

PANTISOCRACY AND PENNSYLVANIA: PLANS OF COLERIDGE AND SOUTHEY AND OF COOPER AND PRIESTLEY ⁽¹⁾

J. Edmund White

Introduction

During the period 1793-95, two plans for settlements in the central part of the State of Pennsylvania were proposed and pursued, each associated with the immigrations to that region of Dr. and Mrs. Joseph Priestley and their three sons. One of these plans—a refuge for English “friends of liberty”—involved a Priestley son and perhaps the father, whereas the other—a utopian “Pantisocracy”—was conceived and developed by several young poets, primarily Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Robert Southey. The two proposals are connected to some extent by the fact that the poets decided to establish their colony close to the Priestley settlement. A mutual friend had assured Coleridge that Dr. Priestley would join them (Coleridge to Southey, September 6, 1794) (2), and some writers have asserted that the poets were following Priestley. The extent to which the two projects were inter-related will be examined.

Biographers of the men involved have treated these episodes in their lives quite differently, but few have dealt carefully with the relationship between the two proposals: e.g., a) a recent excellent study of Dr. Priestley’s emigration to America does not include any mention of pantisocracy (3); and b) editors and biographers of the poets often barely mention the Pennsylvania land scheme or, when they do, often get the details wrong. One thorough study of both proposals in 1947, by Mary Cathryne Park (4), is very valuable for the in-

formation she retrieved about the sites of the proposed settlements and the lands involved; but she assumed a participation by Dr. Priestley in the project not supported by the evidence, possibly because of some confusion between references to the father and the son. Thus it is important to distinguish between the two Joseph Priestleys; Cooper sometimes referred to them as “old Priestley” and “young Priestley,” but, in this paper, the father will be “Dr. Priestley” and the son “Joseph.”

Some questionable claims and some clearly incorrect statements have reappeared through the years. One illustration of such errors is found in a biography of Coleridge published in 1996 (5). Several pages are given to a description and good analysis of the concepts underlying Pantisocracy; but, then, it is stated incorrectly that Dr. Priestley “settled in Philadelphia, where he owned land,” that, at the start of the Birmingham Riots, the mob followed him home from the meeting, and that Thomas Cooper was his son-in-law. Similar inaccuracies occur in a recent biography of Southey (1997), in which the author says that Priestley emigrated in 1791 and describes him as Cooper’s father-in-law (6). The error about Cooper has reappeared many times from at least 1917 (7), but the claim is easily refuted. Dr. Priestley’s one daughter, Sarah, married William Finch, and the couple remained in England. Thomas Cooper was not the Doctor’s son-in-law.

Both schemes for settlements in the New World had their origins in dissatisfaction with the state of affairs in

England with regard to both religion and government. When the French Revolution began, the upper classes of England feared that the spirit of revolt would spill over the Channel. The long-established alliance of Church and State rose to meet this perceived threat, and oppression of all liberal voices increased. The young poets, especially Southey while still in his teens, were impressed by the social ideas of Godwin, by the goals of the French revolution, and by Dr. Priestley's writings on civil, religious, and political liberty. They were upset by the actions of the government and spoke out against them. In the public eye, they were associated with Priestley and other radicals, as shown by a Gillray caricature, published as a very large foldout in the *Anti-Jacobin Magazine and Review*, August, 1798, four years after the Doctor already had left the country (8, 9). Southey and Coleridge are shown with asses' heads, clearly a reference to the latter's poem, "To a Young Ass" (10), which includes the first mention in print of pantisocracy (11).

Emigration and the Cooper/Priestley Land Project

The Birmingham Riot of 1791 was the beginning of the end in England for Dr. Priestley and his sons. Joseph, the eldest, had been placed with a merchant in Manchester, but, in the winter of 1792, he was fired, and no one would risk giving him a position. In 1792 William, the second son, went to France, where his father had some money invested, and became a naturalized citizen. Although his father and older brother had considered joining him there, conditions in France worsened, and William left, early in 1793, for America. Six months later, on August 15, 1793, Joseph and Henry, the third Priestley son, left England for America. With them went Thomas Cooper, a political ally of their father and henceforth a family friend (12). Cooper was one of the most active radicals of the time, especially as an editor of the *Manchester Herald* (13). The emigrants had planned to visit friends in Kentucky and Boston and to look around before deciding where to settle. "We intended to have gone directly from Philadelphia to Kentucky" (14). After talking to John Vaughan, a friend from Birmingham now located in Philadelphia, they traveled instead into north and central Pennsylvania, were impressed with lands along the Susquehanna River, and soon had launched a major land development scheme. They contracted for over 200 "purchases" of 300 to 1,000 acres each and six of 25,000 to 216,000 acres, much of it in various partnerships of Joseph with several different people. The

eventual total was about 700,000 acres. Some transactions are dated in 1795 and, curiously, even 1803 and 1804 (15).

