

Reformed Churches, the Scottish especially and the French, have not that which best agreeth with Scripture, the government by bishops, I rather lament the defect than exagitate (reproach), since none without fault may be driven to erect that polity which is best." Again he says: "Where the Church must needs have some ordained; and neither hath nor can have possibly a bishop to ordain; in case of such necessity the ordinary institution of God hath given oftentimes, and may give place." Yet again: "Some do infer that no ordination can stand but only such as is made by bishops. . . . To this we answer that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reasons to allow ordination made without a bishop."—*E.P. VII. xiv., II.*

Fifthly: Hooker expressly asserts the form of Church polity to be a matter of liberty. He insists that all may hold the necessity "of polity and regimen" without holding "one form necessary in all." "Matters of faith," he declares, "necessary to salvation and sacraments, are contained in God's Word. But matters of ceremony, order, Church government, are free, if nothing against them be alleged from Scripture."—*E.P. III., ii., I, 2, etc.*

In corroboration of my representation of Hooker's positions, I will cite three witnesses. The late Bishop Waldegrave, of Carlisle, affirms that Hooker regarded episcopacy as necessary to the *bene esse*, but not to the *esse* of the Church. The writer of the article on Hooker in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* states "Hooker's exact position" to be that "a necessity of polity and regimen may be held in all Churches without holding any form to be necessary." Hallam, in his "Constitutional History," states that Hooker "maintains that no certain form of polity is set down in Scripture as generally indispensable for a Christian Church."

I will also add three testimonies relating not only to