

Adams on Priestley

1. April 19, 1786

“I walked to the Booksellers, Stockdale, Cadel, Dilly, Almon, and met Dr. Priestly for the first Time.”

2. April 23, 1786

“Heard Dr. Priestley at Mr. Linseys in Essex Street.”

3. To David Ramsay – Aug. 1, 1786

“there have been hints of designs or desires to publish a mutilated Edition of your History, but your Friends have expressed so much Indignation at them that I hope & believe they will be laid aside, and that by degrees the American Edition may be sold— There is an Eagerness to read it, even among those who are least favourable to it, all who have read it, express an high opinion of its impartiality as well as of its Composition. The Bishop of S^t. Asaph, Doctor Priestly, & D^r. Price, good judges have highly applauded both in my hearing as well as several others, of less Name.”

4. To Richard Price – Feb. 24, 1787

“I am happy to learn, by your obliging letter of the second of this month, that you have found some amusement, in the volume I left with you, and that I may entertain a hope of its doing good. It is but an humble tho’ laborious office, to collect together so many opinions and examples; but it may point out to my young countrymen the genuine sources of information, upon a subject more interesting to them if possible than to the rest of the world. A work might be formed upon that plan which would be worthy of the pen and the talents of a Hume, a Gibbon, a Price or a Priestley, and I cannot but think that the two former would have employed their whole lives in forming into one system and view all the governments that exist, or are recorded, more beneficially to mankind than in attacking all the principles of human knowledge, or in painting the ruins of the Roman Empire, instead of leaving such an enterprise to the temerity of an American demagogue worn out with the cares and vexations of a turbulent life.”

5. To Benjamin Vaughan – April 1, 1787

“You will therefore be so good as to make my best Respects to Dr Priestly and Compliments to Mr Wilkinsen, and to excuse the Trouble given you.”

6. To Abigail – May 24, 1789

“The Books I wish for, are hume, Johnson Priestley, Ainsworths Dictionary,”

7. To Charles Adams – Feb. 19, 1792

“I wish you to take of Berry and Rogers as handsome a set of my Defence as you can find and packet them up handsomely and address them to The Reverend Joseph Priestley D. D. London.”

8. To Joseph Priestley – Feb. 19, 1792

“I take an opportunity by part of my family bound to London, to remind you of a person who once had an opportunity of knowing you personally, and to express my sympathy with you under your sufferings in the cause of Liberty. Inquisitions and Despotisms are not alone in persecuting Philosophers. The people themselves we see, are capable of persecuting a Priestly, as an other people formerly persecuted a Socrates. By a compliment which I hold very precious in your familiar letters to the Inhabitants of Birmingham, I am emboldened to hope that you will not be displeased to receive an other Copy of my Defence, especially as that which was presented you formerly has probably had the honor to share the fate of your Library. As there is not a sett to be sold in London, at least, I am told so, I have desired Colo: Smith to take one from New-York, and present it to you with my sincere veneration.”

9. To Joseph Priestley – May 12, 1793

“I regret very much the inconveniences the Dissenters experience and am not very well able to account for the violent attachment in the People of England to the Establishment of the Church, yet I neither wonder nor censure their attachment to the monarchical part of their Constitution: because I am convinced by a chain of Facts, authorities and reasonings that appear to me equivalent to a mathematical Demonstration, that both their Liberties and Prosperity would be totally destroyed by the Destruction of it, and I had rather see the whole body of Dissenters in the three kingdoms driven over to America, where they would be kindly received and infinitely happier than they ever can be in England than that the sublime and beautiful fabric of the English Constitution in three Branches should be lost out of Europe to whose Liberties it is essential.”

10. To Abigail – Dec. 30, 1793

“I this day received a Visit from M^r Joseph Priestley the oldest son of D^r Priestley, with a Letter from his Father. The Letter with a Card was left when I was in the Senate: as soon as I came home and found the Letter, I returned the Visit—and found Mr Joseph Priestly with his Wife and his youngest Brother, with another Englishman whose Name is Colman I believe. I revere the D^r and his sons are likely Men: but they will do no good in America, untill they are undeceived. They are blinded by Ignorance or Error: blinded beyond the most stupid and besotted of our American Jacobins. *entre nous*. They are young however and will be corrected by Experience.”

11. To Jefferson – May 11, 1794

“This Country is becoming the Assylum of all the ardent Spirits in Europe. The Bp. of Autun and Mr Beaumez, are arrived and Dr Priestley is expected.”

12. To Abigail – Feb. 13, 1796

“D^r Priestly is here— I drank Tea with him at the Presidents on Thursday Ev.— He says he always maintained against D^r Price that Old Age was the pleasantest Part of Life and he finds it so— I think so too— One knows not what Infirmeties may come on—What Pains, Grievs, or sorrows?”

13. To Abigail – March 5, 1796

“Priestley preached last sunday a sermon on the Religious Rites of the Gentiles in which he exposed their Nakedness like an European to the Blushes and Mortification of American hearers of both sexes.”

14. To Abigail – March 9, 1796

“Priestley preaches once on a Sunday to a crowded Congregation, on the Evidences of Religion and is much Admired.”

15. To Abigail – Jan. 16, 1797

“I went Yesterday to hear D^r Priestley, in the Philosophical Hall of the University and there I met unexpectedly with D^r Euwing and D^r Andross or Andrews ... Priestly has written something in answer to Volneys Ruins of Empires, which has been more universally read in England than any of his Writings.”

16. To John Lathrop – Feb. 20 1797

“I send you for the academy Dr: Priestly’s observations just published in which he has Exposed Voltaire, Volney &ca:”

17. To Timothy Pickering – Aug. 13, 1799

“Of Priestley and Coper, I will say no more at present, than to relate to you, two facts.

Anecdote the 1st. Dr. Priestleys old Friend and my old Acquaintance Mr. Benjamin Vaughan, the celebrated M.P. soon after his arrival in Boston came up to Quincy with his Lady, on a Visit to Us, who had visited his family in London. I was Absent. They dined with Mrs. Adams, and in the Course of Conversation Mr. Vaughan told her, that Mr. Cooper was a rash Man and had led Dr. Priestley into all his Errors in England and he feared would lead him into others in America.

Anecdote the 2d. At the time when We were enquiring for an Agent to conduct the Affairs of the United States before the Commissioners at Phyladelphia, Mr. Cooper wrote

to me a solicitation for that appointment and Dr. Priestly wrote me a Letter, strongly recommending him. Both made Apologies for his Reputation as a Democrat, and gave intimations of a reformation. I wondered that either could think it possible that the People of the U.S. could be satisfied or contented to intrust Interest of such magnitude to an Englishman, or any other Foreigner. I wondered that either should think it compatible with my Duty, to prefer a Stranger to the great number of able Natives who wished for this Trust. But so it was, As it has been from the Beginning a Rule not to answer Letters of solicitation or Recommendation for Officers. I never Answered either. Mr. Reed was appointed, and the dissappointed Candidate is now it seems indulging his Revenge. A meaner, a more artful or a more malicious Libel has not appeared. As far as it alludes to me I despise it. But I have no doubt it is a Libel against the whole Government and as such ought to be prosecuted. I do not think it wise to execute the Alien Law against poor Priestley, at present. He is as weak as water as unstable as Reuben or the Wind. His Influence is not an Atom in the World.”

- Pickering had written:

- “The day before yesterday I received from Mr. Charles Hall of Northumberland County in this State, a letter concerning a publication by Thomas Cooper, an Englishman, & a connection of Dr. Priestly, addressed to the Readers of the Sunbury and Northumberland Gazette, on the 29th of June. This address has been republished in the Aurora of July 12th which I now inclose.

By Mr. Hall’s information, Cooper was a Barrister in England, and like Dr. Priestly a chymist, and a warm opposition man. Dr. Priestly was at the *democratic* assembly on the 4th of July, at Northumberland. But what is of most consequence, and demonstrates the Doctor’s want of decency—being an alien—his discontented and turbulent spirit, that will never be quiet under the freest government on earth, is “his industry in getting Mr. Cooper’s address printed in hand-bills and distributed.” This, Mr. Hall adds, “is a circumstance capable of the fullest proof.” Cooper, has taken care to get himself admitted to citizenship: I am sorry for it: for those who are desirous of maintaining our internal tranquillity must wish them both removed from the U. States.

18. To Timothy Pickering – Aug. 14, 1799

“Inclosed are four petitions for mercy. One from Conrad Marks, Fredk. Heyney Anthony Staler, John Getman, Valentine Kuder, Jacob Kline, David Shaffer & Philip Lesh. Another from George Schaffer, Daniel Swarts, Henry Stahler, Christian Rhodes & Henry Shaffert. A third from Jacob Eyerman & John Everhast & a fourth from John Fries, all supported by numerous petitioners on their behalf. I wish Dr. Priestly could see these petitions, & be asked to consider, whether it would be a pleasant thing to have an equal number of his neighbors in Northumberland, brought by his exertions & example into a situation equally humble.”

19. To Benjamin Rush – Sept. 30, 1805

“The Case of Cooper and Priestly another time.”

20. To Van der Kemp – March 9, 1806

“Davila does not appear to have understood the nature of a free Government any better than Turgot, Neckar, Franklin or Priestly.”

21. To Benjamin Rush – March 26, 1806

“But as it is, I See nothing but We must or rather that We Shall follow the fate of Europe. Voltaire, Buffon, D’Alembert, Diderot, Raynal, Rousseau Dr Priestly, Dr Franklin, Mr Helvetius and that miserable Dupe of his own Vanity and their Intrigues, Frederick the great have made all Europe So discontented with themselves, their Government and Religion that, to abolish the Title of King they are compelled to assume that of Emperor, And instead of the whips of Monarchy, they are obliged to have recourse to the Scorpions of Despotism.”