The location of these "Cooper-Priestley" lands, in the upper middle part of Pennsylvania, is shown in the Figure, which is based on a drawing by Park (16) and includes modern cities and highways. Northumberland, the town in which Dr. Priestley would buy land and build his home, is about 40 miles north of Harrisburg and 110 miles northwest of Philadelphia at the juncture of the two forks of the Susquehanna River. Forksville, about 45 miles from Northumberland on the Loyalsock Creek and originally called "Cooper's Town," is where Joseph and Cooper built their first homes. The distance across the project is about 35 miles. On page 34, Park reproduced the actual Land Patent for a plot of 337 acres purchased by Joseph from Dr. Benjamin Rush, the well-known Revolutionary War figure who also speculated in land. All of these tracts were not bought; Park calls them purchases but does not describe financial arrangements. Many may have been merely options to buy, as implied by Dr. Priestley in a letter of September 14, 1794, as quoted in a letter from William Vaughan (17):

What brought us here was the expectation of its being near the settlement that my Son & Mr. Cooper are projecting, & behold *that is all over*. When the lands came to be viewed they appeared not to be worth purchasing ... They were deceived by the Proprietors & by the Evidence that had appearance of being satisfactory ...

How much was Dr. Priestley involved in this project? Park decided that he had helped devise the plan and sent Joseph to buy the land, saying that the land purchases



Sketch showing location of Cooper/Priestley Project, based on Park (16)

were “probably by his direction” and that “Priestley sent his son Joseph, his son-in-law Thomas Cooper,” and others to find a place for “a proposed settlement of English friends of freedom and to purchase the lands chosen” (18). These statements seem to be contrary to the evidence

A few excerpts from a letter to John Vaughan in Philadelphia show Dr. Priestley’s indecision as of February 6, 1793 (19):

Such is the increasing bigotry and violence of the High church party in this country, that all my sons must leave it, and settle either in France or America. As my daughter, however, must remain here, I own I should incline to France, which is so much nearer.

He then admits that getting to France would be difficult at that time and then adds:

My son Joseph . . . inclines to America. . . They think of going to Kentucky. As I shall, in all probability, follow my sons, I incline to the neighborhood of Boston, where, I imagine, the society will suit me best.

This letter was written about fourteen months before the Priestleys left England; at that time clearly no project or settlement was planned, and Pennsylvania was not mentioned. This state became the site only when, as mentioned, Cooper and the Priestley sons were diverted by John Vaughan to investigate the Susquehanna valley and then “decided upon their ambitious plan of purchasing lands in a consortium” (20). This statement implies that Graham also does not think the plan had been started back in England by Dr. Priestley.

On January 25, 1794, Dr. Priestley wrote to his brother-in-law, John Wilkinson, that the idea of buying the land came from John Vaughan, that he had definitely decided to go to America himself, and that he was “much interested in the scheme formed by Mr. Cooper and my sons in America” (21). In February, 1794, Cooper returned to England to get the rest of his family and to publish his book, *Some Information Respecting America*, which is organized as several letters “To a Friend” (22). In these, he compared possible sites for settlement, recommending Pennsylvania. The book provided a very complete set of directions for persons planning to emigrate, including tables of duties, comparative prices, and other useful information, and it made a strong impression on Coleridge (23).

On April 7, 1794, Dr. and Mrs. Priestley boarded the *Samson*, sailed from Gravesend, and arrived in New York City on June 4 (24). On June 27 he wrote (25):

I think I shall settle in the back part of this state, at Northumberland, near the place where my sons are making their establishment.

