

picture to be a prediction of the future, it is pretty hard for me to see how it can fit a postmil picture, because things are so far from having been that way, and an amil picture just doesn't seem to me to fit at all. I don't see how you can fit it...4.., and my observation is that most amil writ~~ers~~ers spend a good deal of attention to saying we have no reason to think that the image has ten toes, and to saying that this must happen within the time of the Roman Empire, and the Roman Empire is gone now, so it must be prior to what happened then, and that sort of, you might say, attacks on premillennialism, but to present a constructive picture of ^{how}/this, in its major details corresponds to history, I just don't see how to fit it, though as I say, Don't let's be dogmatic now, and say that it couldn't fit it, but of course, if you take a premil viewpoint you are in a very strategic position, because you ~~xxx~~ say it is dealing with things that haven't yet happened, and therefore, nobody can say it doesn't fit, because they haven't happened. You can't say what they are. But it is saying it isn't a description of things ~~xxxxx~~ that have happened yet. It is a description of things that are going to happen. And there is this in its favor that the destruction of the image would seem to mean that the destruction of great political power is wielded by those who are not subject (of) God. You can't say that has happened yet, because the greater power of the political power of the world has always been under the domination of those who were far from being truly subject to the true God, or who had any great amount of His spirit in their minds. It has not yet happened, anything that would seem to fit this very well, the destruction of the image would seem still to be future, and the whole world, it would seem that if that is going to happen, that must still happen, because it is pretty hard to find anything yet that has happened to fit that, so while I personally might incline rather strongly to think that this ~~chapter~~ chapter should be interpreted premillennially, and has the second advent in view, and no mention of this chapter of the first advent, I would incline to that view from this chapter alone. Let's not be ~~xxx~~ dogmatic about that. Let's go on and look at chapter 7, and see how it compares, and when you look at ch.7, most interpreters think that 7 is describing the same