ADVERTISEMENT.

The circumstances under which the present Work appears, seem to require silence rather than explanation. It was commenced several years ago; it was finished and in type before the English Church lost its translator. Immediate duties, and subsequently, long illness, prevented the present writer from doing what little remained to be done, previous to its publication.

A few words must be said upon two or three passages in the notes.

In a part of the note in p. 236, (which from some circumstance this writer did not see while passing through the press,) he thought one statement perplexing, if unexplained. “As Christ was Very God, and had in Him and was Himself in the Holy Spirit from the moment of His Incarnation, the Spirit, of course, did not really descend upon Christ at the Jordan; it was, for our sakes, that He seemed so to do, He being Himself Omnipresent, and so incapable of motion to a place.”

The writer’s objections to this passage were two: 1) in itself, in that it seemed, by its mode of statement, (although, of course, no one who knew the mind of its writer could think this,) to put aside the fact related in Holy Scripture, without substituting any explanation; 2) that it blended two different grounds for denying the “reality” of the descent, one derived from the Person of our Lord upon Whom It descended, the other from the Nature of the Godhead. For this last, “that the Holy Spirit is Omnipresent and so incapable of motion to a place,” would apply equally to any descent of the Holy Ghost, and would make the descent at Pentecost equally unreal. Whereas the doctrine, really intended to be stated, is, that the Holy Spirit did not, after the Baptism, dwell in our Lord in any other way than before, so as to imply that His Manhood before lacked any thing. To obviate these objections the note, p. 386, was written. It may to some not be without its use to state here the received doctrine of the Church in the language of S. Cyril; 1st, negatively; that our Lord Himself did not then receive any Gift or Presence of the Holy Ghost which He had not before; 2nd, positively; that our Blessed Lord, although having the Holy Spirit in Himself, did then, as Man, in a dispensation, receive It, thenceforth in act to overflow to us. One clear statement may suffice, (de rectâ fide, § 34. T 5. p. 2. p. 855. quoted in part by Petav. de Inc. xi. 9. 11.) “We who say that
there is but One Emmanuel and endure not those who separate Him into two Christs, what say we, when ‘the Holy Spirit descended upon Him like a dove and abode upon Him?’ Shall we imagine that the Word from God the Father needed to partake of the Holy Spirit? How should it not be most utterly degrading so to think or speak? For The Spirit is His Own, equally as of God the Father. And so the blessed Paul, ‘Ye are sons, to whom God hath sent the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father! It is impious then even to imagine that he too, the Word from God the Father, needed the communication of the Spirit; and it were exceeding foolish to bestow any pains on what is of such manifest proof. How then did the Spirit descend upon Him? He receiveth It according to His Human Nature, the dispensation with the Flesh well admitting that He should without any disparagement receive It, yea rather necessarily leading thereto. For He receiveth It not so much for Himself as for us; that, since He had withdrawn from those on earth, because the mind of man was diligently set upon evil from his youth, now, descending upon Him, as in a new First-fruit of our race, It might abide, and again rest in us, as having now recovered sinlessness in Christ, and having a life free from all blame. Yet although for us He receives It as Man, see how, as God, He giveth It. For ‘on Whom thou seest,’ He saith, ‘the Spirit descending and abiding upon Him, this is He Who baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.’ But this is a Divine inworking. For our Lord Jesus Christ infuseth into the baptized the Spirit of the Father as His Own.”

On another passage in the last sheet which this writer had not yet been able to read, although the sheets were with him, some observations have been added in a Note at the end, p. 417. And since the translator declined to be responsible for, or to take part in, any alteration, he has been obliged himself to remove an observation at the end of one note, which did not seem to him well-founded. In p. 402. he enlarged the note. (The insertions have been marked by brackets.) In a previous note, p. 229, 30, whose bearing did not seem clear to the Editor of the Library, he substituted a statement which he imaged to express the writer’s meaning, at the same time that he himself wished it to appear that a subject connected with controversy had not been introduced altogether gratuitously. Slight as the change is, he substituted, on this subject, a reference to early volumes of the Library for one to Petavius, lest, by connecting the statements of St. Ephrem with a controversial work, he should seem to recognise the existing practice maintained in the chapters referred to. But, in regard to facts, the Editors pledged themselves from the first to withhold none; and the present writer, believing, as he fully
does, the truth and Divine mission of the English Church, has here, as elsewhere, acted on the principle that no knowledge of facts as to the Ancient Church, to whom she appeals, can any way injure her. He would have been glad, under other circumstances, to have said something as to the differences between the traces of invocation of Saints in the Ancient Church, and modern practice; the circumstances of the present volume, render any thing approaching to controversy, altogether unseemly.

It remains only to pray that, amid all these sorrows, the reverence and humble awe of St. Ephrem may, by God’s mercy, deepen the same spirit in us which He has so mercifully reawakened.

DOMINE, MISERERE.

E.B.P.
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