

his death; editions "amended" by Howes appeared in 1615 and 1631. The work by which Stow is best known is his *Survey of London*, published in 1598, not only interesting from the quaint simplicity of its style and its amusing descriptions and anecdotes, but of unique value from its minute account of the buildings, social condition, and customs of London in the time of Elizabeth. A second edition appeared in his lifetime in 1603, a third with additions by Anthony Munday in 1618, a fourth by Munday and Dyson in 1633, a fifth with interpolated amendments by Strype in 1720, and a sixth by the same editor in 1754. The edition of 1598 was reprinted, edited by W. J. Thoms, in 1842, in 1846, and with illustrations in 1876. Through the patronage of Archbishop Parker Stow was enabled to print the *Flores Historiarum* of Matthew of Westminster in 1567, the *Chronicle* of Matthew Paris in 1571, and the *Historia Brevis* of Thomas Walsingham in 1574. At the request of Parker he had himself compiled a "farre larger volume," but circumstances were unfavourable to its publication and the manuscript is now lost. Additions to the previously published works of Chaucer were twice made through Stow's "own painful labours" in editions of 1561 and 1597. A number of Stow's manuscripts are in the Harleian collection in the British Museum. Some are in the Lambeth Library (No. 306); and from the volume which includes them were published by the Camden Society, edited by James Gairdner, *Three Fifteenth-Century Chronicles, with Historical Memoranda by John Stowe the Antiquary, and Contemporary Notes of Occurrences written by him* (1880). Stow's literary labours did not prove very remunerative, but he accepted poverty in a cheerful spirit. Ben Jonson relates that once when walking with him Stow jocularly asked two mendicant cripples "what they would have to take him to their order." This favour he, however, obtained from King James, who in March 1604 authorized him and his deputies to collect "amongst our loving subjects their voluntary contributions and kind gratuities," and himself began "the largesse for the example of others." If the royal appeal was successful Stow did not live long to enjoy the increased comfort resulting from it, as he died on the 6th April following. He was buried in the church of St Andrew Undershaft, where the monument erected by his widow, exhibiting a terra-cotta figure of him, still remains.

STOWELL, WILLIAM SCOTT, BARON (1745-1836), one of the ablest and most accomplished of English judges, especially in international law, was born at Heworth, a village about four miles from Newcastle, on 17th October 1745. His father was a "coalfitter" (or tradesman engaged in the transport of coal); his mother was the daughter of a small tradesman, Atkinson by name; his younger brother John became the famous Lord Chancellor ELDON (q.v.). Scott was educated at the Newcastle grammar school under the able tuition of the Rev. Hugh Moises. In February 1761 he gained a Durham scholarship at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and was immediately admitted as a student of the university. In 1764 he graduated as bachelor of arts, and became first a probationary fellow and then—as successor to William (afterwards the well-known Sir William) Jones—a tutor of University College. In 1767 he took his M.A. degree. In 1772 he graduated as bachelor of civil law. As Camden reader of ancient history he rivalled the reputation of Blackstone (1774). Although he had joined the Middle Temple in 1762 (June 24), it was not till 1776 that Scott devoted himself to a systematic study of law. In 1779 (June 23) he graduated as doctor of civil law, and, after the customary "year of silence," commenced practice in the ecclesiastical courts. His professional success was rapid. In 1783 he became registrar of the Court of Faculties, and

in 1788 judge of the Consistory Court and advocate-general, in that year too receiving the honour of knighthood; and in 1798 he was made judge of the High Court of Admiralty. Sir William Scott twice contested the representation of Oxford university,—in 1780 without success, but successfully in 1801. He also sat for Downton in 1790. Upon the coronation of George IV. (1821) he was raised to the peerage as Baron Stowell. After a life of distinguished judicial service Lord Stowell retired from the bench,—from the Consistory Court in August 1821, and from the High Court of Admiralty in December 1827. His mental faculties became gradually feeble in his old age, and he died on January 28, 1836. Lord Stowell was twice married,—on April 7, 1781, to Anna Maria, eldest daughter and heiress of John Bagnall of Early Court, Berks, and on April 10, 1813, to the dowager marchioness of Sligo. By his first marriage he had four children, of whom two (a son and a daughter) died in infancy, a third (a son) died unmarried in middle life, while the eldest (a daughter) was twice married and survived her father.

