

## L E T T E R

TO THE

REV. DR. PRIESTLEY;

IN WHICH

THE AUTHOR ATTEMPTS TO PROVE,

BY ONE PRESCRIPTIVE ARGUMENT,

THAT THE

DIVINITY OF JESUS CHRIST

WAS A

PRIMITIVE TENET OF CHRISTIANITY.



BY THE

REV. ALEX. GEDDES, L.L.D.

L O N D O N:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR;

AND SOLD BY R. FAULDER, NEW BOND-STREET;  
J. JOHNSON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD;  
AND C. ELLIOT, IN THE STRAND.

M.DCC.LXXXVII.



THE

TO THE

REV. DR. P. R. ESTLEY

OF

THE AUTHOR OF

THE

DIVINITY

OF

THE

BY

REV. ALEX. GEDDES, F.R.S.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

AND SOLD BY A. KNEELAND, NEW BOND STREET,

AND C. L. BARNES, 11, THE STRAND,

1841.



---

REV. SIR,

ALTHOUGH I have been long occupied about a work that hath allowed me very little leifure to attend to any other subject, I could not help casting, now and then, a curious eye on the several productions that have lately appeared in print, concerning the nature and attributes of Jesus Christ. And as you are the principal writer on one side of the question, I have paid a particular regard to the arguments which you have, at different times, brought forward in support of the Socinian System: not with any previous design to refute them, but merely to satisfy myself how far they were conclusive, or otherwise.

B

This



This hath given me occasion to revolve in mine own mind the state of the important controversy, to recollect what I had formerly read and ruminated on the matter, to trace back my ideas to their first impressions, and subject them all anew to a strict revifal; with a view, either to relinquish my prejudices, if fuch they fhould appear to be, or ftrengthen me in my former opinion, if I fhould fee it to be well founded. For, although I was born, and educated in the communion of a church, which is faid to preclude her children from reasoning at all on the articles which ſhe propoſes to their belief, I muſt here beg leave to proteſt, that I am not diſpoſed to pay that compliment to any church that exiſts; and that no authority whatſoever ſhall preclude me from reasoning on any ſubject upon which I chooſe to reaſon: and, therefore, although I have hitherto believed, on ſuch motives of credibility as I thought highly rational, that our

Saviour



Saviour Jesus Christ was really a divine personage; yet, if stronger motives be presented to me for believing the contrary, the contrary I will, I must believe. For there is no disbelieving against conviction, nor believing without it.

In this disposition I have carefully examined the matter. In this disposition I now sit down to give you and the public the result of my examination with all the candour you can wish for, and with all the moderation you would desire. Both you and I profess to be Christians; but we should ill assert our pretensions to that title, if our disputes about the prerogatives of our amiable teacher should make us forget the most essential part of his doctrine; brotherly love.

And here I cannot but lament, that some of your most vehement antagonists have deserved blame by maintaining, that the



Socinians are not to be called Christians! He is, unquestionably, a Christian, who acknowledgeth Christ for his guide in religion, believeth the divinity of his mission, and professeth to live according to his gospel; whatsoever speculative ideas he may entertain of his person, power, and privileges. I grant then, that you are a Christian as well as I, and embrace you as my fellow-disciple in Jesus—And, if you were not a disciple of Jesus, still I would embrace you as my fellow-man.

Having made this free and fair declaration, I proceed to lay before you the motives, or rather, the one great motive, that makes me believe the divinity of our common Master; that is, which convinceth me that He is a Being of a superior nature to that of man—that he existed before his appearance in human flesh—and that adoration is due to him from his followers, as to “the  
“only begotten Son of God.”

