e

n

ad 2)

ıp, ial

ch

by

of

t's

on

Ιt

of

or

.ve

in

ed

ıes

of

at

ıee

is

ain

te-

the

iio,

by

red

"Anno Domini 1494,* Ioannes Cabotus venetus, & Sebastianus illius filius eam terram fecerunt peruiam, quam nullus priùs adire ausus fuisset, die 24 Iunij, circiter horam quintam bene manè. Hane autem appellauit Terram Primum visam, eredo quod ex mari in eam partem primum oculos iniecerat. Nam quæ ex aduerso sita est insula, eam appellauit insulam D. Ioanuis, hac opinor ratione, quòd aperta fuit eo die qui est sacer D. Ioanni Baptistæ."

The following is from the "Tabula Prima," section viii., on the map in the Imperial Library:—

"Terram olim nobis clausam, aperuit Joannes Cabotus Venetus, necnō Sebastianus Cabotus eius filius, anno ab orbe redempto 1494, die nero 24 Iulij, hora 5, sub diluculo, quā terrā primū nisam appellarūt et insulā quandā magnā ei oppositā Insulā diui Ioannis nominarūt, quippe quæ soleuni die festo diui Ioannis aperta fuit."

* In the third volume of Hakluyt's larger work, published in 1598-1600, where this extract from Clement Adams's map again appears, the year of the discovery is given as 1497 (the true date, in fact), instead of 1494, though this latter is the date on the map in the Imperial Library. Some writers, therefore, who are not familiar with Hakluyt's first folio of 1589, where the extract first appears, and who have consulted only the later edition, where the extract is given with the altered date, have naturally supposed that Adams's map bore the date 1497 upon it as the year of the discovery. M. D'Avezae, in his note on Cabot's map in the "Bulletin de la Société de Géographie" (Quatrième Série, tome xiv. pp. 266-278), and M. Asher, in his work on "Henry Hudson" (p. 261), published by the Hakluyt Society, both express that opinion. It is evident to me, that Mr. Richard Biddle, the author of the "Memoir of Sebastian Cabot," also never consulted the first folio of Hakluyt; and, never having seen Cabot's map, he supposed the date of the discovery given upon it to be that which he found in the later edition of Hakluyt, which he always cites. It was a mystery to him why Harris and Pinkerton should give 1494 as the year of the discovery, not knowing that that date was originally derived, as we now see, from Cabot's map.

I observe that M. D'Avezae, in the note above referred to, adopts the date on the map (1494) as the year of the discovery made on a voyage undertaken prior to the issuing of the patent; which was followed by the voyages of 1497 and 1498.

It may be asked, upon what authority did Hakluyt alter the date from 1494 (which we will suppose he copied into his folio of 1589 from Adams's map) to 1497?

Most of the published authorities for the voyages of the Cabots existing in Hakluyt's time were unhappily confused, and even contradictory, and were