

words

000154

In beginning the examination of the prophecy image that Neb<sup>o</sup> saw it might be wise to mention the ambiguity of certain terms that are used. In the ancient Orient the word "king" was used not only for the supreme ruler in an area, but very often for subordinate rulers of different portions. Thus Darius, the Mede, Darius the Mede is called the king of Babylon in chapter Daniel 5:31 Dan. 5:31 and in 6:6 and ~~xxx~~ 9, etc., although the Scripture makes it clear ~~xxx~~ that it was Cyrus the Persian who had ~~xxx~~ conquered Babylon and who ~~immediately upon his conquest~~

soon after ~~his conquest~~ <sup>words issued</sup> gave an edict permitting the Jews to return to the land of Israel. <sup>3</sup> Among the early Romans, according to tradition, there were kings, <sup>4</sup> but, <sup>1</sup> the Romans discarded the <sup>is positive</sup> system altogether and never again cared to ~~xxx~~ call one of their rulers a king. Rome was a republic from very early days, <sup>any intention to bear almost to</sup> practically until the time of Christ.

When Augustus became the actual ruler of Rome he took the title of emperor, ~~of Rome~~ <sup>which had sometimes been applied to</sup> but this was not a new ~~xxx~~ title. It actually ~~originally it simply designated~~ <sup>1</sup> the leading general of the army, and ~~had been applied to various~~ <sup>2</sup> military leaders, occasionally previously,

but only for short periods. Augustus took it as a permanent title. Eventually the term assumed <sup>new significance</sup> a meaning from its use by the successive Roman emperors. In modern usage a kingdom is thought of as a <sup>(?) fide(?)</sup> area controlled by a ~~xxxx~~ hereditary ruler. This <sup>was</sup> is to some extent true of all four of the kingdoms described in

referred to in chapter 2, but only to a