Lord Stowell's judgments are models alike of literary execution and of judicial reasoning. His style is chaste yet not inornate, nervous without abruptness, and perfectly adjusted in every instance to the subject with which he deals. His decisions in the cases of *Dalrymple v. Dalrymple* (Dr Dodson's *Report*) and *Evans v. Evans* (1 Hagg., 35)—from their combined force and grace, from the steadiness with which every collateral issue is set aside, from their subtle insight into human motives, and from the light which they cast on the philosophy and dark history of marriage law—deserve and will repay attentive perusal. Lord Stowell composed with great care, and some of the MSS. which he revised for Haggard and Phillimore's *Reports* were as full of interlineations as a bill of the Lower House corrected by the Lords. Stowell's mind was judicial rather than forensic,—reasoning, not as for a dialectic victory nor so as to convince the parties on whose suit he was deciding, but only with sufficient clearness, fullness, and force to justify the decision at which he had arrived.

The chief doctrines of international law with the assertion and illustration of which the name of Lord Stowell is identified are these:—the perfect equality and entire independence of all states (Le Louis, 2 Dod., 248)—a logical deduction from the Augustinian philosophy and still one of the fundamental principles of English jurisprudence; that the elementary rules of international law bind even semi-barbarous states (Hurtige Hans, 2 Rob., 325); that blockade to be binding must be effectual (The "Betsey," 1 Rob., 93); that there cannot be a legal where there is no actual blockade; and that contraband of war is to be determined by "probable destination" (The "Jonge Margaretha," 1 Rob., 189). In the famous Swedish convey case (The "Maria," 1 Rob., 350; see too The "Recovery," 6 C. Rob., 348-9) Lord Stowell, in defiance of the complaints of those greedy merchants who, as Pufendorf, himself by choice a Swedish civilian, tells us, cared not how things went provided they could but satisfy their thirst of gain, asserted that "a prize court is a court not merely of the country in which it sits but of the law of nations." "The seat of judicial authority," he added, in words which have become classic, "is indeed locally here, in the belligerent country, but the law itself has no locality."

The judgments of Lord Stowell were, almost without exception, confirmed on appeal, are to this day the international law of England, and have become presumptive though not conclusive evidence of the international law of America. "I have taken care," wrote Justice Story, "that they shall form the basis of the maritime law of the United States, and I have no hesitation in saying that they ought to do so in that of every civilized country in the world." See Townsend, *Lives of Twelve Eminent Judges*, vol. II.; *Quarterly Review*, vol. LXXV.; W. E. Surtees, *Sketch of Lord Stowell and Eldon*; Creasy, *First Platform of International Law*; *Decisions*, by Dodson and Haggard.

STRABISMUS. See OPHTHALMOLOGY, vol. xvii. p. 785. STRABO, the famous geographer and historian, was born at Amasea in Pontus, a city which had been Hellenized to a great extent. Of his father's family we know nothing; but several of his mother's relations, who were probably Greeks, had held important posts under Mithradates Euergetes and his famous son Mithradates Eupator. Dorylaus, a distinguished general of Mithradates Euergetes, was the great-grandfather of Strabo's mother. After the murder of that king, Dorylaus, who at that time was collecting mercenaries in Crete, where he had obtained the command

in a successful war of the Cnossians against Gortyn, settled at Cnossus. By Sterope, a Macedonian, he had a daughter and two sons,—Lagetas and Stratarchus. Dorylaus had a brother Philetærus, whose son Dorylaus was brought up with Mithradates Eupator. This king, at the instance of his friend invited back to Pontus the family of Dorylaus, who was himself now dead, as was also his son Lagetas. Strabo saw Stratarchus in extreme old age. The daughter of Lagetas was the mother of Strabo's mother. Moaphernes, an uncle of Strabo's mother, probably on the father's side, was governor of Colchis under Mithradates Eupator. His mother's father must have held an important position, for, seeing the impending downfall of the king, and also in anger against him for having put to death his kinsmen Tibius and Theophilus, he handed over fifteen forts to Lucullus. In spite of this, with the ruin of the king the fortunes of the family fell, since Pompey refused to ratify the rewards promised by Lucullus.

