

referred to an expected eschatological figure. There was considerable variety of views as to the relation of this "son of man" to Jesus. Most of them held that he was quite distinct from Jesus. A. J. B. Higgins and John Knox made almost identical statements about this.

Higgins said: "How could a sane man have entertained such thoughts (in supposing himself to be the Son of Man) of himself?" And again: "The upshot is that if Jesus was acquainted with a belief of this kind he could hardly have regarded himself, a man on earth, as the Son of Man and have been sane. His references to the Son of Man must all have been directed as if to another than himself ... Jesus said nothing whatever about himself as the Son of Man."¹⁰ In 1958 John Knox had made an almost identical statement. He asked: "Would it be psychologically possible for a sane person to think of himself as either the Enochian Son of man, the Danielic Son of man, or 'the Man' in what I should be inclined to call the later Pauline sense?". . . "A sane person, not to say a good person, just could not think of himself in such a way.". . . "We repeat our conclusion that a sane man could hardly have entertained such thoughts about himself.". . . "One may argue that in Jesus' place and time such self-deception was compatible with sanity (although I wonder again if a really comparable case can be found) -- but that does not make it any the less truly self deception. If Jesus was divine in a way to make psychologically plausible his consciousness of being the apocalyptic Son of man, one would suppose that he would also have been divinely aware that there was no apocalyptic Son of man."¹¹

Numerous articles appeared, most of them giving at least a measure of support to this interpretation, but in recent years more and more scholars have expressed doubts about it. Thus an article appeared in 1971-2 by R. Leivestad called "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man."¹² In 1975-6 an article by B. Lindars called "Re-enter the Apocalyptic Son of Man" appeared in the same magazine.¹³ Although the title seemed directly to contradict that of Leivestad's article, the difference proved, on reading the article, to be more apparent