LEABHARLANN CHOLÁISTE NA TRÍONÓIDE, BAILE ÁTHA CLIATH | TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY DUBLIN
Ollscoil Átha Cliath | The University of Dublin

Terms and Conditions of Use of Digitised Theses from Trinity College Library Dublin

Copyright statement

All material supplied by Trinity College Library is protected by copyright (under the Copyright and Related Rights Act, 2000 as amended) and other relevant Intellectual Property Rights. By accessing and using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you acknowledge that all Intellectual Property Rights in any Works supplied are the sole and exclusive property of the copyright and/or other IPR holder. Specific copyright holders may not be explicitly identified. Use of materials from other sources within a thesis should not be construed as a claim over them.

A non-exclusive, non-transferable licence is hereby granted to those using or reproducing, in whole or in part, the material for valid purposes, providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. Where specific permission to use material is required, this is identified and such permission must be sought from the copyright holder or agency cited.

Liability statement

By using a Digitised Thesis, I accept that Trinity College Dublin bears no legal responsibility for the accuracy, legality or comprehensiveness of materials contained within the thesis, and that Trinity College Dublin accepts no liability for indirect, consequential, or incidental, damages or losses arising from use of the thesis for whatever reason. Information located in a thesis may be subject to specific use constraints, details of which may not be explicitly described. It is the responsibility of potential and actual users to be aware of such constraints and to abide by them. By making use of material from a digitised thesis, you accept these copyright and disclaimer provisions. Where it is brought to the attention of Trinity College Library that there may be a breach of copyright or other restraint, it is the policy to withdraw or take down access to a thesis while the issue is being resolved.

Access Agreement

By using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you are bound by the following Terms & Conditions. Please read them carefully.

I have read and I understand the following statement: All material supplied via a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of a thesis is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or for educational purposes in electronic or print form providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

Warding Off Evil
An Analysis of Apotropaic Tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Synoptic Gospels

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Religions and Theology, Confederal School of Religions, Peace Studies and Theology

Trinity College Dublin
The University of Dublin

2016

Michael Morris

TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN
28 SEP 2016
ACADEMIC REGISTRY
PWS
CONFEDERAL SCHOOL OF RELIGIONS, PEACE STUDIES & THEOLOGY

Declaration

I declare that this thesis has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree at this or any other university and is entirely my own work.

I agree to deposit this thesis in the University's open access institutional repository or allow the Library to do so on my behalf, subject to Irish Copyright Legislation and Trinity College Library conditions of use and acknowledgment.

Signed:_

111200

Summary

This thesis is comprised of five chapters which address human responses to personified evil in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the synoptic gospels. One response, exorcism, is prevalent in each of the synoptics and has been given substantial scholarly attention. It is clear from these studies that demonological beliefs in early Judaism influenced New Testament literature, and there are numerous parallels between early Jewish and synoptic portrayals of exorcism. However, "apotropaism," which is a preventative measure that wards off demonic beings before affliction can take place, is also present in early Judaism, yet has been given only minor consideration in scholarly discussions of the synoptic tradition. This study offers an in-depth examination of apotropaic tradition in order to fill a void and advance critical assessments of the depiction of human interaction with personified evil in the gospels.

Chapter one reviews themes related to demons and the devil in the synoptic gospels. The nature of demonic beings is considered, and terminology such as "unclean" and "impure spirit" is assessed. The role of Satan and demons in each of the evangelists' theologies is also examined. Satanic/demonic opposition to Jesus and his followers is clearly important for each of the synoptic writers, and exorcism is a particularly effective way of emphasizing this conflict. Human responses to the demonic depicted in the gospels have implications for understanding Jesus' identity and his ministry. Yet, although the topic of exorcism is frequently discussed, this chapter also illustrates the need for a thoroughgoing examination of apotropaism in the synoptics.

Before turning to the gospels, it was necessary to systematically engage the early Jewish notion of apotropaism and how it differs from exorcism. In the first of two sections, chapter two discusses scholarly assessments of early Jewish anti-demonic traditions, and focuses especially on the organization and categorization of relevant passages from the Dead Sea Scrolls. These scholarly approaches provide guidelines for analyzing the nature and purpose of anti-demonic passages. The second part of the chapter consists of an examination of primary literature. It is demonstrated that early Jewish anti-demonic passages take many forms, including apotropaic petitions, apotropaic incantation, and exorcistic incantations.

The concept of early Jewish apotropaism, delineated in chapter two, is used to contextualize relevant pericopae in the gospels. Chapter three is concerned with identifying non-petitionary apotropaisms. There are several apotropaic features in the Matthean and Lukan Temptation account; specifically, Jesus' quotation from Deuteronomy and Satan's use of Psalm 91. The quotations from Deuteronomy align with the early Jewish concept that adhering to the law of Moses and quoting scripture have the power to ward off personified evil. Moreover, Psalm 91 is an apotropaic psalm in early Judaism, and viewing Satan's use of it through this lens highlights the hostility of the confrontation between Jesus and Satan.

