As is apparent from the extensive scholarship of contributors to this volume, 2 Enoch has generated much discussion and many questions especially concerning authorship and dating that have yet to be definitively answered. Moreover, scholars in the first decade of the twenty-first century await a critical edition of 2 Enoch and the clarification of the relationship of the long and short recensions. In the face of so much that is unresolved about this enigmatic work, one aspect that might seem far less complicated, and perhaps might be assumed, is the relationship of 2 Enoch to other writings associated with the patriarch of Gen 5:21–24, books such as 1 Enoch and 3 Enoch. Indeed, these contemporary titles for works also commonly referred to as the Ethiopic Book of Enoch (1 Enoch), Slavonic Enoch (2 Enoch) and Hebrew Enoch (or ספר חנוך and Sefer Hekhalot)—however unhelpful these linguistic monikers are as much of the literature is attested in other languages as well—would seem to suggest some sort of relationship among the writings as if the second and third follow chronologically and sequentially from the first of the works. The very nature of 1 Enoch, an anthology attested only in Ge’ez, as a collection of booklets that evince diverse provenances suggests a complex development for Enochic literature and lore. Thus, the onus remains
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2 See in this volume, for example, G. Macaskill, “2 Enoch: Manuscripts, Recensions and Original Language.”

3 For example, most of the booklets within 1 Enoch are attested in Aramaic and Greek, and a selection of 2 Enoch has been recovered recently in Coptic.
for scholars to demonstrate points of contact between early Enochic literature (especially the booklets associated with 1 Enoch which were quite influential in antiquity) and 2 Enoch.

Several treatments of 2 Enoch do contend that some sort of relationship between this work and early Enochic literature existed. Indeed, the subject can be approached from a variety of angles, which range from making a case for the literary dependence of 2 Enoch on previous writings to establishing that 2 Enoch has inherited in some manner assumptions, perspectives and worldviews of earlier traditions. One recent study focusing in particular on the portrayal of Enoch by Andrei Orlov takes up the latter approach; by examining the roles and titles accorded to the seer, Orlov attempts to situate more precisely 2 Enoch among the Enochic writings.

While more work remains on the question of literary dependence so as to discern whether the author(s) and tradent(s) of 2 Enoch knew and used early Enochic texts, we revisit the work of Orlov and extend his study by further examining the role of Enoch in early Enochic texts and 2 Enoch. Building on Orlov’s important work, we demonstrate the ways in which the latter’s depiction of Enoch is in continuity with earlier traditions, and also take the discussion in new directions as we critically assess what we can assume from these commonalities. Our hope, finally, is to reinvigorate the interest of others in defining more precisely the relationship of the various texts associated with Enoch.

The Relationship of 1 Enoch and 2 Enoch in Light of Titles and Roles Attributed to Enoch

In *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, Orlov takes up the titles attributed to and the roles played by the main recipient of revelation, Enoch. An
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6 See especially *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 40–120.