

Collins, Adela Yarbro, and John J. Collins. *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008. 275 pp. Paper, \$28.00.

A. Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins, both of Yale Divinity School, are among the heavyweights in NT and OT scholarship respectively. They have made an especially enormous contribution in the study of apocalyptic literature. A. Yarbro Collins also recently published her commentary on the Gospel of Mark in the Hermeneia series. J. J. Collins's more than eighteen academic books and at least 215 scholarly articles speak to his extensive work, especially on themes associated with Second Temple Jewish literature, including the Dead Sea Scrolls. *King and Messiah* is their most recent book in which they investigate whether or not divinity and preexistence are attributed to messianic figures in biblical and Second Temple Jewish literature. Theirs is a narrower, in-depth focus within the current historical-critical scholarship on messianic texts and NT Christology. They examine how the concepts of king and messiah contributed to the eventual recognition of Jesus as the divine son of God, as to be worshiped. J. J. Collins writes the first four chapters in which he traces Judah's idea of kingship and "messiah" to the ANE royal ideologies. J. J. Collins argues correctly that the concept of "*messiah*" is not found only in passages where the word מָשִׁיחַ ("anointed") occurs, but also in texts which refer to the king as "son of God," (2), or "son of man." He concludes that the royal psalms portray Judah (and Israelite) kingship as having elements of divine attributes by virtue of being referred to as son of God. As for the Deuteronomistic History (DtrH), J. J. Collins finds only what he calls a "chastened" (30) view of kingship, while only Isa 9 in prophetic literature seems to refer to the king explicitly as god. He also finds some influence from the ruler cults of the Hellenistic period in the Septuagint readings of messianic passages, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and other postbiblical Jewish literature. During this period the concept of the "Son of Man" developed to become equivalent to Son of God. A. Yarbro Collins writes the remaining chapters, 5 to 8, in which she discusses the Pauline view of Jesus as messiah and son of God. She then turns to the Synoptic Gospels and examines both the concept of Jesus as messiah son of God, and also as Son of Man. In the last chapter, she studies the portrayal of Jesus as messiah son of God in the Gospel and the Revelation of John. Her overarching question is: In speaking of Jesus as messiah, son of God, do Paul, the Synoptic Gospels (apart from "Son of Man" sayings), "Son of Man" sayings in the Synoptic Gospels, and the Gospel and the Revelation of John, portray Jesus as preexistent (and divine)? A. Yarbro Collins's answer to this question, if in some cases only cautiously, is yes, no, yes, and yes, respectively.

As their point of departure, Collins and Collins reject three theories on the origins of Jesus' divinity. The first one is that it developed in early Hellenistic Gentile-Christian circles in the context of polytheistic paganism (Bousset). The second one is the "mutation" theory (Hurtado); the idea that there is no clear precedent (xii). Third, the theory that Jewish messianism of the Hellenistic period developed into the Christian cult of Christ-Messiah

(Horbury) (xii). On the contrary, Collins and Collins propose that the notion of Jesus as divine and preexistent developed within a uniquely Jewish context, albeit within the wider context of the Greco-Roman world. According to Collins and Collins, the divinity of the messiah was not merely an early Christian understanding, but rather was already presupposed in pre-Christian, Jewish literature, as well as the Hebrew Bible, particularly the royal Psalms, Dan 7, and Isa 9.

