

LEX, REX  
OR  
THE LAW AND THE PRINCE



*Samuel Rutherford*

**LEX, REX**  
**OR**  
**THE LAW AND THE PRINCE**



*Samuel Rutherford*

**Lex, Rex**  
**The Law and the Prince**  
**by Samuel Rutherford**

A DISPUTE FOR  
THE JUST PREROGATIVE OF KING AND PEOPLE:  
CONTAINING  
THE REASONS AND CAUSES OF THE MOST NECESSARY DEFENSIVE  
WARS OF THE KINGDOM OF SCOTLAND,  
AND OF THEIR  
EXPEDITION FOR THE AID AND HELP OF THEIR DEAR BRETHERN  
OF ENGLAND;  
IN WHICH THEIR INNOCENCY IS ASSERTED, AND A FULL ANSWER  
IS GIVEN TO A SEDITIOUS PAMPHLET, ENTITULED,  
"SACRO-SANCTA REGUM MAJESTAS,"  
OR  
THE SACRED AND ROYAL PREROGATIVE OF CHRISTIAN KINGS;  
UNDER THE NAME OF J. A., BUT PENNED BY  
JOHN MAXWELL, THE EXCOMMUNICATE POPISH PRELATE;  
WITH A SCRIPTURAL CONFUTATION OF THE RUINOUS GROUNDS  
OF W. BARCLAY, H. GROTIUS, H. ARNISÆU, ANT. DE DOMI. POPISH  
BISHOP OF SPALATO, AND OF OTHER LATE ANTI-MAGISTRICAL  
ROYALISTS, AS THE AUTHOR OF OSSORIANUM, DR FERNE, E.

SYMMONS, THE DOCTORS OF ABERDEEN, ETC.

IN FORTY-FOUR QUESTIONS

BY THE

REV. SAMUEL RUTHERFORD

SOMETIME PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ST.  
ANDREWS.

"But if you shall still do wickedly, ye shall be consumed, both ye and your  
king."—1 SAM. 12:25

EDINBURGH:

ROBERT OGLE AND OLIVER & BOYD

M. OGLE & SON AND WILLIAM COLLINS, GLASGOW

D. DEWAR, PERTH. A. BROWN & CO., ABERDEEN. W. M'COMB,  
BELFAST

HAMILTON, ADAMS & CO., AND JAMES NISBET & CO., LONDON

MDCCCXLIII

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

[SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF RUTHERFORD](#)

[AUTHOR'S PREFACE](#)

[QUESTION I: Whether government be by a divine law](#)

How government is from God.—Civil power, in the root, immediately from God.

## QUESTION II: Whether or no government be warranted by the law of nature

Civil society natural in radice, in the root, voluntary in modo, in the manner.—Power of government, and power of government by such and such magistrates, different.—Civil subjection not formally from nature's laws.—Our consent to laws penal, not antecedently natural.—Government by such rulers, a secondary law of nature.—Family government and politic different.—Government by rulers a secondary law of nature; family government and civil different.—Civil government, by consequent, natural.

## QUESTION III: Whether royal power and definite forms of government be from God

That kings are from God, understood in a fourfold sense.—The royal power hath warrant from divine institution.—The three forms of government not different in specie and nature.—How every form is from God.—How government is an ordinance of man, 1 Pet. 2:13.

## QUESTION IV: Whether or no the king be only and immediately from God, and not from the people

How the king is from God, how from the people.—Royal power three ways in the people.—How royal power is radically in the people.—The people maketh the king.—How any form of government is from God.—How government is a human ordinance, 1 Pet. 2:3.—The people create the king.—Making a king, and choosing a king, not to be distinguished.—David not a king formally, because anointed by God.

## QUESTION V: Whether or no the P. Prelate proveth that sovereignty is immediately from God, not from, the people

Kings made by the people, though the office, in abstracto, were immediately from God.—The people have a real action, more than approbation, in making a king.—Kinging of a person ascribed to the people.—Kings in a special manner are from God, but it followeth not; therefore, not from the people.—The place, Prov. 8:15, proveth not but

kings are made by the people.—Nebuchadnezzar, and other heathen kings, had no just title before God to the kingdom of Judah, and divers other subdued kingdoms.

