

**WHAT IS THE TRUTH AS TO EVERLASTING
PUNISHMENT? PART II. BEING AN HISTORICAL
INQUIRY INTO THE WITNESS AND WEIGHT OF
CERTAIN ANTI-ORIGENIST COUNCILS. IN
REPLY TO DR. PUSEY'S
LATE TREATISE "WHAT IS OF FAITH AS TO
EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT?"**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649732852

What is the Truth as to Everlasting Punishment? Part II. Being an Historical Inquiry Into the Witness and Weight of Certain Anti-Origenist Councils. In Reply to Dr. Pusey's Late Treatise "What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?" by F. Nutcombe Oxenham

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

F. NUTCOMBE OXENHAM

**WHAT IS THE TRUTH AS TO EVERLASTING
PUNISHMENT? PART II. BEING AN HISTORICAL
INQUIRY INTO THE WITNESS AND WEIGHT OF
CERTAIN ANTI-ORIGENIST COUNCILS. IN
REPLY TO DR. PUSEY'S
LATE TREATISE "WHAT IS OF FAITH
AS TO EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT?"**

WHAT IS THE TRUTH
AS TO
EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT?

PART II.

BEING AN HISTORICAL INQUIRY INTO THE WITNESS
AND WEIGHT OF CERTAIN ANTI-ORIGENIST COUNCILS.

IN REPLY TO
DR. PUSEY'S LATE TREATISE
"WHAT IS OF FAITH AS TO EVERLASTING
PUNISHMENT?"

BY THE REV.
F. NUTCOMBE OXENHAM, M.A.



LONDON:
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH & CO., 1, PATERNOSTER SQUARE.

1882.

130. f. 155.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTORY.

	PAGE
What has been already done in this controversy—Testimony of the early Fathers shown to be uncertain	1
Propositions already proved, viz :—	
(i.) Use of ambiguous Scriptural phrases by early writers no proof that they meant what controversialists now mean—Nothing to show that early writers had faced this controversy.	
(ii.) Endless punishment not commonly taught till middle of third century, and then on false grounds.	
(iii.) The language of the Fathers inconsistent, and sometimes contradictory.	
(iv.) Some of the greatest of the Eastern Fathers denied the doctrine of Everlasting Punishment, and were never blamed.	
(v.) The larger hope taught in the three great schools of divinity in the East.	
(vi.) None of the General Councils acknowledged by the Church of England condemned this " Hope."	
(vii.) At the first three, and probably at the last, of these General Councils, those were received with honour who on this point agreed with Origen.	
(viii.) History of first five centuries proves—(1) That endless punishment was by some not believed, by others held as an opinion ; (2) That, as an opinion, it was held on false grounds ; (3) That it was never laid down by any General Council, nor by any Local Council, whose decrees were generally accepted.	
This last historical question now to be considered	2
II.	a 3

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
THE SUPPOSED CONDEMNATION OF ORIGEN BY SOME LOCAL SYNODS PREVIOUS TO THE FIFTH GENERAL COUNCIL—Much labour bestowed to prove that Origen was condemned by Fifth Council—This not decisive of present question	9
Did Origen hold Restitution only "as an opinion," and in submission to the Church? If so, he was unjustly dealt with	10
Dr. Pusey charging with gross iniquity those Councils which he asks us to receive and honour—Dr. Pusey's two propositions: <i>first</i> , that Origen's errors were sufficiently and decisively condemned before the date of the Fifth Council; <i>secondly</i> , that the Fifth Council condemned these errors in detail anew, though such a condemnation was perfectly useless—The evident improbability of this	11
What took place at the <i>Synod of Diospolis</i> —The charge against Pelagius, and his defence—The acquittal of Pelagius no condemnation of Origen—No "fact brought out," except the opinion of S. Augustine—The <i>Synod of Diospolis</i> unworthy of any respect	12
The three decisive condemnations—The difficulty of "having no acts"—Dr. Pusey refers to certain writings of Theophilus, S. Jerome, and Epiphanius; but none of these afford him any support	17
<i>Synod at Alexandria</i> —There are no acts of this <i>Synod</i> —Its proceedings elaborately related by Theophilus; but no mention of the doctrine of the Restoration of Mankind, either here or in any other record of this <i>Synod</i>	21
<i>Synod in Cyprus</i> , merely asked to subscribe to the letter of Theophilus—No evidence that they did this—Sentence of this <i>Synod</i> carried to <i>Synod</i> at Constantinople, and there disagreed with and set aside	25
<i>Synod in Rome</i> —Probably no <i>Synod</i> at all, but only the Pope acting by himself—Nothing more here than an agreement to the letter of Theophilus of Alexandria	27
Conclusions resulting from history of these three supposed decisive condemnations are entirely adverse to Dr. Pusey's contention	29

