

being a picture of the second coming, is it not natural to think that the parallel holds through~~g~~, rather than to say it is distinct? Well, in this one there are ten horns, and so the ten horns and the antichrist among them must be something that is still future. Well, if that is the case, is not that what the image represents in ch.2 also. It has ten toes also, but Dr. Young says, No, we are not told that it has ten toes. We do not know how many toes it has, so how can it correspond to the ten horns? It seems to me that this is an even weaker position than that which he took ~~than that which he took~~ when ~~we~~ he said, Where else could a stone hit an image to topple it except on the feet? Because actually in ch.2 it does not say that it has ten toes, and an image wouldn't have to have toes at all. There is no need that the image shall show the toes, anymore than there is need that a statue shall ~~show~~ show your fingers. But it does say, in v.42, and as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly stone and partly broken. It explicitly points to the toes. It doesn't say, As the feet... It says, As the toes of the feet... And why mention toes, unless the image has toes, and if an image has toes, it would be perfectly natural in a picture like this, or an ~~image~~ image, to make an image with two toes, or three toes, or four toes on a foot, or perhaps even only one toes on the foot. But if you see an image which is made after a likeness of a man, and who has toes, and the toes it says are made this way, and it doesn't say how many toes, it would seem to me that the presumption that it has the number of toes which are normal for a man to have, and then if you mention specifically that it has toes, anybody would be justified in concluding that it has ten toes, unless you have positive evidence to the contrary. And then when it is represented in parallel, with a beast that has ten horns, and you are told that the ten horns represent ten kings, and that is definitely parallel to the latter part of this, then to say, Well, you say the ten horns are the ten toes, but we are nowhere told it has ten toes, that it seems to me is arguing of the type that is not disposed to find truth. There are a lot of good arguments and good points in Dr. Young's book, but this seems to me to be a very poor one. We are not told how many ~~toes~~ toes it has. Well, there might not be toes, but why way