

La Salle, 1669-1673

Where was La Salle journeying from October 1669 to the beginning of 1673? This question has divided historians into several camps. The answer of one group is that La Salle explored the Ohio; others contend that besides the exploration of the Ohio River at this time as far as the rapids near Louisville, he reached the great river on another journey by way of the Great Lakes. In either opinion La Salle found the Mississippi before the epochal expedition of Marquette and Jolliet in June 1673. Those in this country who have discussed the question decided almost unanimously against La Salle as the finder of the upper Mississippi.

This dispute over priority of discovery arose solely through the ingrained prejudice of one man, Pierre Margry, Curator of the Archives of France. To convince the world that La Salle was "the prince of explorers," as great if not greater than Cortés, Pizarro, and other Spanish *Conquistadores*, had become an *idée fixe* with Margry. This zeal for the cause of Robert Cavelier sprang in part from an antipathy toward the Jesuits that was little short of a phobia, and laboring under this complex prejudice, the French archivist compiled his much-quoted edition of documents on the discovery and exploration of the Mississippi Valley.¹ La Salle in truth never laid claim to the rôle of discoverer of the Mississippi as established for him by Margry,² yet he did ambition a place among the great conquerors. Hurt in pride because a mere Canadian of humble birth, Louis Jolliet, and Marquette, to whom he was formerly a Jesuit

¹ Pierre Margry, *Découvertes et Etablissements des Français dans l'Ouest et dans le Sud de l'Amérique Septentrionale, 1614-1754*, Paris, 1876-1888.

² It is very interesting to note the various views entertained with regard to the Jolliet-Marquette expedition of 1673. La Salle disparaged the Jolliet narratives; Margry claimed that La Salle preceded the Jesuit and the Canadian; Cohesnel is "willing to concede that Jolliet and Marquette descended the Mississippi down to the 33°, but . . . denies that they were the first"; two Franciscans denied that the expedition ever took place at all, Father Douay, in Chrestien Leclercq, *Premier établissement de la Foy*, Paris, 1691, II, 364-366, and Father Hennepin, *Nouvelle Découverte*, Utrecht, 1697, 293-294; the latter states as a conclusive proof that Jolliet told him that he never went down the Mississippi, but remained among the Huron and Ottawa Indians. Gabriel Gravier is of opinion that the expedition really took place; he generously puts it on a par with the two explorations of the Great River by La Salle in 1671 and 1672. Both Jesuits and Franciscans are wrong, he says, the first for denying the priority of La Salle, the second for saying that the Jolliet-Marquette expedition never took place at all.

confrere,³ had anteceded his arrival at the legendary river, La Salle manipulated the names of rivers of the Valley to show that he had found something different from what they found, and, moreover, that *the* great river of the Valley was not the Mississippi but the Chuckagoa of De Soto. His re-discovery of this latter would link him with a *Conquistador*. He disparaged Joliet as an explorer and observer and decried the young Canadian's narrative as teeming with "great mistakes";⁴ still he never attributed to himself the journeys ascribed to him by Margry and his followers, Gravier, Chesnel, and others.

Francis Parkman, whose opinion was of great weight in this country, held that La Salle's priority in the Mississippi discovery had not been proved, but, he wrote, that "he discovered the Ohio may be regarded as established."⁵ If Parkman had been allowed to check the documents supplied to him by Margry, he would have held differently. John Gilmary Shea in an acknowledgment to Parkman for his *Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century* told Parkman he had allowed himself to be influenced by Margry, who belongs, wrote Shea, to the mocking section of the younger French generation of France. When Parkman communicated this news to Margry, he did not deny this influence, but rather remarked that he sent Shea what appears to be a flippant answer.⁶ How Parkman should have been influenced by a man like Margry is beyond the concern of this essay.

Another appraisal of Margry's well known work has to be made unfortunately at this late date, and in this study the conviction grows firm that Margry by publishing documents to his own purpose has obstructed and confused scholarship through several generations. Such a realization comes when his printed page is compared with the document, and the omissions, additions, changes, and other liberties taken with the originals stand revealed. The first three of his six volumes of documents treat almost exclusively of La Salle. To say nothing of the badly edited texts of copies made by Margry, changes in the punctuation of the original occur distorting the author's meaning. Dates

³ Marc de Villiers du Terrage, *La découverte du Missouri et l'histoire du fort d'Orléans, 1673-1728*, Paris, 1925, 11.

⁴ Margry, II, 81, 168, 178, 244, etc.

⁵ *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West*, Boston, 1907, 25.

⁶ "Letters of Francis Parkman to Pierre Margry, with an Introductory note by John Spencer Bassett," in *Smith College Studies in History*, VIII, 1923, 129; hereinafter quoted as *Smith College Studies*.

of certain documents are omitted, and, considering the aim of the compiler, not accidentally. Some documents are abridged, or synopsized, or cut into several sections and printed at random through the volumes. Italics are used where the editor thought a passage proved his point, or even to no purpose, and are lacking when the author of the document underscored a passage. These items, together with the division of the compilation "into chapters with bastard titles as those of a sensational newspaper,"⁷ and the choice of documents, make it quite evident that the prime intent of the compiler was to prove a cherished thesis.⁸

Not a few of the materials selected were already known to American scholars,⁹ while some of the more important had been published in translation in *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of New York*, with this difference that where the American publication gave the document in full, Margry was satisfied with printing an extract. To him the fundamental rule of the context meant nothing. Nor is the provenience of the document stated, except in a confused manner at the end of the third volume for the contents of the first three volumes, and Margry did not see fit to state whether the document he supposedly had seen was the original or a copy, and if a copy, whether an early or a late one. Until the Library of Congress had had photostats or true copies made and checked by disinterested experts, it was

⁷ John G. Shea, *The Bursting of Pierre Margry's La Salle Bubble*, New York, 1879; this tract first appeared in the *New York Freeman's Journal*.