CHAPTER II.

	PAGE
THE FIFTH GENERAL COUNCIL—Improbability that the Council should have consented to re-open a question already decisively settled	33
Two questions—1. Was Origen condemned by the Fifth Council at all? 2. If so, was he merely condemned generally as "a heretic," or were his errors condemned specifically in detail?	35
As to the first of these questions, Dr. Pusey's incorrect assertion—Reasons for supposing Origen's name to have been fraudulently inserted in the Eleventh Canon of the Fifth Council	36
As to the second question, Dr. Pusey says that the defenders of Origen "have directed their attention to bye-issues"—Some of these are not "bye-issues" at all, but just the pith of the question in controversy, <i>i. e.</i> Were the nine Canons recorded by Evagrius passed by the Fifth Council, or by some other Synod, or by no Synod at all?	41

CHAPTER III.

DR. PUSEY'S ARGUMENTS AND AUTHORITIES IN FAVOUR OF THE VIEW THAT THESE NINE ANATHEMAS BELONG TO THE FIFTH GENERAL COUNCIL—"Three contemporary writers," who assert that Origen's errors were condemned in detail, and that Didymus and Evagrius were condemned with Origen—Dr. Pusey's inferences unwarranted	44
1. Cyril of Scythopolis—He only asserts that the Fifth Council passed a general anathema upon Origen and others, so far as Dr. Pusey quotes him: but elsewhere he testifies plainly that it was the Home Synod, and not the Fifth Council, which condemned Origen's errors in detail	44
2. Evagrius, the historian—Dr. Pusey assumes that what he quotes relates to the Fifth Council only—Evagrius' own	

	PAGE
words show that this is not so: but if it were so, it would prove nothing for Dr. Pusey, because Evagrius does not mention the doctrine that future punishment will come to an end, as one which was at any time condemned—Evagrius mentions the fourteen genuine Canons of the Fifth Council: he knows nothing of Dr. Pusey's "nine specific Anathemas"—The saying attributed to Theodorus Ascidas	48
3. <i>Victor of Tunnum</i> , an obscure chronicler—In his chronicle for the year 505, he calls Eutyshius "the condemner of the three chapters, and of Evagrius and Didymus"—This does not imply that all were condemned at the same time—Victor, in his chronicle for the year 553, relates what the Fifth Council, then assembled, did, but makes no mention of any sort of condemnation of Origen, or of Evagrius, or of Didymus—Dr. Pusey's statement about Victor doubly inaccurate	51
These "three contemporary writers" do not then bear out Dr. Pusey's statements—He calls eleven more witnesses, who must be heard, though only two of them say anything about the doctrine now in question	55
4. <i>Maximus of Aquileia</i> —His words here quoted are mere incidental reference, and not the expression of his own opinion: moreover, the words are evidently incorrect	55
5. The Emperor <i>Heractius</i> —His "profession" not fairly quoted—Does not say that Origen was condemned by the Fifth Council at all—What "Confirmation" was	57
6. <i>The Lateran Council</i> of 649 A.D. mentions condemnation of Origen, but not any "detailed proceedings"—Refers to general condemnation by Eleventh Canon—Knows nothing of "nine specific anathemas"	58
7. <i>Sophronius of Jerusalem</i> —Statement quoted evidently incorrect—His whole letter a violent, inflated tirade	60
8. <i>An Imperial Edict</i> , read in Sixth Council—Edict not accurately quoted—Dr. Pusey inserts an important word—Edict evidently refers to Home Synod under Mennas	62
9. Epistle of <i>Leo II.</i> —Leo does not say that it was the Fifth Council which condemned Origen, as we may see from the whole passage, of which Dr. Pusey quotes only a part	64

