

God, constantly stressed in the OT, and certainly never denied in the NT. There is one God. So it would seem to me that the Ancient of Days must be the triune God. I believe in the OT that wherever it says it means the triune God, unless there is something in the context that clearly shows that it indicates one of the Persons of the Godhead.

We find that this term Ancient of Days is used again where it says that One like the Son of man had come to the Ancient of days, and been brought near before him and been given dominion, glory and a kingdom. That very obviously refers to our Lord Jesus Christ. So the Ancient of days there cannot mean the triune God; it must mean God the Father, in this phrase.

The third reference is in v. 22 where it says the little horn made war with the saints and prevailed against Him until the Ancient of days came. That obviously is a reference to the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven. So there the Ancient of days is one person of the Godhead, the Second Person of the Godhead, the Lord Jesus Christ.

So when I say each occurrence, I was happy when you told about all three, and very unhappy if you only made a general statement.

Number five was Briefly mention various possibilities as to what is indicated in Daniel 2 by the stone and its effects and we noticed various possibilities, that might be mentioned. One of them was Islam, the Islamic empire. One of them was the papacy. Then one, of course, is the idea that the Christian church is the stone that comes and gradually grows until it fills the whole earth.

And another is that the stone that comes and hits the statue on the feet refers to the second coming of Christ, utterly destroying all the evil that is involved in human government and substituting a righteous government of the saints.

There were those four various possibilities which could be briefly mentioned. Then I said, as far as time permits, discuss the two most probable. As we noticed, the first two have been proven impossible by the fact that neither of them carried through. So it is very obviously one of the last two. To my mind it takes a good deal of twisting of the statement to represent the stone as being the Christian church. Of course it is very intriguing to suggest that the stone cut without hands represents the virgin birth. If so there is a long break between that and its hitting the image, because that happened in the very beginning time of the Roman empire, when the Christian church began.

No one can say humanly that it is impossible that the Christian church should so grow and so many people be converted that the whole world would be won to Christ, and thus the whole kingdom of happiness and peace be established, but it certainly does not look that way, and there is no promise I know of anywhere in the Bible that such a thing is going to happen. So it fits the imagery far better to say it represents the coming of the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven, putting an end to all that was