⁸ Margry's compilation does not even belong to that class spoken of by Bernheim, "welchẽ mit tendenziöser Auswahl aus umfangreichen Material ausgehoben sind . . . ohne das die einzelnen Dokumente selbst gefälschte wären," *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode*, Leipzig, 1894, 249. Henri Lorin, *Le Comte de Frontenac*, Paris, 1895, xii, "Parmi les documents, tous reproduits avec grand soin et références aux collections originales, il en est qui paraissent de pure polémique et d'assez médiocre valeur." When the document is compared with the printed page, very little care is noticed. Pierre Heinrich, *La Louisiane sous la Compagnie des Indes, 1717-1731*, Paris, n. d., xiv, speaking of Margry's compilation, "auquel on peut reprocher son arbitraire dans le choix des pièces publiées." Cf. Ernest Gagnon, *Louis Jolliet*, Montreal, 1926, 16-17. De Villiers was led astray by the arbitrariness of the selection. From a letter of Bernou to Renaudot, Margry, III, 74, de Villiers in his "La Louisiane, Histoire de son nom et de ses frontières successives, 1684-1819, in *Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris*, XXI, n. s., 1929, 19, concluded that Bernou was not on friendly terms with La Salle. It is evident when this letter of Bernou is replaced where it belongs in the series, that Bernou was not unfriendly toward La Salle at this time, nor was La Salle unfriendly toward Bernou.

⁹ In the first volume there were two documents which Parkman had not seen, Parkman to Margry, 1876, August 8, *Smith College Studies*, VIII, 169. They were Tonty's relation and the "accusations piquantes de Frontenac," the nature of the latter document will appear later. Cf. also Parkman to Margry, 1882, October 17, *ibid.*, 196.

difficult to pass judgment on the compilation, and the student was compelled to rely upon Margry's defective copies.

Margry published the first article in which La Salle's priority to the discovery of the Mississippi was asserted, in 1862.¹⁰ Thereafter, he held over the heads of American scholars the threat that they would have to revise their concepts about the beginnings of the history of the great Valley, asserting that he had in his possession materials proving their former ideas erroneous. Meanwhile, he used his official position as archivist to impede American investigators and to prevent them from profiting from the contents of the Archives of Paris. The story of how Margry's six volumes came to be published has been told.¹¹ Additional light was thrown upon the subject when Parkman's letters to Margry were printed.¹²

After the failure of Harrisse to raise the money for publication, Parkman made use of his influence with members of Congress to have voted a subsidy of ten thousand dollars to print the papers, which Margry had given them to understand contained much more than he chose to disclose. "Whatever Margry was to other men, to Parkman he was a man honored and esteemed for his character," wrote the author of the preface of the letters of Parkman to Margry. After reading this correspondence, one has a higher idea of the forbearing kindness of Parkman and a correspondingly low estimate of Margry's character. The present writer not having seen the letters of Margry to Parkman, judges the former solely on Parkman's answers, and he sees Margry as suspicious, distrustful, and petty by nature, apparently a hypochondriac and completely without appreciation of his debt to Parkman.¹³ That Parkman knew of Margry's prejudices is evident from his warning against including propaganda papers among those about to be published under the

¹⁰ "Les Normands dans les Vallées de l'Ohio et du Mississippi," in *Journal Général de l'Instruction publique*, July-September, 1862.

¹¹ J. Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History of America*, Boston and New York, 1884, V, 241-245; cf. Parkman, *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West*, Boston, 1907, Preface to the Eleventh Edition, vii-x; Charles Hought Farnham, *A Life of Francis Parkman*, Boston, 1900, 155-157.

¹² *Smith College Studies*, VIII, 123-206.

¹³ "Vous m'accusez d'avoir manqué de courage parceque je n'ai pas trouvé un libraire pour entreprendre la publication de votre collection. En effet j'aurais pu en trouver un à condition de le garantir personnellement de toute perte, ce que je n'ai pas voulu faire. Aussi j'ai travaillé tout l'hiver pour porter congrès à vous voter de l'argent." Parkman to Margry, 1876, May 8, *ibid.*, 166.

auspices of Congress.¹⁴ Parkman knew also that if Congress was willing to finance publication of documents to make them more accessible to students of the history of the Valley, Congress was not willing to waste public funds by printing seventeenth-century French lampoons, or idiosyncracies of a nineteenth-century *petit bourgeois*.¹⁵

At the time of publication, since nobody was able either to view the original documents or the copies made by Margry, the question of their authenticity was raised by suspicious scholars in England and France. An unsavory incident was recalled. The honesty of the compiler had been questioned before, for to prove that French and not Portuguese navigators were first to reach the Guinea Coast of Africa,¹⁶ Margry had previously produced a document of exceedingly amazing provenience.¹⁷ Yet in spite of the wariness of some scholars, a similar document was slipped in and published, as shall be seen, by Margry among those for North America in *Découvertes et Etablissements des Français*. Parkman was not aware of what had taken place in 1867-1868, as is clear from his letter of February 12, 1877, acknowledging the arrival of the proof-sheets for the first volume of the collection. Parkman adds in the letter:

That gentleman whom you know (Henry Harrisse) is beginning to get busy. A professor of Harvard University, of which I am one of the trustees, wrote to him last December to ask for some information about a point of French law. M(onsieur) H(arrisse) inserted in his answer a few lines of postscript which the professor sent me. Here they are: "If you should meet Mr. Francis Parkman, tell him to be very careful how he uses the documents in Mr. Margry's new book. I have a letter from Mr. Meyer,

¹⁴ Parkman to Margry, 1873, May 1, *ibid.*, 140. Cf. Margry, Introduction to volume IV, iii, where the compiler says that in this volume and in those following, he would be "plus libre que je ne l'étais pour la publication des trois volumes qui précèdent où bien des passions sont en jeu . . .," that is, Margry resented the fact that he was not allowed to print more propaganda papers.

¹⁵ The Introductions are not found in the American edition.

¹⁶ *Les Navigations françaises et la Révolution maritime du XIV^e au XVI^e siècle, d'après les documents inédits tirés de France, d'Angleterre, d'Espagne et d'Italie*, Paris, 1867. The first section entitled: "Les marins de Normandie aux côtes de Guinée avant les Portugais," 11-70, is a fine example of romantic mid-nineteenth century sentimentality in historical research.

¹⁷ Cf. Richard Henry Major's preface to *Select Letters of Christopher Columbus*, Second Edition, London, 1870, xlv-xlviii, where this author takes Margry to task for having "put forth the empty pretension that the discovery of America was due to the influence of French teaching." The point at issue was the date of publication of the *Imago Mundi* of Pierre d'Ailly. "M. Margry," says Major, "indeed asserts, but without giving his authority, that in the Columbian Library at Seville are d'Ailly's treatises printed at Nuremberg in 1472. This is in contravention of all the bibliographers . . ."

