

of gravity and of a centrifugal force, it could have no other figure: and that, consequently, every hypothesis in which we find greater or less difference are fictions which merit no attention.

But it may be said, if this theory be true, and if 229 to 230 is the just relation of the axis, why did the mathematicians, sent to Lapland and Peru, agree to the relation of 174 to 175? Whence does this difference arise between theory and practice? And is it not more reasonable to give the preference to practice and measures, especially when they have been taken by the most able mathematicians of Europe\*, and with all necessary apparatus to establish the result?

To this I answer, that I have paid attention to the observations made at the equator and near the polar circle; that I have no doubt of their being exact, and that the earth may possibly be elevated an 175th part more at the equator than at the poles. But at the same time, I maintain my theory, and I see clearly how the two conclusions may be reconciled. This difference is about four leagues in the two axes, so that the parts at the equator are  
raised

\* M. de Maupertuis' Figure of the Earth.