

this question, and others arising out of the genesis of the younger Zeno's book and map, had never been satisfactorily answered, and that further investigation and reconsideration of the whole subject, from the point of view of the student of the geographical discoveries and of the cartography of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, was desirable. Mr. Coote then suggested that we should examine the subject afresh and write upon it in collaboration. It soon became apparent, however, that the pressure of exceptionally urgent public duties and other unavoidable circumstances would render it impossible for Mr. Coote to give the time necessary for doing his share of the work. It has therefore fallen to me to collect and arrange the materials for and to write the book; but I have had the inestimable advantage of Mr. Coote's sympathy and of the valuable advice and assistance which his commanding knowledge of cartography has enabled him to give me during the progress of the work.

The late Mr. R. H. Major edited, for the Hakluyt Society, in 1873, a well-known book which, until recently, has been regarded as the greatest authority in the English language upon the subject of the reputed travels of the brothers Zeni. Since that date, several important ancient maps of the Northern Regions (said to have been visited by the Zeni) have come to light:—for example, the long-lost Olaus Magnus *Carta Marina* of 1539, discovered at Munich in 1886, which proves Major's scepticism as to its actual existence, in any form differing from that of the well-known map of 1567, to have been utterly mistaken; and the Zamoiski map of 1467, the appearance of which confirms Admiral Zarhtmann's statement that he had seen a manuscript map evidently, from his description, of a similar character, and renders Major's opinions upon these cartographical questions no longer of value. Many other writers, English, Danish, Swedish, German, French, Italian, and American, have also written since 1873 upon the alleged travels of the Zeni. Most of these writers have taken Major's view, and have contended for the authenticity of the younger Zeno's work of 1558. A notable exception is Professor Gustav Storm, who, in a paper to be referred to later on, has made a most able and most destructive criticism on the Zeno story and map.

There can be no doubt, too, that, if only on account of the immense advantages which photography and its ancillary processes offer for the production of accurate and reliable copies of rare or unique maps, the modern student possesses facilities for the study of comparative carto-