

# 11

## Origen and the Election of Bishops

**O**RIGEN'S FULLEST STATEMENT ON the selection of church officers occurs in his *Homily in Numbers* 13.4. The following is a fairly literal translation of the passage:

At the end of his life he prayed to God that He would provide a leader for the people. What are you doing, O Moses? Are not Gersom and Eleazar your sons? Or if you distrust any one of these, are not the sons of your brother great and distinguished men? Why do you not pray to God for them so that He might appoint them leaders of the people? But the leaders in office of the churches should learn not to designate by testimony nor to deliver the leadership of the churches as an inheritance to those who are related to them by blood or are associated with them by fleshly closeness, but to submit to the choice of God and not to choose that one whom human affection commends but to grant entirely to the judgment of God the choice of a successor. Was not Moses able to choose a ruler for the people by a true judgment and to make choice by a correct and just sentence, to whom God had said, "Choose elders for the people, whom you know to be the elders," and he chose such in whom immediately God's "spirit rested, and they all prophesied." Who therefore is able to choose a leader of the people unless Moses was able? But he did not do it, did not choose, did not dare it. Why did he not dare? That he would not leave to posterity an example of presumption. But listen to what he says, "Let the Lord, the

God of spirits and all flesh, provide a man over this congregation, who shall go out and come in before them and who shall lead them forth and lead them back.” If therefore such a one as Moses gives not his judgment in choosing a leader of the people, in appointing a successor, what man would be he who dares to do so, whether of the people who are always accustomed to be moved by shouts for favor or perhaps excited for money, or of the priests themselves who will there be who would judge himself equal to this task, except only him to whom through prayers and petitions it is revealed by God? And just as God says to Moses, “Take to yourself Joshua the son of Nun, a man who has the spirit in him, and lay your hands upon him; and stand him before Eleazar the priest, and command him in the presence of the whole congregation and commission him from yourself before them; and give your honor to him that the children of Israel may hear him.” You hear obviously the ordination of a leader of the people clearly described, so that there is almost no need of exposition. Here there was held no acclamation of the people, no regard of kinship, no consideration of friendship . . . The government of the people is delivered to him whom God chose.<sup>1</sup>

The writings of Origen have been claimed as evidence for election of bishops by the people,<sup>2</sup> choice by presbyters,<sup>3</sup> or joint participation by the community, the clergy and bishops.<sup>4</sup> Both Gore, in order to refute the contention of an unusual situation at Alexandria,<sup>5</sup> and Telfer, in order to support such a claim,<sup>6</sup> have appealed to Origen. Kemp has cast uncertainty on such appeals, inasmuch as Origen’s language is a homiletic contrast between various possibilities and the more spiritual approach which he advocates.<sup>7</sup>

I suggest that Origen’s language, however homiletical it might be, reflects different modes of selection to church office actually practiced in different regions in the third century.

1. The text used is that of Baehrens in *Origenes Werke* 7 (GCS).

2. Göller, “Die Bischofswahl bei Origenes.” Göller recognizes that in practice the influence of the clergy at elections was strong enough that their relatives were often chosen. Origen’s information on the clergy has been assembled by von Harnack, “Der Kirchengeschichtliche Ertrag der Exegetischen Arbeiten des Origenes.”

3. Telfer, “Episcopal Succession in Egypt,” 5.

4. Müller, “Kleine Beiträge zur alten Kirchengeschichte,” 283.

5. Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, 126–29.

6. Telfer, “Episcopal Succession in Egypt,” 5.

7. Kemp, “Bishops and Presbyters at Alexandria,” 129–31.

The *principes* (“leaders”) appear to be bishops, and Origen speaks of their delivering the *principatus* (“leadership”) of the churches to those whom, out of human affection, they have chosen. From the fourth century there comes definite evidence of bishops choosing and ordaining their own successors. Theodoret records that at Alexandria itself Athanasius chose Peter II as his successor: “First, his blessed predecessor had selected (*psēphizō*) him, then both the priests and worthy men gave their concurrence. All the laity demonstrated their pleasure by acclamations . . . The neighboring bishops came together.” He further records an instance of actual ordination in the late fourth century at Antioch:

After him when Evagrius had occupied his see, hostility was still shown to the great Flavianus, notwithstanding the fact that the promotion of Evagrius was a violation of the law of the church, for he had been promoted by Paulinus alone in disregard of many canons. For a dying bishop is not permitted to ordain (*cheirotonein*) another to take his place, and all the bishops of a province are ordered to be convened.<sup>8</sup>

Canon 23 of the Council of Antioch earlier in the century by its prohibition attests the currency of the practice which its decree failed to eliminate: “It shall not be lawful for a bishop to appoint (*kathistan*) another in his place as his successor, even if it happens at the end of his life. And if any such thing is done, the appointment shall be invalid.”<sup>9</sup> The historian Socrates relates that in the 330s Alexander, Bishop of Constantinople, died, without having ordained (*cheirotonēsas*) a successor.<sup>10</sup>

In the light of these passages Origen’s language seems explicit enough to confirm the practice for the third century. It may be possible to adduce further evidence and to locate the origin of the practice in the region of Syria and Palestine when we recall that two of the fourth-century texts were associated with Antioch.

8. Theodoret, *H.E.* 4.20 and 5.23. I follow the Greek text of the second edition of Theodoret in GCS. Cf. Pseudo-Ignatius, *ad Hero* 7–8.

9. Translated from the Greek text of Lanchert, *Die Kanones der wichtigsten alt-kirchlichen Concilien*. This practice may be the occasion for the positive canon requiring the presence of other bishops at ordination (can. 19).

10. *PG* 67:192–93. *Cheirotonein* may have the generalized sense of “appoint” (choose to be a successor), but this seems precluded by the fact that Alexander had named two possibilities. Later in the context the word is used once to mean “elect” and twice to mean “ordain.” For the terminology see Ferguson, “Eusebius and Ordination,” (chap. 12 below).

A set of passages in the Pseudo-Clementines gives a brief statement of the appointment of bishops at various places by Peter. At Tyre “Peter established a church and installed (*katastēsas*) for them a bishop from one of the presbyters who were with him.”<sup>11</sup> The same pattern was followed at Sidon, Beirut, and Laodicea.<sup>12</sup> The choice of a bishop in each instance was a designation by the apostle. Peter was not appointing successors to himself but “apostolic vicars,” as it were, and so made the selection from his personal associates. Puzzling is the fact that these travelling companions are called presbyters. The unlikely circumstance of presbyters travelling with Peter may be explained if the compiler (or his source) is accommodating his narrative to practices with which he was familiar—a bishop choosing and ordaining his successor from the circle of presbyters in his church.

A Jewish background for episcopal ordination of a successor may be found in rabbinic ordination, which would further point to the same geographical region. Rabbinic ordination raised one to an equal status, and customarily only one or two are mentioned as ordained by one rabbi, indicating that the rite was meant to designate the successor to the master’s teaching.<sup>13</sup> There was the difference between a rabbi and a bishop in that the former had a general power of jurisdiction but a bishop was the officer of a given congregation, and it was not for centuries that he could be transferred to another diocese without objection.<sup>14</sup> Still the idea of designating one’s own successor provides a close parallel in the two circumstances.

Belonging to a different category, but perhaps included in Origen’s language, was the practice of a bishop selecting and appointing (*constituere*) the presbyters and lesser clergy of his church. The *Didascalia Apostolorum* from Syria attests this practice, apparently without any participation by the people,<sup>15</sup> contrary to the pattern which generally prevailed.<sup>16</sup>

11. *Hom.* 7.5.3. Translated from the Greek text edited by Rehm for GCS.

12. *Ibid.*, 8.3; 12.2; 20.23.3. These passages all seem to come from a late stage in the reduction of the *Homilies*. Contrast 1 *Clem.* 44.2 where the apostles appointed bishops from the firstfruits of their converts at the locality concerned; see Eusebius *H.E.* 3.37. Origen, *Hom. in Num.* 11.4 refers to the missionary himself becoming the bishop.

13. Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, 2:647ff.; Newman, *Semikah*, 109ff.; and Ferguson, “Jewish and Christian Ordination,” chap. 9 above..

14. Ferguson, “Attitudes to Schism at the Council of Nicaea,” 62.

15. *Didas.* 9 in Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, 96. Chapter 4 (p. 30) does provide for the congregation “to give testimony that he is worthy” in the election of a bishop.