QUESTION VI: Whether or no the king be so alien from both, in regard of sovereignty and designation of his person, as he is noway from the people, but only by mere approbation

The forms of government not from God by an act of naked providence, but by his approving will.—Sovereignty not from the people by sole approbation.—Though God have peculiar acts of providence in creating kings, it followeth not hence that the people maketh not kings.—The P. Prelate exponeth prophecies true only of David, Solomon, and Jesus Christ, as true of profane heathen kings.—The P. Prelate maketh all the heathen kings to be princes, anointed with the holy oil of saving grace.

QUESTION VII: Whether the P. Prelate conclude that neither constitution nor designation of kings is from the people

The excellency of kings maketh them not of God's only constitution and designation.—How sovereignty is in the people, how not.—A community doth not surrender their right and liberty to their rulers, so much as their power active to do, and passive to suffer, violence.—God's loosing of the bonds of kings, by the mediation of the people's despising him, proveth against the P. Prelate that the Lord taketh away, and giveth royal majesty mediately, not immediately.—The subordination of people to kings and rulers, both natural and voluntary; the subordination of beasts and creatures to man merely natural.—The place, Gen. 9:5, "He that sheddeth man's blood," &c. discussed.

QUESTION VIII: Whether or no the P. Prelate proveth, by force of reason, that the people cannot be capable of any power of government

In any community there is an active and passive power to government.—Popular government is not that wherein the whole people are governors.—People by nature are equally indifferent to all the three governments, and are not under any one by nature.—The P. Prelate denieth the Pope his father to be the antichrist.—The bad success of kings chosen by people

proveth nothing against us, because kings chosen by God had bad success through their own wickedness.—The P. Prelate condemneth king Charles' ratifying (Parl. 2, an. 1641) the whole proceedings of Scotland in this present reformation.—That there be any supreme judges is an eminent act of divine providence, which hindereth not but that the king is made by the people.—The people not patients in making a king, as is water in the sacrament of baptism, in the act of production of grace.

QUESTION IX: Whether or no sovereignty is so in and from the people, that they may resume their power in time of extreme necessity

How the people is the subject of sovereignty.—No tyrannical power is from God.—People cannot alienate the natural power of self-defence.—The power of parliaments.—The Parliament hath more power than the king.—Judges and kings differ.—People may resume their power, not because they are infallible, but because they cannot so readily destroy themselves as one man may do.—That the sanhedrim punished not David, Bathsheba, Joab, is but a fact, not a law.—There is a subordination of creatures natural, government must be natural; and yet this or that form is voluntary.

QUESTION X: Whether or not royal birth be equivalent to divine unction

Impunged by eight arguments.—Royalty not transmitted from father to son.—A family may be chosen to a crown as a single person is chosen, but the tie is conditional in both.—The throne, by special promise, made to David and his seed, by God, (Psal. 89,) no ground to make birth, in foro Dei, a just title to the crown.—A title by conquest to a throne must be unlawful, if birth be God's lawful title.—Royalists who hold conquest to be a just title to the crown, teach manifest treason against king Charles and his royal heirs.—Only, bona fortunæ, not honour or royalty, properly transmittable from father to son.—Violent conquest cannot regulate the consciences of people to submit to a conqueror as their lawful king.—Naked birth is inferior to that very divine unction, that made no man a king without the people's election.—If a kingdom were by birth the king might sell it.—The crown is the patrimony of the kingdom, not of him who is king, or of his father.—Birth a typical designment to the crown in Israel.—The choice of a family to the crown, resolveth upon the free

election of the people as on the fountain cause.—Election of a family to the crown lawful.

QUESTION XI: Whether or no he be more principally a king who is a king by birth, or he who is a king by the free election of the people

The elective king cometh nearer to the first king. (Deut. 17)—If the people may limit the king, they give him the power.—A community have not power formally to punish themselves.—The hereditary and the elective prince in divers considerations, better or worse, each one than another.