Life.—Though the exact date of Strabo's birth is unknown, a close approximation is possible. Clinton places it not later than 54 B.C. The most probable date lies between 64 and 62, since he speaks of certain events occurring at the former as "a little before my time," whilst he describes an occurrence in the latter year as "in my own time," phrases which he uses elsewhere with great exactness in speaking of persons and events. He received a good education in the Greek poets, especially Homer; he studied at Nysa under the grammarian Aristodemus, under Tyrannio the grammarian at Rome, under the philosopher Xenarchus either at Rome or Alexandria, and he had studied Aristotle along with Boethus (possibly at Rome under Tyrannio, who had access to the Aristotelian writings in Sulla's library). It is to be noted that from none of those teachers was he likely to learn mathematics or astronomy. He was at Corinth in 29 B.C., where he saw Octavian on his return from Egypt to celebrate his triumph for Actium. He was in Egypt in 24 B.C., and took the opportunity of ascending the Nile in company with the prefect Aelius Gallus. He was at Rome after 14 A.D., for he describes (v. 236) as an eyewitness the place where the body of Augustus was burnt in the Campus. He was still writing in 21 A.D. The date of his death is unknown. Strabo's statement that he saw P. Servilius Isauricus has caused some difficulty. This Servilius died at Rome in 44 B.C. at an advanced age. Some suppose that Strabo confused him with P. Servilius Casca, also called Isauricus, or some other distinguished Roman whom he had seen in Asia, but by his words he clearly means the conqueror of the Isaurians. This difficulty only arises from an entirely unwarranted assumption that Strabo was on his way to Rome for the first time in 29 B.C. We have seen that he studied under Tyrannio in that city; if he did so after 29 B.C. Tyrannio must have been very old, which Strabo would probably have mentioned, as he does in the case of Aristodemus. Although he had seen a comparatively small portion of the regions which he describes, he had travelled much, as he states himself: "Westward I have journeyed to the parts of Etruria opposite Sardinia; towards the south from the Euxine to the borders of Ethiopia; and perhaps not one of those who have written geographies has visited more places than I have between those limits. For those who have gone farther west have not gone so far eastward, and the case is the same with the regions between the northern and southern limits." The fullness of his description in certain places, contrasted with the meagreness and inaccuracy in others, seems to indicate that in the former cases he had actually visited the places, but that he is dependent on second-hand information for the latter. He tells us that he had seen Egypt as far south as Syene

and Philæ, Comana in Cappadocia, Ephesus, Mylasa, Nysa and Hierapolis in Phrygia, Gyarus, and Populonia. Of Greece proper he saw but little; he visited Corinth, Athens, Megara, and places in their vicinity, and perhaps Argos, although he was not aware that the ruins of Mycenæ still existed; he had seen Cyrene from the sea, probably on his voyage from Puteoli to Alexandria. He remained at the latter place a long time, probably amassing materials, and studying astronomy and mathematics. For nowhere could he have had a better means of consulting the works of historians, geographers, and astronomers, such as Eratosthenes, Posidonius, Hipparchus, and Apollodorus. When and where he went from Egypt we know not. It has been commonly assumed that he returned home to Amasea. For this there are no grounds. Probabilities are in favour of his having returned to Rome, where he undoubtedly resided in his old age. The place of his death is unknown; but, since we find him at Rome in what must in the course of nature have been the closing years of his life, it is not unreasonable to suppose that there he died. Various passages in his work indicate that he held by the Stoic rule.

Works.—His earliest writings were two (not one, as commonly stated) historical works now lost, which he himself describes (xi. 515) as his *Historical Memoirs* and his *Continuation of Polybius*. There can be no doubt but that these were two distinct works; for he speaks (ii. 70) of having treated of the exploits of Alexander in his *Memoirs*, a topic which could not have found a place in a work which began where that of Polybius ended (146 B.C.). According to Suidas, the continuation of Polybius was in forty-three books. Plutarch, who calls him "the Philosopher," quotes Strabo's *Memoirs* (Luc., 28), and cites him as an historian (Sulla, 26). Josephus, who constantly calls him "the Cappadocian," often quotes from him, but does not mention the title of the work.

The *Geography* is the most important work on that science which antiquity has left us. It was, as far as we know, the first attempt to collect all the geographical knowledge at the time attainable, and to compose a general treatise on geography. It must not be regarded as nothing more than a new edition of Eratosthenes. In general outline it follows necessarily the work of the last-named geographer, who had first laid down a scientific basis for geography on which his successors could not help building. Strabo made considerable alterations, but not always for the better. The three books of the older work formed a strictly technical geographical treatise. Its small size prevented it from containing any such general description of separate countries as Strabo rightly conceived to fall within the scope of the geographer. "Strabo indeed appears to be the first who conceived a complete geographical treatise as comprising the four divisions of mathematical, physical, political, and historical geography, and he endeavoured, however imperfectly, to keep all these objects in view." Moreover, the incidental historical notices, which are often of great value and interest, are all his own. These digressions at times interrupt the symmetry of his plan; but Strabo had all the Greek love of legendary lore, and he discusses questions relating to the journeyings of Heracles as earnestly as if they were events within recent history. He regarded Homer as the source of all wisdom and knowledge, and consequently accepted the Homeric geography in its entirety, as needing only proper explanation for the removal of all difficulties. On the other hand, he treats the work of Herodotus with undeserved contempt, and classes him with Ctesias and other "marvel-mongers"; and yet in some respects Herodotus had better information—for instance, in regard to the Caspian—than that possessed by Strabo himself.

