plates are not thoroughly polished, their contact is imperfect so that when you attempt to separate them slowly the only resistance offered is that of weight; if, however, the pull be sudden, then the lower plate rises, but quickly falls back, having followed the upper plate only for that very short interval of time required for the expansion of the small amount of air remaining between the plates, in consequence of their not fitting, and for the entrance of the surrounding air. This resistance which is exhibited between the two plates is doubtless likewise present between the parts of a solid, and enters, at least in part, as a concomitant cause of their coherence. /60/

SAGR. Allow me to interrupt you for a moment, please; for I want to speak of something which just occurs to me, namely, when I see how the lower plate follows the upper one and how rapidly it is lifted, I feel sure that, contrary to the opinion of many philosophers, including perhaps even Aristotle himself, motion in a vacuum is not instantaneous.\(^1\) If this were so the two plates mentioned above would separate without any resistance whatever, seeing that the same instant of time would suffice for their separation and for the surrounding medium to rush in and fill the vacuum between them. The fact that the lower plate follows the upper one allows us to infer, not only that motion in a vacuum is not instantaneous, but also that, between the two plates, a vacuum really exists, at least for a very short time, sufficient to allow the surrounding medium to rush in and fill the vacuum; for if there were no vacuum there would be no need of any motion in the medium. One must admit then that a vacuum is sometimes produced by violent motion.

---

\(^1\) Sagredo is here referring to Aristotle’s argument against the possibility of a vacuum, which is described in more detail on pages /106–107/; see Chap. 3 of this volume. Briefly, Aristotle argues that the existence of a vacuum would entail instantaneous motion, which is absurd. Thus, there can be no vacuum.—[K.K.].
[violenza] or contrary to the laws of nature, (although in my opinion nothing occurs contrary to nature except the impossible, and that never occurs).

But here another difficulty arises. While experiment convinces me of the correctness of this conclusion, my mind is not entirely satisfied as to the cause to which this effect is to be attributed. For the separation of the plates precedes the formation of the vacuum which is produced as a consequence of this separation; and since it appears to me that, in the order of nature, the cause must precede the effect, even though it appears to follow in point of time, and since every positive effect must have a positive cause, I do not see how the adhesion of two plates and their resistance to separation—actual facts—can be referred to a vacuum as cause when this vacuum is yet to follow. According to the infallible maxim of the Philosopher, the non-existent can produce no effect.

SIMP. Seeing that you accept this axiom of Aristotle, I hardly think you will reject another excellent and reliable maxim of his, namely, Nature undertakes only that which happens without resistance; and in this saying, it appears to me, you will find the solution of your difficulty. Since nature abhors a vacuum, she prevents that from which a vacuum would follow as a necessary consequence. Thus it happens that nature prevents the separation of the two plates. /61/

SAGR. Now admitting that what Simplicio says is an adequate solution of my difficulty, it seems to me, if I may be allowed to resume my former argument, that this very resistance to a vacuum ought to be sufficient to hold together the parts either of stone or of metal or the parts of any other solid which is knit together more strongly and which is more resistant to separation. If for one effect there be only one cause, or if, more being assigned, they can be reduced to one, then why is not this vacuum which really exists a sufficient cause for all kinds of resistance?

SALV. I do not wish just now to enter this discussion as to whether the vacuum alone is sufficient to hold together the separate parts of a solid body; but I assure you that the vacuum which acts as a sufficient cause in the case of the two plates is not alone sufficient to bind together the parts of a solid cylinder of marble or metal which, when pulled violently, separates and divides. And now if I find a method of distinguishing this well known resistance, depending upon the vacuum, from every other kind which might increase the coherence, and if I show you that the aforesaid resistance alone is not nearly sufficient for such an effect, will you not grant that we are bound to introduce another cause? Help him, Simplicio, since he does not know what reply to make.

SIMP. Surely, Sagredo’s hesitation must be owing to another reason, for there can be no doubt concerning a conclusion which is at once so clear and logical.