22. To Benjamin Rush – June 22, 1806

“I must confess to you, that the data, upon which you reason from the Prophecies concerning the future amelioration of the condition of mankind, are too obscure and uncertain, to authorize us to build any System upon them for the conduct of Nations—It is well to understand as much of them as we can: but the rulers of men would presume too much if they neglected History, experience, and Philosophy, and depended upon the Theological interpretations of mysterious predictions, which were not intended to be perfectly understood until the time of their accomplishment. Our friend Priestley believed that France would establish a free Government because the King of France was the first of the ten horns, which were to fall off. Whiston was disappointed, several times, and my friend Dr West of New Bedford fully believed that Bonaparte had totally destroyed the man of Sin full seven years ago.”

23. To Benjamin Rush – Sept. 19, 1806

“Dr Priestleys Life, I should be very glad to See, and hope that some of them will be Sent to Boston for Sale. He was a man of very extraordinary Talents and incredible Application. If he had written but a tenth part of his Works he would have left a ten times greater reputation. If he had written nothing, but his Chimistry he would have been thought a prodigy.

Suppose a grave controversy Should arise, among the friends of Dr Rush, Dr Franklin and Dr Rittenhouse, which of the three had the best pretensions to the honor of the discovery of the demonstration that the 3 Angles of a triangle are equal to two right Angles! You will say this would be ridiculous, for the discovery was made some thousands of Years before either of those Philosophers was born. Very true, and equally absurd is the dispute, whether the original Idea of the perfectibility of Man, is to be

ascribed, to Dr Price Dr Priestly or Mr Condorcet. It is more ancient than either by thousands of Years. Plato had it, when he talked of imitating God. The Stoicks had it, when they described their wise Man. Epicurus had it when he described his man of pleasure. The human mind is made capable of conceiving something more perfect than any created Being, that exists. Artists Painters, Poets, Statuaries, Musicians, are all capable of conceiving and imagining Something in their Arts, Superiour to any thing they have done or has been done by others. It is a precept in all these Arts as well as in Ethicks to aim at greater perfection than has ever been Attained and perhaps than ever can be attained. The Christian Religion has adopted and Sanctioned this Theory in Stronger terms than any modern Philosophers have employed. Be ye perfect, even as your Father in Heaven is perfect. The eternal, omniscient, omnipotent, and all benevolent Model of perfection is placed before Men, for their perpetual Meditation and imitation. By this however it is not intended, that every Man can ever become, eternal almighty and Alwise. It is an Idea of the Christian religion, And ever has been of all Believers in the immortality of the Soul that the intellectual part of Man is capable of progressive improvement for ever. Where then is the Sense of calling the perfectability of Man an original Idea or a modern discovery. What is their meaning under these Words; perfectability of Man. Do they mean that the human Body can be made immortal on Earth and incorruptible, free from Pains and diseases, by human reason? Do they mean that the Strength of the human Body can be increased so as to remove mountains, to Shake the Earth and Stop the planets? If they mean any, Such things as these, the discovery has not yet been made and never will be. Do they mean that the human Intellect can be enlarged, here in the Body to comprehend the whole Constitution and cause of nature? This is not less incredible, and extravagant than the rest.—In Short I consider, the Perfectibility of Man as used by modern Philosophers, to be mere Words without a meaning, that is mere nonsense.

The continual amelioration of the condition of Man in this World moral Physical, political, civil and Economical, is a very intelligible Idea and no doubt is to be desired, meditated laboured; and promoted by all Men and those who do most for it ought to be most esteemed. But in this there is nothing but Simplicity and common Sense, nothing to excite the gaping Wonder of a vicious mob, nor the ignorant Admiration of Superficial Philosophers. As a friend to Dr Price and Dr Priestly I will never require this honor for them, from any body. Condorcet is well come to as much of this honour as he pleases, and to all the mischievous nonsense, impudence and Cruelty that he instigated and promoted. Poor Price was once left, gravely to publish in print that the progress of Knowledge might discover a Method, of rendering Men immortal on Earth.

Kant the German Philosopher, has advanced, as I understand, though I never could find any intelligible Account of his reveries, something like this notion of perfectability, and I believe before Priestly Price or Condorcet. His System is Antagonism. And what is Antagonism? Why, all Government, is to be abolished, as well as all religion, and Men are to be left to their natural Jealousies and Competitions, till they beat and bruise and murder one another, Sufficiently to convince and compell each other to practice perfect Justice Humanity and Benevolence. Are Such Dreams, Visions and ravings any honor, to any body. Call them Philosophy if you will but they are bedlamism.”

24. To Benjamin Rush – Nov. 11, 1806

“When I recd your favour of the 24. Oct, I Soberly expected a grave dissertation on the Perfectibility of Man. Although I thank you for the political information you give me, which is amusing and although I doubt not your Physiological researches will result in something usefull to the publick, yet, as I have ever considered all Arts Sciences and Litterature as of small importance in comparison of Morals, I was disappointed in finding nothing upon the great subject of the Perfectibility of human Nature, which I Suppose is to be ranged under the head of Ethicks. I really wish you would tell me what you understand by this nights discovery of Price, Priestley or Condorcet. Perfectibility, I Should Suppose to mean capability of Perfection or Susceptibility of perfection. But what is Perfection? It is self evident, there cannot be more than one perfect Being in the Universe. If this Truth is not perceived by one Act of Intuition the proccess of reason is so obvious and so decisive, in the demonstration of it that it may well pass for self evident. Divine Power is no doubt essential to Perfection. There can be but one being in the Universe possessed of almighty Power: because if there were two each would be able to controul the other, and indeed to annihilate him: and the Hypothesis would be equivalent to asserting that there was no Power at all in the Universe. The Absurdity is multiplied in proportion as you suppose more than two Almighty Beings. These great Phylosophers then cannot be supposed to mean that every Man Woman and Child is capable of becoming a Supream and all perfect Being. What then do they mean? Do they mean perfection in this World or in a future state? Do they mean perfection of Mind or Body or both. Condorcet and Priestley believed in no Soul Spirit or Mind distinct from the Body: they must therefore have meant that the Perfectibility resided in the Body or matter. Do they mean that in a future state, the Body may be purified from all causes of disease and death, liberated from all Pain Grief Sorrow and Uneasiness and that forever. If this is all their meaning, it is no more than the Christian Doctrine, and therefore certainly no discovery of Price, Priestly or condorcet.

The greatest part however of the modern Philosophers, who have written and discoursed upon this Mysterious doctrine, have confined their Ideas to this terrestrial Existence and have believed in no other. If they mean that Man is capable, by abstract meditation, and habitual practice of acquiring that self possession and command which can bear pain and think it no more intolerable than Pleasure, the Felicis Animi immota tranquillitas, this is no more than the Perfectibility of the Stoick Philosophy. If they mean that by banishing all Ideas of God, or Gods, of future Rewards and Punishments and of moral Government or Providence in the Universe, every Man may get into an habit of taking pleasure in ever Thing, this is no more than the Perfectibility of Epicurus or Lucretius, and certainly no discovery of Price Priestly or Condorcet. What then do they mean? Do they mean that Chiminal Proccesses may be invented by which the human Body may be rendered immortal and incapable of Disease upon Earth. This, in a fit of Enthusiasm, resembling Instances which I shall enumerate before I finish this Letter, Dr Price advanced in a printed Note to one of his publications. Surely the good Doctor had forgot his Bible which pronounces an irrevocable Decree of Death on every human Being, allmost in every page of it. Price and Priestly were honest Enthusiasts carried away by the popular

contagion of the times, for those moral and political Histericks are at least as infectious as the Small Pox or yellow fever.”

25. To Benjamin Rush – Dec. 22, 1806

“I was in hopes you would have explained to me the System of human Perfectibility which is claimed as the Invention of Dr Priestley ... This Idea was not invented by Dr Priestley, for the Abby de Saint Pierre had written two Volumes upon Universal and perpetual Peace an hundred years before him ... Quanay taught before Priestley. So did the Quakers. Your honest Neighbours of this denomination can harrangue as eloquently on this subject as the French Philosophers: so could their Predecessors before Priestley was born.

I am not about to write a Book upon the Prophecies and therefore will not be more particular. But there are other Prophecies which speak of a time to come when Men shall beat their Swords and into Ploughshares and their Spears into pruning Hooks and learn “War no more.” What may be the meaning of these highly figurative Expressions, I shall not present enquire. But they seem to intimate an happier and more pacific state of human Life than Reason or Experience would justify us in expecting.

Price and Priestley believed these Prophecies to be inspired. How then can they pretend to have invented the Same thing. I Say Priestley believed these Prophecies for they Survived to be the only parts of the Bible that he thought inspired.”

26. To Benjamin Rush – May 23, 1807

“The Claim of the 1776 Men to the honour of first conceiving the Idea of American Independence, or of first inventing the project, of it, is as ridiculous as that of Dr Priestly, to the discovery of the Perfectibility of Man.”