Professor in the College of France (College de France), and one of the commission appointed by the State for publishing historical documents, stating that the reason why they always declined publishing Mr. Margry's documents is that they are not convinced of their authenticity and ascribed his always refusing to exhibit the originals or stating where they are to the belief that some of them have been manufactured by Mr. de Rosny."

This same professor told me that Mr. Harrissee has a brother employed in one of the departments at Washington. I wrote to Mr. Spofford (The Librarian of the Library of Congress) to put him on guard against the preventions that they might try to insinuate. It is unnecessary to remind you of the importance of indicating at the end of the third volume at the latest, the provenience of all the documents. It is true that they speak for themselves, but there are few people intelligent enough or sufficiently educated to fully appreciate the testimony of their internal evidence, and anyway we must forestall all protests.

Who is this M. de Rosny? I think I correctly deciphered this name, although badly written in the letter of M. H.¹⁸

The answer to Parkman's last question is found in the Preface of Major's book on Prince Henry of Portugal.¹⁹ Major ends his discussion thus: "With respect to the documents now produced by Mr. Margry, the sum of the investigation yields a result which, unless further explanation can be given, is unavoidable, that, as all the surrounding evidence is not only not corroborative, but contradictory and condemnatory, an unauthenticated document, with internal indications of not being genuine, and represented by a copy of a copy, which is itself not forthcoming, is worth absolutely nothing."²⁰

Although the provenience of the notorious *Récit d'un ami de l'abbé de Galinée*, one of the two documents on which the exploration of the Ohio by La Salle in 1669-1670 is partly based, and the priority of his exploration of the Mississippi to that of Jolliet and Marquette is wholly based, is not quite as worthless as the document referred to by Major, it is almost so; as for the other document on which the exploration of the Ohio is based, there is a statement of its author to the effect that for those years of La Salle's career he had no data at all.

The other champion of this priority is Gabriel Gravier,²¹ for whom the vague, suspected documents are more definite, more genuine than they appeared to Margry. And it speaks volumes

¹⁸ *Smith College Studies*, VIII, 173.

¹⁹ Richard Henry Major, *The Life of Prince Henry of Portugal*, London, 1868.

²⁰ Major, *ibid.*, Preface, li.

²¹ Gabriel Gravier, *Découvertes et Etablissements de Cavelier de la Salle de Rouen, dans l'Amérique du Nord*, Rouen, 1870; *Cavelier de la Salle de Rouen*, Paris, 1871.

for Gravier's broad-mindedness, when it is remembered that he accepted their contents as apodictic proofs before ever having seen them.²² Gravier's reasons are not far to seek. Besides being anticlerical, Gravier was *de Rouen*, as was La Salle, and hence civic pride played its part. Margry and Gravier became united by strong bonds of mutual admiration,²³ and thirty years later Paul Chesnel attached himself to their school, contributing little more than volume to the chorus.²⁴

On the appearance of the first three volumes of the *Découvertes*, Shea wrote his sharp criticism, "The Bursting of Pierre Margry's La Salle Bubble," in which he called attention to Margry's duplication of documents printed elsewhere, sometimes at greater length, and notably in Broadhead. Winsor tabulated names and arguments lined up for and against the priority of La Salle in the discovery of the Mississippi.²⁵ The exploration of the Ohio by La Salle was taken for granted. This came into question when American scholars focused their attention on the accounts of Virginia travelers, and when the Ohio legend, invented by Bernou and Renaudot, was thrust upon Parkman by Margry, the American could not defend himself, for his way was barred in that he had access only to copies of materials which it pleased the archivist to give him. Having accepted the legend, Parkman lent his great name unwittingly as proof for it to later historians.²⁶ "Although many have suspected the accounts of La Salle's discovery of the Ohio, the majority of historians have accepted it on very slender evidence. Mr. Frank E. Melvin of the University of Illinois has finally proved in our opinion, by the use of new evidence, its falsity. His essay on the subject will soon be published."²⁷ The latest writer concerning this region, Mr. Hanna,²⁸ is also prepared to reject the tale as a fabrication, and writes that it is 'only a question of time when the evidence will be declared wholly false.'²⁹ A little more than a decade after Alvord and Bidgood wrote, De Villiers pointed out that the two

²² *Cavelier de la Salle de Rouen*, 22-23.

²³ *Ibid.*, 5-6.

²⁴ Paul Chesnel, *Histoire de Cavelier de la Salle*, Paris, 1901.

²⁵ Winsor, *Narrative . . .*, V, 245-246.

²⁶ Clarence Walworth Alvord and Lee Bidgood, *The First Explorations of the Trans-Allegheny Region by the Virginians, 1650-1674*, Cleveland, 1912, 20.

²⁷ Dr. T. C. Pease of the University of Illinois informed the writer that to his knowledge the essay of Melvin was not published.

²⁸ Charles A. Hanna, *The Wilderness Trail*, New York, 1911, II, 87 ff.

²⁹ Alvord and Bidgood, *ibid.*, 24 note 8; cf. C. W. Alvord, *The Illinois Country, 1673-1818*, Springfield, 1920, 78.

documents by means of which the legend was imposed upon the world, were in reality mere modifications of the Galinée account and belonged wholly to imaginative literature.³⁰

It is now the purpose of this essay to submit the evidence contained in the two documents upon which the claims are based, that is, the *Mémoire sur le projet du Sieur de la Salle* and the *Récit d'un ami de l'abbé Galinée*, to a critical examination with regard to their authorship and their contents.

The authors of the documents are known. Parkman thought that the first one was written by La Salle, modestly speaking of himself in the third person.³¹ De Villiers on the other hand stated that the *Mémoire sur le projet du Sieur de la Salle*³² was most certainly written by La Salle's "agent," Abbé Bernou.³³ The document printed by Margry is in the hand of Bernou,³⁴ who, as will appear, wrote many other relations of the journeys of La Salle. The author of the second document³⁵ is another abbé, Eusèbe Renaudot. The reasons that prompted these two politicians to fabricate these documents are easily found. Renaudot belonged to the Jansenistic faction; he was a friend of Arnauld, the leader of the group of bitter enemies of the Jesuits, and he felt that by imagining one or two La Salle journeys, the priority of a discovery attributed to a Jesuit could be overturned, and their *Relations* found at fault. Renaudot was not the man to hesitate in inventing such imaginary explorations.³⁶ It must be stated, however, that neither Renaudot, nor Bernou, nor La Salle, ever made public such a claim; it was necessary to wait more than two centuries before Margry made this "discovery." As for the Ohio, the French Government *asserted* that it had been discovered by La Salle,³⁷ but not one shred of proof was ever produced during the bitter disputes between the

³⁰ De Villiers, *La découverte du Missouri* . . . , 2-18.