I wish



I wish you to remark, that, in establishing these propositions, I am not obliged to adopt or defend either the Arian or Athanasian system, or, indeed, any system whatsoever that hath been, or may be, formed on the subject. My task is barely to shew—That the *Divinity* of Jesus Christ was (in some sense or other) an original article of the Christian belief—A part of that ‘faith once delivered to the Saints;’ which, until Socinus arose, was never controverted but by a few obscure sectarists, whose very existence we should not have known, but for the testimony of those Christian writers who mention them as the first corrupters of Christianity; although you, now, labour to throw back on themselves the grievous imputation,

I shall reduce the point in dispute into a very narrow compass, and strip it of all the extraneous matter that hath, perhaps, unnecessarily been heaped on it. Controversialists



are but too apt to impress into their service auxiliaries that are often more hurtful than serviceable to their cause. This was the great fault of our famous Bellarmine. He thought he could never collect too many arguments; and, therefore, he collected a great many bad ones, which, like a multitude of spiritless and feeble troops in an army, made the strength of his good ones less conspicuous and forceful.

The figures, the allusions, the prophecies even of the Old Testament I fairly, for the present, give up to you, because I am conscious that, by themselves, they present to the unprepossessed reader no explicit idea of absolute divinity in the promised Messiah. I do not even except the celebrated passage of Isaiah, on which so much hath been written to so little purpose, and of which I despair ever to see a satisfactory explanation. The divinity of the Messiah being once presupposed, all those texts, I know, may



may be ingeniously adapted to it: but I know also, that an equal degree of ingenuity may adapt them to the opposite hypothesis; and I must confess, that if we had no other clue to guide us, no other lantern to direct our steps, I should be inclined to conclude the Messiah to be a mere man, though endowed with privileges above the rest of mankind.

On New-Testamental ground I could, I think, make a firmer stand, and fight with you, at least, on equal terms. Among the many ambiguous texts that may be urged against your system, there are, certainly, three or four, the force of which cannot easily be eluded; witness the hard strainings that have been made by yourself and your party to give them a plausible Socinian interpretation; whilst they seem, at the very first sight, expressly calculated to justify the doctrine of your adversaries.



Strong, however, as they appear to be, I shall not now avail myself of them, because I do not think them necessary for the enforcement of my argument. They may afterwards come in as subsidiaries to illustrate and corroborate it, but on them it is not dependant. Let us, therefore, now consider them as, at best, but equivocal testimonies, and try if we can find out a proper touch-stone to determine their genuine value.

It will not, I think, be denied, that the Apostles were sufficiently instructed with regard to the person of their Master, and that they knew perfectly in what light they were to consider him: whether as a divine pre-existing Being, clothed, in time, with mortality, or, as a mere man, like themselves, who had no existence before his conception in the womb of Mary.

To say, or suppose, that they had no distinct and explicit idea on this head, is to say

say



say and suppose what hath not the smallest degree of probability ; nay, what appears to me the height of absurdity. For if the Holy Ghost was to “ teach them all truth,” he would have badly executed his commission, if he had left them in the ignorance of so capital an article as the *divinity* or *non-divinity* of Him who had repeatedly made this promise to them. To have left them in any doubt, on so important a point, would have been to expose them to the sad dilemma of impiety or idolatry. If, Jesus being really a divine person, they had mistaken him for a mere man, and refused him divine homage, they would not have rendered ‘ to God what is due to God ;’ and if, being a mere man, they had mistaken him for God, they would have ascribed to him honours to which he had no right. In either case, their ignorance would have been attended with the worst of consequences, both in themselves and in the

corol-



corollaries thence deducible; for, if 'the spirit of truth' had left them uncertain in this point, he might have left them uncertain in every other point; and the whole apostolic doctrine might be no more than a tissue of uncertainties.

Either, then, the Apostles believed and taught the divinity of Jesus, or they believed and taught the contrary; and the only question is, which they believed and taught.

