

18th Canon of the Council of Aneyra, A.D. 314, twenty-one years before that of Nicæa. "If any being created Bishops, and not received by that Parish (Diocese) to which they were nominated, choose to proceed to other Parishes, and use violence against the settled (Bishops), and move seditions against them, let them be suspended from Communion." Again, the 18th Canon of the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, provides, "If any Bishop being ordained go not to the Parish for which he was ordained, not through his own fault, but either through the refusal of the people, or for any other cause that arises not from himself, let him partake of the honor and office." It is true this Canon was made seventeen years after the Council of Nicæa, but Bishop Beveridge has made it clear that the Canons of this Council were drawn up in studied imitation of the Apostolic Canons, and are therefore declaratory of long existing usages. It seems then, that it was no uncommon thing for a Diocese to refuse the Bishop appointed over them. Who, then, appointed him? Not the people surely, nor the clergy either who were to be excommunicated for not having taught the people better. There can be no solution of the question but by admitting that he was appointed by the Bishops as provided for by the 4th Canon of Nicæa, subject always to the fundamental maxim that a Bishop should not be given to an unwilling people. Bearing in mind that the Council of Antioch is but a testimony to very early, even to Apostolic usage, let me draw attention to its 16th Canon: It provides that, "If a Bishop without a See, throwing himself upon a vacant Church, usurp the throne without a full Synod, he be rejected *even though the whole people on whom he has intruded choose him*, that is a perfect Synod at which the Metropolitan also is present." The 19th Canon provides, "Let not a Bishop be ordained (elected) without a Synod, and the presence of the Metropolitan, but when he is present, it is better by all means, that all his fellow ministers in the Province be with him, and it is meet that the Metropolitan summon them by letter, and if all come so much better, but if this be difficult, the majority at least by all means ought to be present, or give their consent by letters, and so let the election be made with either the presence or the suffrage of the majority." These Canons prove that even if "the whole people