³¹ *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West*, 24, note 3.

³² Margry, I, 329-336.

³³ *La découverte du Missouri* . . . , 11, cf. C. W. Alvord, *The Illinois Country*, 78.

³⁴ *Bibliothèque Nationale*, hereinafter quoted as BN, Clairambault, 1016:49-50 v.

³⁵ *Récit d'un ami de l'abbé de Galinée*, Margry, I, 345-402. The present writer did not see the document in the Archives Nationales, K 1232: n. 1, 111 p. The entry in Surrey's Calendar, under the date [1678, June], states that there are omissions in Margry. Cf. the note in Margry, III, 626, on this document.

³⁶ To ridicule the *Relations de la Nouvelle-France* as so many fairy tales became later a task of the Recollect Chrestien Leclercq, *Premier établissement de la Foy*, Chapter XV and ff.

³⁷ T. C. Pease, *Anglo-French Boundary Disputes in the West, 1749-1763*, Springfield, Illinois, 1936, lix.

courts of France and Britain over the western boundary line of the English provinces in America.

Bernou's aim in this question was to profiteer on La Salle's explorations.³⁸ He wanted to be La Salle's "agent," if the explorer succeeded, but his paid agent. Bernou was willing to devote himself to the aggrandizement of France. He was, he wrote to Renaudot,³⁹ passionately zealous for the development of the French colonies, provided there be some consideration, a *certum quid* as he calls it, which in this case was a bishopric in the French West Indies, or in the countries discovered by La Salle. Biographical data on this abbé are very scanty. His name, says De Villiers, is not found in the catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale,⁴⁰ although he corresponded with many scholars of his time, and collaborated in newspaper work. For a while, according to Margry,⁴¹ he edited the *Gazette de France* during the absence of his friend Renaudot. What is known and set down here is gathered from passing remarks about himself found in his writings. He was born in the "vicinity of the estates of the illustrious House of Nemours."⁴² He made the acquaintance of Renaudot about 1671,⁴³ who thereafter molded Bernou to his own image.⁴⁴ In 1683, Bernou went to Rome as unofficial agent,⁴⁵ as counsel of the special envoy of the Portuguese government, then in trouble with Spain over Colonia do Sacramento in South America. Bernou's talents for intrigue and politics were being made use of by Portugal.⁴⁶ This task was to the liking of the abbé who heartily detested the Spaniards.⁴⁷ But in this as in the

³⁸ There are too many statements by Bernou in his letters to Renaudot to admit any other conclusion. "I beg of you," he wrote February 22, 1864, "if M. de la Salle's affairs are successful to have him confirm my commission as his agent. . . . You know, or you ought to know, that all or the majority of men like him have an agent. That of M. de Cussy is M. Apoil, who was the agent of the former governor [of Santo Domingo]. . . . His salary was 500 *écus*. . . . M. de la Salle promised to give me 500 *écus* also, but he has met with many misfortunes. I did not, however, abandon him when he found himself in adverse circumstances, he should not abandon me in prosperity." BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:98 v. This volume contains the letters of Bernou to Renaudot during the latter's sojourn in Rome. Cf. *ibid.*, 54 v., 96-96 v., 108, 158, and Margry, III, 82.

³⁹ Margry, III, 82.

⁴⁰ "La Louisiane, Histoire de son nom . . .," in *Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris*, XXI, n. s., 1929, 19.

⁴¹ Margry, III, 629.

⁴² BN, Clairambault, 1016:651.

⁴³ BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:220.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 93.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 32, 45.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 18, 44, etc., BN, Clairambault, 1016:199-205 v., 208-209 v., etc.

case of being La Salle's agent, Bernou wanted his zeal financially rewarded.⁴⁸ His enthusiasm for the "cause" of Portugal singularly cooled off when the recompense for his services did not come up to his expectations.⁴⁹ There is no doubt that Bernou was a first class diplomatic agent who was able to tell some very unpalatable truths without antagonizing people; he had always in mind that those with whom he disagreed at present might be needed later on to secure his own ends.⁵⁰ He was far above the bitter feelings of Renaudot or La Salle. He disapproved the latter's attitude towards the Jesuits, for he thought that the explorer might be greatly helped in his plans by the missionaries in North America,⁵¹ and the abbé himself considered that M(onsieur) R(obe) N(oire), as he designates the Jesuits in his letters, might be helpful for the success of his "great design,"⁵² despite his lack of any penchant for Mr. R. N.⁵³

During his sojourn in Rome, he wrote to Renaudot at least once a week. These letters, says Leland, "are exceedingly interesting for the light they throw on various aspects of La Salle's enterprises, and other American matters."⁵⁴ Besides, as will appear later, they also throw light on the composition of La Salle's relations, on La Salle's character, on his last expedition, on Bernou's schemes and plans.

Bernou's friend and correspondent, Renaudot, the author of the second document, the *Récit d'un ami de l'abbé Galinée*, on which La Salle's exploration of the Ohio and his priority to the discovery of the Mississippi is based, is better known. Eusèbe Renaudot was born in Paris in 1646. He was the grandson of Theophraste Renaudot, the founder of the *Gazette de France* (1631), the first French newspaper. His classical studies were made at the Jesuit college in Paris, and he joined the Oratorians in 1665, but for a short time. Notwithstanding his title of abbé, he never took major orders. After the death of his father, Eusèbe, and of his uncle, Isaac, he was the editor of the *Gazette de France*. Renaudot became one of the foremost Orientalists of

⁴⁸ BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:26 v., 38 v., 43, etc.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 228 v., 230.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 143.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 86 v.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 143 v., 224.

⁵³ Margry, III, 80.

⁵⁴ Waldo G. Leland, *Guide to Materials for American History in the Libraries and Archives of Paris*, Washington, D. C., 1932, I, 98.

his time, and was elected to the French Academy in 1689. He died in 1720.⁵⁵

The article in Michaud, written by an Orientalist, adds important details concerning Renaudot's literary activities.⁵⁶ These details help to understand the composition of the *Récit* printed in Margry. Renaudot's best known book is the *Perpétuité de la Foi*, which aroused the opposition of both Catholics and Protestants. To prove his point, the abbé translated ambiguous expressions to fit in with his own opinions. Later he published a translation of the *Anciennes Relations des Indes et de la Chine*. They are accounts of travel by Arab merchants to South China in the ninth century, and while the narrative is interesting, they did not deserve the confidence Renaudot gave to the information supplied by the merchants with regard to the customs of China.

The author of the article in Michaud continues:

When he published his translation—from Arabic—the learned theologian had neglected to make known where the manuscript which he published and annotated was to be found. He was satisfied with saying in a vague way that it was in the library of Count de Seignelay, Colbert's son. As a result scholars long doubted the authenticity of these relations, if not of the whole, at least of some of them. Scholars were all the more inclined to doubt of their authenticity when they saw the translator, in the preface and in long notes, made it too evident that he was not sorry to find in these relations information which seemed to demonstrate that the Relations sent by the Jesuits missionaries from and about China were either false or full of gross exaggerations.

The *Récit* was also an occasion to disparage the Jesuit Relations of North America. In 1797, a French scholar discovered the mysterious manuscript. It was found that it had been faithfully edited, but "assertions in the preface and long explanations at the end, inserted with the evident intention to decry the Chinese and to cast doubt on the veracity of the relations of the missionaries or on the scholarship of those who praised these relations, caused the book of Renaudot to be much criticized."

The *Récit* remained buried in the Archives until it was found by Margry who inserted it in the first volume of his compilation. Since it was unpublished, the missionaries of New France were not able to answer it, as those in China were. The answer came from a Jesuit who had spent years in China, and who knew the

⁵⁵ Louis Moréri, *Le Grand Dictionnaire Historique*, Paris, 1759. The article on Renaudot in the *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*, Paris, 1862, is an abridgment of that in Moréri.

⁵⁶ *Biographie Universelle*, Paris, 1824.

language and the customs of the people much better than Renaudot's Arab merchants, and infinitely better than the speculative abbé. Renaudot, a scholar in so far as the languages of the Near East were concerned, was definitely not at home in Far East lore. This answer, complete and thorough, is not only a refutation, it is also a devastating blow at Renaudot's authority.⁵⁷

These, then, are the authors of the two documents, which are both based on the account of Galinée for their details about the Ohio River. The voyage of La Salle found in Renaudot's *Récit*, is a pure invention. The pertinent passages of Galinée's narrative are given below for the sake of comparison, and at the same time to show that La Salle before leaving Montreal, in 1669, knew all that he needed to supply Bernou and Renaudot with details about the course of the Ohio.

It was at this place (Quebec) that M. de Courcelles requested him (Dollier) to unite with M. de la Salle, a brother of M. Caveller, in order that they might make the journey M. de la Salle had long been premeditating towards a great river, which he understood (by what he thought he had learned from the Indians) had its course towards the west, and at the end of which, after seven or eight months' traveling, these Indians said the land was "cut," that is to say according to their manner of speaking, the river fell into the sea. This river is called in the language of the Iroquois, "Ohio." On it are settled a multitude of tribes, from which as yet no one has been seen here, but so numerous are they that, according to the Indians' report, a single nation will include fifteen or twenty villages. The hope of beaver, but especially of finding by this route the passage into the Vermilion Sea, into which M. de la Salle believed the River Ohio emptied, induced him to undertake this expedition, so as not to leave to another the honor of discovering the passage to the South Sea, and thereby the road to China.

M. de Courcelles, the governor of this country, was willing to support this project in which M. de la Salle showed him some probability by a great number of fine speeches, of which he has no lack. . . .

M. Barthelemy was intended to be a member of the party. . . . Accordingly, towards the end of the month of June, 1669, everybody was preparing in good earnest to set out. M. de la Salle wished to take five canoes and fourteen men, and Messieurs Dollier and Barthelemy three canoes and seven men.

The talk was already of starting as soon as possible, and every one had done his packing, when it occurred to the abbé de Queylus that M. de la Salle might possibly abandon our gentlemen, and that his temper, which was known to be rather volatile, might lead him to quit them at the first whim,

⁵⁷ *Lettres Edifiantes et curieuses*, Paris, 1781, 183-237. Bernou who had seen the manuscript of Renaudot's book, had called his friend's attention to some errors, cf. BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:230 v.

perhaps when it was most necessary to have some one with a little skill in finding his bearings for the return journey or acquainted with the situation of known countries, in order not to get them into difficulties through imprudence, and besides, it was desirable to have some trustworthy map of the route that was contemplated.

It was from these considerations that the abbé de Queylus permitted me to accompany M. Dollier when I asked his leave. I had already some smattering of mathematics, enough to construct a map in a sort of fashion, but still sufficiently accurate to enable me to find my way back again from any place I might go in the woods and streams of this country. . . .

Our fleet, consisting of seven canoes each with three men, left Montreal on the 6th of July, 1669, under the guidance of Seneca Iroquois, who had come to Montreal as early as the autumn of the year 1668 to do their hunting and trading. These people while here had stayed a long time at M. de la Salle's, and had told him so many marvels of the river Ohio, with which they said they were thoroughly acquainted, that they inflamed in him more than ever the desire to see it. They told him that this river took its rise three days' journey from Seneca, that after a month's travel one came upon the Honniasontkeronons and the Chiouanons, and that, after passing the latter and a great cataract or waterfall that there is in this river, one found the Outagame and the country of the Iskousogos, and finally a country so abundant in roebucks and wild cattle that they were as thick as the woods, and so great a number of tribes that there could be no more.

M. de la Salle reported all these things to M. Dollier . . . (whose) zeal prevented from remarking that M. de la Salle, who said that he understood the Iroquois perfectly and had learned all these things from them through his perfect acquaintance with their language, did not know it at all, and was embarking upon this expedition almost blindly, scarcely knowing where he was going. He had been led to expect that by making some present to the village of the Senecas, he could readily procure slaves of the tribes to which he intended to go, who might serve him as guides.⁵⁸

There is not the slightest reason to doubt any part of the account of the young Sulpitian, who although friendly was not deceived by the *belles paroles* of La Salle.⁵⁹ Abbé de Queylus, the Superior of the Sulpitians of Montreal, had also had time to notice the unstable character of La Salle, who might change his mind about the discovery he was so bent upon making and

⁵⁸ James H. Coyne, translator and editor, "Explorations of the Great Lakes, 1669-1670, by Dollier de Casson and de Brehant de Galinée, Galinée's narrative and map," in Ontario Historical Society, *Papers and Records*, IV, part I, 5-9. Galinée's account, English only, is found in L. P. Kellogg, *Early Narratives of the Northwest, 1634-1699*, New York, 1917, 167-209; Margry, I, 112-166.