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 Caesar'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 books 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, and 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 Ierne (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 censures 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

zodiac, the tropics, and the arctic circles; he assumes the earth's circumference as given by Eratosthenes, 252,000 stades (= 25,200 geographical miles), and his division of the great circle into sixtieth parts; the habitable world, the geographer's proper province, shaped like a chlamys, occupies a quadrilateral space in the northern hemisphere, filling little more than one-third of the north temperate zone; its maximum length is 70,000 stades, its breadth less than 30,000 stades. Whilst correcting the error by which his predecessors placed Massilia and Byzantium in the same latitude, he falls into an equal mistake by placing the former city two degrees south, instead of two degrees north of Byzantium. As Massilia is his cardinal point for measurements, this error distorts his whole map of the Mediterranean and western Europe, the mouths of the Elbe and Danube being in the same latitude. He next gives directions for making a plane map of the world, as a globe of sufficient size, like that of Crates, is too cumbersome. All lines that are circles on a globe must be straight lines on the map. Before describing each country in detail, he gives a general sketch of the habitable world with reference to seas, continents, and peoples, and explains the doctrine of climate and of the shadows projected by objects in consequence of the sun's varying position with respect to them. In the third book, starting from the Straits, he begins his description with Iberia, which he likens in shape to a bull's hide. His chief authorities were Artemidorus, whom he uses for the coasts of the Mediterranean and ocean generally, Eratosthenes, Posidonius, Polybius, Pherecydes, Timosthenes, Asclepiades, Myrleanus, and Dicearchus. He gives a valuable account of the Roman administrative system, probably gained from his own inquiries, also of the native tribes, of the mines and methods of mining, and of the remains of the Greek and Phœnician settlements; he describes the Balearic Isles, following Artemidorus, and at the end of the book mentions the Cassiterides, which he seems to have identified with the Scilly Isles, probably erroneously, and describes their inhabitants as wearing long black garments, and walking about with long wands in their hands, looking like the Furies of tragedy. It is remarkable that he has no notion of the proximity of the Tin Islands to Britain, but treats them in connexion with Spain. The fourth book deals with Gaul in its fourfold division under Augustus, gives a meagre account of Britain, its trade and relations with Rome, and mentions Ireland, the natives of which were said to be cannibals and to hold their women in common, and finally treats of the Alps. His authorities were Posidonius, who had travelled in Gaul and Britain, Artemidorus, Ephorus, Timagenes, Aristotle, Polybius, Asinius Pollio, and Cæsar. For Britain Pytheas, as quoted by others, furnished some important details. His description of Gallia Narbonensis is fuller than that of the rest of Gaul. He mentions the four great Roman roads converging at Lyons, probably following the chorography of Agrippa. He conceives the Pyrenees as running north and south, and parallel to the Rhine, and Britain as lying north of Gaul, extending from the Pyrenees to the Rhine's mouths. Of the Alpine region he gives an excellent description. He undoubtedly must have gathered much information for this book at Rome. The fifth and sixth books contain an accurate description of Italy and the adjacent islands. Besides his own observation he used Eratosthenes, Polybius, Artemidorus, Ephorus, Fabius Pictor, Coelius, Antiochus of Syracuse for southern Italy, and the "chorographer," who was certainly a Roman, as he gave his distances in miles, and who probably was Agrippa, the chief objection to such an authorship being the wrong assumption that Strabo was not in Italy after 24 B.C., whilst Agrippa's work was not published until after his death 12 B.C. The sixth book ends with a short but valuable sketch of the extent and condition of the Roman empire. The seventh comprises northern and eastern Europe, both north and south of the Danube, Illyricum, Pannonia, Dalmatia, the coast of Thrace and the Euxine, and Epirus. The part which dealt with Macedonia and Thrace is only known to us from the epitomes. We do not know his authorities for the German tribes, but he probably used Roman materials. For the other northern tribes he had Posidonius, whilst for the region south of the Danube he had Aristotle's lost work on *Politics*, Polybius, Posidonius, Theopompus, and Ephorus. The eighth, ninth, and tenth books contain his description of the mainland of Greece and the islands, which he treats rather as an antiquarian than a geographer, using chiefly, besides Homer, Apollodorus, Demetrius of Scepsis, Ephorus, and Eudoxus. Personally he had but little knowledge. With the eleventh begins Asia. Divided from Europe by the Don, it is split up into two large masses by the Taurus. Beginning with the region bounded by the Taurus, Caspian, and Euxine, he next describes the part east of the Caspian, then those south of the Caucasus, Media, and Armenia. His authorities are Artemidorus, Eratosthenes, Theophanes, Herodotus, Apollodorus of Artemita, Patrocles, Metrodorus of Scepsis, Hysicrates of Amisus, Posidonius, and Aristobulus. In the twelfth he describes Asia Minor, basing his description on oral information, personal observation, and the Greek writers. In the thirteenth he continues with Asia Minor, devoting much space to

