

What you did have came from some of these Germanic tribes who

gave what real strength there was to the Roman empire during this time, but its name and its reputation carried a great deal of weight. It's a period of great intermingling of people. There is a marked similarity of those two centuries to that description.

5. Verse 34 says the stone strikes the statue upon its feet of iron and clay.

In a symbolic picture there are apt to be many elements that are just part of the picture and do not convey a meaning, like the two arms and possibly the ten fingers. We don't know whether the fingers were shown or not or whether Nebuchadnezzar noticed them or not. We don't know whether the arms were longer than usual or shorter than usual. There were the normal features that a statue would have so that to know which have a meaning you need an interpretation. Unless you have something pictured that is very very unusual. Like you have here different metals. The metals themselves may not have had a specific meaning, but the fact that you have a different metal certainly is an unusual thing which has meaning. There is a change from one empire to another.

The stone strikes the statue and it specifically says upon its feet of iron and clay. Since the statue represents a progression of events, when it specifically says the stone strikes the statue on the feet of iron and clay that suggests very strongly that the event described by the hitting of the statue by the stone and demolishes it, is something that would take place in the fifth period of the statue, rather than in one of the first four. That would seem to me to be quite obvious.

But there are those who do not like that idea at all. I noticed in one commentary the statement is made: The striking of the feet is symbolical and does not necessarily have any particular reference to the fourth kingdom. The image is struck on the feet because such a blow will cause it to totter and fall. Where else would one strike a blow that would cause the entire image to fall?"

That is a case where a man has a certain interpretation that he wants to stand for and so he tries to twist everything in line with it or explain away anything that does not fit with it. This particular commentary I am not criticizing it greatly on this account. It is a little worse than a good many commentaries in this direction but not a great deal. Most people approach it with a definite idea in mind and they try to fit everything in with their idea or explain away what does not seem to fit. It is specifically said the stone strikes the image upon its feet that are of iron and clay. Why bother to tell where it struck? Why not just say it struck the image and destroyed it? There would seem likely to be some reason for saying where it struck, but more than that hitting it on the feet is a very unusual and strange thing! If one of you were standing here and if for some reason I wanted to demolish you, I can't imagine I'd pick up a stone and try to hit you upon the feet! I think that would be the last place I would think of aiming it. If there was a statue here I wanted to knock over, I might hit it in the head, in the chest, perhaps even in the legs but I can't imagine I would try to hit it in the feet to try to knock it over!