

*Enochic Judaism: Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars*, by David R. Jackson. Library of Second Temple Studies 49. London: T&T Clark International, 2004. Pp. xi + 316. \$69.95 (paper). ISBN 0567081656.

*The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, by Andrei A. Orlov. TSAJ 107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005. Pp. xii + 383. €99.00 (hardcover). ISBN 3161485440.

The two works reviewed here belong to the current efflorescence of scholarly interest in the Enoch traditions. They represent important new developments in the study of these traditions and deserve wide readership. Both works build upon earlier doctoral research, Jackson at the University of Sydney, and Orlov at Marquette University. While the weight of Orlov's study falls on 2 (*Slavonic Enoch*), Jackson's focuses on the Enochic literature attested at Qumran that became the bulk of 1 (*Ethiopic Enoch*). Both works are essential reading for scholars and graduate students working on any aspect of the Enoch traditions. The readership of Jackson's study should include students of the Qumran literature, the book of *Jubilees*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, and the Jewish context of earliest Christianity, while the readership of Orlov's should also include students of any aspect of early Jewish mysticism, especially heavenly mediator figures, and of the transmission of the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha.

Jackson begins by challenging the view that book(let)s of Enoch found at Qumran are to be regarded as part of the common heritage of late Second Temple Judaism, given that they, along with the so-called "sectarian" texts from Qumran, make exclusive claims for God's end-time elect: "The fact that works such as 1 *Enoch* or *Jubilees* have been preserved since 70 CE through other/Christian channels need not indicate that they were accepted as authoritative within Second Temple Judaism beyond the pale of the sect which came in part to occupy Qumran" (7).

Jackson uses the sections of 1 *Enoch* found at Qumran as a basis for defining "Enochic Judaism," and proceeds to find in *Jubilees*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, and the Qumran literature evidence for the development of this tradition. To define the system of belief that constituted Enochic Judaism, Jackson borrows Thomas Kuhn's language of "paradigm," "paradigm shift," and "exemplar," and he adopts the notions of "anti-society" to describe the sect implied by the Enochic literature, and "anti-language" to describe terms whose "meaning and significance in 1 *Enoch* . . . are determined by their place in the Enochic paradigm and which were not shared by those whose world-view stood outside of that paradigm" (20).

The fundamental Enochic paradigm is that of regularity/deviance (1 *Enoch* 2–5). Three exemplars developed by which the paradigm could be applied. The first is the "Shemikhazah exemplar," which ". . . concerns the going astray of a cohort of angels, under the leadership of one Shemikhazah . . . their sexual union with women and the resultant creation of an anomalous race of violent and destructive creatures whose disembodied spirits live on as demons after they had slaughtered each other" (22). The second, termed by Jackson the "ʿAzaʿel exemplar," "concerns the revelation to humans of heavenly secrets by angels under the representative leadership of ʿAzaʿel" (loc. cit.). Just as Shemikhazah and ʿAzaʿel represent exemplars of deviation, Noah and the "plantation

of righteousness" represent an example of the righteous elect. The third or "cosmic" exemplar "concerns the going astray of the spirits whom God placed in leadership over the cosmic phenomena related to the calendar" (26).

Jackson seems not to be drawn by the notion that a text can be more or less fully understood if one can reconstruct the tradition history of its constituent parts, and his approach thus differs significantly from attempts to distinguish the various underlying traditions that now form *1 Enoch*, and to trace their origins. The three exemplars are examined in turn, beginning with the evidence of the Enochic books found at Qumran and proceeding through *Jubilees*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, and related works. The 364-day calendar is tabulated in Appendix 1 (222–23), with a second appendix tabulating the evidence for each exemplar in all of the extant scrolls from Qumran (234–52). Jackson concludes that "Enochic Judaism was an exclusive sect seeing itself as definitive of elect status, and . . . was in part manifest in the sectarian communities identified among the Qumran 'sectarian' literature. . . . It is not so much that *1 Enoch* or *Jubilees* are works of the Qumran sect, but rather that the Qumran sectarian works are works of 'Enochic Judaism'" (221). This tradition was cut off by the catastrophe of 70 c.e., though faint echoes may be heard in the later works *Syriac Baruch* and *4 Ezra*, as well as the NT.