the Troad, his sources being Demetrius, Menecrates, and the Greek mythographers. With the fourteenth he ends Asia Minor and the islands lying off it, using, in addition to the authorities for the last, Pherecydes, Thucydides, Anaximenes of Lampsacus, Herodotus, Ephorus, Artemidorus, Eratosthenes, and Posidonius. The fifteenth deals with India and Persia, giving much valuable information from Patrocles, Aristobulus, Nearchus, the historians of the campaigns of Alexander and Seleucus, and with reserve from Megasthenes, Onesicritus, Deimachus, and Clitarchus. In the sixteenth he treats of Assyria, under which he includes Babylonia and Mesopotamia, Syria, Phœnicia, Palestine, the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea and the coast of Ethiopia, and Arabia. For Asia he used the historians of Alexander, Eratosthenes and Herodotus; for Judæa and Syria probably Posidonius, himself a native of Apamea; for Arabia and the coast of Libya Eratosthenes and Artemidorus, the latter of whom followed Agatharchides of Cnidus. Strabo must have got many details about Arabia from Ælius Gallus and the Stoic Athenodorus. The last book comprises Egypt, Ethiopia, and the north coast of Libya. He describes Egypt from his own observation, having gained much information at Alexandria in addition to that of Eudoxus, Aristo, Eratosthenes, Polybius, and Posidonius, using the last three with the addition of Iphicrates for Libya, and for Ethiopia Petronius, Herodotus, and Agatharchides. Though probably acquainted with the work of Juba, he did not make much use of it. The book concludes with a summary of the provinces of the Roman empire, as organized by Augustus into senatorial and imperial.

EDITIONS.—Aldus, Venice, 1516; Hopper and Heresbach, Basel, 1549; Xylander, Basel, 1571; Casaubon, Geneva, 1687, Paris, 1620 (Casaubon revised the text); Almeloveen, Amsterdam, 1707, reprinted Casaubon's text; Falconer, Oxford, 1807, reprinted Almeloveen's text; Siebenkees and Teschucke, Leipzig, 1818; Kory, Paris, 1815-18, the first really critical edition; Kramer, Berlin, 1844-52; C. Müller, Paris, 1853; Meineke, Leipzig, 1877. TRANSLATIONS.—Latin: Guarini and Gregorio, 1471; Xylander, 1571. French: Kory and Letronne, 1805-19. German: Groskur, 1833 (with dissertations). Italian: Ambrosoli, 1828. Dissertations, &c.—Banbury, *Ancient Geography*; Heeren; Hassenmüller; Niese, *Hermes*, 1878. (W. R.)

STRADELLA, ALESSANDRO, composer, singer, and performer on various instruments, was one of the most accomplished Italian musicians of the 17th century. The generally accepted statement that he was born at Naples about 1645 rests upon no trustworthy foundation; and the few biographical notices that we possess savour so strongly of romance that we can only be said to know him truly through his works, which show extraordinary genius, and have exercised a highly beneficial influence upon Italian art. The story of his life was first circumstantially narrated in Bonnet-Bourdelot's *Histoire de la Musique et de ses Effets* (Paris, 1715). According to this account, Stradella not only produced some successful operas at Venice, but also attained so great a reputation by the beauty of his voice that a Venetian nobleman engaged him to instruct his mistress, Ortensia, in singing. Stradella, the narrative goes on to say, shamefully betrayed his trust, and eloped with Ortensia to Rome, whither the outraged Venetian sent two paid *bravi* to put him to death. On their arrival in Rome the assassins learned that Stradella had just completed a new oratorio, over the performance of which he was to preside on the following day at S. Giovanni in Laterano. Taking advantage of this circumstance, they determined to kill him as he left the church; but the beauty of the music affected them so deeply that their hearts failed them at the critical moment, and, confessing their treachery, they entreated the composer to ensure his safety by quitting Rome immediately. Thereupon Stradella fled with Ortensia to Turin, where, notwithstanding the favour shown to him by the regent of Savoy, he was attacked one night by another band of assassins, who, headed by Ortensia's father, left him on the ramparts for dead. Through the connivance of the French ambassador the ruffians succeeded in making their escape; and in the meantime Stradella, recovering from his wounds, married Ortensia, by consent of the regent, and removed with her to Genoa. Here he believed himself safe; but a year later he and Ortensia were murdered in their house by a third party of assassins in the pay of the implacable Venetian.

