

the  
 But about a third of half of the scholars today, if unchristian scholars, they just  
 and they write their articles and any verse that does  
 not fit the matter is not genuine! One writer said Jesus never that  
 he was the Son of man.

Now there is a new group of scholars who approach it, and they say in  
 the Aramaic language when it says "~~Son~~ Son of Man" it is just another way of  
 saying "I". Just like I would say, "This man is getting hungry." So the Son  
 of Man is just a way of saying I, they said. They find an instance where a  
 Jewish rabbi nearly 200 or 300 years after the time of Christ writes something  
 in Aramaic in which he says, "This man said so and so." He always said "this  
 man," These are all two or three hundred years after the time of Christ. There  
 is no evidence of such a usage in Aramaic from the time of Christ.

There are these arguments back and forth Maybe they will find that  
 this part of the book of Enoch was from an early time. The evidence is against  
 it now. We may find it but it does not prove there was this use among the Jews,  
 the fact that a man wrote such a thing. But none of them seem to notice what  
 seems to me the vital thing: the words Son of Man in the Gospels is always in  
 the mouth of Jesus. So if in the early church—they say very soon after the  
 resurrection there developed the Son of Man Christology which died by 100 A.D.  
 after the Gospels were written--no one of them mentions in its relevance here the  
 fact which they all recognize that in the Gospels the term Son of Man is never  
 used by anyone about Christ. He is never addressed that way. He is never spoken  
 of as the Son of Man came and did so and so. It is always in His mouth.

Now if it had been a development in the early church, would they say, Well  
 now when we write the Gospels we must only have it in Jesus' mouth and never have  
 anybody else use it. It completely disproves their whole theory.

Then the other attitude that it is just another way of saying "I"—now  
 in that case it should say "this man" not "the man", the son of man. But that it  
 means "I" there are those writing books and articles to try to prove that it  
 just means "I". that's all it means when he says the Son of Man. If that is the  
 case why don't the Gospels and Acts present somebody else as calling themselves  
 the son of man? If it just means "I" why doesn't somebody else say it? It's  
 only in the mouth of Jesus, never in any other way. So God has given us the  
 answer to all of these attacks. We can believe Jesus called himself the Son of  
 Man for a certain specific purpose, and that purpose found its end at his cruci-  
 fixation and after that he used a term which he hardly ever used in his life—he is  
 the Christ, the Messiah. The Son of God.

Others used it [Messiah, Christ, Son of God] of him, he hardly did. In  
 the Upper Room Discourse he taught them he that has seen me has seen the Father.  
 He spoke about the relation of the Son to the Father. But not in His general dis-  
 courses. In the end of his ministry in the Upper Room he did use the term Son of  
 God. He did use the term Messiah, or Christ. He used the term Son of Man and  
 gradually led them to understand what the Son of Man really is.

So we go back to Daniel and see in ch. 7 where he says that the Son of Man  
 will come in the clouds of heaven and he has there a prediction that Jesus Christ  
 will come on the clouds of heaven to this earth to take out of it his people and to  
 establish his glorious kingdom of truth and righteousness.