

called "Is the Son of Man Problem Really Insoluble?" Here's one a man wrote in 1960 "The Son of Man." In 1962 he wrote one called "The Son of Man Again." A professor in the U. of Chicago who died about 10 years ago, shortly before his death wrote a book called A Modern Pilgrimage in NT Christology. So scholars who try to interpret the Bible ~~xxx~~ as a purely human document find that this matter of the Son of Man is a problem to which they cannot find a satisfactory answer. So all sorts of attempts to interpret it are given in these long articles which are constantly appearing in these journals which are widely circulated not only among modernist schools in NT but among all specialists in this field of study.

There are two approaches which are basic to this problem. One approach is the approach that says there was a widespread belief in the time of Christ that there was going to be a supernatural figure called the Son of Man and that this figure was to come from heaven on the clouds of heaven sometime and this man Jesus got the crazy idea that he would actually become that Son of Man! So he kept using the term Son of Man to represent that. So we have the title of the book, Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man, and then the other titled Re-enter the Apocalyptic Son of Man.

Now in order to prove that there was such an idea widespread among the Jews they have to say it must be based upon this one verse in Daniel--one like a son of man coming on the clouds of heaven. But with the term occurring over 90 times in Ezekiel, and this ~~being~~ being only one half of the occurrences in the book of Daniel that speak of him in this way it is a pretty big thing to tie on that the idea that from that there came this widespread idea. So these writers--some say Jesus thought he was the Son of Man, some say he thought he would eventually become the Son of Man. Some thought that after he died he would return the Son of Man. There is considerable argument as to which of these is the correct interpretation.

One book says The Son of Man Christology must have developed very soon after the resurrection. I've looked at these various books and articles to find out what they mean by the resurrection! Because they all speak of what is coming after the resurrection. One writer I found said, I do not like Professor Bultmann think of the resurrection as a myth; I think it is simply another term for the beginning of the Christian Church!

Well! now did the Christian church begin because a lot of people got together and said we believe Jesus is risen from the dead and they started telling people to believe that way and they were willing to give their lives for it, and to suffer for it and they were so convinced that it spread all through the Roman Empire! That surpasses belief that it should have happened that way. If it happened that way why didn't it happen with a dozen other cases of religions that started instead of                     . But they all speak of the resurrection. But they never speak of it as if they believed in an actual resurrection.