Bonnet-Bourdelot gives 1670 as the date at which the assassination actually took place; but the oratorio *San Giovanni Battista*, assumed to be that which saved its author's life, is dated "Roma,"

1676"; and a cantata, called *Il Barcheggio*, is known to have been composed by Stradella for the marriage of Carlo Spinola and Paola Brignolo in 1681. These discrepancies are not, however, of sufficient moment to justify the rejection of Bonnet-Bourdelot's account, which has been accepted as genuine by Burney, Hawkins, Féti's, and many other careful writers, including the remarkably accurate and conscientious Wanley.¹ And it must be remembered, in its defence, that Pierre Bourdelot, by whom the materials for the *Histoire de la Musique et de ses Effets* were originally compiled, was an actual contemporary of Stradella, and died as early as 1685, when a host of the composer's friends must still have been living, and able to give evidence on the subject of his fate. It seems therefore only reasonable to assume that the main facts of the narrative are correctly given, though the dates may need confirmation; while for the embroidered versions of later writers the authors of the *Histoire* are certainly not responsible.

The finest collection of Stradella's works extant is that at the Biblioteca Palatina at Modena, which contains 148 MSS., including eleven operas and six oratorios. A collection of *canti a voce sola* was bequeathed by the Contarini family to the library of St Mark at Venice; and some MSS. are also preserved at Naples and in Paris. Eight madrigals, three duets, and a sonata for two violins and bass will be found among the Additional MSS. at the British Museum, five pieces among the Harleian MSS., and eight cantatas and a motet among those in the library at Christ Church, Oxford. Very few of these compositions have been published; but an extremely beautiful *aria di chiesa*, entitled *Pietà Signore*,² has been frequently printed, under the name of Stradella, and popularly accepted as the air which produced so marvellous an effect upon the assassins. The piece, however, is not to be found in *San Giovanni Battista*; and its style so little resembles that of Stradella's other works that no less decisive evidence than the discovery of an undoubted autograph could justify its ascription to him. On the other hand, no more extravagant mistake could be made than that of describing it, as some have done, as a forgery, perpetrated either by Féti's, Rossini, or Niedermeyer. Not one of these great musicians could have written it; and it is certainly no forgery, but a genuine work of the 17th century or the opening decade of the 18th. In the absence of trustworthy documentary evidence, all attempts to ascertain the real authorship of the piece must necessarily end in mere conjecture; but the extraordinary similarity of its style to that cultivated by Francesco de' Rossi, who is known to have been flourishing at Bari at the time of Stradella's death, is very significant.

Much controversy has also been excited by another work, lately attributed to Stradella, viz., a *serenata* for voices and instruments, of which two copies only are known to exist,—one at the Conservatoire at Paris, and the other, a late transcript, now at the Royal College of Music in London. The date of this *serenata* is absolutely unknown. Of evidence proving it to be a genuine work by Stradella there is none in existence. Yet the question of its authenticity is a most important one, for upon the strength of it Handel may perhaps be some day gravely accused of having stolen from the Italian composer some of the finest passages in *Israel in Egypt*.

The compositions of Stradella are remarkable for their graceful form and the tenderness of their expression. Detached movements will be found in Burney's *History of Music* and the modern collection called *Gemme d'Antichità*.

STRADIVARIUS. See VIOLIN.