Chapter four focuses on apotropaic petitions in the gospels. There is an apotropaic plea in the Matthean Lord's Prayer if τοῦ πονηροῦ in verse 13b refers to "the evil one." This interpretation of the Greek phrase is convincing due to the eschatological nature of the Lord's Prayer and the precedent in Matthew for interpreting the phrase as "the evil one." Part of Jesus' prayer in the Johannine Farewell Discourse includes the request that God keep the disciples from τοῦ πονηροῦ. The phrase in John, like in the Lord's Prayer, is best interpreted as "the evil one" due to the general dualistic themes in John. It is the case that apotropaic incantations and petitions in the gospels are compatible with broader views of demonology and Christology, and, moreover, they enhance the understanding of how Jesus and his followers relate to Satan and the demonic.

In conclusion, this study shows that there are apotropaisms in the gospels, but they are finely nuanced. Chapter five summarizes and contextualizes these findings. It is especially emphasized how exorcism and apotropaism function alongside one another, and how both anti-demonic techniques are significant for understanding the depiction of human interaction with demons in some of the earliest Christian writings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this project was possible because of the many people who gave me encouragement and support throughout my time in Dublin. My supervisor, Benjamin Wold, provided crucial guidance from the conception of this project through its completion. In addition to his sharp insight, scholarship, and erudition, his infinite patience, counsel, and kind friendship have made a profound impact on me.

Many scholars helped shape my academic endeavor, including William Horbury, David Shepherd, Daniele Pevarello, Loren Stuckenbruck, Benedict Viviano, Tim Gray, Sean Innerst, and Edward Sri. Many gave me spiritual guidance and edification throughout this task, including Archbishop Samuel Aquila, Msgr. Gregory Schlesselmann, Fr. Charles Fischer, and Fr. Wesley Dessonville.

To Andrew, Griffin, and my entire family, who supported me throughout my long absence, thank you. Finally, with immense gratitude I dedicate this work to my parents Jon and Linda, my grandparents Charles and Shirley Feeney, and to the loving memory of my grandparents James and Marion Morris.

Michael Morris
May 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1:
INTRODUCTION.....1

1.1 Review of Demonology in the Synoptic Gospels.....3

1.1.1 The Nature of Demons in the Synoptic Gospels.....3

1.1.1.1 "Impure/Unclean Spirits" – Terminology.....4

1.1.1.2 The Nature of Demons – Influences from Background Traditions.....11

1.1.2 The Place of Satan and Demons in the Evangelists' Theologies.....19

1.1.2.1 Mark: Satan and Demons.....20

1.1.2.2 Matthew: Satan and Demons.....25

1.1.2.3 Luke: Satan and Demons.....32

1.1.3 Demonic Possession and Exorcism in the Synoptic Gospels.....38

1.1.3.1 Exorcism and the Historical Jesus.....38

1.1.3.2 Demonic Possession and Exorcism in the Synoptic Gospels.....49

1.1.4 Summary of Reviews.....60

1.2 Conclusions, the Task of this Study.....61

CHAPTER 2: ANTI-DEMONIC TRADITIONS IN EARLY JUDAISM.....64

2.1 Anti-Demonic Traditions in Early Jewish Prayer: Categories and Terminology.....65

2.1.1 David Flusser.....67

2.1.2 Esther Eshel.....69

2.1.3 Loren Stuckenbruck.....76

2.1.4 Summary of Scholarly Observations.....83

2.1.5 Issues for Further Consideration.....85

2.2 Anti-Demonic Traditions in Early Jewish Prayer: Assessment of Primary Literature.....90

2.2.1 Biblical Antecedents.....91

2.2.1.1 The Priestly Blessing (Num. 6:24-26).....91

2.2.1.2 Psalm 91.....93

2.2.1.3 Tobit.....96

2.2.2 Apotropaic Petitions.....101
2.2.2.1 *Prayer of Levi* in *4QAramaic Levi*[b] (4Q213a 1 i).....101
2.2.2.2 *Plea for Deliverance* in *11QPsalms*[a] (11Q5 xix 1-18).....105
2.2.2.3 *Syriac Psalm* in *11QPsalms*[a] (11Q5 xxiv 3-17).....114
2.2.2.4 Psalm 91 in *11QApocryphal Psalms* (11Q11 vi).....116
2.2.2.5 Petitions in the *Book of Jubilees*.....119
2.2.3 Apotropaic Incantations.....129
2.2.3.1 *1QRule of the Community* (1QS ii 5-9).....129
2.2.3.2 *1QHodayot*[a] (1QH[a] 4 xxii 1-14).....131
2.2.3.3 *4QIncantation* (4Q444 1-4 i + 5 col. i).....134
2.2.3.4 *4QSongs of the Sage*.....139
2.2.3.5 *6QHymn* (6Q18).....152
2.2.4 Exorcistic Incantations.....155
2.2.4.1 *4QExorcism ar* (4Q560).....155
2.2.4.2 *8QHymn* (8Q5).....161
2.2.4.3 *11QApocryphal Psalms* (11Q11 i-v).....163
2.2.5 An Exorcistic Narrative in *1QGenesis Apocryphon*.....178

2.3 Conclusions 182

CHAPTER 3: NON-PETITIONARY APOTROPAISMS IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS 188