27. To Benjamin Rush – Dec. 22, 1808

“It grieves me to relate an Anecdote of our Friend Dr. Priestley whom I greatly esteemed and sincerely loved, though I think he was seduced by a hot headed Friend Cooper to injure me very grossly. At Breakfast with me alone when I was Vice President, he talked very freely of the French Revolution and with great satisfaction. I heard him a long time in silent wonder, but in perfect good humour, till at last, when he paused, I asked him very coolly “Dr. Do you really believe that the French Nation will succeed in establishing a free Government?” He answered me with a good natured smile “Yes I do believe they will.” I then enquired “Upon what principles and by what Reasons do you ground your opinion? Is not all experience and all History against it?” “Why I fear it is,” said the Dr. “but I found my Judgment wholly upon the Prophecies. I understand the King of France to be the first of the ten horns of the great Beast which were to fall off, and I believe that the nine others will fall off after him at no very distant period of time.” “I am very glad to know your Reason, sir, and it is impossible for me to say that it is not sufficient: but it would be dangerous for public Men to hazard any great and decisive critical Measure

upon such Information only” was my answer. The Doctor after a little pause added, with a smile “There is however I confess still some uncertainty attending it, for I was but yesterday reading The Travels of a French Gentleman in England in the year 1659. He had visited all parts of England, and said he found the Nation universally engaged in Deliberations upon the permanent form of Government they were to assume for the Preservation of Liberty for their Posterity. Various Parties were for different forms of a Republick, but all Parties unanimously agreed in this that there should never be Kings, Nobles or Bishops any more in England. Monarchy, Nobility and Prelacy were to be abolished forever. This was in 1659 when the Nation was so unanimous against Monarchy yet in 1660 the whole Nation went mad for Monarchy, Nobility and Prelacy again.” Thus the Dr. I thought as he did that this example had great weight. I was not unacquainted with the passage in the French Traveller, tho I have forgot his name; and the rise, progress and Termination of the civil war in England was very familiar to me. I read very early in Life Clarendon and Whitelock and all the principal writers upon that Period, and I know of no Book of mere History that was ever of more service to me than Clarendon or gave me so much insight into Men and Government, though I knew him to be partial. If our youth would read Clarendon more tho they should be obliged to read Johnson, Hume and Gibbon less there would be no loss.

Whether the Prophecies, my Friend, are divine, as you and I believe them to be, or whether they are mere human Inventions of learned and ingenious Men as Voltaire his Masters and Disciples represent them to be they profess to comprehend a vast dispensation of Providence beginning with the Creation and ending with the Conflagration of the World. The Universal History of the whole Family of Mankind therefore comes within the limits of this incomprehensible system. Not only the Hebrews, the Christians and Mahometans, but all the other Nations of the earth for all these have been more or less connected with the others, may be traced with a view to illustrate some passage or other in these ancient Predictions. A subject so sublime never fails to engage the attention, and often wholly engrosses it, of every Man of Learning and Genius who indulges himself in turning his Thought that way. It always excites enthusiasm and often transporting visions, and not infrequently Delirium. I do not think it an unlawful study, but I believe it to be a very dangerous one to any Man who is not well fortified with Philosophical as well as Theological Caution. To me it appears Presumption, I had almost said Impiety to pretend to foresee future events through this Telescope.”

28. To Van der Kemp – Dec. 31, 1808

“What a wonderful Genius was Machiavel? you exclaim. Wonderful indeed. What a wonderful Genius was Hobbs? Priestley? Bonaparte? Voltaire? all very Strange Genius’s however. I have read this last fall half a dozen Volumes of this last wonderful Genius’s Ribaldry against the Bible. How is it possible this old Fellow Should represent the Hebrews in Such a contemptible Light? They are the most glorious Nation that ever inhabited this Earth. The Romans and their Empire were but a Bauble in comparison of the Jews. They have given Religion to three quarters of the Globe and have influenced the Affairs of Mankind more, and more happily than any other Nation ancient or modern.”

29. To Benjamin Rush – Feb. 20, 1809

“When you informed me that Mr Cooper in his Life of Dr Priestly had ascribed to that Philosopher, the first hint of the Perfectibility of the human Mind, I answered you that this was the Doctrine of the ancient Stoicks.”

30. To Benjamin Rush – Aug. 28, 1811

“I agree with you in Sentiment that Religion and Virtue are the only Foundations; not only of Republicanism and of all free Government: but of Social Felicity under all Governments and in all the Combinations of human Society. But if I should inculcate this doctrine in my Will, I should be charged with Hypocrisy and a desire to conciliate the good Will of the Clergy towards my Family as I was charged by Dr Priestly and his Friend Cooper and by Quakers, Baptists and I know not how many other Sects, for instituting a National Fast for even common Civility to the Clergy, and for being a Church going Animal.”

31. To Benjamin Stoddert – Nov. 16, 1811

“Dr Priestley was the greatest and ablest writer of his age. He wrote an hundred Volumes to the admiration of all the world. He solicited me in person to send him on a Mission to France. I admired Dr Priestly and should have been glad to oblige him. He might have been as brilliant a Feather in my Cap as Grotius was to Louis 14th. at least in the opinion of Philosophers. But I could not in Conscience believe that he was qualified for the office or capable of performing its duties. The Senate would have negatived him and every one of you Gentlemen, as well as the people of America, would have thought me a Candidate for Dr Rush’s tranquillizing Chair, If I had appointed him.”

32. To Van der Kemp – Jan. 9, 1812

“Your Favour of the 23. Ult, with its in closed Sketch, Skeleton, Frame, Plan, Scheme, System, Plott, Platt, or by whatever other name you please to call your Etching, has been received ... But have you not omitted Some great Characters Such as, Tom Paine, Lord Bolinbroke, Voltaire, Hume Gibbon, Priestly and the Great Franklin, and the great Raynal? The great Vander Kemp, the great Luzac, and the Great Gyzelaer; their opposition to England and The Statholder, and their Complaisance and Kindness to France and America? The great Zinzendorf, the great Swedenborg, the Great Whitefield and the great Westley! [. . .]? cum multis aliis.?”

33. To Jefferson – Feb. 10, 1812

“nor than D^r Priestly who told me Soberly, coolly and deliberately that though he knew of Nothing in human Nature or in the History of Mankind to justify the opinion, Yet he fully believed upon the Authority of Prophecy, that the French Nation would establish a free Government and that The King of France who had been executed, was the first of the Ten

Horns of the great Beast and that all the other Nine Monarchs were Soon to fall off after him.”

34. To Van der Kemp – April 20, 1812

“Is not the RATIO of Manilius the Same with the LOGOS of Plato? and the Progress of the HUMAN Mind in Condorcet? Pray have you read Condorcets “Outlines of an historical View of the Progress of the human Mind”? If you have not you ought to read it, before you complete the Skeleton of your Giant.

... Read Condorcet p.185 of the English Translation, “We Shall See REASON triumphing against Violence & Stratagem, braving the flames and resisting Seduction.” crushing fanatical and political Hypocrisy.

... p. 258. Ratio [produced] Turgot, Price Priestly and the infinite Perfectibility of Man.—Ratio meets with Some Obstructions, but in p. 262 She triumphs and avenges the human Race, by the French Revolution!”

35. To Benjamin Rush – June 12, 1812

“I have lived among Infidel Philosophers for more than half a Century, and been engaged in continual disputes with them. This has compelled me to spend more time in reading Universal History but especially Ecclesiastical History, than has been for my Interest or Comfort. While the Result has been an increasing Love of Christianity, as I understand it, a growing Jealousy of the Priesthood has accompanied it all the Way. Levites, Magi, Faquirs, Mandarines, Mufti, Druids, Popes, Cardinals, Arch bishops, Bishops, Bernardines, Jacobins, Dominicans, Westleys the Prophet of Wabash, or Tippacanoe, Nimrod Hughs Christopher McPherson, and even Priestly and Price, even Dr. Ewing, Dr Rogers and Dr Dwight, have conspired together, to rivet to my Soul, the Duty and Necessity of Tolleration.”

36. To Benjamin Rush – Aug. 17, 1812

“A man may believe with all Mankind, that there are distinctions of good bad and indifferent in Birth and origin and descent, as well as in Beauty, Strength, Stature, figure, Air Grace, Agility, Activity, Sense, Wit or, humour, education, manners or morals without Advocating the Senseless Systems of Nobility in France Germany Geneva Switzerland, Holland, Italy or England. Tho’ the last is by far the last irrational of them all, and even of those of Greece and Rome.

...Our Friend Priestley argued against Birth, because the Turks paid no regard to it. This when I read it appeared to me like Saying that virtue was good for nothing because the Devil does not like it.

...How is it, my Friend, that I, poor, ignorant I, must Stand before Posterity as differing from all the great Men of the Age! Priestly, Price, Franklin, Burke Fox Pitt, Mansfield

Cambden, Jefferson Madison? So it is. I Shall be judged the most vain conceited, impudent arrogant Creature in the World. I tremble when I think of it. I blush, I am ashamed. But as I have Dr Rush and one or two others to keep me in Countenance. I hope I Shall not be wholly reprobated.”

37. To Benjamin Rush – Oct. 22, 1812

“Whether the Mind, the Intellect, be matter or Spirit, can never be determined till We know what Matter is and what Spirit is, and untill We can give a logical or mathematical deffinition of both. We know nothing of either. We can define neither. We know nothing but attributes qualities and Effects. Therefore I think, Berckley had more Sense than Leibnitz, Clark, Bolingbroke or Priestley. Berckley never denied the Existence of Matter. And Priestley had been wiser; had he not denied the Existence of Spirit.”

38. To John Binns – Nov. 26, 1812

“The ruffian Language in the 4th page concerning Dr Priestly is not in the Character of Cobbets latter days in America, when his Writings appeared to court Dr Priestley and Mr Cooper and every other Englishman.”

