

Sate, and he be imprisoned at the discretion of the king. And King James, though Francis Bacon pled with King James, King James said there's nothing I can do to help you, so Bacon was thrown out of his position, ejected from Parliament, had to pay this heavy fine and put in the Tower of London. Immediately upon that being done, the King exercised his right of pardon, he ~~was~~ pardoned Francis Bacon, gave him other gifts and allowed him to continue in private life without further penalty. But he could not interfere to stop the penalty, and shortly before the Revolution in the next reign when Charles I's principal supporter in the government was accused by Parliament of crimes against the Parliament which were done in order to help the king, and they sentenced him to death, Charles I didn't feel he could do anything to interfere with them, and the Earl of Stratford was beheaded at the orders of Parliament when he simply had been doing what the king had wanted, like James and Charles who both on occasion committed terrific atrocities, but it was recognized there was a law of the land superior to them. And that is very evidently the situation here in Israel and Judah. It was a constitutional monarchy. Our present point is in relation to the prophets, that the prophets could say things about the king, which an ordinary man, in most countries, would hardly dare say, and that it was recognized that the prophetic institution was an established situation, in which the prophet had a right to speak what he considered ~~was~~ to be the Will of God. And it was only occasionally that the king would dare to use serious methods to stop the mouth of the prophet.

Now, I think this is an extremely important (5)

chapter 21. What is your instance, Miss (5)

(student. 5 1/4)

That's a very interesting thing. There are those who think that the idea of verbal inspiration, the idea that the words of the Bible are inspired of God to give a true