

105 To THEOPHILUS LINDSEY, 11 March 1791

MS: Dr. Williams's Library, MS. 12.12, f. 210-211

PRINTED: Rutt, I, ii, pp. 105-106

ADDRESS: The Rev<sup>d</sup> Mr Lindsey Essex Street London

POSTMARK: March 1791

[Mar. 11.91]

Dear friend

On my return from Heath, where I left all well, and where you were ~~not~~ particularly remembered, I find yours, with another from Mr Hampson,<sup>1</sup> and a copy of his son's<sup>2</sup> intended Preface. As he says that anything sent to Mr Johnson<sup>3</sup> will be transmitted to him, I write to him by this post. If you have a care for him, you will find my letter to him at Johnson's. I wish you would soften the wax, and read it, telling him on the blank paper that I desired you would do it and tell him whether you approve of the advice I there give him. I am very desirous that this publication should have all the effect it can have. I shall return the Preface when I make up a parcell for you.<sup>4</sup>

I rejoice that D<sup>r</sup> Price<sup>5</sup> is out of danger.

I wish you would send me the Sermon<sup>6</sup> in a parcell together with the piece against my brother,<sup>7</sup> which has not come, as you say it would, with Mr Hampson's Preface. Send also at the same time my Papers for the Royal Society, sent to Dr Heberden,<sup>8</sup> who has written to me on the subject, and pointed out something, that require correction.<sup>9</sup>

I am indeed in better spirits, but not without much anxiety, on account of my son,<sup>10</sup> as I hear nothing from his uncle,<sup>11</sup> so that I conclude he is irreconcilable, which will be the source of much uneasiness, however we may approve our own conduct, and condemn his. Joseph himself is in good spirits, and says every thing to keep up mine, so that I do not despair. When I send you a parcell, I will inclose one of his letters, in which he speaks of his Partner that is to be. He is, I fear, too much charmed with him, as he knows but little of the world. My confidence is in the opinion of others, which appears to be highly favourable to him.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> John Hampson, Manchester Methodist.

<sup>2</sup> John Hampson (1760-c.1817), author of *Memoirs of the late Rev. John Wesley* (Sunderland, 1791), see 16 Jul 1790.

<sup>3</sup> Joseph Johnson (1738-1809), see 18 Jan 1770.

<sup>4</sup> This paragraph is omitted from Rutt's edition.

<sup>5</sup> Richard Price (1723-1791), see 18 Dec 1769.

<sup>6</sup> Priestley, *The Proper Objects of Education in the Present State of the World: represented in a Discourse, delivered on Wednesday, the 27th of April, 1791, at the Meeting-House in the Old-Jewry, London; to the Supporters of the New College at Hackney* (London, 1791).

<sup>7</sup> William Huntington, *The Barber; or, Timothy Priestley Shaved, as reflected from his own Looking Glass* (London, 1791), see 7 Mar 1791.

<sup>8</sup> William Heberden (1710-1801), see 18 Nov 1789.

<sup>9</sup> This paragraph is rewritten in Rutt's edition, omitting the requests for the sermon and the piece on Priestley's brother.

<sup>10</sup> Joseph Priestley jnr. (1768-1863), see 12 Oct 1789.

<sup>11</sup> John Wilkinson (1728-1808), see 17 May 1786.

<sup>12</sup> This paragraph is omitted from Rutt's edition.

105 To THEOPHILUS LINDSEY, 11 March 1791

What is the case with respect to Mr Paine's pamphlet?<sup>13</sup> ~~?~~ Is the edition cancelled, or will it be sold in France and America, and a new one be printed for England. Was Mr Johnson threatened,<sup>14</sup> or did he take the alarm of himself?

I rejoice that the Catholic Bill<sup>15</sup> goes on so well, and I should not be sorry if it appear that Mr Pitt<sup>16</sup> becomes unfriendly to it. I do believe the Court, and the high church party, are much embarrassed, and this makes it proper that we should appear bold, and take advantage of th[eir] consternation.<sup>17</sup>

I am anxious to know what will be do[ne] on the demise of Mr Wesley.<sup>18</sup> Mr Hampson will have pretty early intelligence.

I am in haste  
yours & M<sup>rs</sup> Lindsey's  
most affectionately  
J Priestley

Birm. March 11. 1791

---

<sup>13</sup> Thomas Paine, *Rights of Man: being an Answer to Mr. Burke's Attack on the French Revolution* (London, 1791).

<sup>14</sup> Johnson was visited on a number of occasions by agents of the government. Sensing that Paine's book would be controversial, he decided not to release it on the day it was due to be published.

<sup>15</sup> The bill to provide relief for 'persons called protesting Catholic Dissenters' was introduced to Parliament on 21 February 1791 by John Freeman-Mitford (1748-1830) [D. S. Greer, 'Mitford, John Freeman-, first Baron Redesdale (1748-1830)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, online edn.].

<sup>16</sup> William Pitt (1759-1806), see 14 May 1789.

<sup>17</sup> The second part of this sentence is omitted from Rutt's edition.

<sup>18</sup> John Wesley (1703-1791), see 10 Nov 1789.