3.1 Scriptural Apotropaism in the Temptation Narrative 189
3.1.1 Introductory Comments on the Temptation Narrative 191
3.1.2 Deuteronomy and "Scriptural Apotropaism" 198
3.1.3 The Implications of Apotropaisms in the Temptation 215
3.1.3.1 Apotropaism and the Satanology/Demonology of the Gospels.....216
3.1.3.2 Jesus as Practitioner of Apotropaisms 229
3.1.4 Psalm 91 and "Apotropaic Inversion" in the Temptation 230
3.1.4.1 Inversion Techniques 237
3.1.4.2 Implications of the Satanic Inversion of Psalm 91...250

3.2 Mark 9:25: An Anti-Demonic "Symbiosis"? 251

3.2.1 Surrounding Traditions 252
3.2.2 The Command in Mark 9:25 and its Implications for the Gospel.....254

3.3 Passages Alluding to Apotropaic Efficacy 258
3.3.1 Anti-Demonic Authority in Luke 10:19 258
3.3.2 Taking Up Serpents and Protection from Poison in the Longer Ending of Mark 262

3.4 Conclusions 270

CHAPTER 4: APOTROPAIC PETITIONS IN THE GOSPELS 273

4.1 The Matthean Lord's Prayer 273
4.1.1 Introductory Comments on Matthew 6:9-13 277
4.1.2 The Lord's Prayer as a Deliverance Plea 285
4.1.3 The Reception of the Lord's Prayer in Apotropaic Tradition.....299

4.2 Jesus' Prayer for Peter in Luke 22:31-32 305

4.3 A Plea for Deliverance in John 17:15 309

4.4 Conclusions 321

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 325

5.1 Locating this Study Among Previous Assessments of Demonology in the Synoptics 325

5.2 Anti-Demonic Traditions in Early Judaism 327

5.3 Apotropaic Traditions in the Synoptics with Reference to John's Gospel.....329

5.4 Conclusions 333

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....339

Chapter 1: Introduction

The writings of early Judaism and the New Testament attest to complex and developing conceptions of evil and responses to it. Early Jewish literature, building on some rather laconic traditions in the Hebrew Bible, offers a rich portrayal of angels, demons[1], the origins of these beings, their hierarchical structure, and their activities. The material from the Dead Sea Scrolls sheds tremendous light on these traditions and provides insight into human interaction with spiritual beings, both good and bad. Although cave discoveries began in 1947, the painstaking excavation, reconstruction, and translation of the scrolls has spanned the decades. And while the majority of manuscripts have now been published, some relatively recently, scholars are still benefiting from their enormous value as witnesses to textual traditions and for understanding surrounding literature and worldviews.

The New Testament likewise contains numerous accounts of spiritual beings and their activities, though admittedly it is a field more trodden. When it comes to human interaction with demons the synoptic gospels are especially noted for their depiction of exorcism as a (mostly) effective solution. Exorcism and the battle against demonic influence clearly extends beyond the synoptic gospels and, some will argue, is a prominent feature in the early church. This aspect of human responses to demonic evil in the synoptic gospels is particularly interesting,

---

[1] The terms "demon," "evil spirit," "unclean/impure spirit," etc. can have various meanings and may carry implications regarding the aetiology and nature of evil. The unique connotations attached to these terms are apparent especially when engaging the demonologies of different cultures and traditions. Discussions that focus on the topic of demonology must be aware of the issues of terminology; cf. Ryan E. Stokes, "What is a Demon, What is an Evil Spirit, and What is a Satan?," in *Das Böse, der Taeufel und Dämonen – Evil, the Devil, and Demons: Dualistic Characteristics in the Religion of Israel, Ancient Judaism, and Christianity* (eds. J. Dochhorn et al.; WUNT II; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 259-272. While acknowledging these issues, as a matter of convenience this study uses "demon," "evil spirit," "unclean/impure spirit," and corresponding designations as equivalent terms for referring to evil spiritual beings. The terms, in themselves, do not presume a relationship to any specific culture, tradition, aetiology, or theological construct unless otherwise specified explicitly or by context.

especially since it is also a concern in some early Jewish literature. As new conclusions continue to be drawn about the Dead Sea Scrolls and the impact of early Jewish tradition on early Christian writings, we may find that the endeavor to bridge the demonologies of these two traditions is not entirely complete. It is to these remaining gaps that I turn my attention.

This study is interested in aspects of demonology in the synoptic gospels; specifically, human interaction with demonic evil. It is becoming increasingly evident that the relationship of synoptic gospel demonology to the world of early Jewish practice is an important one. A comparison with early Jewish literature sharpens the understanding of beliefs and traditions which may comprise the backdrop of various synoptic gospel depictions of demonic forces and the responses of individuals to demons. For instance, early Jewish works attest to two distinct anti-demonic techniques. The first is "exorcism" which is a curative tactic used when a person is already under demonic influence. The second response to demonic evil is characterized by its preventative nature and is typically referred to as "apotropaism." Exorcism in the gospels has been given sustained attention, although the same cannot be said of apotropaism. This may be due to a lack of apotropaic elements in New Testament writings. However, if apotropaic features are present they would have implications for larger issues of synoptic gospel demonology. Whether or not apotropaisms are expressed in the early Christian literature is a question deserving of attention, especially since apotropaic tradition is a feature of early Jewish demonology. The purpose of this study is to determine the presence or absence of apotropaic elements in the synoptic material and thereby contribute to an understanding of synoptic gospel demonology as well as further explain the relationship between early Jewish and early Christian demon traditions. Furthermore, an assessment of apotropaic traditions provides a better picture of the first century conception of, and response to, evil.