QUESTION XII: Whether or no a kingdom may lawfully be purchased by the sole title of conquest

A Twofold right of conquest.—Conquest turned in an after-consent of the people, becometh a just title.—Conquest not a signification to us of God's approving will.—Mere violent domineering contrary to the acts of governing.—Violence hath nothing in it of a king.—A bloody conqueror not a blessing, per se, as a king is.—Strength as prevailing is not law or reason.—Fathers cannot dispose of the liberty of posterity not born.—A father, as a father, hath not power of life and death. Israel and David's conquests of the Canaanites, Edomites, Ammonites not lawful, because conquest, but upon a divine title of God's promise.

QUESTION XIII: Whether or no royal dignity have its spring from nature, and how it is true "Every man is born free," and how servitude is contrary to nature

Seven sorts of superiority and inferiority.—Power of life and death from a positive law.—A dominion antecedent and consequent.—Kings and subjects no natural order.—A man is born, consequenter, in politic relation.—Slavery not natural from four reasons.—Every man born free in regard of civil subjection (not in regard of natural, such as of children and wife, to parents and husband) proved by seven arguments.—Politic government how necessary, how natural.—That parents should enslave their children not natural.

QUESTION XIV: Whether or no the people make a person their king



[conditionally or absolutely; and whether the king be tyed by any such covenant](#)

The king under a natural, but no civil obligation to the people, as royalists teach.—The covenant civilly tyeth the king proved by Scriptures and reasons, by eight arguments.—If the condition, without which one of the parties would never have entered into covenant, be not performed, that party is loosed from the covenant.—The people and princes are obliged in their places for justice and religion, no less than the king.—In so far as the king presseth a false religion on the people, eatenus, in so far they are understood not to have a king.—The covenant giveth a mutual co-active power to king and people to compel each other, though there be not one on earth higher than both to compel each of them.—The covenant bindeth the king as king, not as he is a man only.—One or two tyrannous acts deprive not the king of his royal right.—Though there were no positive written covenant (which yet we grant not) yet there is a natural, tacit, implicit covenant tying the king, by the nature of his office.—If the king be made king absolutely, it is contrary to Scripture and the nature of his office.—The people given to the king as a pledge, not as if they became his own to dispose of at his absolute will.—The king could not buy, sell, borrow, if no covenant should tie him to men.—The covenant sworn by Judah (2 Chron. 15) tyed the king.

[QUESTION XV: Whether the king be univocally, or only analogically and by proportion, a father](#)

Adam not king of the whole earth because a father.—The king a father metaphorically and improperly, proved by eight arguments.

[QUESTION XVI: Whether or no a despotical or masterly dominion agree to the king, because he is king](#)

The king hath no masterly dominion over the subjects as if they were his servants, proved by four arguments.—The king not over men as reasonable creatures to domineer.—The king cannot give away his kingdom or his people as if they were his proper goods.—A violent surrender of liberty tyeth not.—A surrender of ignorance is in so far involuntarily as it oblige not.—The goods of the subjects not the king's,

proved by eight arguments.—All the goods of the subjects are the king's in a fourfold sense.

QUESTION XVII: Whether or no the prince have properly the fiduciary or ministerial power of a tutor, husband, patron, minister, head, master of a family, not of a lord or dominator

The king a tutor rather than a father as these are distinguished.—A free community not properly and in all respects a minor and pupil.—The king's power not properly marital and husbandly.—The king a patron and servant.—The royal power only from God, *immediatione simplicis constitutionis, et solum solitudine causæ primæ*, but not *immediatione applicationis dignitatis ad personam*.—The king the servant of the people both objectively and subjectively.—The Lord and the people by one and the same act according to the physical relation maketh the king.—The king head of the people metaphorically only, not essentially, not univocally, by six arguments.—His power fiduciary only.