However, in this otherwise masterly study, Collins and Collins make a number of less persuasive arguments. For example, in his treatment of the royal ideology in the DtrH, J. J. Collins argues that Deuteronomistic historians had a much lower view of kingship compared to the royal psalms. To support this view he examines 2 Sam 7. With several scholars he dates this chapter to the time of Josiah, but avers that DtrH scribes were working with older traditions regarding the dynastic promise to David (26), with some of the material dating to the time of Solomon (27, 28). At the heart of this dynastic promise, J. J. Collins argues, the king is not depicted as son to God by means of “begetting,” but rather by “adoption.” According to him, the king as “son of God” by adoption implies a less exalted view of kingship, as opposed to the language of begetting found in Ps 2 (22). In my view, this distinction between begetting and adoption is not convincing for a number of reasons. First, 2 Sam 7:14 אָנִי אֲהִיָּה לּוֹ לְאָב וְהוּא יִהְיֶה לִּי לְבֵן (“I will be a father to him and he will be a son to me”) is not a statement on the manner by which the Davidic king becomes son of God. The situation is different in Ps 2 where the root יָלַד (“beget”) is used to state how the king becomes a son of God. Even here, Collins argues, that “this day have I begotten you” means that the king becomes a son of God on the day of the king’s accession (28). There is nothing in 2 Sam 7:14 that would militate against envisioning the future Davidic king being begotten by God at accession. Secondly, it is somewhat anachronistic to make the distinction between “begetting” and “adoption” since the Hebrew Bible lacks explicit adoption language as we find in the NT (cf. *υἰοθεσία*, especially in Pauline writings). Third, Collins accepts the conclusion of most literary (I prefer the term “source”) and redaction-critical studies on 2 Sam 7 that include v. 14 among the older, original traditions with which DtrH scribes were working (26, 27). Collins is unequivocal that 2 Sam 7:14, was not a DtrH “fabrication” (28). To be consistent with his line of thought, this older tradition should be expected to speak highly of the king, before the putative “chastened” view of the DtrH historians (30, 33). It is therefore not possible to determine what the biblical writer thought of kingship on the basis of the use of “adoption” or “begetting” language.

There is some measure of ambivalence and arbitrariness throughout this book as to the point in time at which Jesus would have assumed his role as messiah. The problem begins earlier in the book with J. J. Collins’s treatment of Isa 9. This is the one text in the prophetic writings in which Collins finds near explicit attribution of divinity to the messiah, something of a “transcendental aura” (citing Blenkinsopp, 42). According to J. J. Collins, the son, whom he takes to be Hezekiah, is proclaimed as God either at enthronement or at birth

(41). This uncertainty as to when the son is proclaimed God continues in A. Yarbro Collins's treatment of the messiah, son of God in the NT. Whereas A. Yarbro Collins concludes that there is evidence of Jesus' preexistence in Pauline writings, on the analogy of personified wisdom (148), she thinks that Paul shares with the Synoptics the idea that Christ's exercise of his messianic office is only after resurrection (148 *et passim*). She asserts that "Jesus will exercise his role as divine agent, son of God and messiah, only after the resurrection" (141). She does not adduce any evidence that messiahship only commences after the resurrection. Earlier she had surmised that it is "likely" that Jesus only becomes son at baptism (127). Where she allows that Jesus was understood as messiah during his lifetime, A. Yarbro Collins says that he was only messiah "designate" (117) without adducing evidence for this claim. Interestingly, she regards the crucifixion, or the "lifting up" of the son of man as "revelatory" (186). One wonders why she does not consider events such as baptism, crucifixion, resurrection, and the like, as "revelatory" (186) rather than as commencement of Jesus' messiahship.

One area in which there is lack of clarity is in regard to the figure Michael and his relationship to king and messiah, as Son of God. First, J. J. Collins discusses how the "Son of God" figure in the *Aramaic Apocalypse* or "Son of God" text 4Q246 (4Qpseudodaniel<sup>d</sup>) is identified with an angelic figure Michael, Melchizedek or Prince of Light (66). This Son of God, Collins says, is also referred to as Son of the Most High, in language reminiscent of Luke 1:32-35 and is an interpretation of Dan 7's "one like a son of man" (72). For Collins, the son of man of Dan 7 refers to Michael the archangel of Dan 10-12, but not the messiah (78). J. J. Collins does not adduce evidence to support this singular assertion when his study brings out such a close connection between the figures of Michael and Melchizedek, and the messiah.

