

to the third on ch.7, and I think they have to because of the statement of our Lord. Hereafter ye shall see the Son of Man coming, so that hereafter then is the time when these things happen. Well, now, the amil view holds that this is the kingdom of Christ today. Some of them hold that the millennium is described in Rev. 20 represents the happiness of the saints in heaven during the present period. And some hold that it represents the condition on the earth/ during this period. Hengstenberg, the great German ~~Evangelist~~ evangelical interpreter said, The binding of Satan in the beginning of ch.20 represents the time when the German nations were converted/ to the Gospel, and became Christian, and he said that ~~it~~ would be about 700 to 800 A.D., and he said in his day it was about 1000 years, and he said the millennium was nearly at its end, and he said, already he began to see signs of upheaval and turmoil in that last final uprising before the end of the millennium. Well, that's perhaps more of a postmil than an amil, but it is a strange thing to think of the millennium as including all those days of riots and anarchy and misery of the middle ages. But the usual amil idea is that this is the kingdom today. Well, there is a sense that it is the kingdom. But is it the kingdom here spoken of. Question.....AAM: Well, on ch.2 it seems more logically Postmil, but it is very wrongly maintained by some amils. Well, on ch.7, you see I would say that logically a postmil or an amil would be in a much stronger position to make ch.7 a picture of the ~~first~~ first coming of Christ, than he is to make ch.2, but if they are believing then, how can they? Because Jesus said, Hereafter ye shall see me.... So that sort of knocks the foundation out of that sort of interpretation of ch.7. So that they usually interpret ch.7 ...13½... Yes?.....AAM: Well, I would say this, that if you are going to fit one of these into an amil view, apart from the N.T., ch.7 would more adapt to it, than ch.2. That I would say. But to fit ch.2 into it, and say ch.7 isn't, it seems to me quite illogical. If the N.T. proves ch.7 doesn't, why it seems to me very strange to insist that ch.2 does. And of course, if it wasn't for that N.T. text, logically they would surely do it with ch.7. Now you take with this for instance, what happens? V.13, "I saw in the night vision, Behold one like the Son of Man came with the cloud of heaven...that all peoples...should