QUESTION XVIII: What is the law or manner of the king (1 Sam. 8:9, 11) discussed fully

The power and the office badly differenced by Barclay.—What is *משפת המלך* the manner of the king, by the harmony of interpreters, ancient and modern, protestants and papists.—Crying out (1 Sam. 8) not necessarily a remedy of tyranny, nor a praying with faith and patience.—Resisting of kings that are tyrannous, and patience, not inconsistent.—The law of the king not a permissive law, as was the law of divorcement.—The law of the king (1 Sam. 12:23, 24) not a law of tyranny.

QUESTION XIX: Whether or no the king be in dignity and power above the people

In what consideration the king is above the people, and the people above the king.—A mean, as a mean, inferior to the end, how it is true.—The king inferior to the people.—The church, because the church, is of more excellency than the king, because king.—The people being those to whom the king is given, worthier than the gift.—And the people immortal, the king mortal.—The king a mean only, not both the efficient, or author of

the kingdom, and a mean; two necessary distinctions of a mean.—If sin had never been, there should have been no king.—The king is to give his life for his people.—The consistent cause more excellent than the effect.—The people than the king.—Impossible people can limit royal power, but they must give royal power also.—The people have an action in making a king, proved by four arguments.—Though it were granted that God immediately made kings, yet it is no consequent, God only, and not the people, can unmake him.—The people appointing a king over themselves, retain the fountain-power of making a king.—The mean inferior to the end, and the king, as a king, is a mean.—The king, as a mean, and also as a man, inferior to the people.—To swear non-self-preservation, and to swear self-murder, all one.—The people cannot make away their power, 1. Their whole power, nor 2. Irrevocably to the king.—The people may resume the power they give to the commissioners of parliament, when it is abused.—The tables in Scotland lawful, when the ordinary judicatures are corrupt.—Quod efficit tale id ipsum magis tale discussed, the fountain-power in the people derived only in the king.—The king is a fiduciary, a life-renter, not a lord or heritor.—How sovereignty is in the people.—Power of life and death, how in a community.—A community void of rulers, is yet, and may be a politic body.—Judges gods analogically.

[QUESTION XX: Whether inferior judges be essentially the immediate vicegerents of God, as Kings, not differing in essence and nature from kings](#)

Inferior judges the immediate vicars of God, no less than the king.—The consciences of inferior judges, immediately subordinate to God, not to the king, either mediately or immediately.—How the inferior judge is the deputy of the king.—He may put to death murderers, as having God's sword committed to him, no less than the king, even though the king command the contrary; for he is not to execute judgment, and to relieve the oppressed conditionally, if a mortal king give him leave; but whether the king will or no, he is to obey the King of kings.—Inferior judges are ministri regni, non ministri regis.—The king doth not make judges as he is a man, by an act of private good-will; but as he is a king by an act of royal justice, and by a power that he hath from the people, who made

himself a supreme judge.—The king's making inferior judges hindereth not, but they are as essentially judges as the king who maketh them, not by fountain-power, but power borrowed from the people.—The judges in Israel and the kings differ not essentially. Aristocracy as natural as monarchy, and as warrantable.—Inferior judges depend some way on the king in fieri, but not in facto esse.—The parliament not judges by derivation from the king.—The king cannot make or unmake judges.—No heritable judges.—Inferior judges more necessary than a king.

QUESTION XXI: What power the people and states of parliament hath over the king and in the state

The elders appointed by God to be judges.—Parliaments may convene and judge without the king.—Parliaments are essentially judges, and so their consciences neither dependeth on the king, quoad specificationem, that is, that they should give out this sentence, not that, nec quoad exercitium, that they should not in the morning execute judgment.—Unjust judging, and no judging at all, are sins in the states.—The parliament co-ordinate judges with the king, not advisers only; by eleven arguments.—Inferior judges not the king's messengers or legates, but public governors.—The Jews' monarchy mixed.—A power executive of laws more in the king, a power legislative more in the parliament.