⁵⁹ Bernou, speaking of La Salle, wrote to Renaudot, November 4, 1684, "Je vois que c'est un grand discoureur, peu sincere, et d'assez mauvaise foy, et je vous avoue que si je ne savois que de luy ce qu'il nous a débité, j'aurois peine à en rien croire." BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:169. Two weeks later: "Je le (La Salle) connois et je sçais par expérience que dans la

abandon the missionaries when they least expected it.⁶⁰ It is clear that this is the first voyage of La Salle, and that his knowledge of Indian languages was not as comprehensive as his admirers supposed.⁶¹

The expedition reached Sonnontouan, a Seneca village, and during the sojourn there, continues Galinée,

we had made careful inquiry as to the road we must take to reach the river Ohio, and everybody had told us that in order to get to it from Seneca, it was six days' journey by land of about twelve leagues each. This made us think it was not possible for us to get to it that way, as we could hardly carry anything for so long a journey but the mere necessities of life—carrying our baggage being out of the question. But at the same time, we were told that in going to Lake Erie by canoe we should have only three days portage to get to that river, much nearer to the tribes we were seeking than we should find it going by Seneca.⁶²

As they could not obtain a guide, they left this village, crossed the Niagara below the Falls. They reached Tinawatawa, an Iroquois village on the northern shore of Lake Ontario, September 24. Here they met Jolliet coming from Lake Superior. He told them of the Potawatomi, a numerous Ottawa tribe, and gave them a description of a shorter route to reach these Indians which M. Dollier wished to evangelize.

Meanwhile M. de la Salle's illness was beginning to take away from him the inclination to push further on, and the desire to see Montreal was beginning to press him. He had not spoken of it to us, but we had clearly perceived it,

so that when the two Sulpitians were making themselves ready to leave for the Potawatomi country by the route Jolliet had indicated to them,

nécessité il est homme à tout promettre aus gens dont il a besoin pour gagner du tems, et à aller à ses fins sans se mettre beaucoup en peine des suites que pourront avoir ses manquemens de parole." *Ibid.*, 173.

⁶⁰ M. de Queylus had more than one reason to apprehend the consequences of La Salle's fickleness, cf. Faillon, *Histoire de la Colonie Française en Canada*, Villemarie, 1866, III, 290. With this opinion of de Queylus, cf. what La Salle's Jesuit superiors formerly thought in this respect, C. de Rochemonteix, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France au XVII^e siècle*, Paris, 1895-1896, III, 44.

⁶¹ After La Salle's arrival in Canada, "he at once began to study the Indian languages, and with such success that he is said, within two or three years, to have mastered the Iroquois and seven or eight other languages and dialects," Parkman, *La Salle*, 24. Parkman refers here to the *Papiers de Famille*; if the information found in other family papers is as accurate as that found in these, for instance in the papers referred to in the letter of Madeleine Cavelier, Margry, I, 379, there seems little reason to regret their loss.

⁶² Coyne, 35-37.

M. de la Salle, seeing us determined to depart in two or three days, in order to proceed to the bank of the river that was to take us to Lake Erie, explained himself to us, and told us that the state of his health no longer permitted him to think of the journey he had undertaken along with us. He begged us to excuse him if he abandoned us to return to Montreal, and added that he could not make up his mind to winter in the woods with his men, where their lack of skill and experience might make them die of starvation.⁶³

On September 30, 1669, after M. Dollier had said Mass, the expedition broke into two groups.

We had no trouble in persuading our men to follow us. There was not one at that time who desired to leave us; and it may be said with truth that more joy was remarked in those who were going to expose themselves to a thousand perils than in those who were turning back to a place of safety, although the latter regarded us as people who were going to expose ourselves to death; as indeed they announced as soon as they arrived here (Montreal) and caused a great deal of pain to those who took some interest in our welfare.⁶⁴

Where did La Salle go after he left the Sulpitians on the northern shore of Lake Ontario? For Margry and others he went down the Ohio as far as Louisville,⁶⁵ that is, he made with fewer men, minus the companions of Dollier and Galinée and minus those of his own men who returned to Montreal, a journey much more hazardous than the one he could not make up his mind to undertake with the Sulpicians because of the lack of skill and experience of all his men for wintering in the woods; and furthermore, thus at a disadvantage, he made a journey of incomparably greater difficulty than anything he ever attempted afterwards.⁶⁶ Naturally, if La Salle had made the journey, if there were proofs that he went down the Ohio, such reasoning would be worth nothing, but there is no proof other than the account of Bernou and that of Renaudot. The next time the explorer was heard of was in the following summer, 1670, when Perrot met "a little below (the rapids) of the Chats, M. de la Salle, who was hunting with five or six Frenchmen and ten or

⁶³ Coyne, 47-49. Lorin, 13, tells his readers that Dollier and Galinée "abandoned" La Salle, and, 14, that the two Sulpitians "laissèrent leur compagnon malade, vers l'extrémité occidentale du Lac Ontario."

⁶⁴ Coyne, 49.

⁶⁵ Gravier, who never has any difficulty, asserts in *Découvertes*, 38, that La Salle "marcha droit sur l'Ohio."

⁶⁶ Charles Whittlesey, "Discovery of the Ohio River, by Robert Cavelier de la Salle, 1669-1670," in *Western Reserve and Northern Ohio Historical Society, Tract 38*, 12.

twelve Iroquois."⁶⁷ This portage, situated on the Ottawa River near Arnprior, is more than 700 miles in a straight line from the Louisville rapids. La Salle himself never said he went down the Ohio, or where he spent the winter of 1669 and the Spring of 1670. It was left to Bernou to concoct this voyage more than ten years later. What the explorer did after he left Dollier and Galinée, anybody may guess. He might have gone back to the Iroquois village where the party had received a hearty welcome; he apparently did not go back to Montreal with some of his men; this cannot be deduced from the account of Galinée, who was back in Montreal in June, 1670.⁶⁸

The vague, confused, misleading account of Bernou published by Margry⁶⁹ reads as follows:

Memoir on the project of Sieur de la Salle to discover the West part of North America between New France, Florida and Mexico.