The title of Jackson's book might lead the reader to expect a study within the framework of Boccaccini's Enochic-Essene hypothesis, but apart from a few brief rebuttals of Boccaccini's reconstruction, Jackson is moving in a different direction. He sees no basis for reconstructing a split between Enochic and Essene Judaisms, seeing the *yahad* as an example of a community that stood firmly within Enochic Judaism. One might have expected a more thorough rebuttal of Boccaccini's position, however, particularly given the influence it has had in recent scholarship (see G. Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and Qumran Origins* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005], 327–435). Indeed, with a few exceptions, such as the question of delimiting the "sectarian" corpus (9–14), or the issue of the origins of the 364-day calendar (204–7), *Enochic Judaism* exhibits a relative lack of direct engagement with wider scholarly debates. This has advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, the reader is not forced to trudge doggedly through a ponderously exhaustive *Forschungsbericht*, with the consequence that neither author nor reader runs the risk of missing the wood for the trees, and the book's argument is allowed to shine through clearly. The engagement first-hand with the *texts* rather than with all the current scholarly debates about them is refreshing and is perhaps an antidote to the work of authors determined to read every drop of ink spilt on their subject and share all of it with their readers before venturing their own analysis. On the other hand, there are very good reasons for attempting to be comprehensive in scholarly writing. There are some noteworthy omissions from Jackson's bibliography that would have added depth to his discussion, the consequence being that it isn't always crystal clear precisely where Jackson stands in relation to current scholarship. For example, Markus Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (WUNT 2/36; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990) and Armin Lange's *Weisheit und Prädestination* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995) would have nuanced Jackson's otherwise excellent discussion of varieties of special revelation (114–36), and Crispin Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of*

*Adam* (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002) would have nuanced his discussion of links between the sectarian priesthood and the angelic priesthood (163–70). For a work on the Enoch traditions, the absence of Pierre Grelot, Helge Kvanvig, and Paolo Sacchi from the bibliography is somewhat surprising.

*Enochic Judaism* nevertheless bristles with intriguing suggestions. For example, the idea that the phrase *rz nhyh* alludes to the Divine Name, while not entirely convincing and asserted rather than argued, deserves consideration. The notion that Qumran was used as “an academy for new converts, elders-, teachers-, or priests-in-training to serve, upon their graduation, the wider Enochic communities in their places of residence or their assemblies” (168–69) is worth adding to the various views on the nature of the Qumran site and its relationship to the scrolls of the nearby caves. But there are problems. Jackson does not pay enough attention to the complex literary development of *1 Enoch*, despite being well aware of scholarly debate on the subject, nor to the fact that *1 Enoch* has been transmitted in its present form by Christians. While the question of defining “sectarian” texts is discussed, it is not clear where Jackson’s study leaves texts such as 4Q381, which is cited as evidence for the Enochic cosmic exemplar but is generally regarded by scholars as “nonsectarian” (152–53, cf. 245; missing from index of refs.). Most seriously, the absence of any discussion of *Slavonic Enoch* or *Sefer Hekhalot*, or even of any mention of these works, is deeply problematic, particularly given that Enochic Judaism as such is supposed to have been decimated by the events of 70 c.e. The persistence of speculation about the figure of Enoch after this date clearly suggests otherwise.

*Enochic Judaism* contributes to the study of Jewish sectarianism, the 364-day calendar, and the relationship between the Enoch literature and the scrolls from Qumran. Jackson’s understanding of Enochic Judaism should be developed further so that light is shed on the NT and other early Christian documents, and on the development of the traditions embodied in *Slavonic Enoch*, the rabbinic corpus, and the *Hekhalot* tracts, especially *Sefer Hekhalot*.

This is an appropriate point at which to discuss Orlov’s work, which treats both *Sefer Hekhalot* and *Slavonic Enoch* in detail. *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* is a thorough and compelling discussion of the development of early Jewish speculation about the seventh antediluvian patriarch, with special reference to *Slavonic Enoch*. Orlov advances the bold thesis that not only can the original text of *Slavonic Enoch* be convincingly dated in the first century c.e. prior to the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple, but the roles and titles of Enoch in this work represent a transitional phase between the early speculation of *Jubilees*, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the Book of Giants, and *Ethiopic Enoch* on the one hand, and the later speculation of *Sefer Hekhalot* and related works on the other. This is a powerful antidote to the “philosophy of super-prudence” (Paolo Sacchi’s phrase) exhibited by scholars who would argue that the extreme uncertainty of the date and provenance of this pseudepigraphon render it unusable for historical purposes (see Francis I. Andersen in *OTP* 1:97). Orlov’s argument is presented in a somewhat unorthodox fashion, delaying a detailed discussion of the date of *Slavonic Enoch* until the last chapter of the book (320–33), but it is largely persuasive, drawing on a broad range of primary and secondary literature in an impressive range of ancient and modern

languages, and it is presented in often splendid prose that manages to convey a real sense of the joy, excitement, and absorption that scholarly research can inspire.

