d his

apher

falsi-

that

t falls

facts?

lso in

a date

s this

raphe

to the

these

3; of

a and

1707:

tilles.

these

ie des

J'Isle.

have

deno-

car-

from

s the

have,

ziven

yet,

King,

le in

per-

ı the

aude

red.

de L'Isle, who died in 1720, and who had had for pupils in the Historical Sciences and Mythology, all the Princes of the Court of Louis XIV. Guillaume de L'Isle was, in fact, from 1701, always consulted by the old King, and always employed as Geographer at the Court? (as may be seen by an historical memoir of Fréret, copied by the hand of Philip Buache, son-in-law and successor of Guillaume de L'Isle.)

Or, must it be admitted that Guillaume de L'Isle, become first Geographer to the King in 1718, caused this denomination to be added upon all the maps anterior to that period; though it may be remembered that this denomination does not resemble an addition, and that, in general, it appears to form the same body with the primitive engraving?

Or must it, in short, be admitted that a former possessor of the map which serves as the principal document in the law-suit, having, after one thousand seven hundred and eighteen, seen the maps of Canada, with the date of 1703, bearing the denomination of first Geographer to the King, was desirous of presenting to Guillaume de L'Isle, as a singularly curious document, the famous map, and begged of him to have added to it the same title which he had caused to be engraved upon so many other maps, especially that of Canada, the publication of which was anterior to 1718?

This supposition is not impossible; it will even appear natural enough, if we refer back to the period, and if we consider that it must have appeared important to the possessor of the map, that it should receive a greater degree of authority by that very title which G. de L'Isle had caused to be added, after 1718, to the unsold copies of his map of Canada.

Besides, letting all suppositions be indulged in, still the most unlikely, the most impossible, would always be that final one which represents as *forgeries* the writings upon the map now in process. It could only be by conjectures, more or less uncertain, that further arguments could be brought forward. But, can anything in a criminal suit be submitted to arbitrary decision, and to