in my poem
S. Bannister
London, and
he believed
id induce me
hat no declasuch as should
ers that were

uty to inspect ted, and I felt iressed, which ly wronged it. ving was cont the son and it, or be affectns to whom I me, smile with ving it. With l it in popular that you have fore, though I nonorable menhowever, in the ity, I must say, offered only a and not such a nd, judge how ad stood in the icted for thirty h a confidence

in English books.
hefoucault, whose
ed. "Col. Brant
te English banner,
ceived by the King,
manners are semiself in the English
on; and neverthepresent (1795) at
h the western Ineneral bears so exted with him."—

which beguiled at last my suspicion, and I believe that of the public at large. Among those authors were Gordon, Ramsay, Marshall, Belsham, and Weld. The most of them, you may tell me, perhaps, wrote with zeal against the American war. Well, but Mr. John Adolphus was never suspected of any such zeal, and yet he has said in his History of England, &c. (vol. iii. p. 110) "that a force of sixteen hundred savages and Americans in disguise, headed by an Indian Col. Butler, and a half Indian of extraordinary ferocity named Brant, lulling the fears of the inhabitants (of Wyoming) by treachery, suddenly possessed themselves of two forts, and massacred the garrisons." He says farther, "that all were involved in unsparing slaughter, and that even the devices of torment were exhausted." He possessed, if I possessed them, the means of consulting better authorities; yet he has never to my knowledge made any atone. ment to your father's memory. When your Canadian friends, therefore, call me to trial for having defamed the warrior Brant, I beg that Mr. John Adolphus may be also included in the summons. And after his own defence and acquittal, I think he is bound, having been one of my historical misleaders, to stand up as my gratuitous counsel, and sav, "Gentlemen, you must acquit my client, for he has only fallen into an error, which even my judgment could not escape."

In short, I imbibed my conception of your father from accounts of him that were published when I was scarcely out of my cradle. And if there were any public, direct, and specific challenges to those accounts in England ten years ago, I am yet to learn where they existed.

I rose from perusing the papers you submitted to me certainly with an altered impression of his character. I find that the unfavorable accounts of him were erroneous, even on points not immediately connected with his reputation. It turns out, for instance, that he was a Mohawk Indian of unmixed parentage. This circumstance, however, ought not to be overlooked in estimating the merits of his attainments. He spoke and wrote our language with force and facility, and had enlarged views of the union and policy of the Indian tribes. A gentleman who had been in America, and from whom I sought information respecting him in consequence of your interesting message, told me that though he could not pretend to appreciate his character entirely, he had been struck by the naïveté and cloquence of his conversation. They had talked of music, and Brant said, "I like the harpsichord well, and the organ still better: but I like the drum and trumpet best of all, for they make my heart beat quick." This gentleman also described to me the enthusiasm