

ferent persons," but echoes the evil doctrine of ancient date, which marks princes as a sort of higher beings, but which cannot accord with the confession of the free sovereignty of God. The fact that only lately the Duke of Chambord refused to accept the principles of 1789 as flatly as a treaty with the National Assembly, was the outcome of an equally false notion of the divine rights of kings. Even for a prince there cannot be, nor may be, any mention of a *regnum dei gratia*, or *droit divin* in another sense than that in which each of us exercises authority conferred on us, and on the grounds of which, after every recognition of the rights of others, we are still responsible to God.

This likewise shows that the confession of this divine right goes hand in hand with abhorrence of all worship of princes, and severely reproves all cringing before the king. If God alone is sovereign, then are we all, the king included, creatures dependent upon Him, and adoration of royalty and the esteem of princes as beings of a higher sort, are heinous offences committed against the glory of his name. Therefore the Calvinists have always demanded that the king as belonging to a church, should be dealt with as any lay member; and when one of the princes of Condé gave command to begin the battle of Drieux, the field preacher did not shrink from asking him, in the presence of his troops, how he dared to go to war without making confession of the outrage he had committed upon a daughter of one of his officers. And Condé, rather than striking him in the face with his whip, called the outraged father to him, dismounted, and did penance.

This principle of God's sovereignty turns with equal severity against the supremacy of the state. Whether that which belongs to God, is given to prince, parliament, or state makes no difference. The state, as well as the prince, is a creature that owes existence to Him, and therefore may not assume those prerogatives, of which he spake in majesty: