

had a book containing a map, "which is agreeable to the booke of Iacques Cartier," that it "is made in maner of a sea chart,"¹ and that his two sons had it with them in Canada. Again he says:—"I can write nothing else unto you of any thing that I can recover of the writings of Captain Iacques Cartier, my uncle diseased, although I have made search in all places that I could possibly in this Towne; saving of a certain booke made in in maner of a sea Chart, which was drawne by the hand of my said uncle, which is in the possession of master Cremeur, which booke is passing well marked and drawne for all the River of Canada." Some inscriptions on the maps are also quoted. (3) Some of the maps we are presently to consider, show plainly that they did not copy their topography, one from another, but must have taken it from a common source. That source could not have been Cartier's narrations, for aside from the inaccessibility of the latter (none of them having been published until after the dates of some of the maps in question), the maps are too accurate and too much alike to have been drawn from materials which have puzzled modern historians who had accurate charts of the Gulf before them. The appearance in these maps, also of certain words which occur in Cartier's narrations not as place-names, but as used in describing places, seems to indicate that they are fragments of inscriptions taken from some other map. Such inscriptions would hardly have been placed there by any other than Cartier. There can be no reasonable doubt, in the face of this evidence, that Cartier left maps, showing his explorations.²

In considering the cartographical work of old explorers and map-makers, we must endeavour to place ourselves as far as possible in their mental position. Sitting in our studies, with our correct modern charts before us, we cannot, from our standpoint, see why they did many things that they did, or did not do many things they could or should have done. We are always in danger of interpreting their actions from our age rather than from theirs. It is singular how the idea we get of the topography of a place from visiting it, differs from that derived from a chart. Islands a short distance off appear joined together, and in an archipelago we seem to be land-locked. To know an island is not a peninsula, we must go around it; that a bay is not a curved strait, we must go to the head of it; that a passage is navigable, we must go through it. Anyone who has long studied a map of a place of complex topography before an anticipated visit, will remember how surprised he was to find how little he knew of the place, and how different it was in most respects from what he had pictured. We must remember that Cartier and his companions visited the places; we, for the most part, study the correct maps. Then we must take into account other things which they experienced, but which the maps do not show us, mirages, fogs and misty weather, strong currents, storms. They were superstitious, badly educated, often careless in writing. Their maps were mostly made upon a very small scale, and an important place, however small in extent, had to be represented, so that small islands and rivers often appear vastly larger than they should and proper proportion is quite lost. In short, in considering these ancient narratives and charts, we must, as far as possible, place ourselves in the position of their makers and try to view things as they had to, not as we do. Then by a comparison of that standpoint with our own correct knowledge, we may gain truthful and therefore consistent results.

¹ Allefonsee may have had this or a copy to consult when he wrote his *Cosmographie*.

² Indeed, Dr. Kohl, (op. cit., p. 344) considers this so certain that he takes it for granted without discussion.