You read the few writings which they have left behind them; and, comparing passage with passage, conclude, that they believed Christ to be a mere man. The Athanasian and Arian read the same writings with equal care, and conclude just the reverse. I, too, have perused them with as keen, if not so clear, optics, as any of you, and with a mind as impartial and unprejudiced. I have also read, with due attention,  
the



the best Athanasian, Arian, and Socinian glossators on the controverted passages, and have often found myself in much the same situation with Pope, when he was settling his Creed by the aid of such polemical divines as he found in his father's library. I was Athanasian, Arian, and Socinian by turns.

If the works of the apostolical fathers, as they are called, had come down to us entire and unadulterated, we might have from them derived some assistance towards clearing up the point; but of these some are lost, others imperfect, and others interpolated, and altogether afford but an ambiguous commentary on an ambiguous text. "From writings of so suspicious a complexion, who would wish to interpret the sacred volume? who would venture to decide upon the capital articles of revelation?" \*

In

\* Wakefield's Enquiry, p. 332.



In this dubiety, then, I look about for something more explicitly satisfactory; and that, I think, I find in the formal decision of the Nicean Council. Smile not, my friend, nor imagine that I am going to impose on you an article of faith on the authority of an infallible guide. Whatever idea I may myself entertain of infallibility (which, by the bye, is very different from that of the Scholastics), I am not such a novice in logic as to offer it here in proof of a proposition, which it is, certainly, not more difficult to establish, independent of infallibility, than it would be to establish infallibility as a base to support it.

I grant you, then, that the fathers assembled at Nicea were, both severally and conjunctly, an assembly of fallible men: but when I make this concession, I expect that you, on your part, will allow them to have been men of common sense and common integrity: Many of them were remarkable  
for



for the sanctity of their lives; some had shewn the highest degree of Christian fortitude in confessing Jesus before tyrants and persecutors; and there were those among them, whose learning and abilities would not disgrace the most enlightened age. In short, if I should say that they were altogether the most respectable body of ecclesiastics that ever met, and the freest from every sort of control, I hardly think that you would call my assertion unguarded. But I content myself with my first demand; and supposing them only men of *common sense* and *common integrity*, I ask you whether you think it in the smallest degree probable, that three hundred and eighteen of the principal Pastors in the Christian Church, convoked from the three parts of the then known world, could possibly combine to establish a doctrine different from that which they had hitherto taught their respective flocks, and which they had themselves received



ceived from their predecessors in the ministry?

But nothing can be more certain than that the Nicean council were unanimous in their belief of the divinity and pre-existence of Jesus Christ: His coeternity and coequality with the father, were the only points disputed by the Arian party. And their differing from the rest on these points, so far from weakening my argument, adds considerable strength to it; as particular exceptions confirm general rules in all those parts to which they do not extend. You must then, I think, allow, that at this period, the belief of the divinity of Jesus was the universal belief of the Christian Churches of Asia, Africa, and Europe. The professions of faith made on the occasion, are too clear and explicit to admit a doubt, or give room for evasion.

Either, then, you must confess that the *divinity* of Jesus, at that time universally  
believed,



believed, had been a tenet of primitive Christianity, or maintain it to be an universal corruption which had taken place of the true primitive tenet, the *non-divinity* of Jesus.

This is, indeed, what ye have been long labouring to prove, but, in my opinion, with little success; for, what is the result of your long and laborious researches? Ye have carefully collected all those texts of Scripture that prove Jesus to be truly man, which your opponents never called in question, and have endeavoured to explain away the force of those other texts of Scripture which your opponents alledge in proof of his being also God. From the Christian writers of the first three centuries ye have learned that there had existed certain Ebionites, and others, who entertained heterodox notions of the person of Jesus Christ, believing him to be a mere man. Those heterodox Ebionites ye have, by a singular sort of



metamorphosis, converted into the only orthodox believers; and those, who were in their own time, and for many ages after, accounted the props of orthodoxy, into the most dangerous of all heretics. But let me here appeal to your candour; if in the same writers you had found the Ebionites mentioned, as teaching the *divinity* of Jesus, and for that reason, ranked with Heretics, would you think the Trinitarian warranted to maintain that genuine original Christianity was to be found only among the *Ebionites*?—The *Ebionites*, who rejected all the gospels, except that of Matthew, looked on the apostle Paul as an apostate from the sound doctrine, and considered themselves under an obligation of conforming, in all things, to the Jewish ceremonial law, and making Jerusalem the place of adoration.