16. Cyprian notes that his practice was to fill positions in the clergy with the approval of the rest of the clergy and of the people, an approval which could be dispensed with in times of emergency (*Ep.* 38.1, 2). The ordination prayer of a presbyter in the

The theme of Origen's discussion is the choice of a church leader (as seen in the frequency of the term *eligere*). Where the bishop did not actually "deliver the leadership" to a successor, he might make his wishes known through a "testimony."<sup>17</sup> A *testimonium* to the worthiness of a person was the clergy's means of proposing a name for election,<sup>18</sup> or of ratifying a previous choice by the people.<sup>19</sup>

The second method of episcopal selection with which Origen shows an acquaintance is that which has been best recognized in the study of the ancient church—an election or acclamation by the people. Origen speaks of "the people who are always accustomed to be moved by shouts for favor or perhaps excited for money" choosing a leader.

Although approval by the people was required even when the selection was made by someone else, direct election by the people themselves was especially characteristic of the Greek East. One of the most graphic accounts is to be found in the *Life* of the third-century Gregory Thaumaturgus by the fourth-century Gregory of Nyssa.<sup>20</sup> According to the narrative the people of Comana invited the missionary Gregory to come and ordain a bishop for them:

When the time came to accomplish their request and proclaim someone of the church their high priest, then the leading men busied themselves to put forward those considered conspicuous in eloquence, in ancestry, and in other things . . . Because the votes were divided and some preferred one and some another, Gregory awaited some counsel from God to come to him concerning one to be appointed . . . As the people presented their several candidates with commendations each in behalf of his choice, he recommended that they look among those of lower station in life . . . One of those presiding at the vote felt pride and irony at such judgment of the great . . . "If you recommend

*Apos. Const.* 8.16 describes the ordinand as "put into the presbytery by the vote and determination of the whole clergy." The sixth canon of Theophilus of Alexandria calls for clerical choice and popular ratification in orders below the bishop.

17. In the circumstance cited by Socrates (and referred to at n. 10 above), Bishop Alexander of Constantinople, although he had not ordained a successor, "had enjoined the proper persons to select one of the two whom he nominated."

18. Note the sequence in Cyprian's statement, "Cornelius was made bishop by the judgment of God and His Christ, by the testimony (*testimonio*) of nearly all the clergy, by the vote of the people who were present, by the company of old priests and good men (the neighboring bishops)" (*Ep.* 55.9).

19. See *Apos. Trad.* 2.2.

20. *Vita S. Greg. Thaum.* in *PG* 46:933ff.

these things, to overlook such who have been chosen from the whole city and to take someone from the lowest ranks for elevation to the priesthood, it is time for you to call Alexander the charcoal-maker to the priesthood. If you say so, we, the whole city, transferring the votes to this one, will agree together.”

Learning that Alexander was really a philosopher who had been converted to Christianity and had taken a lowly occupation in order to secure privacy for his studies, Gregory planned a means of winning popular support for him as bishop. We see here the full arrangements for elections in Greek civil life, including nominations, election-conducting officials, and voting by the people.<sup>21</sup> Voting in the Greek city-states was performed by a show of hands, but we do not know the method in the early church.<sup>22</sup>

Although popular election had its deepest roots in the ancient world in Greek civic and club life,<sup>23</sup> the practice was observed by Jewish communities of the Diaspora in the selection of their archons,<sup>24</sup> and apparently by the Qumran community in selecting certain officials.<sup>25</sup> Election by the Christian community was widespread in the third century, including Rome and North Africa.<sup>26</sup>

When one remembers that the bishop had charge of distributing the charity of the community, it is no surprise that the populace could become “excited for money” at the selection of a bishop. The method of acclamation lent itself to a popular tumult. One of the most vivid pictures of unruliness is that given by Gregory Nazianzen in the oration on the death of his father. The divided populace of Cappadocian Caesarea finally agreed on an unbaptized person and “not in the best of order but with all sincerity” (as Gregory mildly puts it) secured the aid of a band of soldiers and with violence brought their candidate before the bishops for ordination.<sup>27</sup>

21. Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde*, 1:1071. In the *Vita Polyc.* 22, the deacons are sent to the assembled laity to inquire concerning their vote, very much as the herald called for a show of hands in Greek elections.

22. The term *psēphos* is used for vote in the above passage, but the words in this family had long since come to mean “vote” without reference to mode, Siotis, “Die klassische und die christliche Cheirotonie,” 20 (1949) 725ff. and 21 (1950) 459.

23. Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde*, 1000, 1071; Poland, *Geschichte des Griechisch-En Vereinswesens*, 38:417.

24. Krauss, *Synagogale Altertümer*, 152–54.

25. Ferguson, “Qumran and Codex D,” 77; see chap. 10 above.

26. *Apos. Trad.* 2.1; Cyprian, *Ep.* 55.9; 59.5, 6; 68.2; 67.3; 4; for later sources see Optatus, *De schism. Donat.* 1:18; *Gesta apud Zenophilum* 10; Possidius, *Vita S. Augus.* 4.

27. *Or.* 18.33. See “Nectarius was seized by the people and proposed for the episcopate of Constantinople,” Socrates, *H.E.* 5.8.

Sulpicius Severus' *Life of St. Martin of Tours* describes a stormy scene in which the majority laughed down opposition by bishops and some others to the ordination of Martin as bishop.<sup>28</sup> There was a popular demand at Alexandria for Athanasius as bishop, and the ordination was performed "with the acclamations of all."<sup>29</sup> Sometimes the election was unanimous and such was taken as an indication of divine choice.<sup>30</sup> The choice of the people, sensitive to indications of the divine will, was frequently determined by omens. A child's mistaken cry, "Ambrose bishop," set up a popular clamor,<sup>31</sup> and a dove settling on the head of Fabian caused the people to acclaim him "Worthy!" of the bishopric of Rome.<sup>32</sup>

Origen, in discussing Lev 8:4ff., gives two reasons for the presence of the people at an ordination: to be witnesses to the person's character and to prevent any refusal by the people to obey.<sup>33</sup> This would serve as a ratification by the people even if the constitutive choice should have been made by others.

Origen considers, as a third factor, priests who judge themselves the appropriate ones to select a bishop. Here we must face the question of presbyterial election of bishops at Alexandria. The testimony of Jerome, Severus of Antioch and Eutychius of Alexandria to the effect that prior to the fourth century the presbyters of Alexandria elected and ordained a bishop out of their own number contains mutual contradictions but in its substance has not been overthrown.<sup>34</sup>

28. *Vita S. Mart.* 9.

29. Athanasius, *Apol. c. Arian* 6. For popular acclamations at Alexandria see also Theodoret, *H.E.* 4.20.

30. Ambrose, *Ep.* 63.2, "Justly was it believed that he whom all had demanded was elected by the judgment of God."

31. Paulinus, *Vita. S. Antb.* 3.6.

32. Eusebuis, *H.E.* 6.29.

33. *Hom. in Lev.* 6.3. Origen's language is very similar to that used by Cyprian, *Ep.* 67.4. The sixth canon of Theophilus of Alexandria forbids secret ordinations. The ordination liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions* prescribes a public examination of the candidate in which the people are called upon three times to testify to his worthiness before the ordination can proceed (8.4.2ff.). In the *Testament of Our Lord* this is stylized into a formal cry of *Axios* following the ordination prayer.

34. Jerome, *Ep.* 146; Brooks, *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus Patriarch of Antioch*, 2:213; Eutychius in *PG* 111:982. The latest statement of the case and with some new results is by Telfer, "Episcopal Succession in Egypt." Lecuyer has shown the inconsistencies in the three sources in "Le problème"; he has also undertaken a point by point refutation of Telfer in "La succession." He puts too much reliance on *Vita Saturn.* 8 in the *Historia Augusta* for bishops in Egypt at an early date, but more importantly he does not overthrow the main point or offer conclusive evidence against

Jerome's testimony is as follows:

At Alexandria from the time of Mark the Evangelist until Heraclas and Dionysius the presbyters always named (*nominabant*) as bishop one elected out of their own number and placed in a higher rank, just as an army makes an emperor or deacons elect from themselves one whom they know to be diligent and call him archdeacon. For what except ordination does a bishop do that a presbyter does not do?

Both the sentence structure and Jerome's parallels make it clear that nominate means "called" and not "nominate."<sup>35</sup> Thus the presbyters not only elected the bishop but also installed him by seating him in a higher chair and bestowing on him the name "bishop." No separate imposition of hands seems to be indicated.<sup>36</sup>

With the addition of providing for an election by the people, the *Canons of Hippolytus* makes the same points as Jerome in regard to bishops (a higher rank, the name and the power of ordaining).

