their motives and justifications were very different. The Catholic Montano placed emphasis on the allegorical interpretation, the Protestant Bochart on the literal. Bochart's work proved hugely popular and was used as an authoritative source on the Phoenicians by Protestant and Catholic alike. It was cited as late as the nineteenth century, yet Shalev's study shows that, in its origins, it has to be read against the backdrop of the religious controversy of his own times.

Bochart's biblical exegesis extended the idea of *geographia sacra* hugely, bringing it into a global context. But, as Shalev points out in his last substantive chapter, there was another strand to *geographia sacra*, that of ecclesiastical geography, which covered much more than biblical exegesis. This chapter is devoted to the visual and textual mapping of the Church at the instigation of Catholic authorities.

Shalev has made a fascinating contribution to the growing interest in sacred geography in the early modern period. He has added a more nuanced perspective to the idea that sacred geography was predominantly a Protestant interest, and has woven in the importance of antiquarian studies in the period. The case studies at the core of the book are drawn out to fit into a far bigger and more elaborate picture than simply a study of the work of three scholars. Using their work, he shows how the religious tensions of the period affected the style, production and reception of sacred geography. Shalev's own linguistic abilities provide him with the tools to draw out this picture, and contribute a great deal to the value of this book.

Margaret Small
University of Birmingham

Jeremiah Horrocks and Wilbur Applebaum (trans.), **Venus Seen on the Sun: The First Observation of a Transit of Venus by Jeremiah Horrocks**. Leiden: Brill, 2012. Pp. xxiv + 82. ISBN 978-90-04-22193-2. €99.00 (hardback).
doi:10.1017/S0007087413000058

The June 2012 transit of Venus was the occasion to turn our attention once again to the observers of the previous transits, in 1639, 1761, 1769, 1874 and 1882. Thus it is that we have the first English translation since the nineteenth century of Jeremiah Horrocks's account of his 1639 observation. This seems long overdue, especially given the fact that the only other available translation, which is 'more free in style than necessary' (p. xxii), was produced by someone who lacked familiarity with the history of astronomy and introduced a number of errors.

The text of *Venus in Sole visa*, first published by Johannes Hevelius in 1662, is not only an account of the first observation of this rare event but also a fascinating commentary on astronomy at a period of significant change. The transit gave Horrocks the opportunity to judge and correct the work of Copernicus, Lansberge, Longomontanus and Kepler, with the *Rudolphine Tables* of the last being proved much the superior. It was this, rather than the observation itself, or even its indication of the planets' great distance and lack of luminosity, that marked the significance of the work. In addition, the text is remarkably readable: as Applebaum writes in the brief introduction, 'It is filled with an unrestrained enthusiasm and intensity of commitment from which a youthful and refreshing naiveté is never wholly lacking' (p. xxiii).

Short though the introduction is, it helpfully outlines Horrocks's life, the history of the four draft manuscripts of the treatise, and the astronomical context in which it was produced and read. Applebaum's notes in the main text are full and extremely helpful, in technical matters and in relation to the books and manuscripts that Horrocks was referring to, both scientific and literary. I cannot comment on the faithfulness of the translation but it reads well, with the exception, perhaps, of Horrocks's poetry, which has been translated for meaning rather than scansion.

A sense of Horrocks's personality arises from the text, in part due to his adhering to 'a style now completely gone from scientific literature' (p. xxiv). There is infectious zeal, leading to amusingly damning judgements, as well as the poetry, digressions and classical allusions. (The transit of

Venus is a subject for which coy personifications and metaphors of seduction seem not yet to have gone out of style.) It is not hard to see why successive readers of Horrocks have taken him to their hearts. The Victorians, with Arundell B. Whatton's 1859 *Memoir* and a series of essentially fictional memorials and portraits, naturally led the way, bequeathing their vision of a pious and persevering young cleric, fighting ill health to perform first his Christian and then his scientific duty.

We, no less enthused by a local hero with his finger on the pulse of Continental astronomy, will still rejoice in the account of a young astronomer's greatest moment. Although touched by the thought of his work being cut short by tragically early death, Horrocks nevertheless comes across as wonderfully vital. The modern, positively reclaimed term 'geek' comes to mind in reading Horrocks's description of astronomers who 'immoderately delight in trifling things, which do not move others in the least' (p. 16). Something similar arises from his lauding of Kepler, 'the unparalleled prince of true astronomy' (p. 51), and his dismissal of the 'boasts' and 'impotent clamour' (p. 72) of Philippe van Lansberge and those who relied on his tables.

Apart from Kepler, Horrocks's greatest praise is for 'the recent and wonderful invention of the telescope' (p. 8). Despite writing three decades after the instrument was patented, Horrocks clearly felt that 'the Belgian telescope' still required a better reputation, and thus he affirmed the increased accuracy it allowed and defended it against those who suggested it could create illusions. It is eulogized in verse, as readers are urged to 'learn the wonders of such a great tube' (p. 11) and join him, lying in wait to spy Venus.

Being a review of a book published by Brill, this must end with the inevitable comment about cost. Ninety-nine euros for just over a hundred pages is steep by any measure. Given the accessible style of Horrocks's writing and Applebaum's translation, it is a shame that this should simply be a library-based reference work. The author's preface promises a full-length biography of Horrocks in the near future. It is much to be hoped that this does indeed appear, and that it is available at a price that places it within reach of significantly more pockets.

Rebekah Higgitt
Royal Observatory Greenwich

Gregory Lynall, **Swift and Science: The Satire, Politics and Theology of Natural Knowledge, 1690–1730**. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. Pp. ix + 209. ISBN 978-0-230-34364-1. £50.00 (hardback).
doi:10.1017/S000708741300006X

Publishers regularly resort to two standby artists, Joseph Wright of Derby and James Gillray, for adorning the covers of their books about science and society. When contemplating the title of Gregory Lynall's first monograph, *Swift and Science: The Satire, Politics and Theology of Natural Knowledge, 1690–1730*, the designers at Palgrave Macmillan understandably plumped for a dramatic caricature, presumably deeming it inconsequential that Gillray's *Alchymist* appeared at the end of the eighteenth century and lampooned William Pitt (not even born until 1759) as a royal sycophant spending the Treasury's golden coins on distilling democracy into dictatorship.

This preoccupation with associative symbolism rather than hard historical accuracy characterizes Lynall's approach. I intend this not as a criticism but as a reflection on broad differences between the academic disciplines of English literature and history of science. In a verbal equivalent of caricature – an art form that ruthlessly exposes unpalatable truths by exaggerating beyond the limits of credibility – literary critics have little time for chronology, whereas historians plough unimaginatively through furrows of facts. Or, as Jonathan Swift did not say, experts on literature try to make sunbeams out of cucumbers, while explorers of the past are weighed down by the burdensome load of exactitude.