Sieur de la Salle having always felt much inclination for making discoveries and founding colonies which would be advantageous to Religion and useful to France, went to Canada in 1666, and began that same year the La Chine village, situated in the Island of Montreal, far from all French habitations. In the year 1667 and in those following, he made several journeys with much expense, in which he was the first to discover much land south of the Great Lakes, among which the great Ohio River. He followed it to a place where it falls from very high into vast marshes, at the 37th degree of latitude, after having been increased by another River, very large, which comes from the North, and all its waters⁷⁰ discharging themselves, according to all appearances into the Gulf of Mexico making him hope⁷¹ to find a new way of communication with the sea, from which New France might some day derive great advantages, as well as from the Great Lakes which occupy a part of North America.

It is clear that this is a version of Galinée's account, with the differences that it is no longer the Iroquois Indians who are speaking of the Ohio, but La Salle and he is made to explore this river to the great fall. A few other incorrect data are added. La Salle did not go to Canada in 1666, but in the Fall of 1667,⁷²

⁶⁷ Jules Tailhan, ed., *Memoire sur les Moeurs, Coustumes et Relligion des Sauvages de l'Amerique Septentrionale*, par Nicolas Perrot, Leipzig and Paris, 1864, 119-120.

⁶⁸ Letter of Talon to Colbert, in Margry, I, 80, and *ibid.*, I, 181, the relation of de Courcelles' journey to Lake Ontario.

⁶⁹ Margry, I, 329.

⁷⁰ The translation is that of Bernou's text which has *et toutes ses eaux*, BN, Clairambault, 1016:49.

⁷¹ Margry's two words "fait-on" do not make sense, Bernou has *et luy font espérer*.

⁷² Rochemonteix, III, 51, note 4, says that La Salle is mistaken in saying that he went to Canada in 1666. The Jesuit historian evidently thought that this memoir had been written by La Salle. For the date of

and consequently he got his tract of land no earlier than at the end of 1667 or at the beginning of 1668.⁷³ The Iroquois came in the Fall of 1668; La Salle did not travel that year, for he was clearing his concession, and he did not travel in 1669, for he was busy preparing to leave with Dollier from the Spring until July.⁷⁴ We have the desire for explorations spoken of by Galinée, and the great fall spoken of by the Iroquois. No longitude is given. The latitude is one degree farther north than that observed by Jolliet, whose narrative Bernou possessed, where the Ohio flows in the Mississippi. Bernou thought it would be prudent to stop La Salle one degree north of the point reached by Jolliet and given by the Canadian as the latitude 36 degrees, where the Ohio met the Mississippi. As is known Cairo is on the 37 degree, for Jolliet made a mistake of one degree in his calculations; and the rapids near Louisville, the only falls on the Ohio, are on the 38 degree. The very great river that comes from the north can only be the Wabash and this does not flow into the Ohio above the rapids, but some 130 miles below. The fall of the Ohio is not "great," there is a drop of twenty-seven feet over a course of two and a half miles. There are no marshes. But it is argued that there might have been a flood that year, and, for the French clauses *il la suivit jusques à un endroit où elle tombe de fort haut dans de vastes marais*, an ingenious if somewhat fantastic explanation has been suggested. In order to do away with this bothersome fall, this sentence is translated: 'he followed it to a place where it empties after a long course, into vast marshes.'⁷⁵

This explanation to all appearances was advanced, because

La Salle's arrival in Canada, cf. Faillon, III, 228; Rochemonteix, III, 48; Gilbert J. Garraghan, "Some Newly Discovered Marquette and La Salle Letters," in *Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu*, IV, 1935, 277; *id.*, "La Salle's Jesuit Days," in *MID-AMERICA*, XIX, 1937, 98.

⁷³ Faillon, III, 229, found a document in the *greffe* of Montreal that in the winter of 1668, La Salle granted 200 arpents of pasture land from his own fief to Barthélemy Vinet.

⁷⁴ The sale of his property to the Sulpitians is of the beginning of 1669, Faillon, III, 288.

⁷⁵ J. P. Dunn, *Indiana, A Redemption from Slavery*, Boston and New York, 1905, 10, note. The philological discussion in this note is not pertinent. To be of any value this explanation should have been supported by a text from the letters of La Salle—or in this case from those of Bernou, since he is the author of the memoir—where "tomber de fort haut" refers to the length of the stream. Indeed, the text in Margry II, 80, has "fort haut," but the full expression is "remonter jusques fort haut," which meant then as it means now "to go far up a stream." The verb "tomber" as in Margry, II, 128, referring to the discharge of a river, and the two words "fort haut" in the expression "remonter jusques fort haut" cannot be combined as in Bernou's text to mean the length of a river.

it was supposed that La Salle had written the memoir, and it is a desperate attempt at reconciling the text with the geography of the country it purports to describe. The explorer, if he had in reality been near the rapids at Louisville, could not have made such a mistake. The memoir is Bernou's; and it is the abbé who interprets the "grand sault ou cheute d'eau" of the Iroquois in Galinée's account by "tomber de fort haut." In 1682, when Bernou sent the memoir⁷⁶ to Seignelay, together with the so-called *Relation officielle*, the word Ohio is not even mentioned, and the journey down this river to the great fall at the 37° of latitude has also disappeared. "He (La Salle) was the first to conceive the project of these discoveries, which he mentioned more than fifteen years ago⁷⁷ to M. de Courcelles, governor, and to M. Talon, intendant of Canada, who approved it. He then made several journeys in that direction (Mississippi River), among others in 1669, with MM. Dollier and Galinée, priests of the Seminary of St. Sulpice."⁷⁸ The conclusiveness of this statement is strengthened when it is remembered that Bernou is here answering an objection made that La Salle was not the first to discover the River Colbert, that is, the Mississippi. All the operations of the explorer are recounted, the building of Fort Frontenac, the construction of the *Griffon*, the discovery of the Sioux country. If La Salle had discovered the Ohio, here was the place where mention of it would certainly have been made. Finally, there is an avowal by Bernou showing that he drew upon his imagination when he composed his account of La Salle's travel

⁷⁶ This memoir, BN, Clairambault, 1016:190-193, printed in Margry, II, 277-288, in the handwriting of Bernou, cf. Margry, III, 629, was certainly composed by the abbé. The ideas, the style, and certain peculiarities of spelling remove all reasonable doubt. Bernou is also the author of the so-called *Relation officielle*, BN, Clairambault, 1016-85-91 v., which is an abridgment of the relation printed in Margry, I, 435 ff. This, as well as the long relation of La Salle, BN, Clairambault, 1016:92-147, bear all internal marks of being Bernou's work, but these two documents are in the hand of a copyist, the same copyist. For other details, cf. Leland, *Guide*, 172.

