

*ADDITIONS to the Article concerning
Geography, Vol. I. p. 133.*

I.

On the Extent of the Terrestrial Continents.

PAGE 134. I said, that the longest line which can be drawn in the ancient Continent is about 3600 leagues. By leagues, I mean those used in the environs of Paris, which are 2000 or 2100 fathoms long, and about 27 of them make a degree.

Besides, though in this article of general geography, I endeavoured to reach that degree of exactness which subjects of that nature require; yet a few slight errors have escaped me. For example, 1. I have not used the names adopted or given by the French to several parts of America. I uniformly followed the British globes made by Senex, of two feet diameter, from which my charts were exactly copied. The British are more just than the French, with regard to countries they discover, or through which they travel. They preserve the original name of each country, or that which was bestowed on it by the first discoverers. We, on the contrary, often give French names to the countries we visit, which is the cause of that obscurity in the geographical nomenclature of our language. But, as the lines which traverse the two continents

nents

nents in their greatest length are well marked, in my charts, by the two extreme points, and several other intermediate ones, whose names are generally adopted, no essential ambiguity can arise from this circumstance.

2. I likewise neglected to give the calculation of the surface of the two continents, because it is easily made on a large globe. But, as many persons have expressed a desire to see this calculation, I here subjoin that which M. Robert de Vaugondi transmitted to me at the time*.

From

* Calculation of our Continent by geometrical leagues square.

14 d.	14 d.	14 d.	14 d.	14 d.
5 E	8 D	10 C	12 B	13 A
78750	80937	100625	113730	120312½

Calculation of the left half.

Calculation of the right half.

A × 3 =	360937½	A × 3 =	360937½
A × 3½ =	421093½	A × 1 =	120312½
B × 3½ =	398125	B × 1 =	113750
B × 4 =	455000	B × 4½ =	492916½
C × 2 =	201250	C × 1 =	100625
C × 3 =	301875	C × 4½ =	436041½
D × 1 =	80937½	D × 1 =	80937½
D × 2 =	161875	D × 4½ =	350729
E × 1 =	78750	E × 1 =	78750
E × ½ =	11250	E × 4½ =	334087½

2471092½

2469687

2471092½

2469687

Difference 1405½

Which is scarcely a degree and a half square.

Calcu-

From this calculation it appears, that, on the left of the line of partition, there are $2471092\frac{1}{2}$ of square leagues, and 2469687 square leagues on the right of the same line; and consequently that the Old Continent consists of about 4940780 square leagues, which is not one fifth part of the earth's surface.

In the same manner, the part on the left of the line of partition in the New Continent, contains $1069286\frac{1}{2}$ square leagues, and that on the right of the same line consists of $1370926\frac{1}{4}$;

Calculation of the Continent of America according to the same measures.

Calculation of the left half. Calculation of the right half.

D $\times 2 =$	161965	D $\times 2\frac{1}{2} =$	215833 $\frac{1}{2}$
C $\times 2 =$	201250	C $\times 2\frac{1}{2} =$	225406 $\frac{1}{2}$
B $\times 2 =$	227500	A $\times \frac{1}{2} =$	24062 $\frac{1}{2}$
A $\times \frac{1}{2} =$	60156 $\frac{1}{2}$	A $\times 1\frac{1}{2} =$	144375
A $\times \frac{1}{2} =$	80208 $\frac{1}{2}$	B $\times 2 =$	227500
B $\times 2 =$	91000	C $\times 2\frac{1}{2} =$	218020
C $\times 1\frac{1}{2} =$	125801 $\frac{1}{2}$	D $\times \frac{1}{2} =$	15750
D $\times 2 =$	121406		
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	1069286 $\frac{1}{2}$		1070926 $\frac{1}{4}$

1070926 $\frac{1}{4}$
1069286 $\frac{1}{2}$

Difference 1639 $\frac{1}{4}$

Which is scarcely a degree and one fifth square.

Superficies of the New Continent	2140213
Superficies of the Old Continent	4940780
Total	<hr/>
	7080993 square leagues.

in

in all, about 2140213 square leagues; which makes not one half of the surface of the Old Continent. As both Continents contain but 7080993 square leagues, their superficies is not near one third of the total surface of the globe, which is about 26 millions of square leagues.

3. I ought to have mentioned the small difference of inclination that subsists between the two lines by which I divided the two Continents. I contented myself with saying, that they were both inclined to the Equator, in opposite sides, about 30 degrees, which is not the precise fact; for that of the Old Continent is a little more than 30 degrees, and that of the New a little less. If I had given this explanation, I should have avoided the imputation of having drawn two lines of unequal lengths, under the same angle between two parallels; which would have proved, as an anonymous critic remarks*, that I am unacquainted with the elements of geometry.

4. I neglected to distinguish Upper from Lower Egypt; so that, in p. 137 and 138, there is the appearance of a contradiction. In the first of these passages, Egypt seems to be ranked among the most ancient lands, while, in the second, it is reckoned among the most recent. I was wrong in not distinguishing, as I had elsewhere done, Upper Egypt, which is a very ancient land, from Lower Egypt, which is a very new territory.

* Lestres à un Americain.