Orlov's study is divided into two parts, the first focusing on the evolution of the roles and titles of the seventh antediluvian hero from the Mesopotamian King Enmeduranki (ch. 1) through the early Enochic material, including the *Similitudes* (ch. 2), via the traditions represented by *Slavonic Enoch* (ch. 4) to *Sefer Hekhalot* and related texts (ch. 3). The second part zooms in on the factors that enabled the development from the Enoch of the Second Temple material to the exalted Enoch-Metatron of the later rabbinic and *Hekhalot* materials. Orlov argues that this development was enabled by polemics between Enochic traditions and Adamic (ch. 5), Mosaic (ch. 6), and Noachic (ch. 7) traditions.

In the process of developing his fascinating argument, Orlov employs a slightly unusual methodology. Rather than dealing exhaustively with matters of special introduction at the outset, unraveling the labyrinthine textual tradition of *Slavonic Enoch* and the tradition history of its constituent parts, and determining the date and provenance of the "original" text before proceeding, Orlov expects his readers to take a certain amount on faith while he focuses on the roles and titles of Enmeduranki, Enoch, and Enoch-Metatron. He begins by discussing Enmeduranki's roles as diviner, expert in secrets, mediator of heavenly knowledge, scribe, and priest. These roles are absorbed by Enoch in the early Enochic booklets, where Enoch is presented as oneiromantic, primeval sage, expert in cosmic secrets, scribe, mediator (of knowledge and divine judgment), eschatological witness, and heavenly priest. Orlov skillfully demonstrates how the various roles and titles do not stand alone, but are interdependent, complementing each other in subtle ways. In an important section on Enoch's titles in the *Similitudes*, Orlov shows how the titles "righteous one," "anointed one," "chosen one," and "son of man" reflect both a deep reliance on "biblical" texts and an independence from other Enochic traditions. In relation to the "son of man," Orlov offers a particularly helpful discussion of the notion of the heavenly counterpart, which is fundamental not only to the Enochic traditions but to early christological speculations (which Orlov does not discuss).

Orlov then leaps over *Slavonic Enoch* to *Sefer Hekhalot*. He distinguishes two clusters of roles and titles for Enoch-Metatron. The first, "old" roles and titles, are connected with the early Enochic booklets but have undergone substantial reshaping. This category includes Metatron's scribal role, his expertise in heavenly secrets, his high priestly/liturgical roles, and his role as mediator of knowledge, divine judgment (encompassing intercession and witness against the evil generation of the flood), and the presence and authority of God. In discussing these "old" roles, Orlov includes a useful excursus on the name מיטטרון/מטטרון, summarizing nine theories on the etymology of this name (92–96). The second category contains "new" roles and titles, which cannot be shown to be directly derived from the early Enoch booklets, and include Metatron as Prince of the Presence, Prince of the World, Prince of the Law, the Youth, the Lesser  $\Upsilon\eta\omega\eta\eta$ , and the Measurer (or Measure) of the Divine Extent (שיעור קומה).

At this point we return to *Slavonic Enoch*, in which Orlov perceives two conceptual developments. First, there are the beginnings of roles and titles for the seventh

antediluvian hero that were previously unknown in Mesopotamian and early Enochic lore. Second, the “old” roles and titles are developed in the direction of the new, elevated profile of Enoch-Metatron. Thus we see in the Slavonic pseudepigraphon embryonic forms of the roles and titles of Enoch-Metatron in *Sefer Hekhalot*, such as Servant of the Face, Youth, Governor of the World, and God’s Vice-Regent. Orlov also discusses here the relevance of the notion of the heavenly counterpart for the portrait of Enoch in *Slavonic Enoch*. In terms of “old” roles and titles, we see developments in terms of Enoch as diviner, mediator of divine judgment and the divine presence, expert in the secrets of creation, heavenly priest, and scribe.

Orlov includes a brief excursus in his discussion of “old” roles and titles on the deeply puzzling Slavonic word *prometaia*, which appears, in a variety of different forms, in ch. 43 of the short recension of *Slavonic Enoch* and in *Merilo Pravednoe* (176–80). He advances the bold suggestion that this word is etymologically related to the Hebrew מַטְטָרָא, while allowing the possibility that it might be derived from the Greek προμήθεια (180 n. 127), in the sense of protection, care, or providence. Both possibilities deserve consideration, but a third, very tentative possibility might be added, in light of the second: could *prometaya* be related to the Greek name Προμηθεύς? The connection between the Prometheus myth and the ʾAsaʾel story of *1 Enoch* 6–11 was elucidated by George Nickelsburg in a 1977 article not cited by Orlov. Certainly another son of Iapetus, namely, Atlas (Hesiod, *Theogony* §509; Apollodorus, *Library* §1.2.3), is associated with Enoch elsewhere (Ps.-Eup. 8–9), and both Prometheus and Enoch take the role of transmitters of heavenly secrets, though of course in Enoch’s case the revelation is sanctioned by God, while in the case of Prometheus and ʾAsaʾel divine displeasure is incurred. Could the “theological embarrassment among the scribes” to which Andersen refers (*OTP* 1:217 n. 1) derive from the similarity between Enoch’s title and the name of one whose illicit revelation incurred divine censure?

