

1.1.1 /- 06E: Son of man

Viewpoint

Jesus introduced an ambiguous term to identify himself. This term, *huios anthrōpos*, or in simplified Aramaic *barnasa*, was in use, but Jesus' use of it was unique. He related it to his present, his passion, and his parousia. Biblically it had functioned for humanity in general, such as denying deity to *the son of man* (Nb.23:19), as well as heavenly glorification themes (for example Ezk.3:17; Dan.7:13), the latter of a human representing humanity. In short, it had functioned both messianically, and non-messianically.<sup>1</sup> Once his death cleared the way to switch designation to messiah in the way God had intended it, son of man was dropped by the church – *messiah* became the buzzword. True to the historical self designation of Jesus, as traditionally put, *huios anthrōpos* should be kept as 'son of man' in the Gospels, and the three other references in the NT (Ac.7:56, & Rv.1:13; 14:14).<sup>2</sup> Was Heb.2:6 a fourth reference? In contrasting two complementarians, Don Carson and Wayne Grudem, I have taken Carson as the better guide here. In short, in their contexts both Ps.8 and Heb.2 have used Hebrew parallelism, repeating line one in line two, and speaking not of messiah but of humanity contrasted to the heaven and its angels, and perceiving that God has an amazing plan for man. Exegetically, it seems to me that both Ps.8:4 & its reference in Heb.2:6 were both non-messianic, the wonder of God's plan for redeemed humanity, but completed by the link to an exaltation we see here and now, the risen christ (v9).

Texts

The texts are A (Ps.8:4f.: GNB); B (Heb.2:6-8: NCV); C (Balance: NRSV).

Score

Each text has been allowed two marks, and, if translated aright, a bonus of 1 mark for well connecting them. Lacking its take on Ps.8, I have positioned the EOB as if inline with the KJV. I have excluded the TNIV, which would have scored joint first.

Results

The highest version here is the NRSV at 5 marks, and the lowest the REB at minus 1. I have recalculated the worst as being zero (-1 plus 1), and increased the best to 6 (5 plus 1). All scores have then been divided by 6%, turning them all into comparative percentages.

Barnasa	A	B	C	T	T+1	%	
CEB	2	1.5	0	3.5	4.5	75	B-
CEV	1.5	1.5	1	4	5	83	B+
CJB	2	0	0	2	3	50	C-
EJB	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
EOB	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
ERV	2	0	-1	1	2	33	D-
ESV	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
GNB	2	2	1	5	5	83	B+
GWT	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
HCSB	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
ISV	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
KJ21	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
KJV	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
LEB	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
MEV	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
MSG	2	1	0	3	4	67	C+
NABRE	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
NASU	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
NCV	2	2	0	4	5	83	B+
NET	2	0	-1	1	2	33	D-
NIV	2	0	0	2	3	50	C-
NJB	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
NKJV	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
NLT	2	0	0	2	3	50	C-
NLV	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
NOG	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
NRSV	2	2	1	5	6	100	A
NWT	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
REB	0	0	-1	-1	0	0	E

<sup>1</sup> It's a good example of *illegitimate totality transfer* to imagine that *every* time it was used *every* one had loaded *all* of its possible meanings into the context. Jesus hid his identity within this wide range of meaning, beginning to show by his talk & actions, and concluding by his resurrection, what kind of son of man he was.

<sup>2</sup> Wycliffe had [man's son] for Heb.2:6, but [Son of man] for Ac.7:56; Rv.1:13; 14:14.

Barnasa	A	B	C	T	T+1	%	
TLV	0	0	0	0	1	17	E
VOICE	1.5	0	0	1.5	2.5	42	D+
WEB	0	0	0	0	1	17	E