SAGR. You have guessed rightly, Simplicio. I was wondering whether, if a million of gold each year from Spain were not sufficient to pay the army, it might
not be necessary to make provision other than small coin for the pay of the soldiers.  

But go ahead, Salviati; assume that I admit your conclusion and show us your method of separating the action of the vacuum from other causes; and by measuring it show us how it is not sufficient to produce the effect in question.

Salv. Your good angel assist you. I will tell you how to separate the force of the vacuum from the others, and afterwards how to measure it. For this purpose let us consider a continuous substance whose parts lack all resistance to separation except that derived from a vacuum, such as is the case with water, a fact fully demonstrated by our Academician in one of his treatises. Whenever a cylinder of water is subjected to a pull and offers a resistance to the separation of its parts this can be attributed to no other cause than the resistance of the vacuum. In order to try such an experiment I have invented a device which I can better explain by mere words (Fig. 2.1). Let CABD represent the cross section of a cylinder either of metal or, preferably, of glass, hollow inside and accurately turned. Into this is introduced a perfectly fitting cylinder of wood, represented in cross section by EGHF, and capable of up-and-down motion. Through the middle of this cylinder is bored a hole to receive an iron wire, carrying a hook at the end K, while the upper end of the wire, I, is provided with a conical head. The wooden cylinder is countersunk at the top so as to receive, with a perfect fit, the conical head I of the wire, IK, when pulled down by the end K.

Now insert the wooden cylinder EH in the hollow cylinder AD, so as not to touch the upper end of the latter but to leave free a space of two or three finger-breadths; this space is to be filled with water by holding the vessel with the mouth CD upwards, pushing down on the stopper EH, and at the same time keeping the conical head of the wire, I, away from the hollow portion of the wooden cylinder. The air is thus allowed to escape alongside the iron wire (which does not make a close fit) as soon as one presses down on the wooden stopper. The air having been allowed to escape and the iron wire having been drawn back so that it fits snugly against the conical depression in the wood, invert the vessel, bringing it mouth downwards, and hang on the hook K a vessel which can be filled with sand or any heavy material in quantity sufficient to finally separate the upper surface of the stopper, EF, from the lower surface of the water to which it was attached only by the resistance of the vacuum. Next weigh the stopper and wire together with the attached vessel and its contents; we shall then have the force of the vacuum [forza del vacuo]. If one attaches to a cylinder of marble or glass a weight which, together with the weight of the marble or glass itself, is just equal to the sum of the weights before mentioned, and if breaking occurs we shall then be justified in saying that the vacuum alone holds the parts

---

2 The bearing of this remark becomes clear on reading what Salviati says on p. /67/ below. [Trans.].
of the marble and glass together; but if this weight does not suffice and if breaking occurs only after adding, say, four times this weight, we shall then be compelled to say that the vacuum furnishes only one fifth of the total resistance [resisten
tza].

SIMP. No one can doubt the cleverness of the device; yet it presents many difficulties which make me doubt its reliability. For who will assure us that the air does not creep in between the glass and stopper even if it is well packed with tow or other yielding material? I question also whether oiling with wax or turpentine will suffice to make the cone, $I$, fit snugly on its seat. Besides, may not the parts of the water expand and dilate? Why may not the air or exhalations or some other more subtile substances penetrate the pores of the wood, or even of the glass itself?

SALV. With great skill indeed has Simplicio laid before us the difficulties; and he has even partly suggested how to prevent the air from penetrating the wood or passing between the wood and the glass. But now let me point out that, as our experience increases, we shall learn whether or not these alleged difficulties really exist. For if, as is the case with air, water is by nature expansible, although only under severe treatment, we shall see the stopper descend; and if we put a small excavation in the upper part of the glass vessel, such as indicated by $V$, then the air or any other tenuous and gaseous substance, which might penetrate the pores of glass or wood, would
pass through the water and collect in this receptacle \( V \). But if these things do not happen we may rest assured that our experiment has been performed with proper caution; and we shall discover that water does not dilate and that glass does not allow any material, however tenuous, to penetrate it.

