

Secondly: Hooker's view of the origin of the episcopate, as may be gathered from his statements in the *E.P. VII.*, 11.—too long to quote here. He first followed the view of his great master, Bishop Jewell, that the episcopate arose naturally and without any apostolic sanction out of the presbyterate. Afterwards, he seems to have adopted the opinion that bishops and presbyters were distinct from the outset by apostolic appointment.

Thirdly: Hooker's opinion that it was in the power of the Church to abolish the episcopate. "Bishops, albeit they may assert, with conformity of truth, that their authority hath thus descended from the apostles themselves, yet the absolute and everlasting continuance of it they cannot say that any command of the Lord doth enjoin; and therefore must acknowledge that the Church hath power, by universal consent, upon urgent cause, to take it away. Wherefore, lest bishops forget themselves, as if none on earth had power to touch their states, let them continually bear in mind that it is rather the force of custom whereby the Church, having so long found it good to continue under the requirements of her virtuous bishops, doth still uphold, maintain, and honour them in that respect, than that any such true and heavenly law can be shown, by the evidence whereof it may of a truth appear, that the Lord himself hath appointed presbyters forever to be under the requirements of bishops, in what sort soever they behave themselves. Let this consideration be a bridle unto them; let it teach them not to disdain the advice of their presbyters; but to use their authority with so much greater humility and moderation, as a sword which the Church hath power to take from them."—*E.P. VII.*, 5, 8.

Fourthly: Hooker's view as to the validity of non-episcopal ordinations. He freely allows that the Continental Churches, non-episcopally organized, had a right thus to constitute their polity. "Although," he says, "some