Let us only, for a moment, suppose that such writers as Ireneus, Justin, Athanagoras, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Pamphilus,  
Cyril



Cyril of Jerufalem, Tertulian, Cyprian, Lactantius, Eusebius, &c. had asserted the *non-divinity* of Jefus Chrift, in terms neither more nor lefs unequivocal than thofe in which they assert his divinity ; and had, at the fame time, ranked Cerinthus, Ebion, Theodotus, &c. among thofe who had altered the purity of the true faith, for having taught the contrary opinion ; would you not, from this fole confideration, think yourfelf fufficiently authorifed to affirm, that the *non-divinity* muft have been the primitive apoftolical dogma, and the *divinity* an unapoftolical innovation ? ‘ For what  
‘ (you would probably fay) are thofe children of darknefs, Theodotus, Ebion, and  
‘ Cerinthus, that they fhould be put in competition with men who have ever been  
‘ accounted the brighteft luminaries of the  
‘ Chriftian Church of their days ; and who  
‘ are, indeed, for thofe remote times, the  
C only



‘ only vouchers and recorders of her genuine doctrines ! ’

But if, beside the occasional evidence, whether positive or constructive, express or implicit, that, in the foresaid supposition, you might collect from the Antenicean writers in favour of your system, you could produce the clear, express, aggregate testimony of the Representatives of the whole Christian Church, assembled for the very purpose of discussing the point in question ; and (bating some differences about the miraculous conception, for instance) unanimously agreeing, that the doctrine which they had received from their forefathers, and which, from time immemorial, had been taught in their respective churches, from Lybia to Tartary, from Persia to Spain, from Britain to Constantinople, was, *That Jesus is a mere man, who had no existence before his conception* (whether miraculous or not), and that no divine honour is due to him :

2

would



would you not laugh aloud at the man who, in spite of such testimony, should still insist that the *divinity* of Jesus was the true primitive catholic doctrine?

But shift now the scene, and let supposition give place to reality. And then let me again ask you what, after so many years labour, have you been able to oppose to this strong, and, as I think, invincible, prescriptive proof of the *divinity* of Christ, as declared by the Nicean fathers to be then, at least, the doctrine of the universal church?

Why, in poring on such works of the most ancient writers as, either in whole or in part, remain, you have found out, what was well known before, that among the numerous spawn of heretical sects that sprang up in the two first centuries, and even in the life-time of the apostles themselves, there were some who held Christ to be nothing more than a mere man, begotten



by Joseph, according to one set of them ; miraculously conceived of Mary, according to another ; but still a mere man, and nothing more than a mere man. In their tenets you imagine you find, because you wish to find it, the pure and primitive doctrine of Christianity ; and then, you set about to prove, by a long train of plausible presumptive evidence, not how that primitive doctrine *was*, but how it *might have been* corrupted : Whereas, I think, you should have endeavoured, and been able, to shew when, by whom, and in what manner such an important revolution was brought about ; who was the first broacher of the novel opinion ; what opposition it met with ; which of the apostolic sees was the first to embrace it, and by what wonderful influence it got possession of all the rest ; without noise, without resistance, without any of those circumstances that always attend the introduction of a novelty in matters



ters of religion, especially when the contradictory of an established opinion is attempted to be introduced.

Such another revolution, at least, I cannot recollect; such another, I believe, you cannot indicate in the Annals of Christianity. We can trace innovations of far less importance, and much less discriminable from the precedent doctrines to their primordial sources. We can generally point out the individuals that hatched them, the fautors they met with, the foes they encountered, the bishops that espoused and the bishops that oppugned them, the synods that assembled to oppose their progress, and those that assembled to further it; in a word, their birth, their growth, their full maturity, until they became either the prevalent opinions, or divided the Christian world, or were confined to the few, or were totally obliterated.