QUESTION XXII: Whether the power of the king, as king, be absolute, or dependent and limited by God's

---

first mould and pattern of a king

The royalists make the king as absolute as the great Turk.—The king not absolute in his power, proved by nine arguments.—Why the king is a living law.—Power to do ill not from God.—Royalists say power to do ill is not from God, but power to do ill, as punishable by man, is from God.—A king, actu primo, is a plague, and the people slaves, if the king, by God's institution, be absolute.—Absoluteness of royalty against justice, peace, reason, and law.—Against the king's relation of a brother.—A damsel forced may resist the king.—The goodness of an absolute prince hindereth not but he is actu primo a tyrant.

### QUESTION XXIII: Whether the king hath a prerogative royal above law

Prerogative taken two ways.—Prerogative above laws a garland proper to infinite majesty.—A threefold dispensation, 1. Of power; 2. Of justice; 3. Of grace.—Acts of mere grace may be acts of blood.—An oath to the king of Babylon tyed not the people of Judah to all that absolute power could command.—The absolute prince is as absolute in acts of cruelty, as in acts of grace.—Servants are not (1 Pet. 2:18, 19) interdicted of self-defence.—The parliament materially only, not formally, hath the king for their lord.—Reason not a sufficient restraint to keep a prince from acts of tyranny.—Princes have sufficient power to do good, though they have not absolute to do evil.—A power to shed innocent blood can be no part of any royal power given of God.—The king, because he is a public person, wanteth many privileges that subjects have.

### QUESTION XXIV: What relation the king hath to the law

Human laws considered as reasonable, or as penal.—The king alone hath not a nemothetic power.—Whether the king be above parliaments as their judge.—Subordination of the king to the parliament and co-ordination both consistent.—Each one of the three governments hath somewhat from each other, and they cannot any one of them be in its prevalency conveniently without the mixture of the other two.—The king as a king cannot err, as he erreth in so far, he is not the remedy of oppression intended by God and nature.—In the court of necessity the people may judge the king.—Human laws not so obscure as tyranny is visible and discernible.—It is more requisite that the whole people, church, and religion be secured than one man.—If there be any restraint by law on the king it must be physical, for a moral restraint is upon all men.—To swear to an absolute prince as absolute, is an oath eatenus, in so far unlawful, and not obligatory.

### QUESTION XXV: Whether the supreme law, the safety of the people, be above the king

The safety of the people to be preferred to the king, for the king is not to seek himself, but the good of the people.—Royalists make no kings but tyrants.—How the safety of the king is the safety of the people.—A king,

for the safety of the people, may break through the letter and paper of the law.—The king's prerogative above law and reason, not comparable to the blood that has been shed in Ireland and England.—The power of dictators prove not a prerogative above law.

#### QUESTION XXVI: Whether the king be above the law

The law above the king in four things, 1. in constitution; 2. direction; 3. limitation; 4. co-action.—In what sense the king may do all things.—The king under the morality of laws; under fundamental laws, not under punishment to be inflicted by himself, nor because of the eminency of his place, but for the physical incongruity thereof.—If, and how, the king may punish himself.—That the king transgressing in a heinous manner, is under the co-action of law, proved by seven arguments.—The coronation of a king, who is supposed to be a just prince, yet proveth after a tyrant, is conditional and from ignorance, and so involuntary, and in so far not obligatory in law.—Royalists confess a tyrant in exercise may be dethroned.—How the people is the seat of the power of sovereignty.—The place, Psal. 51, "Against thee only have I sinned," &c. discussed.—Israel's not rising in arms against Pharaoh examined.—And Judah's not working their own deliverance under Cyrus.—A covenant without the king's concurrence lawful.

#### QUESTION XXVII: Whether or no the king be the sole, supreme, and final interpreter of the law

He is not the supreme and peremptory interpreter.—Nor is his will the sense of the law.—Nor is he the sole and only judicial interpreter of the law.

#### QUESTION XXVIII: Whether or no wars raised by the estates and subjects for their own just defence against the king's bloody emissaries be lawful

The state of the question.—If kings be absolute, a superior judge may punish an inferior judge, not as a judge but an erring man.—By divine institution all covenants to restrain their power must be unlawful.—Resistance in some cases lawful.—Six arguments for the lawfulness of