A review of recent research into ancient Jewish demonology and the study of demons in the synoptic gospels is a necessary first step in identifying and articulating the need for a thoroughgoing assessment of apotropaic tradition. In order to establish key features of synoptic gospel demonology a survey of significant demonological themes is presented in this chapter. Careful attention is

paid to the extent to which the history of traditions informs conversations about synoptic gospel demonology. The review below (§1.1) focuses on how scholars describe and explain various aspects relating to demonology and human responses to personified evil in the gospels. It is demonstrated that, although exorcistic and apotropaic tactics are both discussed, the emphasis on the former method is far greater. Following the review of literature a second section (§1.2) highlights the need for a study on the topic of apotropaic tradition in the synoptic gospels.

1.1 Review of Demonology in the Synoptic Gospels

Numerous scholarly articles and monographs have been written on synoptic gospel demonology, and the review here is by necessity selective. Focus is given to works in which the history of traditions is brought to bear on issues of possession, exorcism, apotropaic prayers, and demonic beings/unclean spirits in the earliest Christian traditions. The review below is organized into three thematic sections: (1) the nature of demons; (2) the place of Satan and demons in the evangelists' theologies; and (3) possession and exorcism. Although the focus of each section is different, they all engage a specific theme pertinent to synoptic gospel demonology and appeal to background traditions that may have influenced early Christian beliefs. Therefore, while the material discussed may not have an overt connection to apotropaic tradition, it helps define the parameters of synoptic gospel demonology which is central to adjudicating the presence of possible apotropaisms. Since any apotropaisms must be measured against the demonology of each gospel, this discussion assists overall in the assessment of human responses to demonic evil. Other relevant features (i.e., additional demonological passages, interpretations, translations, etc.) that are not addressed below and yet have bearing on this study are given attention in subsequent chapters.

1.1.1 The Nature of Demons in the Synoptic Gospels

A basic understanding of demonic evil in the synoptics is fundamental to an investigation of human responses to such evil. Therefore, attention turns to how

demonic beings are referred to and portrayed in the gospels in order to delineate their nature and significance in the evangelists' writings. The discussion entails first a consideration of terminology used to describe demonic beings. This is followed by an assessment of the nature of demons in the gospels in light of the possible influences from background traditions. Although the emphasis of this section is not on human responses to the demonic, this conversation helps to establish the meaning and implications of demonic beings in the synoptic material.

1.1.1.1 "Impure/Unclean Spirits" - Terminology

In the synoptic gospels various terms are used to refer to demonic beings that afflict individuals. Clinton Wahlen studies this terminology in order to clarify its significance for the evangelists and, thus, fills a specific void in contemporary research on synoptic gospel demonology which centers mainly on the use and meaning of πνεύματα ἀκαθάρτα.[2] The phrase is usually equated with "demon" or "evil spirit" and Wahlen is the first to give this expression sustained attention. His aim is "to describe how each Gospel's distinctive portrayal of 'unclean spirits' fits within its overall perspective on purity."[3] Questions posited include whether "the Synoptic writers deliberately associate spirits with impurity in order to convey something that 'demon' and 'evil spirit' do not."[4] Another significant issue addressed is the manner in which the spirits are understood to be impure; that is, whether ritual impurity, moral impurity, or some other perspective is in view.[5] With these preliminary points in mind, Wahlen advances his assessment of the gospels' use of "impure spirits" in a successive exploration of relevant sources beginning with early Jewish and Christian writings. A review of Wahlen's work is

---

[2] Clinton Wahlen, *Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels* (WUNT II. Reihe 185; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2004). Reviews of this work include: Mark D. Batluck, *RBL* [http://www.bookreviews.org] (2009); Todd Klutz, *JSNT* 27.5 (2005): 44-46; and Eibert Tigchelaar, *JSJ* 38 (2007): 155.

[3] Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 1.

[4] Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 3.

[5] For the importance of this matter, cf. Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 17-18.

particularly pertinent since it helps to establish the *status quaestionis* regarding the nature of demons in the gospels.

Wahlen begins by laying the necessary groundwork for investigating the impurity of spirits in Jewish and non-canonical Christian texts. Although the connection between impurity and evil spirits in the Hebrew scriptures is marginal, there are a few examples which are noted.[6] The examination of the impurity of spirits in later Jewish writings includes an assessment of passages from the Book of Tobit, *1 Enoch*, and *Jubilees*. In the latter two works especially, demonic/evil beings are linked in various ways to impurity. The Book of Watchers (*1 En.* 1-36) describes the illicit union of rebel angels ("the watchers") and mortal women which produces giant offspring. These giants are characterized as ממזרים ("bastards") in order to highlight their impure and illegitimate origins. As the narrative develops, the role of the giants produces an aetiological account in which the spirits of the giants are equated with "evil spirits." Elsewhere, in the Epistle of Enoch (cf. *1 En.* 99:7), harmful spirits are deemed "unclean" due to their association with idolatry.[7] Likewise, in *Jubilees* evil spirits and demons are accused of leading the faithful astray and promoting idol worship (e.g., 10.1; 11.4-5). Wahlen concludes, based on several passages, that *Jubilees* depicts "the demons as impure because they act physically to destroy the 'holy seed', not only through disease but also through idolatrous worship and abandonment of the ritual laws."[8] Since the demonologies of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* pervade much of early Jewish demonology and may have influenced the notion of impure/unclean spirits in the gospels, attention to them is foundational.

