

The second question was: What past time would best fit the description of the second phase of the fourth kingdom? Give reasons for and against.

If this was a course in history, and I asked you to discuss the history of the Roman empire, and you gave me a very beautiful description of the Hellenistic empire, I might say, Well, you just misread the question; it's a good account of what you thought the question meant because you looked at it carelessly, and we won't take off for it!

But this is a course in exegesis, and if you're going to exegete the Bible, you should be able to exegete a question on a test. So when I asked, What past time would fit the description of the second phase of the fourth kingdom, if I got an answer which mentioned the various interpretations of the meaning of the stone, why I could not give any credit for that naturally. Because that's about as bad exegesis as you could possibly make of a question.

We saw how ch. 2 had the static thing--the four parts to it. Then there is the second phase of the kingdom, and we saw how then there occurred the dynamic events with the coming of the stone.

So those who had an even numbered question and gave an answer to question 5 of the odd numbered questions, could hardly get credit for that particular question. But the past time which would best fit the description was very obviously-- as I think I stated several times in class--a period from 400 to 600 A.D., when the Roman empire was in rapid decline, when there was a great mixture of Germanic peoples marching through the Roman empire back and forth, pillaging and destroying, setting up kingdoms and destroying each other's kingdom. This would exactly fit the situation, except that it says there shall be in it some of the strength of the iron. There was no strength in the Roman empire that we can see in that period-- that 600 year period.

And the statement "they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men" either could fit any time at all, or else must mean some very unusual thing and if so we don't know what it would be in connection with that. But the most important thing against it--that being the second phase of the fourth kingdom-- is the fact it specifically says the stone strikes the image on its feet of iron and clay.

Right at the end of that, the only thing that could be said to be the stone would be the coming of Islam, which did not carry through, Or shortly afterwards-- two or three centuries afterwards-- the development of the power of the papacy, which also does not carry through. So it would look as if what's meant by this second phase must be something still future. That was question two.

Question three: Briefly state whether the statue in Dan. 2 represents four kingdoms or five? Give the reasons for your answer.

Yes, Mr. Martin.

Martin: Question 2 overlaps with question 5 in your discussion. You mentioned this. It would seem that the possibility of Islam arising and also the papacy.

You mean question 5 of the odd numbers?

Martin: You were right at the conclusion of question 2, where you