**Sagr.** Thanks to this discussion, I have learned the cause of a certain effect which I have long wondered at and despaired of understanding. I once saw a cistern which had been provided with a pump under the mistaken impression that the water might thus be drawn with less effort or in greater quantity than by means of the ordinary bucket. The stock of the pump carried \( \frac{64}{64} \) its sucker and valve in the upper part so that the water was lifted by attraction and not by a push as is the case with pumps in which the sucker is placed lower down. This pump worked perfectly so long as the water in the cistern stood above a certain level; but below this level the pump failed to work. When I first noticed this phenomenon I thought the machine was out of order; but the workman whom I called in to repair it told me the defect was not in the pump but in the water which had fallen too low to be raised through such a height; and he added that it was not possible, either by a pump or by any other machine working on the principle of attraction, to lift water a hair’s breadth above 18 cubits; whether the pump be large or small this is the extreme limit of the lift. Up to this time I had been so thoughtless that, although I knew a rope, or rod of wood, or of iron, if sufficiently long, would break by its own weight when held by the upper end, it never occurred to me that the same thing would happen, only much more easily, to a column of water. And really is not that thing which is attracted in the pump a column of water attached at the upper end and stretched more and more until finally a point is reached where it breaks, like a rope, on account of its excessive weight?

**Salv.** That is precisely the way it works; this fixed elevation of 18 cubits is true for any quantity of water whatever, be the pump large or small or even as fine as a straw. We may therefore say that, on weighing the water contained in a tube 18 cubits long, no matter what the diameter, we shall obtain the value of the resistance of the vacuum in a cylinder of any solid material having a bore of this same diameter. And having gone so far, let us see how easy it is to find to what length cylinders of metal, stone, wood, glass, etc., of any diameter can be elongated without breaking by their own weight. \( \frac{65}{65} \) Take for instance a copper wire of any length and thickness; fix the upper end and to the other end attach a greater and greater load until finally the wire breaks; let the maximum load be, say, 50 pounds. Then it is clear that if 50 pounds of copper, in addition to the weight of the wire itself which may be, say, \( \frac{1}{8} \) ounce, is drawn out into wire of this same size we shall have the greatest length of this kind of wire which can sustain its own weight. Suppose the wire which breaks to be one cubit in length and \( \frac{1}{8} \) ounce in weight; then since it supports 50 pounds in addition to its own weight, \( i.e. \),
2.2 Reading

4800 eighths-of-an-ounce,\(^3\) it follows that all copper wires, independent of size, can sustain themselves up to a length of 4801 cubits and no more. Since then a copper rod can sustain its own weight up to a length of 4801 cubits, it follows that that part of the breaking strength \([\text{resistenza]}\) which depends upon the vacuum, comparing it with the remaining factors of resistance, is equal to the weight of a rod of water, 18 cubits long and as thick as the copper rod. If, for example, copper is nine times as heavy as water, the breaking strength \([\text{resistenza allo strapparsi}]\) of any copper rod, in so far as it depends upon the vacuum, is equal to the weight of 2 cubits of this same rod. By a similar method one can find the maximum length of wire or rod of any material which will just sustain its own weight, and can at the same time discover the part which the vacuum plays in its breaking strength.