STRAFFORD, THOMAS WENTWORTH, EARL OF (1593-1641), son of Sir William Wentworth, of Wentworth Woodhouse, near Rotherham, was born in 1593 in Chancery Lane, London. He was educated at St John's College, Cambridge, and in 1611 was knighted, and married Margaret, daughter of Francis, earl of Cumberland. In 1614 he represented Yorkshire in the Addled Parliament, but, as far as is now known, it was not till the parliament of 1621 that he took part in the debates. His position towards the popular party was peculiar. He did not sympathize with their eagerness for war with Spain, and he was eager, as no man of that time except Bacon was eager, for increased activity in domestic legislation. He was what, in modern times, would be called a reformer, and in those days a reformer was necessarily an upholder of the authority of the crown, in whose service the most experienced statesmen might be expected to be found, whilst the members of a House of Commons only sum-

¹ See No. 1272 in *Cat. Harl. MSS., Brit. Mus.* Wanley, however, believed Stradella alone to have been murdered and the lady to have escaped. ² Called in some editions *Se i miei sospiri*.

moned at considerable intervals would be deficient in the qualities necessary for undertaking successful legislation. On the other hand, James's conduct of the diplomatic struggle with Spain was not such as to inspire confidence, and Wentworth's bearing was therefore marked by a certain amount of hesitation. He was, however, more than most men prone to magnify his office, and James's contemptuous refusal to allow the House of Commons to give an opinion on foreign politics seems to have stung him to join in the vindication of the claims of the House of which he was a member. He was at all events a warm supporter of the protestation which drew down a sentence of dissolution upon the third parliament of James.

In 1622 Wentworth's wife died, and in February 1625 he married Arabella Holles, the daughter of the earl of Clare. Of the parliament of 1624 he had not been a member, but in the first parliament of Charles I. he again represented Yorkshire, and at once marked his hostility to the proposed war with Spain by supporting a motion for an adjournment before the House proceeded to business. His election was declared void, but he was re-elected. When he returned to parliament he took part in the opposition to the demand made under the influence of Buckingham for war subsidies, and was consequently, after the dissolution, made sheriff of Yorkshire, in order to exclude him, as hostile to the court, from the parliament which met in 1626. After the dissolution of that parliament he was dismissed from the justiceship of the peace and the office of *custos rotulorum* of Yorkshire.

Wentworth's position was very different from that of the regular opposition. He was anxious to serve the crown, but he disapproved of the king's policy. "My rule," he wrote December 1625, "which I will never transgress, is never to contend with the prerogative out of parliament, nor yet to contest with a king but when I am constrained thereunto or else make shipwreck of my peace of conscience." In January 1626 he had asked for the presidency of the Council of the North, and had visited and made overtures to Buckingham. His subsequent dismissal was probably the result of his resolution not to support the court in its design to force the country to contribute money without a parliamentary grant. At all events, he refused in 1627 to contribute to the forced loan, and was placed in confinement in Kent for his refusal.

Wentworth's position in the parliament of 1628 was a striking one. He joined the popular leaders in resistance to arbitrary taxation and imprisonment, but he tried to obtain his end with the least possible infringement of the prerogative of the crown, to which he looked as a reserve force in times of crisis. With the approbation of the House he led the movement for a bill which would have secured the liberties of the subject as completely as the Petition of Right afterwards did, but in a manner less offensive to the king. The proposal was wrecked upon Charles's refusal to make the necessary concessions, and the leadership was thus snatched from Wentworth's hands by Eliot and Coke. Later in the session he fell into conflict with Eliot, as, though he supported the Petition of Right in substance, he was anxious to come to a compromise with the Lords, so as to leave room to the king to act unchecked in special emergencies.

On July 22, 1628, not long after the prorogation, Wentworth was created Lord Wentworth, and received a promise of the presidentship of the Council of the North at the next vacancy. Even on political matters he had never been quite at unison with the parliamentary opposition, and in church matters he was diametrically opposed to them. Since the close of the discussion on the Petition of Right, church matters had come into greater prominent

than ever, and Wentworth was therefore thrown strongly on the side of Charles, from whom alone opposition to Puritanism could possibly come. This attachment to Charles was doubtless cemented by Buckingham's murder, but, if he took the king's part with decision and vigour, it must be remembered that, as has been already said, he was above all a man prone to magnify his office, and that things would look differently to him than they had done before he was in his new position. For the charge of apostasy in its ordinary meaning there is no foundation.

As yet Wentworth took no part in the general government of the country. In December he became Viscount Wentworth and president of the Council of the North. In the speech delivered at York on his taking office he announced his intention of doing his utmost to bind up the prerogative of the crown and the liberties of the subject in indistinguishable union. "Whoever," he said, "ravels forth into questions the right of a king and of a people shall never be able to wrap them up again into the comeliness and order he found them."

The session of 1629 ended in a breach between the king and the parliament which made the task of a moderator hopeless. Wentworth had to choose between helping a Puritan House of Commons to dominate the king and helping the king to dominate a Puritan House of Commons. He instinctively chose the latter course, and he threw himself into the work of repression with characteristic energy, as if the establishment of the royal power was the one thing needful. Yet even when he was most resolute in crushing resistance he held that he and not his antagonists were maintaining the old constitution which they had attempted to alter by claiming supremacy for parliament.

