Again, Strabo may be censured for discarding the statements of Pytheas respecting the west and north of Europe, accepted as they had been by Eratosthenes. But in this he relied on Polybius, whom he might justly consider as having from his position at Rome far better means of gaining accurate information about those regions. A critical sagacity far stronger than that of Strabo might well have erred at a time when the data for forming accurate judgments on such questions were so meagre and chaotic. It must be admitted that the statements of Pytheas did not accord with the theory of Strabo just in those very points where he was at variance with Erato­sthenes. He showed likewise an unwarranted scepticism in reference to the island of Cerne on the west coast of Africa, which without doubt the Carthaginians had long used as an emporium. Strabo has been censured for not making a greater use of Roman authorities. Although the Roman arms had opened up much of the north and west, he follows the Greek writers almost exclusively in his description of Spain, Gaul, Britain, Germany, and even Italy. For, although he refers to Cæsar’s *Commentaries* once by name, and has evidently made use of them in other passages, he but imperfectly availed himself of that work. He designed his geography as a sequel to his his­torical writings, and it had as it were grown out of his historical materials. Such materials were chiefly Greek. We cannot wonder if a man who at an advanced age has commenced a new work utilizes his old material, and has not the energy to undertake fresh researches. Again, if Strabo amassed his material in the library of Alexandria, Greek authorities would naturally furnish the great bulk of his collections. This involves the questions—When and where did he compose the work ? He began it probably later than 9 B.c. For he says that, just as Alexander had opened up knowledge of the East, so the Roman arms had now opened up the geography of the West as far as the Elbe. This Drusus accomplished in 9 b.c. Strabo was still engaged on the work, or certain parts of it, in 19 a.d., for he mentions in the fourth book the conquest of the Taurisci as having taken place thirty-three years before ; he also speaks, in the sixth book, of Germanicus, who died in 20 a.d., as still alive, and in the seventeenth book he speaks of the death of Juba II. (21 a.d.) as a recent event. As it is not probable that he wrote for the first time all of his work except the first three books between 19 and 21 a.d., we must not make use of these passages as data for determining the date of composition of the whole work, or even of particular books, but rather ought we to regard them as insertions. Strabo, as already pointed out, was at Rome after the death of Augustus (14 a.d.) ; in book vii. 290 and in book xiii. 609 he uses the terms “ here ” and “ hither ” in reference to Rome. It may be inferred from these passages that Strabo certainly revised, if he did not write, the entire work at Rome. If he returned to Rome after a long sojourn in Alexandria, this explains the de­fectiveness of his information about the countries to the east of his native land, and renders it possible for him to have made use of the chorography of Agrippa, and to have obtained the few incidents from Roman sources which here and there appear in his work.

He designed the work for the statesman rather than for the student. He therefore endeavours to give a general sketch of the character, physical peculiarities, and natural productions of each country, and consequently gives us much valuable information respecting ethnology, trade, and metallurgy. It was almost necessary that in such an attempt he should select what he thought most important for description, and at times omit what we deem of more importance. With respect to physical geography, his work is a great advance on all preceding ones. Judged

by modern standards, his description of the direction of rivers and mountain-chains seems defective, but allowance must be made for difficulties in procuring information, and for want of accurate instruments. In respect of mathematical geography, his want of high scientific train­ing was of no great hindrance. He had before him the results of Eratosthenes, Hipparchus, and Posidonius. The chief conclusions of astronomers concerning the spherical figure and dimensions of the earth, its relation to the heavenly bodies, and the great circles of the globe—the equator, the ecliptic, and the tropics—were considered as well established. He accepted also the division into five zones ; he quotes approvingly the assertion of Hipparchus that it was impossible to make real advances in geography without astronomical observations for determining lati­tudes and longitudes.

The work consists of seventeen books, of which the seventh is imperfect. The first two books form a general introduction ; the next ten deal with Europe, the four following with Asia, and the last with Africa. The first two hooks are meant to comprise a general survey of the progress of geography from the earliest times down to his own day. Unmethodical though they are, we owe to these books almost all we know of the geographical systems of his predecessors, especially that of Eratosthenes. Unfortunately he con­tents himself with disjointed criticism of detail instead of giving us an orderly statement of the previous systems. The first book begins with his claim to have geography regarded as a branch of philosophy, and he supports this claim by enumerating the philo­sophers who have studied it, beginning from Homer, as proofs of whose knowledge he adduces his acquaintance with the Ocean, the Ethiopians, aud the Scythians. This discussion of Homer’s geogra­phy takes up more than half the book. Passing over the early geo­graphers, not even mentioning Herodotus, he censures Eratosthenes for using unreliable authorities, and for casting doubts on the voyages of Jason and other early navigators. He next criticizes the physical views of Eratosthenes concerning the changes in the earth’s surface, and especially the hypothesis, adopted from Strato, that by sudden disruptions of land the Euxine and Mediterranean had become united to the ocean, and had sunk to their present level, which theory they supported by pointing to sea shells at places high above the sea. This doctrine Strabo rightly rejected, and referred such phenomena to those changes which with constant operation produce subsidences and elevations of the land ; and he quotes many instances of places engulfed by earthquakes, the disappearance of some islands, and the appearing of others. Hence he thinks it possible that even Sicily has been thrown up by the fires of Etna. Sir C. Lyell eulogizes Strabo’s geological speculations for a soundness of view very unusual on such subjects amongst the ancients. Examining the second book of Eratosthenes, he discusses the length and breadth of the inhabited world, and its division into three continents. He blames Eratosthenes for believing Pytheas, and denies the existence of Thule, consequently rejecting the latitude assigned to it by Eratosthenes, who had taken it as the northernmost limit of the inhabited world. Strabo holds lerne (Ireland), which lies north of Britain, to be the farthest land in that direction, and brings the northern limit much farther south. As he adopts Eratosthenes’s southern limit,—that through the Cinnamon Region and Taprobane (Ceylon),—it follows that in his view Eratosthenes had made the inhabited world too broad. As the Greeks assumed that the world was twice as long as it was broad, Eratosthenes accordingly had made it too long likewise ; but, though Strabo shortens it on the west, there is no material difference between him and Eratosthenes. In this con­nexion he gives his remarkable speculation that, as the inhabited world was only one-third of the globe’s circumference, there might be two or more inhabited worlds besides. In the second book he discusses the changes introduced by Eratosthenes, and rightly defends him from the attacks of Hipparchus. He adopts for Asia the map of Eratosthenes as a whole, for little additional knowledge had been gained in the interval. He even still regards the Caspian as opening into the Northern Ocean, as stated by Patrocles. In the general outline of Africa he makes no change, but he rejects the statement of Eratosthenes about Cerne. It is with respect to western and northern Europe that Strabo had knowledge denied to Eratosthenes. Roman conquest had opened up many places and peoples, yet his general map of Europe is inferior to that of his predecessor. After discussing the “ seals ” of Eratosthenes, he considers the views of Posidonius and Polybius, and recounts the voyages of Eudoxus of Cyzicus. Then having dealt with the division into zones, due to Parmenides, he states his own views, discussing briefly the mathematical geography : the earth is spherical and placed in the centre of the universe ; he assumes five zones, and the circles on the sphere—the equator, the ecliptic or