If now a presbyter is ordained, all things are done with him in the same way as with the bishop, except he is not seated in the chair.

Also in the same way a prayer is prayed over him in all respects like that over a bishop, with the exception only of the name of episcopate.

The bishop in all things is equal to the presbyter except in the name of the chair and in ordination, which power of ordaining is not assigned to the latter.<sup>37</sup>

---

it. His four arguments to challenge the testimony of Jerome are: (1) the silence of Ambrosiaster; (2) the evidence of Origen which we are considering; (3) the possibility that the *Apostolic Tradition* derives from Egypt; and (4) the later idea that it was a heresy to identify presbyters with bishops.

35. Müller, "Kleine Beiträge zur alten Kirchengeschichte," 278.

36. For the importance of seating in the chair, see Ferguson "Jewish and Christian Ordination," 16–19 (see chap. 9 above). Eutychius's account is different: the twelve presbyters elect one of their number and "laying their hands on his head bless him and make him patriarch" and then elect a replacement to keep the number at twelve. Lécuyer, "La succession," 92, suggests that the Arabic may refer to election, not imposition of hands, as in the Latin translation (which I have rendered); but if so, there is a redundant second reference to election in the sentence. Severus simply says that the bishop of Alexandria "was in old times appointed by presbyters" but after Nicaea his institution was performed by bishops.

37. Translated from the Latin version of Haneburg printed by Achelis, "Die Canones Hippolyti." Riedel, *Die Kirchenrechtsquellen des Patriarchats Alexandrien*, 203, gives a briefer rendering of the Arabic into German: "If a presbyter is ordained, the



C. H. Turner has explained the instruction to use the same prayer as for a bishop as the result of a misinterpretation of the *Apostolic Tradition*, which calls for a prayer like that used for a presbyter and then proceeds to give a prayer to be used.<sup>38</sup> The apparent contradiction was solved by the *Canons of Hippolytus* in the simplest way by omitting the prayer altogether. By going one step further, I would raise the question why the compiler chose this alternative. He had a theory of the identity of the two orders save for the power of ordaining, a power which to him was not given through ordination. The development of the parish system could have suggested this theory to him, as it did to Jerome (for whom it was reinforced by study of scripture). But a more immediate basis may have been a recollection of the earlier situation of the Egyptian church. The *Canons of Hippolytus*, therefore, may also be adduced for support of Jerome's testimony.

The Egyptian Monophysite bishop Severus has been appealed to as preserving a more reliable Egyptian tradition than his older contemporary Eutychius.<sup>39</sup> Certain conclusions, however, will emerge from his accounts of the ordination of the patriarchs of Alexandria.<sup>40</sup> The early bishops were only names to the later historian. In describing their appointments he stresses the selection by the people and generally mentions the presence of other bishops (but he gives incidental confirmation that Demetrius was the first bishop of Alexandria to appoint other bishops).<sup>41</sup> These statements follow the same pattern as the formulas announcing the appointment of fourth-century patriarchs. The conclusion which presents itself is that Severus made up the earlier accounts according to his knowledge of later practice. Demetrius was the first bishop of whom Severus had historical knowledge, and this is through Eusebius. But it is to be noted that with Demetrius there is a series of bishops for whom no details are supplied for their appointment. It hardly seems accidental that the first bishops for whom details of their lives are known are

same things are done as with a bishop, with the exception of the word 'bishop.' The bishop is in every relationship like the presbyter, except for the throne and ordination, for no power to ordain is given to the presbyter." A French version is given by Coquin, *Les Canons d'Hippolyte*.

38. Turner, "The Ordination Prayer for a Presbyter in the Church Order of Hippolytus." Turner's solution is rejected by Barlea, *Die Weihe der Bischöfe, Presbyter, und Diakone in Vornicänischer Zeit*, 229.

39. Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, 37; Lecuyer, "La probleme"; and Lecuyer, "La succession," 83.

40. English translation by Evetts in *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria*, I/2, 4.

41. *Ibid.*, 153.

those for whom the least is recorded about their ordination. The first of the “historical” bishops details of whose appointment are given is Peter I; and with the addition of a selection by his predecessor the account corresponds exactly to the Jerome–Eutychius version of episcopal consecration at Alexandria.<sup>42</sup> Severus has apparently reproduced a source contrary to his own principles at this point.

