

ed. Candour, however, must admit that that letter does but very partial and evidently reluctant justice to the calumniated warrior. It is, moreover, less magnanimous, and characterized by more of special pleading, than might have been expected. In addition to this, it appears, by a communication from the young chief to Sir John Johnson, dated January 22, 1822, that Mr. Campbell had not only expressed his regret at the injustice done the character of his father, but had promised a correction in the next edition, then soon to be published. This correction, however, was not made, as it should have been, in the text, but in a note to the subsequent edition; and although, at the close of that note, Mr. Campbell says, for reasons given, that "the name of Brant remains in his poem only as a pure and declared character of fiction," yet it is not a fictitious historical character, and cannot be made such by an effort of the imagination. The original wrong, therefore, though mitigated, has not been fully redressed, for the simple reason that it is the poem that lives in the memory, while the note, even if read, makes little impression, and is soon forgotten.

In the year 1827, Ahyouwaeghs was appointed by the Earl of Dalhousie, then commander-in-chief of the British American provinces, to the rank of captain, and also superintendent of the Six Nations. It was early in the same year that the chief heard that a liberty had been taken with his name in the American newspapers, which kindled in his bosom feelings of the liveliest indignation. Those familiar with that deep and fearful conspiracy in the western part of New-York, in the autumn of 1826, which resulted in the murder of William Morgan by a small body of over-zealous freemasons, will probably remember that the name of John Brant appeared in a portion of the correspondence connected with that melancholy story. The circumstances were these: It was well ascertained that, in the origin and earlier