The disputes that arose at Alexandria towards the end of the third century, were only about the mode of conceiving an article of Christian belief, not about the article itself. Both *Homousians* and *Homoiousians* were perfectly agreed, as to the divinity and pre-existence of Jesus Christ: The question between them was only, whether he were of the *same*, or only of a *similar* substance with the father. And yet this apparently slight difference, this metaphysical innovation, if I may so call it, on which ever side it lay, soon threw the whole church into a ferment, and produced one of the most violent and inveterate contests that ever divided Christianity: bishop declaring against bishop, council excommunicating council, authority opposed to authority, writer to writer; the whole learning and abilities of both parties exhausted to support their respective opinions, and Arianism

and



and Athanasianism alternately triumphing in a real or pretended majority of suffrages.

But is it not strange, that, in this furious conflict, when every arsenal was ransacked for arms, every old record explored, every latent authority dragged to light, and the question agitated with all the skill of dialectic and force of eloquence, in above forty different synods, in the course of a century——Is it not strange, I say, is it not passing strange, that in not one of those assemblies, neither at Alexandria nor Antioch, nor Cæsarea nor Sardica, nor Jerusalem, nor Constantinople, nor Sirmium, nor Milan, nor Rome, nor Rimini, there should not be a single voice raised in favour of Socinianism, a single pen employed to defend it, a single authority quoted in its support? And that, while the whole body of Christians were engaged in a controversy about two opinions, both equally false, the only true dogma should be overlooked, should be re-

C 4

jected,



jected, should be anathematized by all? This, I confess, is to me inconceivable—is, in the nature of things, hardly possible.

You will say, perhaps, that, even at that time, Socinianism was not entirely without its witnesses, among the bishops themselves, and refer me to Paul of Antioch, and Photinus of Sirmium: That both these were, in some measure, Socinians I grant; but this serves only to give a greater degree of strength to my argument. For in what light was their doctrine considered by their fellow-bishops, and what was the consequence of their teaching it? They were regarded as blasphemous innovators, threatened with immediate deposition, unless they retracted, and, in the end, actually deposed, and excommunicated by both parties.—If you think, then, that you can avail yourself of such a testimony, you are welcome to use it; and you may add all the other similar testimonies you can glean through  
all



all the preceding ages, from Paul of Antioch up to Cerinthus: all this, when put in balance with the testimony of the Nicean fathers, to me appears a grain against an hundred-weight.

Indeed, the more I consider this testimony, with its concomitant circumstances, the more forcible I feel the conviction that thence arises. The individuals, who rendered it, were not men of one particular province or nation, speaking the same language, and accustomed to nearly the same modes of thinking, but were brought together from various and far distant regions; between which there was little or no communication or connection, beside the general link of Christianity. To these the gospel had been first preached at different times and by different persons; whether apostles or apostolic men, it is of little moment: to them they were in place of apostles, and from them they received their creed.



creed. Was the divinity of Jesus a part of that creed, or was it not?

If it was a part of their first creed, and if, from the very beginning, they were taught to believe, that the author of the religion which they embraced was a divine personage; then they must, according to your hypothesis, have been, from the very beginning, taught to believe a falsehood; and, instead of embracing Christianity in its genuine purity, embraced it with a capital corruption. The Saviour had commanded his disciples "to teach all nations" his gospel, and promised to send them "the spirit of truth," for the purpose of enabling them to teach it uncontaminated. But where was the utility of such a precept, the force of such a promise, the accomplishment of so momentous a commission, if the gospel, in its progress and propagation over the world, was to carry along with it so mortal a contagion, as you  
take



take to be the doctrine of the divinity? If the salutary waters of life were thus to flow infected from their source, why was it at all opened? If the consequence of preaching the gospel to all nations, was to make all nations, virtually at least, idolators, better, it should seem, it were, that it had not been preached.