Wahlen notes that elements from the Qumran material resonate with synoptic gospel traditions: "These elements include the practice of exorcism to counteract demonic influence, the idea that a spirit of impurity can dwell within a

---

[6] These include the evil spirit which came upon Saul in 1 Sam. 16:14 and the unclean spirit in Zech. 13:2. A persuasive argument for the interpretation of the unclean spirit (רוח הטמאה) in Zechariah as a demon is given in Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 26-30.

[7] Cf. Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 30-34; cf. Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91-108* (CEJL; Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 398-403.

[8] Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 36.

person, and the perception that the impurity can lead ultimately to apostasy from the community of the chosen."[9] A survey of demonological terminology in various passages includes general terms such as שד ("demon"), רוח ("spirit"), and more specific names like "Lilith," "Mastema," and "Azazel."[10] Two references to exorcism are given because they depict types of demonic influence. First, Wahlen regards the *Genesis Apocryphon* as the "clearest example of an exorcism in ancient Jewish literature."[11] This work portrays a "chastising spirit" (רוח מכדש) sent upon Pharaoh by God as a response to Abram's prayer that his wife not be made "unclean" (טמיא). Second, the manuscript 4Q560 mentions physical harm caused by demons. Wahlen examines references to impure spirits in three different manuscripts. In the *Plea for Deliverance* in 11Q5 column xix is a request for protection from "Satan" (שטן), an "impure spirit" (רוח טמאה), and an "evil inclination" (יצר רע); all of which, according to Wahlen, have demonic connotations.[12] *4QIncantation* (4Q444) likewise depicts outward spiritual influences ("unclean" and "wicked" spirits) that may be harmful spirits.[13] In 1QS there are several dualistic layers present, as well as the promise of eventual

---

[9] Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 50.

[10] For the complete citation of demonological terms, cf. Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 37-39.

[11] Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 39.

[12] Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 44. Wahlen concludes that the יצר רע in *Plea for Deliverance* signifies an internal moral quality, and the יצר is a general dualistic term in Qumran and pre-Rabbinic literature; cf. ibid., 43 n. 124. While this may be the case in *Plea for Deliverance*, the matter is complex and a more substantive discussion is not provided by Wahlen. For instance, see Menahem Kister, "The Yetzer of Man's Heart, the Body and Purification from Evil: Between Prayer Terminologies and World Views," in *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls VIII* (eds. M. Bar-Asher and D. Dimant; Haifa University Press, 2010), 241-282 [Hebrew]; and Ishay Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires: "Yetzer Hara" and the Problem of Evil in Late Antiquity* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011). Cf. the section on *Plea for Deliverance* (§2.2.2.2) in the next chapter.

[13] Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 45, concludes: "In view of 4Q444's use of curse formulae, its cosmic dualism, including mention of *mamzerim*, and its potentially apotropaic purpose, the reference to the spirit being 'impure'…may allude to the physical and religious harm which the spirit was feared to cause."

purification from impurity.[14] Wahlen also refers to passages from the *War Scroll* (cf. 1QM xiii) and *4QBerakhot* (cf. 4Q286[a] 7 ii 1-12) because they associate evil spirits with works of impurity. These Qumran passages, along with *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, are seen to represent a development in the early Jewish association of spirits with impurity.

Turning to other Jewish literature, "unclean spirits," "evil spirits," and "demons" are corresponding terms used to describe the negative "spirits of Beliar" in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. In the case of this (likely) first century A.D. work, evil spirits can only bring one to harm if the individual willfully chooses a life outside of God's law.[15] Wahlen mentions the contrast between the rather innocuous view of δαίμονες in the works of Philo and the more traditional ancient Jewish view of Josephus in which demons are malevolent spiritual beings who cause harm. Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*LAB*) describes an "unclean spirit" (*spiritus immundus*) and an "evil spirit" (*spiritus pessimus*). Wahlen also assesses demonological language in later rabbinic texts (e.g. protection from demons in *Sifre Num.* 40.24[16] and the unclean spirits in the Babylonian Talmud on Deut. 18:10-11) dating from the third century A.D. onward, but these are too late for our purposes.

---

[14] Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 45, describes three types of dualism in 1QS: (1) "psychological dualism" explains how "God created human nature with two opposing tendencies [i.e., 'spirit of truth' and 'spirit of deceit'] which struggle for dominance," (2) "ethical dualism" refers to consequence of people belonging to either the good or evil "camp" depending upon "the spirit in which they walk" and (3) "cosmic dualism, represented by the Prince of Light and the Angel of Darkness…[reflects] that God has established the rule of these two cosmic being" and that there will be eschatological judgment and purification from evil.

[15] On the date of this work, see Howard C. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Second Century B.C.)," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 1* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Doubleday, 1983), 777-778. The unclear provenance of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is appropriately taken into account. Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 51, stipulates: "we treat the *Testaments* only as a potential witness to Jewish thought of the STP, recognising that the elements that we study may also be affected by Christian influence."

