

sailed to the west. Gilbert speaks in the plural of "charts," but he could not have referred to this mappemonde of 1544 for this contains no such indications as he describes. There is no trace of Hudson's bay or any such northwest passage to Asia as Sir Humphrey was writing about. It contains no argument for his thesis.

I come now to the DeLaet map. The author gives in his work (published in Leyden in 1640) a fair map of the gulf based on Champlain's early map. He does not give any name to Prince Edward island. He speaks of Cabot's maps as existing in England and gives a French translation of the same legend as Hakluyt; indeed, probably, he merely translated from Hakluyt, only that, by a misprint, the date of the landfall is July 24th instead of June 24. It must be a misprint, for the legend he gives identifies the day as St. John the Baptist's day. The same mistake occurs in the Latin version of the Paris map, but the form of the quotation proves that DeLaet had the Hakluyt legend before him. Not much can be inferred from this reference.

Purchas is a more important witness. The map he saw was in the Queen's gallery, and was engraved by Clement Adams, and it bore date 1549. He speaks of it as a "great map," of which Sebastian Cabot "is often called the author," and adds, "this map some say was taken out of Sir Sebastian Cabot's map by Clem. Adams 1549." The landfall on this map was 1497 not 1494, so here we have ground for concluding that Hakluyt's map was dated 1549, and was not the same as the Paris map of 1544. A difficulty must, however, be noted here that Hakluyt, in his "Discourse on Western Planting," written in 1584, in warm advocacy of the claims of the English crown to the continent of America from the Arctic circle to Florida, gives 1496 as the date of the discovery, and a few pages farther on he quotes Clement Adams as giving 1494 as the date. This "Discourse" is not in Hakluyt's collection of voyages, but is a MS. published for the first time in 1877 by the Maine Historical Society. It was in fact a letter written to advocate the plans of Sir Walter Raleigh. Hakluyt was beginning then to collect materials for his great work and, as in the case of his "Divers Voyages," the later and completed work must be taken to contain the matured results of his deliberate researches. The real date of the landfall is settled now by the contemporary documents recently discovered and unknown to him.

The Chytraeus map presents some difficulty. It was seen in England and was dated 1549 like the Purchas map, but the Latin inscription (No. 8) is that of the Paris map of 1544, excepting that he corrects the date to June 24. He puts the year of the discovery as 1494, as in the Paris map, but gives it as 1594 by an evident misprint. Chytraeus in his book does not reproduce the map but gives all the Latin legends of the Paris map and makes no mention of the Spanish ones. He gives also headings to the legends; differing in that respect from the Paris map which has only three headings. He also quotes from Pliny direct, and does not follow the erroneous citation of the Paris map. The conclusion would follow that the map Chytraeus saw was an edition of the Paris map printed in 1549 on which some minor changes had been made.

There remain now to be compared the Paris map of 1544 and the map cited by Hakluyt in the Queen's gallery and cut by Clement Adams. These two maps differ radically. Hakluyt has preserved the text of legend No. 8. While the main tenor of the information is the same as that of the map of 1544 the wording differs. Before citing the legends it should be observed that the Latin versions must be taken as the originals of which the Spanish and English are translations; for Latin, in that day, was the general international language of cultivated people, and moreover where the legends on the 1544 map were set up there could have been no Spanish type, for the printer had not "ñ" with a *tilla* over it such as was, and is still, used in Spain, and he has doubled the letter and prints *mannana* and not *mañana*. The Spanish tongue was therefore not the vernacular of the printer. On Clement Adams's map, as indeed Hakluyt expressly states, the inscription was in Latin, and the context implies that no other language was used. Hakluyt translates it but glosses it throughout not, as Biddle suggests, of set purpose to distort his original but to elucidate it, as was the frequent practice among the early writers. Then the island was *ex adverso*, over which phrase many battles have