

laws. They were broken in pieces and consumed. And then we have a reiteration of the fact "and it shall stand forever." Again part of the last part.

Then we go back to origin again by simply repeating the statements in the vision: "Forasmuch as thou sawest that a stone was cut out of the mountain without hand . . ." And then a repetition of the destruction of the statue. And that it broke in pieces the iron, the bronze, the clay, the silver and the gold. Then there is the final conclusion.

I have ~~a~~ to say a word about the first phrase in the interpretation. "In the days of these kings." You ask immediately, What kings? You will find many commentators who tell you that they are kings who are described in ch. 7. Well, it is quite unbelievable that Daniel in the time of Nebuchadnezzar speaking of him would use a phrase that was referring to something that was not revealed to him (Daniel) until 45 years later. We can use a later revelation to throw further light on an earlier revelation, but we cannot read it back into the earlier revelation.

My purpose in this course is not to find what Scripture teaches about the future. My purpose is certainly not to give you my interpretation of all these passages. My purpose is to go through it with you, carefully seeing what is clear and definite, and what there is on which perhaps we would not know the answer and would have to wait for further revelation from God.

Here he says "in the days of these kings" the only reasonable interpretation would be he means the kings already mentioned. It has mentioned, Nebuchadnezzar. It has mentioned the kingdoms that followed. The terms king and kingdom are sometimes interchanged. They are used rather loosely. Instead of referring to the man or referring to the whole kingdom over which he rules. In this case ~~xxxx~~ the whole context would seem to require that when he says "in the days of these kings" he means that within the time represented by these four nations and the fifth, whether it be a part of the fourth, or whether it be a separate kingdom. That's not made clear in this ch., but it is made clear in ch. 7. In either case it is in the days of the kings we are talking about. There are commentaries which say, Of course this is referring to the ten toes." They represent 10 kings and in the days of the 10 kings represented by the 10 toes this is going to happen.

Methodologically that is reading too much into this statement. It is only 45 years later that anything is revealed about the number 10 in connection with the fifth part of the vision. So we are not warranted in reading that back. Now if the statement were made there were 10 toes, something to call attention specifically to the toes that perhaps might give a little ground for such an interpretation that the 10 toes represent 10 kings. Unless you have the statement here, it is very hazzardous to read something like that into a                     . You may find that taught in ch. 7 but I don't believe we can read it back at this point.