39. To Benjamin Rush – Dec. 29, 1812

“I have not done with your Letter of the 19th: I care not half, so much about Red Heifer, as I do about the Taureau blanc, the white Bull of Voltaire.... “All volition the Effect of his will, operating upon mind.” My pious learned Parson Wibert, once said to me “I believe God is the Author of sin; but I would not say it, because of the dangerous tendency of it.” My Friend! read in virgil; Jupiters acknowledgment, that though fate had given him the command of Gods & men, yet he and the whole universe, were only instruments of Fate. Read Edwards, read Priestley, read jaques le Fataliste et son maitre, and after all ask yourself, whether you have not a conscience, that still tells you, that you have sometimes done wrong, & sometimes right!”

40. To Van der Kemp – Feb. 5, 1813

“Price Priestly, Jebb. Kippis and others told me that there were then in being, one hundred and Fifty Manuscripts of Sir Isaac, which have never been published”

41. To Jefferson – May 29, 1813

“With Lindsey, Disney, Price, Priestley, Jebb, Kippis &c and their Connections, whom I could name, I was much acquainted in London from 1785 to 1788.

... I wish to know, if you have Seen this Book. I have much to Say on the Subject. And you may depend upon it, I will discuss the Subjects with as much Candour, as much Friendship, as much Freedom, as Price, Priestley Lindsey, Cappe or Farmer, ever displayed in their Controversies. I have not time to enlarge at present.”

42. To Jefferson – June 10, 1813

“In your Letter to Dr Priestley of March 21. 1801, You ask ... The Sentiment, that you have attributed to me in your letter to Dr Priestley I totally disclaim and demand in the French Sense of the Word demand of you the proof.”

43. To Jefferson – June 25, 1813

“During the three Years, that I resided in England, I was Somewhat acquainted, with Lindsay, Disnay, Farmer, Price, Priestley, Kippis, Jebb, Vaughans, Bridgon, Brand Hollis &c &c &c ... Let me Say, however, by the Way, that I fully believe, that Priestley is only guilty of an indiscretion, very pardonable, in this thing.”

44. To Jeferson – June 28, 1813

“It is very true that “the denunciations of the Priesthood are fulminated against every Advocate for a compleat Freedom of Religion. Comminations, I believe, would be plenteously pronounced by even the most liberal of them, against Atheism, Deism.” against every Man who disbelieved or doubted the Resurrection of Jesus or the Miracles of the New Testament. Priestley himself would denounce the man who Should deny The Apocalyps, or the Prophecies of Daniel. Priestley and Lindsay both have denounced as Idolaters and Blasphemers, all the Trinitarians and even the Arrians. Poor weak Man when will thy Perfection arrive? Perfectibility, I Shall not deny: for a greater Character than Priestley or Godwin has Said “Be ye perfect” &c. For my part, I cannot deal damnation round the land on all I judge the Foes of God or Man.”

45. To Jefferson – July 9, 1813

“The Truth is the Dissenters of all Denominations in England and especially the Unitarians, are cowed, as We used to Say at Colledge. They are ridiculed, insulted, persecuted. They can Scarcely hold their heads above water. They catch at Straws and Shadows to avoid drowning. Priestley Sent your Letter to Linsay, and Belsham printed it from the same motive, i.e, to derive Some countenance from the Name of Jefferson. Nor has it done harm here. Priestley Says to Linsay “You see he is almost one of Us, and He hopes will Soon be altogether Such as We are. Even in our New England I have heard a high Federal Divine Say, your Letters had increased his respect for You.”

46. To Jefferson – July 13, 1813

“Let me allude, to one circumstance more, in one of your Letters to me, before I touch upon the Subject of Religion in your Letters to Priestley.”

47. To Jefferson – July 16, 1813

“Priestley in his Letter to Lindsley inclosing a Copy of your letter to him Says ‘He is generally considered as an Unbeliever: if so, however, he cannot be far from Us, and I hope in the Way to be not only almost, but altogether what We are. He now attends publick worship very regularly, and his moral Conduct was never impeached.’

Now, I See not, but you are as good a Christian as Priestley and Lindsey. Piety and Morality were the End and Object of the Christian System according to them, and according to You. They believed in the Resurrection of Jesus, in his Miracles, and in his inspiration: but what inspiration? Not all that is recorded in the New Testament, nor the old. They have not Yet told Us, how much they believe, nor how much, they doubt or disbelieve. They have not told Us, how much Allegory how much Parable, they find, nor how they explain them all, in the old Testament or the new.”

48. To Jefferson – July 18, 1813

“What does Priestley mean, by an Unbeliever? When he applies it to you? How much did he ‘unbelieve,’ himself? Gibbon had him right, when he denominated his Creed, ‘Scanty.’ We are to understand, no doubt, that he believed The Resurrection of Jesus Some of his Miracles. His Inspiration, but in what degree? He did not believe in the Inspiration of the Writings that contain his History? Yet he believed in the Apocalyptic Beast, and he believed as much as he pleased in the Writings of Daniel and John. This great, excellent and extraordinary Man, whom I Sincerely loved esteemed and respected, was really a Phenomenon; a Comet in the System, like Voltaire Bolingbroke and Hume. Had Bolingbroke or Voltaire taken him in hand, what would they have made of him and his Creed?

I do not believe you have read much of Priestleys “Corruptions of Christianity.” His History of early Opinions of Jesus Christ. His Predestination, his No Soul System or his Controversy with Horseley.

I have been a diligent Student for many Years in Books whose Titles you have never Seen. In Priestleys and Lindsay Writings; in Farmer, Cappe, in Tuckers or Edwards’s Searches, Light of Nature pursued in Edwards and Hopkins, and lately in Ezra Styles Ely; his reverend and learned Panegyrist and his elegant and Spirited Opponents. I am not wholly uninformed of the Controversies in Germany and the learned Researches of Universities and Professors; in which the Sanctity of the Bible and the Inspiration of its Authors are taken for granted or waived; or admitted, or not denied. I have also read Condorcets Progress of the human mind.

Now, what is all this to you? No more, than if I should tell you that I read Dr Clark and Dr Waterland and Emlyn, and Lelands View or Review of the Deistical Writers more than fifty Years ago, which is a litteral truth.

I blame you not for reading Euclid and Newton, Thucidides and Theocritus: for I believe you will find as much entertainment and Instruction in them as I have found, in my Theological and Ecclesiastical Instructors:”

49. To Jefferson – July 22, 1813

“Dr Priestley, in a letter to Mr Lindsey Northumberland Nov. 4. 1803 Says

‘As you were pleased with my comparison of Socrates and Jesus, I have begun to carry the same comparison to all the heathen Moralists, and I have all the books that I want for the purpose, except Simplicius and Arrian on Epictetus, and them I hope to get from a Library in Philadelphia: lest however I should fail there, I wish you or Mr Belsham would procure and send them from London. While I am capable of any thing I cannot be idle, and I do not know that I can do any thing better. This too is an Undertaking that Mr Jefferson recommends to me.’

In another Letter dated Northumberland Jan. 16. 1804 Dr Priestley Says to Mr Lindsey ‘I have now finished and transcribed for the Press, my comparison of the Grecian Philosophers, with those of Revelation, and with more ease and more to my own Satisfaction, than I expected. They who liked my pamphlet entitled ‘Socrates and Jesus compared’ will not, I flatter myself dislike this work. It has the same Object and completes the Scheme. It has increased my own Sense of the unspeakable value of Revelation, and must, I think, that of every person, who will give due attention to the Subject.’ I have now given You all that relates to yourself in Priestleys Letters.

This was possibly and not improbably, the last Letter this great, this learned, indefatigable, most excellent and extraordinary Man, ever wrote, for on the fourth of February 1804, he was released from his labours and Sufferings. Peace, Rest, Joy and Glory to his Soul! For I believe he had one: and one of the greatest.

I regret; oh how, I lament, that he did not live, to publish this Work! It must exist in Manuscript. Cooper must know Something of it. Can you learn from him where it is, and get it printed? I hope you will Still perform your promise to Dr Rush.

If Priestley had lived, I Should certainly have corresponded with him. His Friend, Cooper, who unfortunately for him and me, and you, had as fatal an influence over him as Hamilton had over Washington; and whose rash hot head led Priestley into all his Misfortunes and most his Errors in Conduct, could not have prevented explanations between Priestley and me.

I Should propose to him a thousand, a million Questions. And no [Man] was more capable or better disposed to answer them candidly than Dr Priestley. Scarcely any thing that has happened to me, in my curious Life has made a deeper Impression upon me, than that Such a learned ingenious Scientific and talented Madcap as Cooper, could have had influence enough to make Priestley my Enemy.

I will not yet, communicate to you, more than a Specimen, of the Questions I would have asked Priestley.

One is, learned and Scientific Sir! You have written largely about matter and Spirit, and have concluded, there is no human Soul. Will you please to inform me, what matter is? and what Spirit is? Unless We know the meaning of Words, We cannot reason in, or about Words. I Shall never Send you all my Questions that I would put to Priestley; because they are innumerable: but I may hereafter Send you two or three.”

50. To Van der Kemp – July 30, 1813

“Macchiavel, and Voltaire, and Priestley and Bonaparte! When Shall We See an end of these Men of ‘great Souls and vast Views?’”

51. To Benjamin Waterhouse – Aug. 6, 1813

“The Talents and qualities of the Tumble Bugg, are Strength Industry, Patience, Foresight of Futurity, care to provide for Posterity and for individual Wants, at a future day.

Now, which of these mental Faculties or bodily qualities, has this “the most enlightened, the best informed, the most Sagacious, and the most virtuous Nation on the Globe” discovered during the last 13 Years?

