In light of the content of 1 Enoch, the focus of 2 Enoch on the figure of Enoch and his revelatory experiences is expected. What is not anticipated is the shift in the final chapters to Enoch’s descendents and the miraculous birth of Melchizedek (2 Enoch 69–73). This surprising shift, however, should not obscure the complementary relationship between the figures of Enoch and Melchizedek that is set forth in this document. This study will demonstrate that the ideological continuity between Enoch and Melchizedek in 2 Enoch is the concern for a supra-human priestly mediator, one who is the primary figure serving before the divine throne. It will further be argued that Psalm 110 was the major catalyst in generating interest in Melchizedek as the supra-human and heavenly priestly mediator among Jewish groups during the first century C.E., including the one in which 2 Enoch has its origin.

A major hurdle that has hindered the inclusion of 2 Enoch in the wider study of mediator figures in Second Temple Judaism, especially traditions about Enoch and Melchizedek, is its complicated textual history. It is known primarily from manuscripts in Old Slavonic, although a portion of the text in Coptic is now known to exist. Because of the codicological practices of Slavic scribes, it is very difficult to determine the original text of 2 Enoch; it has been abbreviated, expanded, excerpted, and rearranged. Although both shorter and longer recensions are available for scholarly study, there has not been agreement that the longer recension is earlier
and, thus, preferred.\textsuperscript{3} It is generally agreed that deletions and interpolations exist in both. Moreover, Christian interpolations in the Melchizedek narrative of the longer recension have been identified in 71:32–37 and 72:6–7; these do not preclude the use of the rest of the narrative to understand Jewish ideology.\textsuperscript{4} Although a few have argued that 2 Enoch is of Christian provenance, more conclude that it is a Jewish document which was later adapted by Christians.\textsuperscript{5} The challenges presented by this sorted textual history must not be ignored or underestimated. Those who use 2 Enoch need to acknowledge that its textual history renders their research more tentative and their conclusions less certain. In spite of these challenges posed by the text, most scholars date the original composition of 2 Enoch, including the Melchizedek narrative in chapters 69–73 (minus the Christian interpolations), to pre-70 first century C.E.\textsuperscript{6} The scholarly study and use of 2 Enoch has also grown in the past three decades, due in part to the textual work

\textsuperscript{3} This study quotes from the two recensions in English translation presented by Andersen in OTP 1:102–213. The Italian edition attempted to assemble more of a critical edition of 2 Enoch; see P. Saachi, Apocrifi dell’Antico Testamento I–II (Turin: Union Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1969), 1302–213. Sacchi argued that the shorter recension is closer to the original, but that it also contains some additions (see esp. 493–495). C. Böttrich has given the strongest defense to date for accepting the longer recension as older; see Weltweisheit—Menschheitsethik—Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch, WUNT II.50 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 69–107. He notes that evidence for the secondary character of the shorter recension is found especially in 28:1–33:2; see 86–88.


\textsuperscript{5} J. T. Milik proposed, with very little evidential support, that it was a 9th or 10th century Christian document reflecting the context of Byzantine monasticism; see The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), 110–115. J. R. Davila has more recently argued for Christian provenance of some “Jewish” Pseudepigrapha but does not discuss 2 Enoch; see The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?, JSJ Sup 105 (Leiden: Brill, 2005). For support of a Jewish provenance of 2 Enoch, see the contributions by C. Böttrich, G. Macaskill, and A. Orlov to the Fifth International Enoch Seminar found in this volume.

\textsuperscript{6} Andersen dates 2 Enoch as late first century; see OTP 1:91, and Andersen, “Enoch, Second Book of,” 522. Saachi asserts that the ideology and the content of 2 Enoch affirms that the document was written before the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 C.E. and that its Melchizedek tradition pre-dates Hebrews; see Apocrifi 2:498–507. A pre-70 C.E. date is also recognized due to the significance of sacrifice at Akhuzan which is Jerusalem (e.g., 2 Enoch 6:42; 68:5; 69:3; 70:17; cf. Ezek 48:20–21) and that the celebration at Tammuz 17 in 2 Enoch 68:5–69:19 shows no evidence of it being regarded as the day Titus conquered Jerusalem as it was since the second century C.E.; see Böttrich, Weltweisheit—Menschheitsethik—Urkult, 20–54, and Böttrich, “The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch,” 451–452.