

it is never so used.

It is extremely unlikely that this is a feature that would have immediately occurred to the hearer. It is never used in the vocative in the NT^o because no one uses it there in the Gospels because no one uses it there except Jesus. In Ezekiel it is used in addressing one who is so close to God that God would give him revelation. In the NT^o, Jesus the one closest to God of all who ever lived on earth, the one who lived in such close association with God that His very words are the words of God, uses it of Himself.

The --Thus the title was ideally chosen to give people as one that would not immediately arouse offence, immediately declare the deity of Jesus in a way that would lead pious Jews to think Him guilty of blasphemy or that would immediately arouse the opposition of the Roman authorities by leading them to think of Him as one who might lead a rebellion against Roman control over the land of Israel. Jesus told the disciples not to tell people that He was the Messiah, the Son of God in Mat. 16: The term Messiah would have immediately said, "Here is one who is going to raise up a great rebellion." Jesus desired to preach His truth, a carefully select His apostles without conflict with the Roman authorities such as might public use of this term may ~~immediately~~ immediately have aroused. Even so some gathered in [reference] to try to make king by force, but He Himself never told the multitudes of strangers that He was indeed the coming king. It was a part of Jesus' careful intention to use a term that would not arouse opposition but that would gradually put into the ~~max~~ minds of those who were accustomed to hearing the term read in the book of Ezekiel the idea that He was very close to God and lead the more devoted of them to come gradually to see that He was the closest to God of all who had ever lived on earth. In fact. ~~and~~ And to prepare them for the great revelation that He is indeed God himself.

In the last few years students of the Scripture have written article after article and book after book in order to try to explain the term Son of man. None of them have come anywhere near the correct interpretation. This is because they