...A tumble Bugg would have Seen farther than Rochefaucault and Condorcet, or even Turgot or Franklin or Jefferson, or Priestley or Price, in the last Century. Or than Bolingbroke, Voltaire or Raynal, or Gibbon, or Diderot, or Helvetius or Rousseau or De La Lande. So much may Suffice, for this time. If you should ever receive a more curious Letter, let me See it. But I cannot yet leave off. “An undevout Astronomer is mad’ Said Dr Young. But is not a Sordid Adulator of Wharton as mad? Is not a Machiavel celebrating the “great Soul and vast Views” of Cæsar Borgia as mad? Would a Tumble Bugg, have been guilty of this meanness?”

52. To Van der Kemp – Aug. 9, 1813

“My Friend, when I wander in the Wilderness, with Philosophers or Divines, I am often disposed to think that all human Understanding, is one of my Friend Rush’s, distempers of Intellect.

Priestley and Voltaire, Hume and Gibbon: my Friend De Mably, and my Friend Raynall, my Friend Jefferson and my Friend Rush, all appear to have been bewildered. Every one of them, I doubt not, would pronounce me mad; and a proper candidate for Rush’s tranquillizing Chair. So bet it. As there is a pleasure, in being mad that none but madmen know I have an equal right to this pleasure, with any other Man.”

53. To Jefferson – Aug. 9, 1813

“

I believe I told you in my last, that I had given you all in Lindseys Memoirs, that interested you. But I was mistaken. In Priestleys Letter to Lindsey Decr 19. 1803, I find this Paragraph

‘With the Work I am now composing I go on much faster and better than I expected; so that in two or three months, if my health continue as it now is, I hope to have it ready for the Press; though I Shall hardly proceed to print it, till We have dispatched the Notes. It is upon the Same plan with that of ‘Socrates and Jesus compared,’ considering all the more distinguished of the Grecian Sects of Philosophy, till the establishment of Christianity in the Roman Empire. If you liked that Pamphlet, I flatter myself you will like this. I hope it is calculated to Show, in a peculiarly Striking Light, the great Advantage of Revelation, and that it will make an impression on candid Unbelievers, if they will read. But I find few that will trouble themselves to read any thing, on the Subject; which considering the great magnitude and interesting nature of the Subject, is a proof of a very improper State of mind unworthy of a rational Being.’

I Send you this extract for several reasons. 1st because you Sett him upon this work. 2dly because I wish you to endeavour to bring it to light and get it printed. 3ly Because I wish it may Stimulate you, to pursue your own plan which you promised to Dr Rush. I have not Seen any Work which expressly compares the Morality of the old Testament with that of the New in all their Branches: nor either with that of the ancient Philosophers. Comparisons with the Chinese, the East Indians, the Affricans, the West Indians &c would be more difficult; with more ancient Nations, impossible. The Documents are destroyed.”

54. To Jefferson – Sept., 1813

“‘It is our duty and our priviledge to address the Throne of thy grace and pray for all needed lawfull Blessings temporal and Spiritual,’

Θεμυς was the Goddess of honesty, Justice, Decency, and right; the Wife of Jove, another name for Juno. She presided over all oracles, deliberations and Counsells. She commanded all Mortals to pray to Jupiter, for all lawful Benefits and Blessings.

Now, is not this, (So far forth) the Essence of Christian devotion? Is not this Christian Piety? Is it not an Acknowledgement of the existence of a Supream Being? of his universal Providence? of a righteous Administration of the Government of the Universe? And what can Jews, Christians or Mahometans do more?

Priestley, the heroic Priestley, would not have dared to answer or to ask these questions; tho’ he might have answered them,. consistently enough with the Spirit of his System.

I believe Cleanthes to be as good a Christian as Priestley.

55. To Jefferson – Sept. 14, 1813

“I owe you a thousand thanks for your favour of Aug. 22 and its Enclosures, and for Dr Priestley’s ‘Doctrines of heathen Philosophy compared with those of Revelation.’ Your Letter to Dr Rush, and the Syllabus, I return inclosed with this, according to your Injunction; though with great reluctance. May I beg a copy of both? They will do you no harm: me and others much good. I hope you will pursue your plan; for I am confident you will produce a Work much more valuable than Priestleys; tho’ that is curious and considering the expiring powers with which it was written, admirable.”

56. To Jefferson – Sept. 22, 1813

“Considering all things, I admire Dr Priestleys last Effort for which I am entirely indebted to you. But as I think it is extremely imperfect, I beg of you to pursue the investigation according to your promise to Dr Rush, and according to your Syllabus. It may be presumptuous in me to denominate any Thing of Dr Priestley imperfect: but I must avow, that among all the vast Exertions of his Genius, I have never found one, that is not imperfect, and this last is egregiously So. I will instance at present in one Article. I find no notice of Cleanthes: one of whose Sayings alone ought to have commanded his Attention. He compared ‘Philosophers to Instruments of Musick, which made a Noise, without Understanding it, or themselves.’ He was ridiculed by his Brother Philosophers, and called ‘An Ass.’ He owned, he was the ‘Ass of Zeno: and the only one whose back and Shoulders were Stout enough to carry his Burthens.’ Why has not Priestley, quoted more from Zeno, and his Disciples? Were they too Christian? though he lived two Centuries and a half before Christ?

If I did not know it would be Sending ‘Coal to Newcastle,’ I would, with all my dimness of Eyes and trembling of Fingers copy in Greek the Hymn of Cleanthes and request you to compare it, with any Thing of Moses of David of Solomon.

Instead of those ardent oriental Figures, which are So difficult to understand We find that divine Simplicity, which constitutes the Charm of Grecian Eloquence in prose and verse.

Pope had read, if Priestley had not the

ΚΛΕΑΝΘΟΥΣ ΥΜΝΟΣ ΕΙΣ ΔΙΑ.

... Can you conjecture, a reason why Grotius has not translated this Hymn? Were Grotius and Priestley both afraid that The Stoicks would appear too much like Unitarian Jews and Christians?

57. To Van der Kemp – Oct. 15, 1813

“Have you the Hymn of Cleanthes, to God almighty? Have you any translation of it, into Latin, French, or English? Why did not Grotius translate it? Why has Harvard Colledge omitted this Hymn in their Collectanea græca minora, for the Use of Schools? Why has Dr Priestley neglected it, in his comparison of Greek and Roman Divinity with the Christian?”

58. To Jefferson – Nov. 15, 1813

“Here you have the origin of all artificial Aristocracy, which is the origin of all Monarchy. And both artificial Aristocracy, and Monarchy, and civil, military, political and hierarchical Despotism, have all grown out of the natural Aristocracy of “Virtues and Talents.” We, to be Sure, are far remote from this. Many hundred years must roll away before We Shall be corrupted. Our pure, virtuous, public Spirited federative Republic will last for ever, govern the Globe and introduce the perfection of Man, his perfectability being already proved by Price Priestly, Condorcet Rousseau Diderot and Godwin.”

59. To John Vaughan – Nov. 23, 1813

“I never recollect Dr Priestley, but with tenderness of Sentiment. Certainly one of the greatest Men in the World; and certainly one of the weakest.”

60. To Jefferson – Dec. 3, 1813

“Oh! That Priestley could live again! and have leisure and means. An Enquirer after Truth, who had neither time nor means might request him to search and research for answers to a few Questions.

1. Have We more than two Witnesses of the Life of Jesus? Mathew and John?
2. Have We one Witness to the Existence of Mathews Gospel in the first Century?
3. Have We one Witness of the Existence of John’s Gospell in the first Century?
4. Have We one Witness of the Existence of Marks Gospell in the first Century?
5. Have We one Witness of the Existence of Lukes Gospell in the first Century?
6. Have We any Witness of the existence of St. Thomas’s Gospell, that is the Gospell of the Infancy in the first Century?
7. Have We any Evidence of the Existence of the Acts of the Apostles in the first Century?
8. Have We any Evidence of the Existence of the Supplement to the Acts of the Apostles, Peter and Paul, or Paul and Tecele, in the first Century?

... I have fifty more questions to put to Priestley: but must adjourn them to a future Opportunity.”

61. To Jefferson – Dec. 25, 1813

“The fundamental Principle of all Phylosophy and all Christianity is “Rejoice Always in all Things.” Be thankfull at all times for all good and all that We call evil.” Will it not follow, that I ought to rejoice and be thankful that Priestley has lived? Aye! That Voltaire has lived? That Gibbon has lived? That Hume has lived, though a conceited Scotchman? That Bolingbroke has lived, tho’ a haughty arrogant Supercilious Dogmatist? That Burke and Johnson have lived, though Superstitious Slaves or Self deceiving Hypocrites both. Is it not laughable to hear Burke call Bolingbroke a Superficial Writer? To hear him ask,

“Who ever read him through?” Had I been present I would have answered him “I, I, myself, I have read him through, more than fifty years ago, and more than five times in my Life, and once within five years past. And in my opinion the epithat ‘Superficial’ belongs to you and your Friend Johnson more than to him. I might say much more. But I believe Burke and Johnson to have been, as polilitical Christians, as Leo. 10th.

I return to Priestley, though I have great Complaints against him for personal Injuries and Persecution, at the Same time that I forgive it all, and hope and pray that he may be pardoned for it all, above. Dr Broklesby an intimate Friend and convivial Companion of Johnson told me, that Johnson died in Agonies of Horror of Annihilation, and all the accounts We have of his death corroborate this account of Brocklesby. Dread of Annihilation? Dread of Nothing? A dread of Nothing I should think would be no dread at all. Can there be any real Substantial rational fear of nothing? Were you on your deathbed, and in your last moments informed by demonstration or Revelation that you would cease to think and to feel, at your dissolution, Should you be terrified? You might be ashamed of yourself for having lived So long, to bear the proud Man Contumely. You might be ashamed of your Maker, and compare him to a little Girl amusing herself her Brothers and Sisters by blowing Bu[bbles] in Soap Sudds. You might compare him to Boys Sporting with Crakers and Rocketts; or to Men employed in making more artificial Fire Works; or to Men and Women at Farces and Operas, or Sadlers Wells Exploits; or to Politicians in their Intrigues; or to Heroes in their Butcheries; or to Pop[es] in their Devilisms. But what Should you fear? Nothing. Emori nolo sed me mortuum esse nihil estimo.

