Dear Spooner,

I had expected on leaving you to return to Boston as early as Tuesday next (tomorrow); but, finding it necessary to protract a little my absence, I cannot help saying that I have watched with interest what the paper has said of your essay, whose value has been constantly growing in my own estimation. Garrison was more favorable, or rather less unfavorable, than I had ventured to hope. It is considerable, I think, that he should admit you are neither a known [?] nor a fool, and to even go [?] far as to assert, that you are both honest and acute, complimenting the style of your reply. His admiration of your boldness in thus attempting "to the seal off of the bond," his surprise, that the anti-slavery character of the Const. [?] should have been discovered by somebody before this later period, his allegation, that, whatever may be said of your argument, "the fact remains the same"; and sundry other things: these were all to have been expected. But what does he mean by saying "the fact remains the same"? I suppose "the fact" is the premier [?] to have been the character of the constitution touching slavery. --- But Phillips, it seems, was moved to rap G. over the knuckles, slightly, for having taken so favorable a notice of the Essay, and, with all the weight of his authority, both as an abolitionist and as a lawyer, to pronounce it "weak & fanciful," promising, however, to know it to be so in a forthcoming review of the same. I think Phillips will yet respect this contemptuous article of his. By the way, I do not remember, that you pronounced those amendments and that sec 9 of art. 1st to be merely restrictions of the State Legislatures. Nor was I aware before, that Morshole [?] and other have decided, those amendments, etc[?] to be restrictions on the power "of the General Government only"; but imagined they restricted, in part or in whole, the National $\underline{\&}$ the State Legisltaures. He thinks he "has you on the hip[?]," the eligibility of females to the office of President, impairing the obligation of contracts, etc. But I'll not detain you with any impressions of mine, respecting [?] the profoundness of his scribblings on other points that "the book is a pan[?]"! The intellect of an ass [?] might see, that "the confusing of two different meanings of the same word," is a confusion of his own making. --- The notice in Atlas [?] was by Hildrith, I suppose. I could wish it had been fuller; t'was very good, though. --- I wish, --- I can hardly say I hope, notwithstanding what he told you, ---the work may be thoroughly reviewed by Leavitt.# [#I suppose it was Levitt who wrote the brief notice of it that appeared in the C. [?] as a communication. I've [?] member [?] to have heard his or late

the The lawyer was B. J. Hollett [?]] The Granite Freeman
(of Concord, N.H.) speaks highly of it, in an article of only a few
lines. It promises to return to the support, though professing
itself unable [?] to open with all the Essayists views Then
have appeared many notices of the work, doubtable, which I have not
seen. The ed. of the Bangor Gas. is delighted with it. But he is
slow in his movements, & we probably shall not hear from him, very
specifically [?], on the support till you [?] arrive in the next
week.

Let me support[?], if you would not do well to preserve the arguments made against your book by such persons as Phillips, & others of equal caliber, & answer the whole of them together, by ____ in a pamphlet.

I probably shall return to Boston this day or to-morrow week. Meantime I should be gald to hear from you—care of D. Parker Esq., Bangor Maine.

Will you hand or send the _____ into [?] Mr. Russell?

Very Truly Yours,

Ger Bradburn

Envelope:

Lysander Spooner, Esq.

Quincy House

Boston, Mass