Similarly, A. Yarbro Collins explores the angelomorphic nature of the messiah in Revelation. In Rev 13, the protagonists are the Dragon (symbolizing the devil, and working through the beast of Revelation, which symbolizes the Roman emperors and empire, according to Collins) on the one hand, and Michael and his angels, on the other. At other times, Revelation speaks of God and the Lamb, or God and God's messiah (cf. 11:15) (187, 188) embroiled in struggle against the Dragon, showing the parallel between messiah and Michael. According to A. Yarbro Collins, the figure of one like a son of man in Dan 7:13 originally referred to an angel, Michael, later understood to be the Messiah (191). Further, the parallels between Rev 1:13-16 (Jesus) and Dan 10:5-9 (Michael/Angel) show the angelomorphic nature of Jesus in Revelation, according to Collins (191). She concludes that "The idea of a heavenly messiah, however, is compatible with the notion that he is also the principal angel" (193). Yet she does not say what the relationship between the angelic figure Michael and messiah is, whether one of identity or not. Instead, A. Yarbro Collins attempts to identify Jesus with the angel of Rev 1:1. She says the unexpressed pronoun "he" in the phrase "he made it known by sending his angel" refers to God, based upon the supposed case-agreement of the nominative (190) θεός and the subject of the verb ἐσήμανεν.

According to this reading, Jesus is the angel whom God sent to make known the apocalypse to John. However, it should be noted that the pronoun does not have to agree with its antecedent in case, but only in gender and number. Clearly, there is no “ambiguity” (190) here; Jesus is the one who sends his angel to John.

Notwithstanding the foregoing remarks and, I should note, the dittography on page 29 “. . . than to have been been part of its original conception,” where the modal “been” appears twice; and the typographical error on page 142 “Jesus as speakly openly,” for “speaking openly,” this book makes a cogent proposal in regard to the divinity of the messiah, namely, that it was of Jewish origin. The extensive bibliography on some of the latest works in the study of messianism is invaluable. Both scholars and nonacademic readers will find this book informative.

Oakwood University  
Huntsville, Alabama

GILBERT OKURO OJWANG

Crawford, Sidnie White. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 2008. 160 pp. Paper, \$16.00.

In this analysis of the varieties of rewritten Scripture among the Dead Sea Scrolls, Sidnie White Crawford has produced a small volume that is both accessible for the nonspecialist and meticulous in its detail. Setting aside the common separation between “sectarian” and “nonsectarian” literature, Crawford considers works from Qumran that engage in passing on the scriptural traditions of the Pentateuch. Crawford introduces the book by examining previous scholarship on Second Temple works that rework scriptural texts. She gives to these the name *Rewritten Scripture*, and defines them as texts that: closely adhere to a base text that has been generally recognized as authoritative; and show evidence of scribal intervention for the purpose of exegesis. A spectrum of six different approaches is laid out, ranging from the simple transmission of works recognized across early Judaism as sacred authoritative texts, to the creation of new works broadly based on scriptural texts but carrying no claim to scriptural authority. Asserting that, in the ancient world, there was no clear line between author and mere copyist, Crawford asserts that all but the last category claim the authority of Scripture, though the degree of acceptance of this authority varied.

Chapter 2 examines the text of the Pentateuch in its base form as found at Qumran. While the text of Genesis and Leviticus is found to be relatively stable with no systematic variations, Exodus and Numbers are shown to be present in two literary editions: one witnessed to in the MT and the LXX; and another similar to that of the Samaritan Pentateuch. This second type of text, which shows numerous harmonizations with other Pentateuchal passages, differs from the Samaritan Pentateuch mainly in that it is missing its thin veneer of Samaritan sectarian editing. It is thus spoken of as the *proto-Samaritan* Pentateuch. Deuteronomy, like Genesis and Leviticus, shows only a single literary edition; however, in cases where passages from Deuteronomy