

force in approving an election or nomination." Ordination and election continued to be almost convertible terms into Mediæval times. In the extracts from the laws of the Anglo-Saxons, the election of their kings was called his ordination. In A.D. 787, a Council or Witenagemot enacted, "We enact that in the ordination of kings, no one permit the assent of bad men to prevail, but that kings be elected by the Bishops and Elders of the people." *Sanximus ut in ordinatione regum nullus permittat pravorum prævalere assensum sed reges legitime a sacerdotibus et senioribus populi eligantur.**

But I must now attend to Mr. Dawson's statement that, "In elections or even in ordinations, there is no trace before the Council of Nicæa of the assembly of the Bishops and Metropolitan." Before that date, he says "The Clergy and Laity alone were concerned in elections." The earliest account we have of the manner of appointing Bishops is to be found in St. Clement's letter† to the Corinthians. He was a "fellow labourer with St. Paul," and thus wrote, "The Apostles preaching through countries and cities, constituted their first fruits, (having proved them through the Spirit) Bishops and Deacons of those who should afterwards believe." It need not be said that at this period, neither Clergy nor Laity had anything to do with Episcopal elections, as both nomination and consecration rested with the Apostles. Moreover in the 36th Apostolic Canon we find it provided, "that if any one ordained Bishop should not be received, not according to his own desire, but by reason of the malice of the people, let him remain a Bishop, but let the Clergy of the city be excommunicated because they were not (better) instructors of such a disobedient people." This Canon cannot be later than the middle of the third century, and is probably much older, and it is clear (as Johnson remarks) "that the nomination of the Bishop was not in the people in this age, for how can it be conceived that a Bishop should not be received by the Diocese that had elected him?" But if the nomination was not in the people, with whom did it rest? It may be said that this Canon has no fixed date and is therefore unreliable, but it happens that we have a Canon of a Council whose date is known, very similar to the Apostolic Canon—the

* Stubbs Select Charters, p. 72.

† Patres Apost., Vol. I., p. 144.