In this letter and the one of September 14, quoted above, two points stand out: first, the Doctor’s home would be near the settlement, not a part of it; second, he does not consider himself as a partner in the project, which was the province of his sons and Mr. Cooper. On the last page of his autobiography, Dr. Priestley says (26):

At the time of my leaving England, my son, in conjunction with Mr. Cooper and other emigrants, had a scheme for a large settlement for the friends of liberty in general, near the head of the Susquehanna, . . . I . . . came to Northumberland, the town nearest to the proposed settlement, thinking to reside there until some progress had been made in it.

Here again, the scheme is not his in any way, but he does imply that he would have moved to the settlement if it had gone forward.

Thus, no evidence seems to exist to support claims that Dr. Priestley planned the land project and sent his sons and Cooper to carry out the plan. It is just the opposite; he always refers to it as their plan. Although Joseph might be protecting either his personal interest or his father’s reputation, what should be the final word comes from his continuation of his father’s memoirs (27):

He had not, as has been erroneously reported, the least concern in the projected settlement. He was not consulted in the formation of the plan of it, nor had he come to any determination to join it, had it been carried into effect.

Poets and Pantisocracy

Because the poets’ story has been told with a range of detail in various biographies, here only the essential parts are included. When Robert Southey, age 18, began his studies at Balliol College, Oxford, in January, 1793, he had been attracted to William Godwin’s ideas on rationalism and



Robert Southey

and republicanism, was a supporter of the French Revolution, and was unhappy with the situation in England. Utopian ideas were in his thoughts; in November and

December, 1793, he was writing about going to France or America, if he were not tied down by family commitments. He wrote of plowing, swinging an ax, grubbing roots, sleeping on rushes, and probably being scalped by an Indian (28).

Samuel Coleridge also was caught up in the fervor over social justice and civil liberty and was very upset by the treatment of Dr. Priestley, as revealed in his sonnet "To Priestley" (December, 1794) (29). In June, 1794, Coleridge, aged 22 and a student at Cambridge University, came to Oxford to visit a friend and was introduced to Southey. The proverbial spark was struck, and an almost instantaneous friendship blossomed as the two explored their common interests: poetry, democratic ideals, despair over the state of affairs in England, and disillusion with the French Revolution. They were, as one author has said, "caught in the stream of Utopian thought which was sweeping Europe in the wake of the French Revolution" (30). Before parting for the summer, they had discussed a settlement in America. Much later, in a letter to Cottle (March 5, 1836), Southey recalled that "the scheme was talked of, but not by any means determined on. It was talked into shape by Burnett and myself," while they were walking to Bath (31). Probably the main contribution of George Burnett, also a student at Balliol, was to offer a receptive ear to his friend (32). Some weeks later, Coleridge joined them in Bristol, and (from the same letter) "Then it was that we resolved upon going to America."

This statement of the origin of the scheme is emphasized because some biographers write as if the concept were developed by Coleridge. One even calls it "Coleridge's Scheme of Pantisocracy" (33). He certainly was the most vigorous proponent, but, to counter any claim that Southey's memory in 1836 was faulty, consider also a letter to his brother (October 19, 1794), written while the events were occurring (34):

My aunt abuses poor Lovell most unmercifully, and attributes the whole scheme to him; you know that it was concerted between Burnett and me.

Robert Lovell, another Balliol man, was an aspiring poet and the first of the group to marry one of the Fricker sisters, for which his wealthy Quaker family threw him out (35).

Briefly, pantisocracy may be described as a fusion of ideas from Paine, Priestley, Hartley, Godwin, and Dyer concerning human rights, the perfectibility of mankind, civil liberty, religious freedom, benevolence, and similar concepts flowing in that "stream of Utopian thought."

Its name comes from the Greek "pan-socratia" (36). Southey defined the two main aspects of the plan for his brother in September, 1794 (37):

We preached Pantisocracy and Aspheterism every where [*sic*]. There, Tom, are two new words, the first signifying the equal government of all—and the other—the generalization of individual property.

In modern terms, it could be called a democratic, communal society. In a letter of August 22, Southey, revealing his lack of knowledge about life on the frontier, had written that they would establish a system (38):

... where the common ground was cultivated by common toil, and its produce laid in common granaries, where none are rich because none should be poor, where every motive for vice should be annihilated and every motive for virtue strengthened... When Coleridge and I are sawing down a tree, we shall discuss metaphysics; criticize poetry when hunting a buffalo; and write sonnets whilst following the plough. Our society will be of the most polished order.

