

The four wings shows his tremendous movement. I think we are justified in taking that from that, but not in giving any particular attention to the fact there were four wings rather than three or five.

The ~~xxxxxxx~~ beast also had four heads. That's strange that the beast would have more than one head. Four heads. I believe we are justified in saying there is a suggestion there 200 years in advance that Alexander's empire would not remain united very long. It had one great head-- Alexander-- whose genius conquered all these areas, and to whom all his soldiers were devoted and who controlled definitely everything that was done during the 12 years of his reign. After his death his generals could not decide who should succeed him, and they tried to make one nominally succeed him, but the others would not submit to him and after a period of disagreement and discension, they fought with each other, 40 years and finally ended up with dividing it up into various sections each independent of the other.

Yet we can think of them still as being one empire because Greek culture was made predominate in all of them and there was a similarity in outlook and attitude in all of these kingdoms, into which Alexander's empire was divided. So when we say it has four heads it is predicting something that people 200 years after Daniel's time could look at and say, Yes, that corresponds to what actually happened. And that would give them confidence that what else ~~was~~ was said would also come to pass.

We come to the fourth kingdom v. 7-19.

We have a number of things said about the fourth kingdom. That is what Dan. 7 is really leading up to. We find in these verses it is strong and destructive. We find ~~xxxxxxx~~ that is suggested in Dan. 2 by the fact it was iron and like iron it crushes. Here we are told part of it is iron and part of it is bronze. It is strong and destructive.

It is not named. It is simply a beast-- very great and very terrible. So we find it is different from its predecessors. I don't think it was different in being more terrible. I don't think it was different in being more brutal. I don't think it was different in being more determined to take a great oversight over every one of its citizens. But it was when there were _____ when its citizens were upright, or when someone refused to submit.

How was the Roman empire different from the preceding? Actually the ways in which it was would hardly be suggested by the three statements here. But it was very different in three ways.

First, there was an entirely different type of organization. That's one reason why the Roman empire lasted longer than any two of the others put together. Almost as long as the three put together! Because the preceding ones were dependent upon hereditary control, and the power went from father to son, and sometimes the son inherited his father's abilities and strengths but very often he doesn't. So throughout history a hereditary type of control has not been very satisfactory.