

three of them and takes over in power, and then Christ comes back, and puts an end to this, and this would be a picture to the second coming of Christ, rather than the first coming. Now that would be your third view. And the strange thing is that most of those who take the strongly amil view on the second chapter will admit that about the 7th. They will say what this is the 2nd coming of Christ, rather than the first. They will say that. Now, surely it is a beautiful figure to describe the first coming, the son of man comes with the ~~clouds~~ clouds of heaven. One who came because of the divine power which overshadowed Mary, which brought Him into the world, a divine influence which could be symbolized by the clouds of the heaven, coming into this world, Jesus Christ, the one who is God Himself, coming ~~into~~ into life in this world, and pronouncing ~~His~~ His teaching and establishing His kingdom which will never be destroyed. That would surely seem to be a possible figurative way of taking it, but most amils don't take it that way. ~~That~~ They take this as a picture of the second coming. Why do they ~~take~~ take it this way? Who would ~~we~~ know why? No one?.... AAM: Yes, Our Lord Jesus Christ turned to the High Priest and said, I am the one of whom Daniel predicted. My birth was a Virgin Birth, it was not a ~~human~~ normal circumstance, I came in the cloud of heaven, with supernatural power, into the womb of the Virgin Mary, and came out upon this earth as God, the creator, here incarnate in Human form. I am the one who ~~has~~ has the dominion who will never be destroyed. I am the one ~~there~~ there described. That's not what he means. He said, Hereafter ye shall see the son of man coming in the clouds of the heavens. And the high priest rent his garments and said, This is blasphemy. Look who he makes himself to be. What need have we of further witness. Well, Jesus said, Hereafter ye shall see. Did ~~we~~ he not explicitly say, That which is here described is not fulfilled in my first coming, but is something that is yet to happen. And I believe you will find that most interpreters take it that way, and no matter how convinced they are that when the stone struck the image in ch.2, that was the first coming of Christ. They will ~~attribute~~ attribute this to the second coming, which seems to me to be rather inconsistent. If we do not have N.T. warrant for the interpretation of the first vision, but we have N.T. warrant for this vision as