Joseph Cottle, the publisher and a benefactor of the young poets, reports that Lovell told him the plan was "to form a Social Colony, in which there was to be a community of property, and where all that was selfish was to be proscribed." The participants would have "tried and incorruptible characters." They would achieve a society free of the "evils and turmoils that then agitated the world" and would "present an example of the eminence to which men might arrive under the unrestrained influence of sound principles." They hope "to regenerate the whole complexion of society" and to set "an example of 'Human Perfectibility'" (39). Such goals were typical Enlightenment concepts, and the poets' nonsectarian plan, although unrealized, can be viewed as a step toward a secular society in the communitive movement in America, which, for over a century, had been sectarian (40).

The unrealistic expectations, especially as to the hard work that would be necessary, can be blamed to a large extent on the misleading promotional writings about America that were popular in England. Cooper and other travel writers exaggerated the good features and minimized or simply omitted the bad. Probably it was the poets' enthusiasm for their vision that led them to disregard warnings about emigration that were appearing in editorials and articles in the press (41). Cottle wrote that they talked constantly about pantisocracy and that they "repel every objection to the practicability of their scheme." He had thought that "their strong good sense would eventually dissipate their delusion" (42).

There is a lack of agreement as to the initial destination of the Pantisocrats. The claim by some writers that the poets were following Dr. Priestley to Pennsylvania is bothersome for two reasons. First, the poets' letters almost never mention Priestley by name. Second, the original idea, at least for Southey, was to go to Kentucky. On July 20, 1794, he wrote of "dwelling in Kentucky" (43), and, in two letters, both dated August 1, 1794, he invites friends: "Come to us in Kentucky," and "I shall hope you will join us in Kentucky" (44). The destination changed, however, within three weeks; on August 22, Southey wrote that, in one year, "the Pantisocratic society of Aspheterists will be settled on the banks of the Susquehannah [*sic*]." Coleridge also wrote, apparently around the same time, "at present our



Samuel Coleridge

plan is, to settle at a distance, but at a convenient distance, from Cooper's Town, on the banks of the Susquehanna. This, however, will be the object of future investigation." So, in his mind, the location still was not definitely settled. He also said that they intended to leave in March and, again showing his inexperience in such matters, that, during the winter, they would learn "the theory and practice of agriculture and carpentry" (45).

Trying to establish just where the poets intended to settle, Park analyzed Coleridge's statement and pointed out that, to be near Cooper's Town and also on the river, the settlement would have to be in the vicinity of Asylum, a community of French Girondist refugees (see Fig-

ure). She suggests that the land was made available to the French by "Cooper, the Priestleys and their company" and that this settlement may have been an added attraction for Coleridge and Southey, who sympathized with the refugees' cause (46), although no mention of refugees or this town has been found in the poets' writings. Another objection to this suggestion is that only in June, 1795, was it reported in *Gentleman's Magazine* that a group of Girondon emigrants had settled in Frenchtown, near the Susquehanna (47). If this refers to Asylum, it would be too late to have influenced the poets.

The change from Kentucky to Pennsylvania was probably Coleridge's doing. He had read many accounts of travels in America, including Cooper's recently published exuberant presentation of the wonders of the Susquehanna Valley (48), in which he described the pleasing prospects of clearing land easily and living comfortably with only a few hours of work a day. Coleridge wrote to Southey, on September 6, 1794, that, while in London, he had breakfasted with George Dyer, who was enthusiastic about their plans and who claimed to be "intimate with Dr. Priestley, and doubts not that the Doctor will join us" (49). George Dyer was an author interested in social problems and one of the lesser literary lights around London. In the same letter, Coleridge reported meeting several times with "a most intelligent young man" who had spent five years in America and "is lately come from thence as an agent to sell land" and that "He recommends the Susquehanna." It sounds as if Coleridge still was trying to convince himself.

Park concludes that this young man was an agent for the Cooper/Priestley development, because the arguments he used were essentially the same as those in Cooper's book (50). Other writers have suggested he was Cooper himself, but this is impossible for two reasons: Coleridge said he had known the man in school, and Cooper had not lived in America five years.

With the possible exception of this meeting with a land agent, who may have represented Cooper and Joseph, there appears to have been no contact between the poets and the land developers. There is no evidence that anyone reported Coleridge's interest back to Pennsylvania. There is no mention of the poets or of pantisocracy by the Priestleys or Cooper during these years. Ironically, about this time, Dr. Priestley, if not the proprietors, had given up on the project (see his letter of September 14, above, in which he said: "behold that is all over.") So, as the poets continued their plan-

ning, they did not know that the large settlement of English expatriates, near which they intended to settle, probably would not exist.