Telfer’s reconstruction of the ceremony by which the Alexandrian bishops entered office ascribes a central place to the action of the bishop-elect in lifting the hand of the dead predecessor and placing it on his head.<sup>43</sup> The principal evidence for this comes from Liberatus in describing the rivalry of Theodosius and Gaianus to succeed the Monophysite Timothy III in 536. He relates that nothing appeared so decisive to either rival as the touch of the dead man’s hand and the transfer of the pallium of St. Mark.<sup>44</sup> A connection may be observed between this and the language of the Egyptian Severus. From the bishops at the end of the third century forward Severus makes a point of recording the dying bishop’s choice of a successor. Is the touch of the dead man’s hand in Liberatus’ account meant to take the place of such a choice?

A problem in Origen’s passage remains: does “priest” mean “presbyter” here? The translator uses *sacerdos*, which in third-century Latin (so in Cyprian) normally means bishop. On the other hand, Origen speaks of the presbyters as priests,<sup>45</sup> and his translator elsewhere uses *pontifex* where the bishop is meant.<sup>46</sup> Understanding Origen’s priests in our text passage as presbyters fits his testimony neatly into the picture drawn by the later evidence.

There is a parallel to this Alexandrian Christian practice in the priestly colleges and sodalities of Rome which filled their ranks by cooption and elected from their membership *magistri* to preside over their functions.<sup>47</sup>

42. “When Abbe Theonas, the patriarch, went to his rest, the clergy of Alexandria assembled with the people and laid their hands upon Peter the priest, his son and disciple, and seated him upon the episcopal throne of Alexandria” (ibid., 383). Even Eutychius’ number twelve for the presbyters at Alexandria may reflect an old tradition. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 6.13.107, understands the twenty-four elders of the Apocalypse as representing twelve Jewish and twelve gentile (Christian?) elders; and see the twelve elders of the Pseudo-Clementine *Hom.* 11.36.2.

43. Telfer, “Episcopal Succession in Egypt,” 10.

44. *PL* 68:1036–37.

45. *Hom. Jer.* 12:3: *en toutois tois hierousi (dieknumi de tous presbyterious emas).*

46. *Hom. in Lev.* 6.3.

47. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 487, 495.

Nearer to hand, the Great Sanhedrin, and presumably the lesser sanhedrins of the Jews, practiced cooption.<sup>48</sup> The gerousiarch of Jewish inscriptions at Rome may have been selected by his fellow elders to his position as president of the *gerousia* or council.<sup>49</sup> Much to be desired would be information relative to the selection of members of the ruling council of Alexandrian Jewry.<sup>50</sup> It would be reasonable to suppose that the Christian community there followed the precedents of the ruling body of the Jews.

Whatever method of selection is employed—by the bishop, by the people, by the presbyters—Origen advocates that divine guidance be sought in prayer. He prefers choice to be made by a spiritual man to whom the will of God has been revealed in answer to prayer.<sup>51</sup> It is to be God's judgment or decision.<sup>52</sup> Origen thus picks up the theme of inspired or prophetic designations which occur in the New Testament.<sup>53</sup> He further enunciates the principal doctrinal interpretation of ordination in the ancient church, namely that the selection of a bishop is God's action.<sup>54</sup>

48. *m. Sanhedrin* 4.3, 4; *b. Sanhedrin* 17b.

49. Frey, "Les communautés Juives a Rome," 136.

50. The meager evidence is in Tcherikover and Fuks, eds., *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, 1:10, 57, 101.

51. *Hom. in Josh.* 23.2 comments about the selection of a successor to Judas: "Seeing that prayer precedes, the lot is not by chance but leads to a divine choice by providence."

52. Origen's word *iudicium* is also Cyprian's in the passage cited in n. 18; see also *Ep.* 59.5 and 68.2 and Ambrose in the passage cited in note 30.

53. Acts 13:1-3; 1 Tim 1:18; 4:14. See Clement of Alexandria, *Quis dives* 42.

54. Cyprian, *Ep.* 48.3; 55.9; 61.3; *Vita S. Mart.* 9; Eusebius, *H.E.* 6.29; Theodoret, *H.E.* 4.7.4.