

something like mud, something which could not possibly stand up. The statue could not possibly stand up if it just had some mud in the feet. It is quite obvious what he means is potter's clay: in other words, it is clay which is dried in the sun or else baked in a furnace and therefore becomes what we now call china, or pottery. It is something which could stand up by itself and you could put a fair amount of weight on it, but nothing like what you could ~~put~~ put on iron.

So it means the feet had interspersed between ~~xxx~~ them this material which is brittle and easily broken; it is not ~~xxxxx~~ strong like the iron in this part.

3. Does the statement in v. 43 simply mean an unintegrated mixture of people? What is the character of this last part? The kingdom shall be divided, there is in it the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou the iron mixed with mirey clay, and the toes were part of iron and part of clay so the kingdoms shall be partly strong and partly broken. Whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miery clay they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men but they shall not cleave one to another even as iron is not mixed with clay.

Does that simply mean an unintegrated mixture of people, something like the present nation of Israel where you have a large part of the area with mostly Jews speaking Hebrew and then you have another large section of people who are ~~under~~ under their control of people who are mostly Arabs, a very different culture? Is that the sort of picture that is described here?

It is like Switzerland today where you have about 60% speaking German, and maybe 25% speaking French. One day I walked from the German section five miles across through the woods into the French section and I could not a person in the first town I came to who could even talk German! So distinct is the line, yet they are one nation. Does this mean an unintegrated mixture of people? Does it mean something more than that? If that's all it means it would fit the whole history of each of these empires. The Babylonians had various peoples mixed together. They transported people away from their homes to another section of the land, carried some ~~of~~ of the people from that to another section, so they had these peoples together and all looked to the Babylonian king for protection from the other groups.

Does it simply mean an unintegrated mixture of people? If so, it could ~~fit~~ fit the Babylonian empire; it could fit the Persian empire which had so many different peoples in it that when Xerxes sent his tremendous armies to conquer Greece they had maybe 40 different languages spoken by the soldiers. It was ~~xxx~~ very difficult to organize them, to communicate. The Greeks with extra good weather and various unusual circumstances were able to prevent them from conquering. The Persian empire ~~was~~ was , the Hellenistic had many different troops in it. It is not very well ~~xxxxxxx~~ together, and certain not the Roman ~~empire~~ empire (?) assimilated