In this same September, in the letter to his brother quoted above, Southey wrote that they were planning to depart in March, 1795. On October 12, he reported to his brother that their number now was 27 (51). Five days later, the first disaster struck: Southey's wealthy aunt, of whom he was to be the heir, learned of his plans to go to America and to marry Edith Fricker. She disinherited him and ejected him from her house into a violent rain storm. Southey, however, did not lose his resolve; he and the others spent the winter trying to earn the necessary funds but were not successful enough. On March 21, he raised the possibility of his and Coleridge's taking wives and living on a farm to begin to learn the skills they would need in America and to begin to practice the ideals of pantisocracy. The situation, however, continued to worsen. Lovell died, and Coleridge heard that Southey had talked of having servants and private ownership of land—except for a small amount to be held communally—and had decided to accept a position offered by an uncle. In November, an angry Coleridge wrote a long critical letter to Southey, condemning him as a traitor to the ideal of pantisocracy and blaming him for the death of their scheme (52).

Southey broke away fairly easily from the doctrine and the enthusiasm that had been a dominating part of his life for over a year, but it was not easy for Coleridge, who continued to dream and write about pantisocracy for several years. Even in 1801, he wrote to Poole that, if he could retain his annuity, "I would go and settle near Priestley in America" (53). This mention of Priestley, five or six years after the project was dead, seems to be only the second one in the early letters of Coleridge, the first, in 1794, being merely the report of Dyer's remarks. The only mention in a Southey letter, in 1797, is similarly indirect: "I have lived much among the friends of Priestley ..." (54).

Conclusion

1. Dr. Priestley did not take an active part in the Pennsylvania land development consortium. He did not contract for land on speculation or buy a lot in that area for his own home. The settlement proposed by his son and Cooper was an attempt to attract liberal minded Englishmen who felt compelled to leave their country, but it was a money making enterprise, and probably no purchaser would have been excluded. It appears that

neither Cooper nor the two Priestleys knew about the emigration plans of the poets back in England.

2. In the end, the poets fared better than if they had raised the funds needed to emigrate. Since they were completely unprepared for the hard labor that would be required, it is highly unlikely that they could have survived in Pennsylvania and, even if they somehow had managed, that they would have produced the body of Romantic poetry, which is the basis of their substantial literary reputations. This reason for predicting that the poets' project would fail, if they had managed to get to America, is suggested by Joseph in his insightful analysis in which he admits that it is just as well that his own project did not go any further. He wrote, in 1804 (55):

Fortunately for the original proposers, the scheme was abandoned.

After saying that it might have worked out financially, he goes on:

...but the generality of Englishmen come to this country with such erroneous ideas, and, unless previously accustomed to a life of labour, are so ill qualified to commence cultivation in a wilderness, that the projectors would most probably have been subject to still more unfounded abuse than they have been, for their well-meant endeavours to promote the interests of their countrymen.

3. Although the poets shared many of Dr. Priestley's principles and beliefs, as reflected in the various descriptions of pantisocracy, a claim that they were following him to America is difficult to support. He is rarely mentioned in their letters, and the specific details of their plan were based on Cooper's book. The Doctor's significant role in the development of British thought in the later years of the Enlightenment, his calm resolve in the face of abuse and adversity, and his eventual 'exile' (seen as martyrdom) made him, in accord with the metaphor in the title of the ACS symposium (56), an obvious catalyst for the blossoming of the latent social sensibilities of the young poets; but, as is often the case, the reaction proceeded without the presence of the catalyst being obvious.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. A version of this paper was presented as part of the symposium "Joseph Priestley, Universal Catalyst" at the 228th National Meeting of the American Chemical Society, Philadelphia, Pa., August 23-24, 2004, HIST 021.
2. E. L. Griggs, Ed., *Unpublished Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, Constable, London, 1932, 21-22.

