

testimonia humana, cum precedunt divina suffragia. He applies the term to express the importunity with which the Jews clamored for our Lord's crucifixion, "Importuning with violent and pertinacious suffrages." *Suffragiis violentis et pertinacibus flagitantes.** He uses it to express the joy of the people at the death of Goliath, "they leaped forth into a suffrage of praises,"† and many more such instances may be cited to show that all that is meant by suffrage is the concurrence and good will of the people.

Again, in primitive times the ordination of a Bishop and his election meant the same thing, except that ordination meant sometimes the whole transaction of election, confirmation and consecration. In those days the Bishops had to make wearisome journeys to the city or diocese that wanted a Bishop, and for the most part a Bishop was consecrated by them immediately after his election, not, however, without the consent in writing of a majority of the Provincial Bishops. I cannot agree with Mr. Dawson when he says, "The consent of the absent Bishops could not refer to the person of the candidate, but to the empowering of the Bishops present to act for all; for the reason of the Canon, as Van Espen shews was to prevent secret ordinations." But the consent of a majority was essential to an ordination which was equivalent to an election. Van Espen says, "The Metropolitan together with the Comprovincial Bishops, after having made an examination into the form of the election and concerning the person elected, proceeds to the ordination or consecration, if he found the election canonical, and the person elected fit." *Si personam electam idoneam reperisset.‡* Thus Mr. Dawson's own witness, Van Espen, refutes the assertion that "the consent of the Bishops could not refer to the person of the candidate," and I would submit for Mr. Dawson's consideration whether he be quite accurate in stating that Van Espen shows that the reason of the Canon was to prevent secret ordinations. He simply tells us that such was the opinion of Innocent I., but gives us no opinion of his own. He adds moreover that the 4th Canon of Nicæa "could not be considered one of ordination or consecration only, because the consent of the absent Bishops could add nothing to the form of consecration, but would have

* De Vanitate, p. 16.

† De Zelo, p. 228.

‡ Van Espen, p. 107.