**Sagr.** It still remains for you to tell us upon what depends the resistance to breaking, other than that of the vacuum; what is the gluey or viscous substance which cements together the parts of the solid? For I cannot imagine a glue that will not burn up in a highly heated furnace in 2 or 3 months, or certainly within 10 or 100. For if gold, silver and glass are kept for a long while in the molten state and are removed from the furnace, their parts, on cooling, immediately reunite and bind themselves together as before. Not only so, but whatever difficulty arises with respect to the cementation of the parts of the glass arises also with regard to the parts of the glue; in other words, what is that which holds these parts together so firmly? /66/

**Salv.** A little while ago, I expressed the hope that your good angel might assist you. I now find myself in the same straits. Experiment leaves no doubt that the reason why two plates cannot be separated, except with violent effort, is that they are held together by the resistance of the vacuum; and the same can be said of two large pieces of a marble or bronze column. This being so, I do not see why this same cause may not explain the coherence of smaller parts and indeed of the very smallest particles of these materials. Now, since each effect must have one true and sufficient cause and since I find no other cement, am I not justified in trying to discover whether the vacuum is not a sufficient cause?

**Simp.** But seeing that you have already proved that the resistance which the large vacuum offers to the separation of two large parts of a solid is really very small in comparison with that cohesive force which binds together the most minute parts, why do you hesitate to regard this latter as something very different from the former?

**Salv.** Sagredo has already [p. /62/ above] answered this question when he remarked that each individual soldier was being paid from coin collected by a general tax of pennies and farthings, while even a million of gold would not suffice to pay the entire army. And who knows but that there may be other extremely minute vacua which affect the smallest particles so that

---

\(^3\) Galileo seems to be using the fact that 12 troy ounces make a (troy) pound.—[K.K.].
that which binds together the contiguous parts is throughout of the same mintage? Let me tell you something which has just occurred to me and which I do not offer as an absolute fact, but rather as a passing thought, still immature and calling for more careful consideration. You may take of it what you like; and judge the rest as you see fit. Sometimes when I have observed how fire winds its way in between the most minute particles of this or that metal and, even though these are solidly cemented together, tears them apart and separates them, and when I have observed that, on removing the fire, these particles reunite with the same tenacity as at first, without any loss of quantity in the case of gold and with little loss in the case of other metals, even though these parts have been separated for a long while, I have thought that the explanation might lie in the fact that the extremely fine particles of fire, penetrating the slender pores of the metal (too small to admit even the finest particles of air or of many other fluids), would fill the small intervening vacua and would set free these small particles from the attraction which these same vacua exert upon them and which prevents their separation. Thus the particles are able to move freely so that the mass becomes fluid and remains so as long as the particles of fire remain inside; but if they depart and leave the former vacua then the original attraction returns and the parts are again cemented together.

In reply to the question raised by Simplicio, one may say that although each particular vacuum is exceedingly minute and therefore easily overcome, yet their number is so extraordinarily great that their combined resistance is, so to speak, multiplied almost without limit. The nature and the amount of force which results from adding together an immense number of small forces is clearly illustrated by the fact that a weight of millions of pounds, suspended by great cables, is overcome and lifted, when the south wind carries innumerable atoms of water, suspended in thin mist, which moving through the air penetrate between the fibres of the tense ropes in spite of the tremendous force of the hanging weight. When these particles enter the narrow pores they swell the ropes, thereby shorten them, and perforce lift the heavy mass.

Sagr. There can be no doubt that any resistance, so long as it is not infinite, may be overcome by a multitude of minute forces. Thus a vast number of ants might carry ashore a ship laden with grain. And since experience shows us daily that one ant can easily carry one grain, it is clear that the number of grains in the ship is not infinite, but falls below a certain limit. If you take another number four or six times as great, and if you set to work a corresponding number of ants they will carry the grain ashore and the boat also. It is true that this will call for a prodigious number of ants, but in my opinion this is precisely the case with the vacua which bind together the least particles of a metal.

Salv. But even if this demanded an infinite number would you still think it impossible?

Sagr. Not if the mass of metal were infinite; otherwise . . .
Otherwise what? Now since we have arrived at paradoxes let us see if we cannot prove that within a finite extent it is possible to discover an infinite number of vacua. At the same time we shall at least reach a solution of the most remarkable of all that list of problems which Aristotle himself calls wonderful; I refer to his *Questions in Mechanics*. This solution may be no less clear and conclusive than that which he himself gives and quite different also from that so cleverly expounded by the most learned Monsignor di Guevara.4

First it is necessary to consider a proposition, not treated by others, but upon which depends the solution of the problem and from which, if I mistake not, we shall derive other new and remarkable facts. For the sake of clearness let us draw an accurate figure (Fig. 2.2).