3. J. Graham, "Revolutionary in Exile: The Emigration of Joseph Priestley to America, 1794-1804," *Trans. Am. Philos. Soc.*, **1995**, 85, Part 2, 1-213.
4. M. C. Park, "Joseph Priestley and the Problem of Pantisocracy," *Proc. Delaware Co. Inst. Sci.*, **1947**, 10, 1-60.
5. R. Ashton, *The Life of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, Blackwell, Cambridge, MA., 1996, 45.
6. M. Storey, *Robert Southey: a Life*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997, 52.
7. W. Haller, *The Early Life of Robert Southey, 1774-1803*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1917, 141.
8. Anon., "Explanation of the Satyrical Print," *Anti-Jacobin Mag. and Rev.*, **1798**, 1, 115-16.
9. C. Edmonds, *Poetry of the Anti-Jacobin*, G. Willis, London, 2nd ed., 1854, 247.
10. J. C. C. Mays, Ed., *The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2001, Vol. 16: *Poetical Works: Part 1, Poems*, 146.
11. R. Holmes, *Coleridge: Early Visions*, Viking, New York, 1990, 82-83.
12. Some authors have stated incorrectly that Cooper left after Dr. Priestley.
13. C. Horner, "The Rise and Fall of Manchester's 'Set of Infernal Miscreants': Radicalism in 1790s Manchester," *Manchester Region History Review*, **1998**, 12, 18-26.
14. T. Cooper, *Some Information Respecting America*, J. Johnson, London, 1794, 24, n.
15. Ref. 4, pp 52-57.
16. Ref. 4, p 33.
17. Ref. 3, p 178.
18. Ref. 4, p 12.
19. Ref. 3, p 174.
20. Ref. 3, p 33.
21. Ref. 3, p 34.
22. Ref. 14.
23. S. Eugenia, "Coleridge's Scheme of Pantisocracy and American Travel Accounts," *PMLA*, **1930**, 45, 1069-84, 1073.
24. Ref. 3, p 35.
25. R. E. Schofield, Ed., *A Scientific Autobiography of Joseph Priestley: Selected Scientific Correspondence*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1966, 281.
26. J. Lindsay, *Autobiography of Joseph Priestley*, Adams & Dart, Bath, 1970, 133.
27. J. Priestley, *Memoirs of the Rev. Dr. Joseph Priestley to the year 1795 with a Continuation by his son, Joseph Priestley*, J. Johnson, London, 1809, 147-148.
28. Ref. 6, p 40.
29. Ref. 10, p 157.
30. R. W. Armour and R. F. Howes, *Coleridge The Talker*, Johnson Reprint, New York, 1969.
31. J. D. Campbell, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, Macmillan, London, 1896, 31.
32. Ref. 7, p 131.
33. Ref. 23.
34. J. Dennis, Ed., *Robert Southey. The Story of his Life Written in his Letters*, Bell and Sons, London, 2nd ed., 1894, 91.
35. K. Jones, *A Passionate Sisterhood: The Sisters, Wives, and Daughters of the Lake Poets*, Constable, London, 1997, 10.
36. Ref. 35, p 13.
37. K. Curry, Ed., *New Letters of Robert Southey*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1965, 74.
38. Ref. 37, p 70.
39. J. Cottle, *Reminiscences of Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Robert Southey*, Houlston and Stoneman, London, 2nd ed., 1848, 2.
40. A. E. Bestor, *Backwoods Utopias; The Sectarian Origins and Owenite Phases of Communitarian Socialism in America: 1663-1829*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, PA, 2nd ed., 970, 36-37.
41. Ref. 23, pp1080-1081.
42. Ref. 39, pp 6,11.
43. Ref. 37, p 60.
44. Ref. 37, pp 65, 66.
45. W. G. T. Shedd, Ed., *The Complete Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, Harper & Sons, New York, 1884, 623-624.
46. Ref. 4, p 32, n.
47. Ref. 6, p 51.
48. Ref. 14.
49. Ref. 4, p 38.
50. Ref. 4, p 38.
51. Ref. 37, p 80.
52. Ref. 5, pp 72, 73.
53. Ref. 23, p 1080.
54. C. Ramos, Ed., *The Letters of Robert Southey to John May, 1797 to 1838*, Jenkins, Austin, TX, 1976, 26.
55. Ref. 27, pp 147,148.
56. Ref. 1.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

J. Edmund White is Professor Emeritus of Chemistry, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Edwardsville, IL 62026. He is interested in the history of science in the 18th century and has presented and published papers on Joseph Priestley. Correspondence should be directed to the author at 110 N. Newstead Ave., No. 202, St. Louis, MO 63108.