In the second part of the book, Orlov shows how, in *Slavonic Enoch*, there is evidence that the portrait of Enoch has been shaped by intense polemical interaction with canonical and extracanonical speculation about Adam, Moses, and Noah. Thus Enoch is portrayed as one who regained, through his ascent and transformation, the glory of Adam that was lost through the transgression of the protoplast. Enoch thus takes a redeeming role, decisively removing Adam’s sin. This anticipates a comparable portrayal in *Sefer Hekhalot*. There follows a thorough discussion of the two-way polemics between exalted Moses traditions, especially the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian, and the traditions in *Slavonic Enoch*, Orlov stressing the extent to which the authors of the texts “often did not hesitate to borrow the imagery and exegetical strategies of their opponents in order to build up the exalted profile of their own hero” (277). Finally, Orlov discusses how, in *Slavonic Enoch*, Noah has been replaced by Methuselah as the originator of the tradition of animal sacrifice, and by Melchizedek as the one who carries the priestly tradition across the period of the flood. Unlike the polemical interaction with Adamic and Mosaic traditions, the denigration of Noah took place *within* the Enochic lore itself.

While generally persuasive, there are two potential weaknesses in Orlov’s discussion of mediatorial polemics. First, these polemics are implicit, not explicit, which suggests that Orlov’s trenchant criticisms of Christfried Böttrich for not recognizing these

polemics are somewhat overdrawn. Second, if the interaction between these mediatorial traditions is polemical, there must have been real people behind the texts for whom much was at stake in this polemical interaction. But who were they? While deriving “sects from texts” (Philip Davies’s phrase) is a notoriously troublesome procedure, it would have been helpful if Orlov had offered more discussion on this issue than he does (see 295–99). This would have been especially helpful in his concluding chapter on Noachic polemics, where the issues of halakhah and the sacrificial cult loom so large.

It would be difficult to overstate the significance of Orlov’s monograph, which not only contributes in important ways to the study of the development of the Enoch-Metatron tradition, but also convincingly rehabilitates *Slavonic Enoch* in the context of Second Temple Judaism and the evolution of early Jewish mysticism. There are gaps in this study, but that is inevitable and leaves the way open for some exciting research in the future. Two areas in particular should be noted. There is relatively little said about the Qumran scrolls, though Orlov’s study suggests that the relationship between the traditions in *Slavonic Enoch* and those preserved at Qumran needs to be investigated more intensively. For example, how might the study of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* be affected by this study? On a more microscopic level, how might Orlov’s study of Enoch’s role as King of the Earth (215–19), the counterpart of the prelapsarian kingship of the protoplast, affect our understanding of the significance of the root מִשַׁל in 4QInstruction? More puzzling is the almost total lack of reference to early christological speculation. Only three NT texts are even mentioned (Matt 18:10; Acts 12:15; 2 Cor 12:2), which is surprising given the overlap between the material covered by Orlov and that covered by Fletcher-Louis in his equally bold study *Luke-Acts* (WUNT 2/94; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997). Orlov’s study of polemics between competing mediatorial traditions needs to be extended to incorporate the interaction between Christ and Adam, Enoch, Noah, Melchizedek, and Moses traditions, particularly given the proliferation of studies focusing on the relationship between christological speculation and Jewish exalted patriarch traditions published since Larry Hurtado, *One God, One Lord* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988; 2nd ed., Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998). Also, Orlov’s discussion of the polemic between Enochic and Mosaic traditions touches on the luminous face of Moses and Enoch (289–91), and could have been extended to discuss 2 Cor 3:1–18.

Orlov leaves us much in his debt as a result of this study of *Slavonic Enoch*, and his work shows clearly the degree to which scholars need to devote much more time and energy to the Slavonic pseudepigrapha, and to acquiring and refining the research skills necessary to their study. It might be suggested that we do not need too many more new commentaries on Deuteronomy or Romans, but that we do have a pressing need for much more intensive study of hitherto relatively neglected works such as *Slavonic Enoch*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, and the *Ladder of Jacob*, not to mention neglected works in other, better known languages, such as the Greek *Testament of Solomon*.

James E. Harding  
University of Otago, Dunedin, Aotearoa/New Zealand