

Kepler's Astrology and the Wallenstein Horoscopes Keplers Astrologie und die Wallenstein-Horoskope

KLAUDIA EINHORN¹, GÜNTHER WUCHTERL²

¹Kuffner-Sternwarte, Johann-Staud Strasse 10, A-1160 Wien, Austria
(Klaudia.Einhorn@ehochw.de)

²University Observatory Jena, Schillergäßchen 2-3, 07749 Jena, Germany
(wuchterl@astro.uni-jena.de)

Historical horoscopes contain clues to the history of astronomy. They contain, in a kind of applied astronomy, the theories for planetary positions — from commonly used to state of the art — as well as evaluations of rise-, culmination and setting-times, time-keeping, and geographical position determinations. Kepler, likely to be the most learned and vivid critic of astrology at his time and author of famous horoscopes played a key-rôle in the process that ultimately led 'the second death of astrology' (J. Tester). He left in-tact close to nothing of classical, Tetrabiblos-astrology. Much of the process can be seen in his famous Wallenstein Horoscopes, cast in 1608 and rectified in 1625. As noted by Henseling, Kepler's 1608 Wallenstein Horoscope contain serious inconsistencies. Based on an analysis of the astronomy and astrology of the time we show that the first 1608 horoscope contains errors that e.g. lead to 4 year shifts in the evaluation of the 'directions', that are commonly used in astrology to derive statements about important live-events. We show that the rectification of 1625 is a masterpiece in the use of various ill-defined concepts and loop-holes in the astrology of Kepler's contemporaries to cover-up the error of 1608 and staying astrologically well positioned for any critique that might come up from astrologers of the time. The result is a birth chart plausible for laymen and astrologers of his time (and of ours), but that does not correspond to Wallenstein's birth data by any requirement of consistency of techniques or to Kepler's own statements about the subject. In short there is no known astrologically correct Kepler-birth-chart for Wallenstein.