In November 1629 Wentworth became a privy councillor. In October 1631 he lost his second wife, and in October 1632 he married Elizabeth Rhodes. In January 1632 he had been named lord-deputy of Ireland, having performed his duties at York to the king's satisfaction, though he had given grave offence to the northern gentry by the enforcement of his authority. It was a cardinal point of his system that no wealth or station should exempt its possessor from obedience to the king. Not only was the announcement of this principle likely to give offence to those who were touched by it, but in its application Wentworth was frequently harsh and overbearing. In general he may have been said to have worked rather for equality under a strong Government than for liberty.

In Ireland Wentworth would have to deal with a people which had not arrived at national cohesion, and amongst which had been from time to time introduced English colonists, some of them, like the early Norman settlers, sharing in the Catholicism of the natives, whilst the later importations stood aloof and preserved their Protestantism. There was also a class of officials of English derivation, many of whom failed to reach a high standard of efficiency. Against these Wentworth, who arrived in Dublin in July 1633, waged war sometimes with scanty regard to the forms of justice, as in the case of Lord Mountnorris, whom he sent before a court-martial on a merely formal charge, which necessarily entailed a death sentence, not because he wanted to execute him, but because he knew of no other way of excluding him from official life.

The purifying of official life, however, was but a small part of Wentworth's task. In one way, indeed, he conceived his duty in the best spirit. He tried at the same time to strengthen the crown and to benefit the poor by making the mass of the nation less dependent on their chiefs and lords than they had been before, and,

though Wentworth could not do away with the effects of previous mistakes, he might do much to soften down the existing antagonism between the native population and the English Government. Unhappily his intentions were frustrated by causes resulting partly from his own character and partly from the circumstances in which he was placed.

In the first place, Wentworth's want of money to carry on the Government was deplorable. In 1634 he called a parliament at Dublin, and obtained from it a considerable grant, as well as its co-operation in a remarkable series of legislative enactments. The king, however, had previously engaged his word to make certain concessions known as the "graces," and Wentworth resolved that some of these should not be granted, and took upon himself to refuse what his master had promised. The money granted by parliament, however, would not last for ever, and Wentworth resolved to create a balance between revenue and expenditure before the supply was exhausted. This he succeeded in doing, partly by making a vast improvement in the material condition of the country, and partly by the introduction of monopolies and other irregular payments, which created wide dissatisfaction, especially amongst the wealthier class.

Towards the native Irish Wentworth's bearing was benevolent but thoroughly unsympathetic. Having no notion of developing their qualities by a process of natural growth, his only hope for them lay in converting them into Englishmen as soon as possible. They must be made English in their habits, in their laws, and in their religion: "I see plainly," he once wrote, "that, so long as this kingdom continues Popish, they are not a people for the crown of England to be confident of." It is true that he had too much ability to adopt a system of irritating persecution, but from time to time some word or act escaped from him which allowed all who were concerned to know what his real opinion was. For the present, however, he had to content himself with forging the instrument by which the hoped-for conversion was to be effected. The Established Church of Ireland was in a miserable plight, and Wentworth busied himself with rescuing from the hands of such men as the earl of Cork the property of the church, which had in troublous times been diverted from its true purpose, and with enforcing the strict observance of the practices of the English Church, on the one hand upon recalcitrant Puritans, and on the other hand upon lawless disregards of all decency. In this way he hoped to obtain a church to which the Irish might be expected to rally.

Till that time came, he must rely on force to keep order and to prevent any understanding growing up between the Irish and foreign powers. With this object in view he resolved on pouring English colonists into Connaught as James had poured them into Ulster. To do this he had taken upon himself to set at naught Charles's promise that no colonists should be forced into Connaught, and in 1635 he proceeded to that province, where, raking up an obsolete title, he insisted upon the grand juries in all the counties finding verdicts for the king. One only, that of Galway, resisted, and the confiscation of Galway was effected by the Court of Exchequer, whilst he fined the sheriff £1000 for summoning such a jury, and cited the jurymen to the castle chamber to answer for their offence. He had succeeded in setting all Ireland against him.

High-handed as Wentworth was by nature, his rule in Ireland made him more high-handed than ever. As yet he had never been consulted on English affairs, and it was only in February 1637 that Charles asked his opinion on a proposed interference in the affairs of the Continent. In reply, he assured Charles that it would be unwise to