

---

**ORLOV, Andrei A**, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 107). Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2005. Hardcover. ISBN 3-16-148544-0. Pp. 383 + Notes, Bibliography and Index. \$175-00.

Recent finds and new translations of ancient Jewish texts continue to challenge the old scholarly orthodoxy about the nature of Second Temple Judaism, the matrix of the NT. This new book on the Enoch-Metatron tradition builds on a number of important studies of this Jewish mystical tradition. The studies by Gershom Scholem in the mid-twentieth century began a process which has seen major studies on the roots of the Enoch tradition on the one hand and major studies on the later rabbinic tradition of the angel Metatron on the other hand. While there are clearly links between the two traditions, scholars have found it difficult to account for the development or to trace its continuity. Scholem finally concluded that the parallels may be fortuitous, but it seems unlikely. Helge Kvanveg and others have demonstrated that the roots of the Enoch tradition lie in ancient Babylonian tradition concerning the King Emmeduranki. Thus the roots of the Enoch stories, typified by 1 Enoch, are ancient and remarkably consistent: fragments of the Enochic *Book of the Watchers* are found among the Qumran scrolls, for instance. The dating of the Metatron material, which is found definitively perhaps in 3 Enoch and is linked with speculation on the *merkabah*, the divine throne chariot, has proved more difficult.

Andrei Orlov's major contribution in this book is to bring to the forefront of this discussion the Slavonic apocalypse 2 Enoch. No doubt the fact that this has survived only in Slavonic, a language few of the scholars in the field are familiar with, has contributed to a certain neglect of the text. Orlov argues convincingly that 2 Enoch provides the missing link, the evidence for a continuity between the Enoch tradition and the Metatron tradition. Moreover he argues from the priestly and sacrificial practices in 2 Enoch's polemic against Noachic traditions that the document originates in the Second Temple period, before the fall of the temple, and is not a late work of Bulgarian heretics. The Metatron tradition, then, develops out of the Enoch tradition under the influence of polemics against other mystical traditions of the metamorphosis of Adam, Moses and Noah, and the tradition of various powerful Name-bearing angels of the presence or "lesser gods". This conclusion has important ramifications for NT study, if sustained. It would, for instance, add substance to arguments that John's Christology has its roots in such a mystical Jewish tradition of Enoch-Metatron rather than in Greek philosophical speculation on the Logos. Likewise, it would clarify the throne room scenes of the book of Revelation and the relationship between Jesus and the angels in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

After providing a helpful overview of the debate around early Jewish mysticism, Orlov proceeds methodically: in Part One he examines first the evolution of the Enoch tradition from Babylon to the early Enoch writings, focusing particularly on the titles given to the hero. He then proceeds to the other end of the spectrum, to the fully developed Enoch-Metatron tradition in the *Sefer Hekhalot* mystical writings, focusing mainly on the titles given to the hero. 2 Enoch is excluded from the survey. This procedure throws into relief the extensive continuity of titles, as well as the evolution of new titles and roles. Finally, he examines 2 Enoch and finds that it preserves most of the old roles and titles of Enoch and also adds most of the new roles of Metatron. He concludes from this that the traditions are linked and are already present in the Second Temple period.

In Part Two, Orlov examines successively the impact of polemic against proponents of the glorified Adam (image of God), Moses (one who has seen the face of God and is transformed by it into an angelic figure) and Noah (image of God restored and the originator of the sacrificial system). This section of the book is most suggestive for many fields of NT studies. It also allows Orlov to conclude that the book should be dated before the fall of the Second Temple.

This is a well researched and well argued book, carefully documenting both the primary and secondary material on which it is based. It is likely to determine the next stage in scholarly study of this important tradition, which has remained on the fringes of Biblical studies before now. It should be in any serious theological library alongside collections of Jewish apocalyptic literature. For too long, the rabbinic tradition has been allowed to determine the picture of what a first century Jew might have thought and argued. This book shows that there was a continuing and powerful

alternative strand of Jewish thinking which was not dominated by the revelation of the Torah to Moses in the Sinai tradition, but traced its origin to the revelation of God to Enoch.

**Jonathan A. Draper**  
*University of KwaZulu-Natal*  
*draper@ukzn.ac.za*