[16] This particular passages contains an apotropaic invocation of Psalm 91 to ward off demons. Here, "[a]ngels are seen as the appropriate source of help and protection against demons." Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 56.

Wahlen examines terminology in a selection of early Christian works outside of the gospels. Language in some New Testament writings, especially Revelation, is briefly mentioned. Significant traditions in the *Testament of Solomon* include various activities attributed to demons (e.g., inciting idolatry and constructing Solomon's temple) and Solomon's authority over demons. Wahlen concludes by highlighting the evolving relationship between demons/spirits and impurity in early Christian texts from the early to late second century A.D.[17] and beyond.[18] Thus, while there is a development of the traditions vis-à-vis impurity of spirits from the Jewish scriptures to later Christian writings, many basic features (e.g., the association of evil spirits with impure acts) are consistent.

On the topic of the impurity of spirits in the synoptic gospels, Wahlen examines Mark, Matthew, and Luke-Acts respectively. Exploration of this topic in Mark begins with a discussion on the Markan attitude toward purity. While purity language is important for Mark, Wahlen concludes that the strict ritualistic concerns of the Pharisees are transcended by Jesus' emphasis on internal purity.[19] Wahlen focuses on major demonological narratives in order to understand Mark's association of purity language with external spirits. This includes a catalogue of demonological terminology in Mark, assessments of exorcism accounts, and reference to other pericopae such as the Beelzebul Controversy. In Mark, as well as the other two synoptic gospels, ἀκάθαρτος occurs only in combination with πνεῦμα. It is therefore probable that the expression arose from tradition rather than redaction.[20] Still, labelling a spirit as "unclean" serves a Christological purpose for Mark, especially in the exorcism stories. For instance, Wahlen explains: "The

---

[17] These include the writings of Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and Clement of Alexandria. In general, "evil spirits" and "demons" are equivalent, and these evil spiritual beings can and do lead people into moral impurity; cf. Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 62-65.

[18] Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 65, states: "Later writers continue to associate impure spirits with immoral activity, idolatry in particular." Writers include Tertullian and Cyprian from the third century and Eusebius from the fourth.

[19] "Purity issues [in Mark] serve as a foil to demonstrate the messianic character of Jesus, who claims authority to interpret the divine law and announces that the long-anticipated καιρός has come with him." Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 86.

[20] Cf. Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 88.

holiness and divine power of Jesus drive the impure spirits away without a struggle."[21]

Like the section on Mark, Wahlen's discussion of Matthew begins with an appraisal of the gospel's treatment on purity issues. Attention to ritual purity is more accentuated in Matthew than in Mark, but it does not supersede the importance of one's internal disposition toward God.[22] A catalogue of demonological terms in Matthew, as well as an examination of pertinent demonological passages, is presented. The use of "impure spirit" by Jesus occurs only twice in Matthew, and in both cases Wahlen interprets the term to be used in relation to Israel as a whole.[23] In Luke's gospel and Acts, Luke displays a concern for the importance of ritual law, yet the law should not be an impediment to the Gentiles.[24] An analysis of demonologically relevant terms and narratives in Luke-Acts is presented.[25] The use of various demonological terms appear merely to be different designations for evil spiritual beings. There seems to be a shift in Luke's writings from πνεῦμα-phrases to "the more Gentile-familiar δαιμόν-terminology."[26] "Impure spirits" are mentioned primarily in relation to Israel. Regarding Luke-Acts, Wahlen concludes: "the equation made early on between

---

[21] Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 107. Additionally, since "impure spirits" is a typically Jewish category yet is used by Mark in Gentile contexts (e.g., the Gerasene Demoniac), this points to a concern beyond Jewish cultural parameters; cf. ibid.

[22] For instance, "[r]itual purity is neither denigrated nor abandoned but reinforces a presumed purity of the heart." Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 116.

[23] This is certainly the case in Jesus' mission discourse to the twelve when he sends them out "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt. 10:6). The narrative of the Return of the Unclean Spirit (Mt. 12:43-45) is interpreted in light of the surrounding judgment language against the leadership of Israel; cf. Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 128-130, 135-137.

[24] Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 141, explains: "In Luke, moral concerns do not obviate the ritual law. The Jews of the infancy narratives epitomize piety. Similarly, Luke presents a Jesus who is law-observant in in every way." Still elsewhere he clarifies: "Luke's careful delineation of matters reflects a delicate handling of Jewish purity concerns and effectively utilizes them to explain the basis for the more open attitude of Christianity towards the Gentile world." Ibid., 144.

[25] Regarding evil spirits, "Lukan terminology is the most varied of the NT." Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 149.

[26] Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 168.

various kinds of spirits and demons, which is carried forward throughout Luke-Acts, makes it clear that the evangelist attaches little, if any, significance to the idea of spirits as impure. Disease is just one manifestation of that evil whose ultimate author is Satan."[27]

In summary, Wahlen's monograph approaches a specific niche in early Jewish and synoptic gospel demonology. Understanding the "impurity of spirits" in relevant traditions begins with a substantive examination of key passages from the Hebrew scriptures and early Jewish literature. Wahlen's approach to the Qumran material in particular is assiduous and cautious. Care is taken to "examine the texts which associate spirits with impurity on a case by case basis, without presuming an interrelationship among them or supposing that they fit some larger sectarian view."[28] Also included is the critical presentation of important sections of the scrolls. The function of "impure spirit" in the synoptic gospels and Acts is addressed. The gospel writers express a continuity with fundamental Jewish notions regarding purity, even if the emphasis sometimes shifts away from ritual concerns. The unique attitude of each gospel writer toward purity issues is demonstrated. Wahlen shows that while in each gospel the words "unclean" or "impure" spirit may be used so as to hint at ritual implications, the terms, overall, are equivalent to other designations for evil spirits/demonic beings. This clarifies the nature of certain beings in instances where varying terminology is applied to them.