If, on the other hand, the divinity of Jesus was *not* a part of the creed of nations when profelyted to Christianity, but a novel heretical opinion posteriorly substituted, no one can tell when, to the true faith, the non-divinity of Jesus; by what wonderful fascination was it effected, that this spurious, supposititious bantling came to be received into the bosom of every church of Christendom, while the genuine offspring of the apostles was, by all the churches of Christendom, considered and abhorred as a bastard? I was well acquainted with a woman who, in consequence of a severe nervous fever, had

her



her ideas so perverted, that she called *black white*, and *white black*, *good evil*, and *evil good*, a *boy a girl*, and a *girl a boy*, *to-morrow yesterday*, and *yesterday to-morrow*, &c. and in that state she continued all the remaining part of her life, yet always consistent in her new nomenclature, and going about her household affairs with as much address and dexterity as before. One would be apt to think that such a revolution must have happened here; that some unaccountable paralytic disorder had, at once, seized the professors of Christianity, and that the doctrine of the divinity had, like an electric shock, been, by some invisible chain or other, instantaneously communicated to them all, and so effectually communicated as to hide from themselves even the knowledge of their ever having believed the contrary; for, without such a convulsion, is it comprehensible that they could ever have so universally changed their first belief?—a belief  
so



so plain, so plausible, so little calculated to be a scandal to the Jew, or a stumbling-block to the Gentile; for a belief to which none of these predicaments belong; a belief which flesh and blood could not reveal; and which you yourself make no scruple to affirm to be, in any mode of explaining it, either downright nonsense, or an improbability little less revolting to the human mind than a manifest contradiction. Yet, astonishing to tell! we here find the deputies of all the Christian churches bearing testimony to this "revolting improbability," as to a portion of the sacred deposit of faith which they had received from their fathers; and we hear "Parthians, and Medes, and "Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judea, and in Cappadocia, "in Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and Lybia, strangers of "Rome, Cretes and Arabians," Gauls and Iberians, Celts and Scythians, Greeks and Barba-



Barbarians "speaking" in their respective "tongues;" not "the wonderful things of "God," as erst on the day of Pentecost, but uttering, with one voice, a most pernicious heresy, for the sound doctrine of Christ and his apostles!

Another circumstance that makes the testimony of the Nicean fathers the more incontestable and conclusive, is the keenness with which the Arian party, at first, defended their opinions, the reluctance and modifications with which some gave them up, and the obstinacy with which others maintained them after the Nicean decision. They certainly never shewed any inclination to side with the Athanasians, or to lean that way, but as far as stubborn conviction obliged them: and they seem to have been in much the same disposition with Luther, when he wished to find some plausible argument against certain popish doctrines, merely in despite of the Pope and popery; but the



Scriptures appeared to him so decisive in their favour, that he could not for his soul get over them. So nothing could, in all appearance, have kept the Arians from going farther lengths from the Athanasians than they did, but the conscientiousness that they could, on secure ground, go no farther.

The creed of Nicea, then, in as far as it professeth the pre-existence and divinity of the Son of God, was so evidently the doctrine of the universal church, that the boldest of the Arians did not dare to controvert it: Nay, their modification even of that doctrine was by the greater part of the Synod considered as an intolerable blasphemy; on the first hearing of which they shut their ears. What would have been their surprise if a Priestley or Lindsay had started up among them and affirmed, that they were all blasphemers together; that he whom they adored as God, was a mere mortal like themselves; and that the lately deposed

Paul



Paul of Samosata was the only pastor of Christ's flock who held the true faith?