Table of Contents.

ix

	PAGE
10. <i>Epistle of Tarasius</i> , certainly relates condemnation of Origen, Didymus, and Evagrius, by Fifth Council—Reason for concluding that he had before him the history of another Synod, not the Fifth Council	67
11. <i>The Definition of the Second Council of Nice</i> —This is no more than a repetition of the last witness—The records of this Council, moreover, are very imperfect	69
12. <i>A Profession by a Bishop of Rome</i> —He too says that Origen, Didymus, and Evagrius were condemned by the Fifth Council: but this he says also of others, who beyond doubt, were condemned <i>not</i> by the Fifth Council	70
13. <i>Photius</i> —Two extracts from his writings: one a mere reference to guide research: the other a distinct piece of evidence, but of what value?—Some significant mistakes ...	72
14. <i>Nicephorus</i> —The claim of Nicephorus to be believed—What Perennés and Huet say of him—Dr. Pusey says he had “The Acts” of the Fifth Council: Nicephorus himself says otherwise—He records condemnation of many strange doctrines, but not that of Restitution, as now held—What were the “nine specific anathemas” which he mentions?—His evidence wholly worthless	77

CHAPTER IV.

DR. PUSEY'S OWN ADMISSIONS WHICH TELL AGAINST HIS VIEW THAT ORIGEN'S ERRORS WERE CONDEMNED IN DETAIL BY THE FIFTH COUNCIL— <i>First</i> , the <i>a priori</i> improbability that the Fifth Council should have re-opened a controversy which, on Dr. Pusey's showing, had been already finally settled	85
<i>Second</i> , Dr. Pusey's admission that the Letter of Justinian, commanding the Council, was addressed to Mennas	87
<i>Third</i> , the testimony of “the Roman copy” of the Acts of the Fifth Council read in the Lateran Synod, which Dr. Pusey says is “decisive”	88

CHAPTER V.

	PAGE
SOME AUTHORITIES AND SOME FACTS OPPOSED TO DR. PUSEY'S VIEW.—(i.) <i>Cave</i> , who examines this controversy and shows how the confusion arose between the Acts of the Home Synod and of the Fifth Council—His witness shows: (1) That Origen was not condemned at all by the Fifth Council, unless it were generally by the insertion of his name in the Eleventh Canon; (2) That the "detailed proceedings" against him, which Dr. Pusey ascribes to the Fifth Council, are clearly proved not to belong to that Council; (3) That the "nine specific anathemas," which also Dr. Pusey attributes to the Fifth Council, were not the Canons of that Council, or of any other Council, but merely forms proposed by Justinian to the Home Synod	92
(ii.) <i>Gernorius</i> , who has gone into this at great length—He gives reasons for believing that the records of several local Synods were confused with those of the Fifth General Synod—He sums up in five propositions: (1) That the errors of Origen were examined by some Synod; (2) That by the Fifth General Council they were not examined; (3) That by that General Council Origen was condemned <i>generally</i> by the Eleventh Canon; (4) That the case of Origen was entertained at several local Synods; (5) That at the Synod, sometimes spoken of as the Fifth Council, the errors of Origen were examined and adjudicated upon: that this Synod was in reality the Home Synod of 543 A.D.	97
(iii.) <i>Hefelé</i> , who holds that "it is no longer possible to arrive at complete certainty on this question," but thinks that he "has represented things in their true light"—His representation is directly opposed to that of Dr. Pusey on every one of the main points at issue: (1) On the authenticity of Canon XL; (2) On the supposed condemnation of Origen's errors by the Fifth Council; (3) On the origin of the "nine specific anathemas"... ..	101
<i>Three Writers</i> to whom Dr. Pusey refers as having supplied him with information upon which his conclusions in this controversy rest—What were the views of these writers themselves?—(1) <i>Cardinal Noris</i> —Perplexed by an historical difficulty, is	