Apotropaic passages are given some attention in the section on Qumran literature, and Wahlen distinguishes between apotropaic and exorcistic ways of counteracting demonic influence. He convincingly describes David Flusser's definition of "apotropaic" as "too vague,"[29] and states that the differences between apotropaic and exorcistic works as highlighted by Esther Eshel are evidence of

---

[27] Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 168-169.

[28] Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 37.

[29] Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 42 n. 112, explains: "In one sense any prayer for God's protection is apotropaic; but this does not seem to be what Flusser means…". David Flusser's article on apotropaic prayer is discussed in §2.1.1 of the next chapter.

"two distinct genres" of anti-demonic material in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[30] Although the various apotropaic prayers and approaches in ancient literature are acknowledged, these traditions are not brought into conversation with specific demonological accounts in the synoptic gospels.

The focus of Wahlen's study is quite narrow, and as a result some potentially relevant issues are not tended to. For example, ancient materials containing apotropaic measures are not regarded as important for the study because of, according to Wahlen, a lack of association between demons and impurity contained in those prayers.[31] However, apotropaic texts may indeed provide insight into early Jewish demonology and the notion of impurity, even if the term "impure spirit" is absent. At the very least, consideration should be given to the "bastard spirits" in some Qumran and pseudepigraphic works as there may be cause to view this designation within the context of purity.[32] Also missing are treatments of the background traditions for specific gospel accounts. While there is a comprehensive examination of early Jewish demon traditions, these are not extensively brought to bear on the gospel material.[33] Todd Klutz states that some of Wahlen's weaknesses "stem from his methods and assumptions about language," though this does not detract from the importance of the study.[34] As a final note, Wahlen appears to differentiate between the meaning of the terms "moral" and "ethical" without sufficiently clarifying the definition of each.

1.1.1.2 The Nature of Demons – Influences from Background Traditions

---

[30] Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 42. Esther Eshel's contributions to Qumran anti-demonic texts are explored in §2.1.2 of the next chapter.

[31] Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 18.

[32] Though the use of "bastards" (ממזרים) in the Qumran scrolls is footnoted by Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 38, no discussion of the term is present. The use and meaning of ממזרים in certain scrolls is assessed in the next chapter.

[33] Tigchelaar reflects on this point as well; c.f. idem, review of Wahlen, 155.

[34] Klutz, review of Wahlen, 45.

Wahlen demonstrates that early Jewish demonology influenced, to some degree, the concept of demonic beings in the synoptic gospels. The Watcher tradition from *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* is especially prominent in many demonologically relevant passages from Qumran. While Wahlen discusses the association of demons with impurity in the early Jewish and synoptic traditions, it is worthwhile to consider whether any characteristics of the demonic in the gospels indicate an aetiology of demons informed by the Watcher myth. An exploration of aetiology helps not only to further explicate the nature of demons in the gospels, but also to situate synoptic gospel demonology in relation to background traditions.

Archie Wright addresses the relationship between portrayals of the demonic in the gospels and the Watcher tradition in early Judaism.[35] Specifically, Wright focuses on the Gerasene Demoniac in Mark 5:1-20 which depicts a man possessed by an unclean spirit(s). Wright isolates three characteristics of the demon that are mentioned in the pericope: (1) the demon has tremendous strength (v. 3-4); (2) "it has the ability to possess a physical body"[36] (v. 2, 8, 13); and (3) "it recognizes the authority of God over its activity (v. 7)."[37] When Jesus confronts the demoniac and proceeds to perform an exorcism the demon requests to be cast into a nearby herd of swine (v. 12). Based on this request, Wright infers a characteristic similar to point 2; namely the demon's need or desire to possess a physical body.[38]

The narrative, in addition to conveying attributes of the demon, provides five details about the afflicted man which Wright identifies. First, the man is living among tombs (v. 3), and therefore according to the torah is unclean. Second, the man has acquired great strength. Third, some effects of possession include crying out, self-mutilation, and social withdrawal (v. 5). Fourth, the man suffers loss of speech, though the demon speaks through him. Finally, "following the

---

[35] Archie T. Wright, "Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism: The Watcher Tradition as a Background to the Demonic Pericopes in the Gospels," *Henoch* 28 (1/2006): 141-159.

[36] Wright, "Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism," 142.

[37] Wright, "Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism," 142.

