

parts of the Roman Empire. I don't think we have any warrant for that --any more than for the precious statements. Particularly when we realize the Roman empire lasted for four centuries, and was almost ready for its downfall before its division into two parts occurred. So I want to warn against that sort of reading into it additional meanings above what is suggested in the text.

Now we may as we find other parallels somewhere have a right to look back and say, Here is something that fits with something in history or that fits with something in a ~~ax~~ later tradition. But I'm particularly anxious that we look at it from the viewpoint, "What do we have in this chapter? We think of Nebuchadnezzar and of Daniel, and what would they find there? We may find points suggested that are clarified later on in Daniel. In such a case if you note a particular thing like that you may make a note of them and bring them to my attention later. Make a note of anything that occurs to you where you think of something later in the Bible throws light on something here. But at this point we are interested in seeing what we have here and what can be legitimately drawn from this without looking further forward in the Scripture. We are justified, I think, at this point in looking at the future history to see how it fits with it.

~~X~~ The Five parts of the statue. What has specific meaning and what is only a part of the picture. That I was just speaking of.

What do the metals signify? We are told, You are this head of gold. Beyond that that the head of gold stands for Nebuchadnezzar, I don't think we have a right to say that the Babylonians kingdom from this had more gold than any of the other kingdoms, or that it was a more powerful kingdom. It is simply the first of the metals. It does not say anything about a difference in meaning between the gold and the silver.

Silver next, then bronze, then the iron. Of the iron we do have evidence it has a specific meaning. It says iron is ~~x~~ strong and breaks in pieces. Similarly this kingdom will be strong. So we have four kingdoms here mentioned, of which the fourth one is to be very strong. Of course the art of warfare was gradually improved in those years.

The Persians, for instance, were able to make tremendous conquests because of their ability in shooting arrows. They would shoot great clouds of arrows and nothing could stand before them. But then the Greeks came under Alexander the Great and they were encased in heavy armour standing close together with the strong armour that could hold back the arrows and keep them from injuring them, and they had a step forward. The art of warfare stepped forward, so we might say the iron represents a stronger force than the previous ones. Beyond that we don't know, but we do know that the iron stands for strength.

Then there is clay mixed with iron in the feet and toes and the clay we are told more about. We'll look at that later.

#### D. The Five Parts of the Statue

I just referred to four kingdoms, As it is stated here you could not tell whether there were 4 kingdoms or 5 kingdoms.