⁷⁷ Bernou still thought that La Salle went to Canada in 1666. This date the document, 1682.

⁷⁸ The *Relation officielle* as printed in Margry, I, 436, reads: "Il (La Salle) communiqua ensuite au Sieur de Courcelles, gouverneur du Canada, le dessein qu'il avoit de travailler à ceste decouverte, et il le trouva si bien fondé qu'il l'encouragea à l'exécuter au plus tost. Le Sieur de la Salle pour prendre des mesures plus justes, fit divers voyages, tantost avec des François, tantost avec des Sauvages, et mesme avec MM. Dollier et Galinée, prestres du séminaire de Saint-Sulpice, l'année 1669; mais une violente fièvre l'obligea à les quitter à l'entrée." The text in Bernou up to here is the same as that reproduced by Margry, but the abbé has three words after "l'entrée" which change somewhat the text: "mais une violente fièvre l'obligea à les quitter à l'entrée du lac Erie," BN, Clairambault, 1016:85.

down the Ohio in 1669-1670. La Salle was then in France (1684); the abbé wrote to Renaudot: "Give him (La Salle) the relation I wrote, which I left with you. He will be able to use it as an outline (canevas); let him correct it or lengthen it, if this should be easier for him, although I would prefer him to re-write it not being myself very much satisfied with it, especially with regard to the beginning for which I lacked dates and memoirs."⁷⁹

La Salle himself mentions the Ohio several times, but not as one who had a direct knowledge of that river. In September, 1680, he refers to it as a river *que j'ai trouvée*, as a better means of communication to bring back the products of the Illinois country to Fort Frontenac than by way of the Great Lakes.

This river, which I call Baudrane, the Iroquois name Ohio, and the Ottawa, Olighin-cipou.⁸⁰ . . . This river Baudrane rises behind Oneida, and after a westward course of about 450 leagues, almost always equally large and more than the Seine at Rouen, but much deeper, discharges itself into the River Colbert, twenty to twenty five leagues, South-south-west of the mouth by which the Illinois river flows into the same stream. A *barque* can go up this river very far near to Tsonnontouan.⁸¹

Margry italicized the words *que j'ai trouvée*, as if La Salle had made the discovery, whereas La Salle had merely heard about it from the Indians,⁸² just as he had heard from the Iroquois of the great falls; the latter have disappeared altogether from this account. He says that this Baudrane-Ohio-Olighin-cipou river can be ascended very far by *barques*, that is, by decked ships like the *Griffon*, as opposed to canoes.

In his letter of August 22, 1682, La Salle speaks of the Maumee as being "called Tiotontaraeton by the Iroquois, . . . —without doubt the passage to go to the Ohio or Olighinsipou, which means in Iroquois and in Ottawa, Beautiful River." The route between this Tiotontaraeton and the Ohio, on the other hand, is too long and too difficult, but at one day's journey from the mouth of the Maumee, there is a little lake whence flows a creek which soon becomes a river. After a course of one hun-

⁷⁹ "Donnez luy ma relation que vous avez qui pourra luy servir de canevas, ou qu'il pourra corriger et augmenter si cela luy est pluscommode, quoyque j'aimerois mieux qu'il la fit de nouveau, n'en estant pas moi mesme beaucoup satisfait, surtout dans le commencemens ou je manquois de dates et de memoires." BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:89.

⁸⁰ Margry, II, 141.

⁸¹ Margry, II, 80; cf. *ibid.*, 98.

⁸² The distance given, twenty to twenty-five leagues, is less than a third of the actual distance.

dred leagues the river receives the Miami, and finally discharges itself into the Illinois river, "two leagues below the village," and then into the Mississippi. This river without rapids, which flows into the Illinois is the Wabash or the Aramoni (Vermilion).⁸³ La Salle was evidently speaking from hearsay. He had met a Shawnee chief the year before, who had mentioned a great river (the Wabash) "which flows into the Ohio, and thence into the Mississippi."

It is easy to understand that Bernou was puzzled when he read all this. The abbé wanted La Salle to make a clear distinction between what he himself had seen and what he had heard from the Indians. He wrote to Renaudot to urge La Salle to write a detailed account of his travels from the time the explorer left Fort Frontenac in a canoe after the defeat of the deserters, and to urge La Salle to draw a map, "but I have two things to tell you on this subject. First, it is necessary that he (La Salle) add the true shape of all the lakes, for he told me that Lake Ontario was not as it is represented (on maps) and that it is narrower toward the middle. He must add the course of the rivers and the (direction and lay) of the mountains which he did not see, but according as he will have learned from the Savages or from the French, (such items) as the Aramoni River, the old Ohio River, etc., indicating on the map what he saw and what he heard."⁸⁴ The second thing Bernou is asking for, is that a copy of the map be sent to him in Rome.

The other passages where La Salle speaks of the Ohio will be treated later. The two notices by Tonty⁸⁵ and by Nicholas de la Salle⁸⁶ of the Ohio River in their account of the journey down to the mouth of the Mississippi are negative arguments corroborating the view that La Salle never went down the Ohio either in 1669-1670, or at any other time.

JEAN DELANGLEZ

(To be continued)

⁸³ Margry, II, 243. This autograph letter of La Salle has been tampered with by Bernou; cf. Leland, *Guide*, 172; the changes come after the passage quoted in the text.

⁸⁴ "Mais j'ay deux choses à vous dire sur ce sujet. La premiere qu'il est necessaire qu'il y joigne la figure veritable de tous les lacs telle qu'elle est, car il m'a dit que le lac Ontario n'estoit pas fait comme on le representoit, et qu'il se retrecissait vers le milieu, qu'il ajoute le cours des rivières et des montagnes qu'il n'aura pas vûes selon ce qu'il en aura appris des sauvages ou des françois comme la rivière Aramoni l'ancienne rivière Ohio &c, marquant sur la carte ce qu'il a veu et ce qu'il a oüy." BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:89 v.

⁸⁵ Margry, I, 596.

⁸⁶ Margry, I, 550.