About $G$ as a center describe an equiangular and equilateral polygon of any number of sides, say the hexagon $ABCDEF$. Similar to this and concentric with it, describe another smaller one which we shall call $HIKLMN$. Prolong the side $AB$ of the larger hexagon, indefinitely toward $S$; in like manner prolong the corresponding side $HI$ of the smaller hexagon in the same direction, so that the line $HT$ is parallel to $AS$; and through the center draw the line $GV$ parallel to the other two. This done, imagine the larger polygon to roll upon the line $AS$, carrying with it the smaller polygon. It is evident that, if the point $B$, the end of the side $AB$, remains fixed at

---

4 Bishop of Teano; b. 1561, d. 1641. [Trans.].
the beginning of the rotation, the point $A$ will rise and the point $C$ will fall
describing the arc $CQ$ until the side $BC$ coincides with the line $BQ$, equal
to $BC$. But during this rotation the point $I$, on the smaller polygon, will rise
above the line $IT$ because $IB$ is oblique to $AS$; and it will not again return
to the line $IT$ until the point $C$ shall have reached the position $Q$. The point
$I$, having described the arc $IO$ above the line $HT$, will reach the position $O$
at the same time the side $IK$ assumes the position $OP$; but in the meantime
the center $G$ has traversed a path above $GV$ and does not return to it until
it has completed the arc $GC$. This step having been taken, the larger poly-
gon has been brought to rest with its side $BC$ coinciding with the line $BQ$
while the side $IK$ of the smaller polygon has been made to coincide with
the line $OP$, having passed over the portion $IO$ without touching it; also
the center $G$ will have reached the position $C$ after having traversed all its
course above the parallel line $GV$. And finally the entire figure will assume
a position similar to the first, so that if we continue the rotation and come
to the next step, the side $DC$ of the larger polygon will coincide with the
portion $QX$ and the side $KL$ of the smaller polygon, having first skipped
the arc $PY$, will fall on $YZ$, while the center still keeping above the line
$GV$ will return to it at $R$ after having jumped the interval $CR$. At the end of
one complete rotation the larger polygon will have traced upon the line $AS$,
without break, six lines together equal to its perimeter; the lesser polygon
will likewise have imprinted six lines equal to its perimeter, but separated
by the interposition of five arcs, whose chords represent the parts of $HT$
not touched by the polygon: the center $G$ never reaches the line $GV$ except
at six points. From this it is clear that the space traversed by the smaller
polygon is almost equal to that traversed by the larger, that is, the line $HT$
approximately equals the line $AS$, differing from it only by the length of one chord
of one of these arcs, provided we understand the line $HT$ to include the five
skipped arcs.

Now this exposition which I have given in the case of these hexagons must
be understood to be applicable to all other polygons, whatever the number of
sides, provided only they are /70/ similar, concentric, and rigidly connected,
so that when the greater one rotates the lesser will also turn however small
it may be. You must also understand that the lines described by these two
are nearly equal provided we include in the space traversed by the smaller
one the intervals which are not touched by any part of the perimeter of this
smaller polygon.

Let a large polygon of, say, 1000 sides make one complete rotation and thus
lay off a line equal to its perimeter; at the same time the small one will pass
over an approximately equal distance, made up of 1000 small portions each
equal to one of its sides, but interrupted by 1000 spaces which, in contrast
with the portions that coincide with the sides of the polygon, we may call
empty. So far the matter is free from difficulty or doubt.

But now suppose that about any center, say $A$, we describe two concentric
and rigidly connected circles; and suppose that from the points $C$ and $B$, on
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