To return to Priestley. You could make a more luminous Book than his upon “the Doctrines of Heathen Phylosophers compared with those of Revelation.” Why has he not given Us a more Satisfactory Account of the Pythagorean Phylosophy and Theology? He barely names Ocellus, who lived long before Plato. His Treatise of Kings and Monarchy has been destroyed, I conjecture by Platonic Phylosophers, Platonic Jews or Christians, or by fraudulent Republicans or Despots. His Treatise of The Universe has been preserved. He labours to prove the Eternity of the World. The Marquiss D’Argens translated it, in all its noble Simplicity. The Abby Batteux has since given another translation. D’Argens not only explains the Text, but sheds more light upon the antient Systems. His remarks are so many Treatisses, which devellop the concatenation of antient opinions. The most essential Ideas of the Theology, of the Physics and of the Morality of the antients are clearly explained: and their different Doctrines, compared with one another, and with the modern discoveries. I wish I owned this Book and 100,000 more than I want every day, now when I am almost incapable of making any Use of them. No doubt he informs Us that Pythagoras was a great Traveller.

Priestley barely mentions Timæus: but it does not appear that he had read him. Why has he not given Us an Account of him and his Book? He was before Plato and gave him the Idea of his Timæus, and much more of his Phylosophy. After his Master he maintained the existence of Matter: that Matter was capable of receiving all Sorts of forms: that a moving Power agitatated all the Parts of it: and that an Intelligence directed the moving Power; that this Intelligence produced a regular and harmonious World. This Intelligence

has seen a Plan, an Idea (Logos) in conformity to which, it wrought, and without which it would not have known what it was about, nor what it wanted to do. This Plan was the Idea; Image or Model, which had represented, to the Supreme Intelligence, the World before it existed, which had directed it, in his Action upon the moving Power, and which it contemplated in forming the Elements the Bodies and the World. This Model was distinguished from The Intelligence which produced the World as the Architect is from his plans. He divided, The productive Cause of the World, into a Spirit, which directed the moving Force, and into an Image, which determined it in the choice of the directions which it gave to the moving Force, and the forms which it gave to matter.

I wonder that Priestley has overlooked this because it is the same Philosophy with Plato's and would have shown that the Pythagorean as well as the Platonic Philosophers probably concurred in the fabrication of the Christian Trinity. Priestley mentions the name of Archytas, but does not appear to have read him; tho he was a Successor of Pythagoras, and a great Mathematician, a great Statesman and a great General. John Gram a learned and honourable Dane has given a handsome Edition of his Works with a latin translation, and an ample Account of his Life and Writings. Saleucus The Legislator of Locris and Charondas of Sybaris were Disciples of Pythagoras, and both celebrated to immortality for the Wisdom of their Laws, 500 Years before Christ. Why are those Laws lost? I say the Spirit of Party has destroyed them. Civil, political and ecclesiastical Bigotry. Despotical, monarchical Aristocratical and democratical Fury, have all been employed in this Work of destruction of every Thing that could give Us true light and a clear insight of Antiquity. For every One of these Parties, when possessed of Power, or when they have been Undermost and Struggling to get Uppermost, has been equally prone to every Species of fraud and Violence, and Usurpation.

Why has not Priestley mentioned these Legislators? The Preamble to the Laws of Zaleucus, which is all that remains, is as orthodox Christian Theology as Priestleys: and Christian Benevolence and forgiveness of Injuries almost as clearly expressed.

Priestley ought to have done impartial Justice to Philosophy and Philosophers. Philosophy which is the result of Reason, is the first, the original Revelations of The Creator to his Creature, Man. When this Revelation is clear and certain, by Intuition or necessary Induction, no Subsequent Revelation Supported by Prophecies or Miracles can Supercede it. Philosophy is not only the love of Wisdom, but the Science of the Universe and its Cause. There is, there was and there will be but one Master of Philosophy in the Universe. Portions of it, in different degrees are revealed to Creatures. Philosophy looks with an impartial Eye on all terrestrial religions. I have examined all, as well as my narrow Sphere, my Streightened means and my busy Life would allow me; and the result is, that the Bible is the best book in the World. It contains more of my little Philosophy than all the Libraries I have seen: and Such Parts of it as I cannot reconcile to my little Philosophy I postpone for future Investigation.

Priestley ought to have given Us a sketch, of the Religion and Moral of Zoroaster of Sanchoniathon of Confucius, and all the Founders of Religions before Christ, whose Superiority, would from Such a comparison have appeared the more transcendent.

Priestley ought to have told Us, that Pythagoras passed twenty Years, in his Travels in India, in Egypt, in Chaldea, perhaps in Sodom and Gomorrah, Tyre and Sydon. He ought to have told Us that in India he conversed with the Brahmans and read the Shasta, 5000 Years old, written in the Language of the Sacred Sanscrits with the elegance and Sentiments of Plato. Where is to be found Theology more orthodox or Phylosophy more profound than in the Introduction to the Shasta? "God is one, creator of all, Universal Sphere, without beginning, without End. God governs all the Creation by a general Providence, resulting from his eternal designs.—Search not the Essense and the nature of the Eternal, who is one; your research will be vain and presumptuous. It is enough that, day by day, and night by night, you adore his Power, his Wisdom and his Goodness, in his Works." The Eternal willed, in the fullness of time, to communicate of his Essence and of his Splendor, to Beings capable of perceiving it. "They as yet existed not. The Eternal willed, and they were. He created Birma, Vitsnow, and Sib." These Doctrines, Sublime if ever there were any Sublime, Pythagoras learned in India and taught them to Zaleucus and his other disciplines. He there learned also his Metempsychosis, but this never was popular, never made much progress in Greece or Italy, or any other Country besides India and Tartary, the Region of the Grand immortal Lama: And how does this differ from the Possessions of Demons in Greece and Rome, from the Demon of Socrates from the Worship of Cows and Crocodiles in Egypt and elsewhere. After migrating throw various Animals from Elephants to Serpents according to their behaviour, Souls that at last behaved well became Men and Women, and then if they were good, they went to Heaven. All ended in Heaven if they became virtuous. Who can wonder at the Widow of Malabur. Where is the Lady, who if her faith were without doubt, that she should go to Heaven with her Husband on the one, or migrate into a Toad or a Waspe on the other, would not lay down on the Pile and Set fire to the Fuel? Modifications and disguises of the Metempsychosis that crept into Egypt and Greece and Rome and other Countries. Have you read Farmer on the Dæmons and Possessions of the New Testament?

According to the Shasta Moisazor, with his Companions rebelled against the Eternal, and were precipitated, down to Ondero, the region of Darkness. Do you know any thing of the Prophecy of Enoch? Can you give me a Comment on the 6th. the 9th. the 14th. Verses of the Epistle of Jude?

If I am not weary of writing, I am sure you must be of reading Such inchohent rattle; I will not persecute you So Severely in future, if I can help it.

... I should have given my Reason for rejoicing in Voltaire &c. It is because I believe they have done more than Even Luther or Calvin to lower the Tone of that proud Hierarchy that shot itself up above the Clouds, and more to propagate religious Liberty than Calvin or Luther, or even Lock."

62. To Jefferson – Feb – March 3, 1814

"You will perceive by these figures that I have been looking into Oriental History and Hindoo religion. I have read Voyages and travels and every thing I could collect, and the

last is Priestleys 'Comparison of the Institutions of Moses, with those of the Hindoos and other ancient Nations' a work of great labour, and not less haste. I thank him for the labour, and forgive, though I lament the hurry. You would be fatigued to read, and I, just recruiting a little from a longer confinement and indisposition than I have had for 30 years, have not Strength to write many observations. But I have been disappointed in the principal Points of my Curiosity.

1. I am disappointed, by finding that no just Comparison can be made, because the original Shasta, and the original Vedams are not obtained, or if obtained not yet translated into any European Language.

2. In not finding Such Morsells of the Sacred Books as have been translated and published, which are more honourable to the original Hindo Religion than any thing he has quoted.

3. In not finding a full developement of the History of the Doctrine of the Metempsychosis which originated

4. In the History of the Rebellion of innumerable Hosts of Angells in Heaven against the Supream Being, who after Some Thousands of Years of War conquered them and hurled them down to the Region of total darkness, where they Suffered a part of the punishment of their Crime, and then were mercifully released from Prison permitted to ascend to Earth and migrate into all Sorts of Animals, reptiles, Birds Beasts and Men according to their Rank and Character and even into Vegetables and Minerals, there to Serve on probation. If they passed without reproach their Several gradations they were permitted to become Cows and Men. If as Men they behaved well, i.e to the Satisfaction of the Priests, they were restored to their original rank and Bliss in Heaven.

5. In not finding the Trinity of Pythagoras and Plato, their contempt of Matter, flesh and blood, their almost Adoration of Fire and Water, their Metempsychosis, and even the prohibition of Beans So evidently derived from India.

6. In not finding the Prophecy of Enoch deduced from India in which the fallen Angels make Such a figure.

But you are weary. Priestly has proved the Superiority of the Hebrews to the Hindoos as they Appear in the Gentoo Laws and Institutes of Menu: but the comparison remains to be made with the Shasta.