Such, Sir, is the great motive of credibility, which leadeth me to believe that the doctrine of the divinity and pre-existence of Jesus Christ was a tenet of primitive Christianity; for, if it was not a tenet of primitive Christianity, there must have been a period, prior to the Nicean council, when it was accounted an heresy, and when the *non-divinity* was universally taught as the sole orthodox doctrine. Be pleased, then, to point out that period, and prove that it existed; not by negatives, presumptions and arguments *ab improbabili*, but by clear, positive testimony: for, until you do that, I shall always consider the decision of the Nicean synod as an irrefragable proof that the divinity of our Lord was an original article of Catholic faith.

I am



I am far, however, from thinking it the only proof. Were I, independently of it, to form my opinion of the person of Christ from the scattered testimonies of the Antenicean writers, compared with the texts of the New Testament, I should certainly not hesitate to pronounce him more than man: In what precise sense I should understand his Godhead, I might be puzzled to determine; but still I should think his Godhead sufficiently established to claim my assent, as an opinion of the highest probability. In what we call the canonical writings there is not, in my apprehension, a single passage that may not be explained in the trinitarian system; some that seem inexplicable in any other system. In the works of the Antenicean fathers, whether genuine or spurious, there is not, I think, beside the Clementine romance, a single work that speaks directly the language of



Socinianism ; few that speak not a language diametrically opposite ; a single fragment in which the Socinian doctrine is mentioned at all, or not mentioned with marks of disapprobation.

It would not then, I imagine, be a very difficult, though it would be a tedious, task to refute all the arguments, and answer all the objections, which your party have been long employed in collecting from these store-houses, and which you, Sir, have summed up in so masterly a manner in your last great work. With abilities far inferior to yours, I could, if at leisure, erect from the same materials out of which you have reared so specious an edifice, a fabric of a different order, as plausible, I trust, and compact as yours, without being under the suspicious necessity of garbling and rejecting as you have done.



But this task will, I hope, be undertaken by more able and less occupied hands. It may possibly be already executed. For I cannot allow myself to believe that the divinity of Jesus will ever be without defenders, or that its ablest defenders will not be Englishmen: but let its defenders be mild and moderate; let them imitate the conduct of him whose cause they undertake to plead; let not their zeal, however fervent, transport them beyond the bounds of decency and decorum. Their style will not be the less nervous, because it is void of asperity; nor their arguments the less conclusive, because unmixed with injuries. To discover truth is professedly the aim of us all: let us pursue the path that seems the most likely to lead us to her abode with ardour, but not with animosity; and, if we be convinced that we have been happy enough to find it out, let us not insult those who, in our estimation, may have



have been less successful. *Non contumeliis  
et probris vexemus alii alios ; sed honestè positif-  
que præjudiciis, causam disceptemus.* I have  
the honour to be with great sincerity and  
esteem,

Rev. Sir,

Yours, &c.

A. G.

London, Aug. 14, 1787.



## PUBLICATIONS

*By the same* AUTHOR ; *sold by* R. FAULDER,  
*Bond-Street.*

I. PROSPECTUS of a New Translation of the HOLY BIBLE, from corrected Texts of the Original ; with various Readings, Explanatory Notes, and Critical Remarks. Price 7s. 6d.

II. LETTER to the Bishop of London, containing Queries, Doubts, and Difficulties, relative to a New Version of the Scripture ; being an APPENDIX to PROSPECTUS. Price 3s. 6d.

III. LETTER to a Member of Parliament on the CASE of the DISSENTERS, and the Expediency of Repealing Religious Tests. Price 1s.



# PUBLICATIONS

By the same Author; Edited by H. PAULSEN,  
London.

I. Progress of a New Translation of  
the Holy Bible, from corrected Texts of the  
Originals with various Readings, Explanatory  
Notes, and Critical Remarks.

II. Letters to the Editors, containing  
various Questions, replies, and  
five to a letter; being a series of  
an Appendix to the former.

III. Letters to a Member of Parliament  
on the Case of the Dissenters, and the  
Necessity of Repealing Religious Tests.

London.