

observation on this head, which entirely subverts any such conclusion. "If," he says, "a great country had already been found there in 1494, it would have been quite unnecessary for the Cabots to persuade the Bristol men to continue their exploring expeditions after that time;" whereas they were continued in 1495, 1496, and 1497. To my own mind this argument is beyond all reply.

Another idea has been advanced by Mr. Nicholls which must not be overlooked, as it appears to present a formidable objection. He says:—"Pasqualigo tells us they were three months on the voyage; yet we find the head of the firm, John, at the Court in London, and in possession of the reward on the 10th of August, 1497. The land was seen, it is said, on June 24th. If they were three months on the voyage—they sailed about the 10th of May—and were thirty-four days beating out; take the same period for their return, including the landing at Bristol, and the two days' journey to London, and it will just give three weeks to do what we venture to say no hydrographer of the present day, with all the knowledge which experience has brought, and all the appliances of science, would venture to attempt in less than as many months."

The remark is very just, but is admirably met by a piece of reasoning which Mr. Kohl had already committed to paper in his valuable work. He says:—"The first or preliminary exploring expeditions for discovery were generally short excursions; and for good reasons, such as the uncertain nature of the projects, and consequently the difficulty of obtaining the requisite means of conducting them. They usually commenced such voyages with one or two light and small ships, and, after having made a discovery, or even obtained a distant glimpse of some new country, they were eager to return and proclaim their success, and to obtain a reward, and a larger outfit for more thorough explorations. We observe, therefore, that in the history of discovery the first exploring expeditions continued but a very short time, whilst in the second undertaking a large fleet and more ample supplies have enabled the adventurers to remain longer abroad, and to make more thorough surveys. But if we adopt the year 1494 for the first exploring voyage of the Cabots, we find that in the two subsequent years, 1495 and 1496, no voyage at all was performed; and that in 1497, what would then be their second voyage, was a very small undertaking with only one little vessel, the "Matthew," from which they returned quickly after an absence of only three months. Such inactivity in the Cabots, the King, and the Bristol men, after the apparently great success of 1494, with the small outfit and quick return in 1497, would be perfectly out of analogy with the usual course of things, and wholly unaccountable. If, on the contrary, rejecting the theory which supposes a voyage to have