In his remarks on Mr Dupuis, p.342 Priestley Says, 'The History of the fallen Angels is another Circumstance, on which Mr Dupuis lays much Stress. 'According to the Christians,' he Says, Vol. 1. p.336, 'there was from the beginning, a division among the Angels; Some remaining faithful to the light, and others taking the part of Darkness' &c. But this Supposed History is not found in the Scriptures. It has only been inferred, from a wrong interpretation of one passage in the 2d Epistle of Peter, and a corresponding One in that of Jude, as has been Shown by judicious Writers. That there is Such a Person as

The Devil is no part of my Faith, nor that of many other Christians; nor am I sure that it was the belief of any of the christian Writers. Neither do I believe the doctrine of demoniacal possessions, Whether it was believed by the sacred Writers or not; and yet my unbelief in these Articles does not affect my faith in the great facts of which the Evangelists were eye and ear Witnesses. They might not be competent Judges, in the one case, tho perfectly So, with respect to the other.’

I will ask Priestley, when I See him, Do you believe those Passages in Peter and Jude to be interpolations? If so; by whom made? and when? and where? and for what End? Was it to Support, or found the doctrine of The Fall of Man, Original Sin, the universal corruption depravation and guilt of human nature and mankind; and the Subsequent Incarnation of God to make Attonement and Redemption?—Or do you think that Peter and Jude believed the Book of Enoch to have been written, by the 7th. from Adam, and one of the Sacred canonical Books of the Hebrew Prophets? Peter, 2.Ep.c.2.v.4, Says ‘For if God Spared not the Angels that Sinned, but cast them down to Hell and delivered them into chains of Darkness, to be reserved unto Judgment.’ Jude v.6th Says ‘And the Angels which kept not their first Estate, but left their own habitations, he hath reserved in everlasting Chains under darkness unto the Judgment of the great day. v.14th. ‘And Enoch also, the 7th. from Adam, prophesied of these Saying, behold the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his Saints, to execute Judgment upon all &c’ Priestley Says ‘a wrong Interpretation’ has been given to these Texts. I wish he had favoured Us with his right interpretation of them.

In another place. p. 326. Priestleys Says ‘There is no Circumstance of which Mr Dupuis avails himself So much, or repeats So often, both with respect to the Jewish and Christian religions, as the history of the Fall of Man, in the beginning of the Book of Genesis. I believe with him, and have maintained in my Writings, that this history is either an Allegory, or founded on uncertain Tradition: that it is an hypothesis to account for the origin of evil, adopted by Moses, which by no means Accounts for the Facts.’

... I Shall never be a Disciple of Priestley. He is as absurd inconsistent, credulous and incomprehensible as Athanasius. Read his Letter to The Jews in this Volume. Could a rational Creature write it? Aye! Such rational Creatures as Rochefaucault and Condorsett and John Taylor in Politicks, and Towers’s, Jurieus and French Prophets in Theology.

Priestleys Account of the Philosophy and Religion of India appears to me to be much Such a Work, as a Man of busy research would produce, who Should undertake to describe Christianity from the Sixth to the twelfth Century, when a deluge of Wonders overflowed the World; when Miracles were performed and proclaimed from every Convent and Monastery, Hospital, Church Yard, Mountain Valley Cave and Cupola

There is a Work which I wish I possessed. It has never crossed the Atlantic. It is entitled Acta Sanctorum, in forty Seven Volumes in Folio. It contains the Lives of the Saints. It was compiled in the beginning of the 16th. Century by Bollandus, Henschenius and Papebrock. What would I give to possess: in one immense Mass, one Stupendous draught all the Legends, true doubtful and false. These Bollandists dared to discuss Some of the

Facts and to hint that Some of them were doubtful, E.G. Papebrock doubted The Antiquity of the Carmelites from Elias; and whither the Face of J.C. was painted on the Handkerchief of St Veronique; and whether the Prepuce of the Saviour of the World, which was Shewn in the Church at Antwerp, could be proved to be genuine? For these bold Scepticisms he was libelled in Pamphlets and denounced to the Pope and the Inquisition in Spain. The Inquisition condemned him: but the Pope not daring to acquit or condemn him, prohibited all Writings, Pro and Con. But as the Physicians cure one disease by exciting another, as a Fever by a Salivation, this Bull was produced by a new Claim. The Brothers of the Order of Charity asserted a Descent from Abraham 900 years anterior to the Carmelites.

A Phylosopher who Should write a description of Christianity from the Bollandistic Saints of the Sixth or the tenth Century would probably produce a Work tolerably parrallel to Priestleys upon the Hindoos,

63. To Van der Kemp – April 3, 1814

“I have recd Condorcet, in good order and your favour of 20th. Ult. Enfields History of Philosophy, is worth many Condorcets. This great Work is drawn up from Brucker’s ‘Historia critica Philosophiæ’; an immense Work in half a dozen folio Volumes of Greek and Latin. Can you give me the Sketch of this Brucker? Who was he? Neither Brucker nor his Abridger, had Seen the Asiatic Researches; nor Priestleys nor Sir William Jones’s Hindoos.

... I know nothing of Th. Browns popular Errors. Enfield contains enough. The Acta Sanctorum in 47 Volumes in Folio contains a pretty Specimen of them. Dr Middletons Works, the Model of Priestleys, without his excentricities, are a fine Sample.

When I was a Boy, I wrote a Letter to my Friend Cranch more than 60 years ago in which this Globe was asserted to be the Bedlam of the Universe, into which all the insane, in Mercury Venus and Mars &c &c &c, were Sent to be cured or confined.

Neither The Acta Sanctorum nor Priestley nor Middleton nor Bruker nor the 18th nor the 19th Century have confuted my juvenile Hypothesis.

64. To John Taylor – April, 19, 1814

“Mr Adams leaves to Homer and Virgil, to Tacitus and Quintilion, to Mahomet and Calvin, to Edwards and Priestley, or if you will, to Milton Angels reasoning high in Pandaemonium: All their acute Speculations about Fate, Destiny, Foreknowledge absolute, Necessity, and Prædestination. He thinks it problematical whether there is, or ever will be more than One Being capable of understanding this vast Subject.”

65. To Van der Kemp – May 2, 1814

“If with blind Eyes and paralytical Hands, I could enfanter des in Folio, like De Wolf, Priestley and Voltaire, and at the Same time had the Library of the late King of France, about me I might be qualified in part to correspond with you.”

66. To Jefferson – July 16, 1814

“Metaphysics I would leave in the Clouds with the Materialists and Spiritualists, with Leibnits, Berkley Priestley and Edwards, and I might add Hume and Reed.”

67. To James Lloyd – March 26, 1815

“if you were to pursue all the Investigations and Speculations that these Papers suggest, you might write as many Folios as Priestley or Voltaire ever produced.”

68. To John Quincy – June 12, 1814

“Priestly when dying left two treatises, one upon the Hindoos, and one a comparison between the ancient philosophers, and the Christians.

... Priestly has written a curious book on the corruption of Christianity. But I believe the Acta Sanctorum in 40, 50 or 60, volumes in Folio written by the Bollandists, is necessary to shew in detail, the corruptions of Christianity.”

69. James Lloyd – Feb. 14, 1815

“The English and Scotch and Irish Presbyterians; the Methodists, the Anabaptists the Unitarians and Universalists with Dr Priestly at their head and all the other Sectaries, even many of the Episcopalians themselves had been carried away with the French Revolution, and firmly believed that Bonaparte was the Instrument of Providence to destroy the Pope and introduce the Millenium.”

70. To Jefferson – June 19, 1815

“The War of the Reformation Still continues. The Struggle between different and opposite Systems of Religion and Government has lasted from Huss and Wickliff to Lindsey and Priestly. How many powder Plotts, Bartholomews days, Irish Massacres, Paris Guillotines, how many Charles'es and Maurices Louis's and Williams, Georges and Napoleons have intervened. And the Philosophers, if we believe Condorcet, have been as arrant Hypocrites as any of them.”

71. To Jefferson – June 20, 1815

“The fit of recollection came upon both of Us, So nearly at the same time that I may, Sometime or other, begin to think there is Some thing in Priestleys and Hartleys vibrations.

... Our Athanasians have printed in a Pamphlet in Boston Your Letters and Priestleys from Belshams Lindsey.”

72. To Thomas McKean – July 6, 1815

“The present question before the human Race, that great Democratical Trybunal; is whether the Jus divinum, is in Men or in Magistrates? in human Nature, or in instituted offices? in human Understanding, or in holy Oil? in good sense and sound Morality,? or in crowns, scepters Crosses and Episcopal and presbyterian ordination?

... Will the Verdict be, in favour of Zinzindorph? or Sweedenburg? or Whitefield or Westley, or Hopkins? or Priestly? or Voltaire? Phylosophy and Religion will still move with Politicks; and both like matter, are infinitely divisible. As We Mariners say ‘I can yet see no blue sky.’”

73. To Jefferson – Aug. 24, 1815

“If I am neither deceived by the little Information I have, or by my Wishes for its truth, I Should Say that France is the most Protestant Country of Europe at this time, though I cannot think it the most reformed. In consequence of these Reveries I have imagined that Camus and the Institute, meant, by the revival and continuance of the Acta Sanctorum, to destroy the Pope and the Catholic Church and Hierarchy, de fonde en comble, or in the language of Frederick, Voltaire, D’Alembert &c ‘ecraser le miserable,’ ‘crush the Wretch.’ This great Work must contain the most complete History of the corruptions of Christianity, that has ever appeared; Priestleys not excepted. And his History of ancient opinions not excepted.”

