optical illusion, there was nothing to observe, so nothing to confirm. O'Meara remained a trusted figure because even the best visual observer may see an optical illusion. If such reasoning occurred, his evidence became untrustworthy by association with a distrusted technique.

6 CONCLUSION

Inaction that followed O'Meara's report of spokes in 1976 may have been caused by others' distrust of the visual method he used. This explanation may be correct even though his audience had verified his ability to produce scientifically-valid results for Saturn's rings.

Except in their dealings with O'Meara, the planetary scientists he consulted almost certainly had no other active involvement with visual observation. The consequence of the decision not to act was to postpone recognition of spokes until Voyager 1 arrived. Would his audience have responded differently if O'Meara had, instead of seeing spokes, measured them with an instrument and reduction process?

8 REFERENCES

Bryan, J., 2007. E.E. Barnard and the eclipse of Iapetus in 1889. *Journal of Astronomical History and Heritage*, 10, 31-48.

Shapin, S., 1994. *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

James Bryan is a Research Fellow at McDonald Observatory, a branch of the University of Texas at Austin. His research interests include history of astronomy in early Texas, historical observations of the supernova S Andromedae in 1885, and historical visual observations of Saturn's ring system. He is a member of the American Astronomical Society and is a Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society.

CORRIGENDA

James Bryan noticed a misprint in his Barnard paper that was published in the previous issue of *JAH²*. On page 39, near the end of the first paragraph, the uncertainty of Barnard's estimated magnitudes is shown as ± 0.01 whereas it should be ± 0.1.