74. To John Quincy – Nov. 3, 1815

“You advise me to read Massillon. Thank you. I advise you to read Carlostad and Scheffmacher. I have read Sixty Years and five more on the Subjects. Had I about me all the Books relative to it which I have seen, and many of which I have read, and had fifty Years to live, I could make the press groan with as many Volumes as Priestly or Voltaire or Wolfius ever dissembogued upon the World. But I should not make one Proselyte nor add an Ounce to the heap of Usefull Knowledge. Priestleys Socrates, his ancient Philosophers and his Hindoos; their pamphletts published in America, I esteem as little as you do. His Judgment Reasoning and Eloquence are not always to be envied: but his Industry, Research, and compilations may be as usefull as they are admirable. His History of the Corruptions &c and of early opinions &c are worth Reading after, or before Dr Waterland, and Dr Clark. Read these and then believe the Athanasian Creed if you can. Read Deausobre too, and trace Plato and Pythagoras to the orientals.”

75. To David Sewell – Nov. 4, 1815

“I dare not reason upon the prophecies of the Millennium. So many have erred from Peter the Hermit, to Priestly and Towers & our Friend West, that I have reason to distrust my

learning. When I recollect the horrible butcheries of mankind, that have been excited by false interpretations, however honestly adopted, I dare not march upon such ground.”

76. To John Randolph Jr. – 1815

“I now recollect three Instances in point. Christopher McPherson a Gentleman of Virginia, Parson Austin a Gentleman of Connecticut and Abraham Brown a Gentleman of Rhode Island, were all ambitious of Embassies to Europe: They all thought themselves Jure divino, ‘Commanders in Chief’ of all Nations, they all Solicited John Adams to Send them to Europe. And So did Dr Priestley. But Adams could not See his Way clear, any more than Jefferson and Madison”

77. To John Quincy – March 28, 1816

“His Materialism and his Fatalism I despize as much as I do that of Tacitus Quintilian Pliny Priestly or Diderot; or of Ocellus or Timæus”

78. To John Quincy – June 6, 1816

“Predestination, eternal decrees, everlasting Counsels, Fate, the Parcae, the Fatal Sisters Le grand Roulleau. I can see no Liberty in the Universe, consistent with these Theories, and consequently no fault, no blame, no Crime, no Sin, and no punishment and no Reward; no merit nor demerit.

Edwards Hopkins, Priestly, Diderot, Jacques Le Fatalist, Mahomet Homer Virgil, all held the Same Dogma. The Calvinists and the Atheists differ in nothing but his; the former believe in eternal Misery; the latter, not.”

79. To John Quincy – June 16, 1816

“The Philosophy and the Religion of our little terrestrial Universe, is in a fair Way to be more thoroughly investigated; Brama Confucius Pythagoras Cicero Logauta and Voltaire and Priestly and Farmer will be read, and compared. The human Mind cannot be much longer muffled as it has been by the old Artifices of Politicians or Priests the Worst of Politicians.”

80. To John Quincy – July 18, 1816

“What Shall I say of the Season? The Eclipse of 1806 the Commet, the Spots in the Sun, the popular Astronomy Phylosophy, Politicks and Theology. I might write as many Folios as Priestley or Voltaire; and to as little Pu[rpose.]”

81. To John Quincy – July 24, 1816

“I have Searched the Opinion of Phylosophers ancient and modern. I can agree with none of them. Yet I have a Faith, deliberately fixed I believe in Voltaire as much as in Priestly:

that is to Say in neither. I receive hints and Reflections form both, for which I am obliged to them: but I believe in neither.”

82. To Charles Francis Adams – Aug. 28, 1816

“My dear Boys! You have a vast Field of Inquiry before You. You all belong to the Family of the Searches. Be cool, be cautijs, be reserved in your Researches. But be not afraid to Read Waterland or Clark; Nonotte or Voltaire; Horsely or Priestly. Let the Truth be your Object.”

83. To Van der Kemp – Sept. 16, 1816

“Tucker is an Oddity, like Tristram Shandy. His Metaphyicks would give no more Satisfaction, than Edwards, Priestly, Soame Jennings, Frederick the Great D’Alembert”

84. To Jefferson – Sept. 30, 1816

“When I read Dr Priestlys Remarks upon ‘Du Puis,’ I felt a Curiosity to know more about him. I wrote to Europe and engaged another to write. I had no Idea of more than one or two Volumes in 8o or 12mo.

But Lo! I am overwhelmed with 8 or ten Volumes and another of Planches!

Sixteen Years of Research the Author acknowledges, and as he quotes his Authorities I would not undertake to verify them in 16 years, If I had all his Books which Surely are not to be found on America.

If you know any Thing of this “Monsieur Dupuis or his ‘Origine de tous les Cultes’; candidus imperté.

I have read only the first Volume. It is learned and curious. The whole Work will afford me Business, Study and Amusement for the Winter.

Dr Priestley pronounced him an Atheist, and his Work ‘The Ni Plus ultra of Infidelity.’ Priestly agrees with him that the History of the Fall of Adam and Eve, is ‘an Alegory,’ a Fable, an Arabian Tale, and so does Dr Middleton, to account for the origin of Evil; which however it does not

Priestly Says that the Apocalypes, according to Dupuis is the most learned Work that ever was written.

With these brief Fletrissures, Priestly Seems to have expected to annilate the Influence of Dupuis Labours; as Swift destroyed Blackmore with his

‘Did off Creation with a Terk
And of Redemption made damn’d Work.’

And as he disgraced Men as good at least as himself by his

‘Wicked Will Whiston
And Good Master Ditton.’

But Dupuis is not to be So easily destroyed. The Controversy between Spiritualism and Materialism between Spiritualists and Materialists, will not be Settled by Scurrilous Epigrams of Swift, nor by dogmatical Censures of Priestly.

You and I have as much Authority to Settle these Disputes as Swift Priestly or Dupuis, or The Pope.

And if you will agree with me, We will issue our Bulls, and enjoy upon all these Gentlemen to be Silent, till they can tell Us, What Matter is and What Spirit is! And in the mean time to observe the Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount.”

85. To Van der Kemp – Oct. 23, 1816

“There is a Monsieur *Du Puis*, a very modern Author who deserves, ten thousand times more, than Cecco did to be burned, for the Same cause. This Man has printed Ten or a dozen huge Volumes Sur “L’origine de tous les Cultes” besides a Volume of Plato. Priestly Says, He is an Atheist. This I cannot Say and Priestly had no right to Say it. Priestly Says, the Work is the Ne plus ultra of Infidelity. This may be true; but I cannot say it. Infidelity may go farther still for what I know.”

86. To Jefferson – Nov. 4, 1816

“It is more worth your while to live to read Dupuis than Grim. Of all the Romanes, and true Histories I ever read, it is the most entertaining And instructive, though Priestley calls it ‘*dull*.’”

87. To John Quincy – Jan. 22, 1817

“St. Justin and Dupuis, Dr Priestley and my Neighbour Colman all agree in the Precept ‘Be good.’”

... I am Still a Spiritualist, in spight of Priestley Grim and Dupuis, and Tracy; and believe a God, a Soul and a future State. I Should with Berkley, call in question the Existence of matter as soon as with Priestly and Dupuis, that of Spirit.

88. To Jefferson – May 26, 1817

“If Spirit is an abstraction, a conjecture, a Chimera: Matter is an abstraction, a conjecture, a Chimera; for We know as much, or rather as little of one as of the other. We may read

Cudworth Clerk Leibnitz, Berkley Hume Bolinbroke and Priestley and a million other Volumes in all Ages, and be obliged at last to confess that We have learned nothing.

... We find that Materialists and Immaterialists existed in India and that they accused each other of Atheism, before Berkly or Priestley, or Dupuis, or Plato, or Pythagoras were born.

89. To William Tudor Sr. – April 5, 1818

“I have now before me a Pamphlet printed in 1763 by Edes and Gill in Queen Street Boston—Entitled a Vindication of the Conduct of the House of Representatives of the Province of the Massachusetts Bay—More particularly in the last Session of the General Assembly, by James Otis Esqr. a member of said House

... Look over the Declarations of Rights and Wrongs issued by Congress in 1774. Look into the Declaration of the Independence in 1776. Look into the Writings of Dr Price and Dr Priestly, look into all the French Constitutions of Government, and to cap the Climax, look into Mr Thomas Pains Common Sense, Crisis and Rights of Man; what can you find that is not to be found in Solid Substance in this ‘Vindication of the House of Representatives?’”

90. To George Washington Adams – Jan. 6, 1822

“I will pass over the first and the last, and fix on Locke. Inquire who have been his disciples. Bishop Berkley, David Hume, Condillac, Leibnitz, Clarke, Priestley, Hartley Reid, Voltaire, Rousseau, D Alembert, Turgot and the French oeconomists.”

91. To Aaron Bancroft – Jan. 21, 1823

“In later times, I have lived with Atheists Deists, and scepticks, with Cardinals, Archbishops, Bishops Monks Priests and Fryars, of the Roman Catholic persuasion, with Arch Bishops, bishops, deans and priests of the Church of England, with Farmer, Price Priestly, Kippis, Rees, Lindsey, Disney and Jebb with the English and Scotch cleargy in Holland and especially with Dr. Macklane at the Hague. I have conversed freely with most of the sects in America and have not been wholly inattentive to the writings and reasonings of all these denominations of Philosophers and Christians.”

92. To Jefferson – Aug. 15, 1823

“Or do you forsee the fulfilment of the prophecies according to Dr. Priestly’s interpretation of them?”