[38] Wright, "Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism," 142.

exorcism…the man is described as being in his right mind, fully clothed and presumably in a state of normalcy."[39]

To contextualize these features of the demon and the possessed man in Mark 5 in light of potential influencing traditions, Wright traces the development of demonology and the origin of evil spirits in early Judaism.[40] The basis for a major strata of early Jewish demonological tradition is Genesis 6:1-4:

> 1 When men began to multiply on the face of the ground, and daughters were born to them, 2 the sons of God [בְּנֵי־הָאֱלֹהִים] saw that the daughters of men were fair; and they took to wife such of them as they chose. 3 Then the Lord said, "My spirit shall not abide in man for ever, for he is flesh, but his days shall be a hundred and twenty years." 4 The Neph'ilim [הַנְּפִלִים] were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God [בְּנֵי ׳הָאֱלֹהִים] came in to the daughters of men, and they bore children to them. These were the mighty men [הַגִּבֹּרִים] that were of old, the men of renown.[41]

As Wright notes, "the context of [this narrative] has been demonstrated to be a story of the rebellion of the 'sons of God' that brought about the Flood."[42] The offspring of the "sons of God" and "daughters of men" are "giants," as reflected in the Septuagint's (LXX) translation of בני אלהים and גברים as γίγαντες. The passage is non-descript regarding the identity of either the sons of God or the daughters of men, and the giants are referred to with somewhat positive language.

The Genesis narrative is an object of interpretation in early Judaism which is particularly concerned with the origin of evil. Drawing upon the framework provided in Genesis 6, *1 Enoch* 1-36 tells of "the Watchers" who are rebel angels that descend to earth to procreate with human women. The offspring of the

---

[39] Wright, "Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism," 143; cf. Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "The Origins of Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Interpretation of Genesis 6:1-4 in the Second and Third Centuries B.C.E.," in *The Fall of the Angels* (*TBN* 6; eds. C. Auffarth and L. T. Stuckenbruck; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 87-118.

[40] This topic is the focus of Wright's monograph, *The Origin of Evil Spirits: The Reception of Genesis 6:1-4 in Early Jewish Literature* (WUNT II.198; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).

[41] The English translation is from the RSV and the Hebrew is from The Masoretic Text (MT). All biblical quotations, unless otherwise noted, are from the RSV.

[42] Wright, "Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism," 143. Wright engages with the Genesis passage and its implications more significantly in chapters 3 and 5 of his monograph.

Watchers and human women are of gigantic stature (*1 En.* 7:2). Wright discusses various characteristics attributed to these giants, including their strength, thirst for blood, and overall violent nature (*1 En.* 7:4-6). He explains: "Thus, the author of [the Book of Watchers] has turned the seemingly heroic gibborim of Genesis 6.4 into a group of bloodthirsty creatures with little inducement from the Genesis passage."[43] The giants' violence against humanity results in God sending the flood to destroy them (*1 En.* 10). However, while their physical bodies are destroyed, their spiritual/angelic nature survives (*1 En.* 15:8-12; 16:1). Consequently, according to this myth, demons are the spirits of the giants.

The Watcher tradition and aetiology of evil spirits is also expressed in *Jubilees* and the giants are similarly described as the progeny of the fallen watchers and mortal women (*Jub.* 5:1-2; 7:21-22; 10:4-6). The giants commit great violence against humanity and, though their physical bodies are destroyed, their spirits continue to remain active and hostile to humans. A unique feature in *Jubilees* is the explanation of how demonic activity operates under divine sanction. In *Jubilees* 10 Noah requests that God prohibit the harmful activity of evil spirits. In response to Noah, God intends to bind the evil spirits, but Mastema, "the chief of the spirits" (*Jub.* 10:8), beseeches God to let some remain active to execute Mastema's authority against humanity. God grants that one tenth of the evil spirits remain upon the earth while the rest are bound. This detail clarifies why there is demonic activity and how this evil influence can operate within God's created order.

According to Wright, the Qumran material "provides evidence of a well developed and widely received Watcher tradition in first-third century B.C.E."[44] Wright points to numerous passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls which are probably influenced by demonology in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*. For example, the "Angel of Darkness" (מלאך חושך) in 1QS iii 20 ff. resembles Mastema in *Jubilees*,[45] and evil

[43] Wright, "Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism," 144-145.

[44] Wright, "Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism," 149.

[45] Wright, "Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism," 155, states: "The Angel of Darkness described [in 1QS] is perhaps responsible for a later tradition of Satan as one of the Fallen Angels. However,

spirits are sometimes depicted as functioning within an established divine economy.[46] The Qumran material also displays continuity with the Watcher tradition in relation to demonic affliction. Demonic possession is equated with impurity (e.g. 1QS iii 8 ff.), and demons "lead astray" individuals and affect them ethically (e.g. 4Q510 1; 1QS iv 20 ff.). These characteristics may reflect the impure lineage of evil spirits (half human, half angelic) and their tendency to lead humans away from God in the Watcher tradition.

Wright identifies similarities between the depiction of demons and possession in Mark 5 and features of the Watcher tradition in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Since the physical bodies of the giants are destroyed in the flood, the ability and desire of a demon to inhabit an individual suggests to Wright a possible parallel with Watcher demonology.[47] He observes that the tremendous strength and corresponding violence exhibited by the possessed man on account of the invading spirit in Mark 5 is similar to the strong and destructive nature of the giants. Regarding Mark 5:4 Wright states: "The description of the spirits of the giants as 'strong spirits' [*1 En.*15:8] seems to be reflected in the superhuman strength of the demoniac and his ability to tear apart the chains and

---

the Angel of Darkness likely falls into a similar category of 'the leader of the spirits,' which includes Mastema, Beliar, Belial, and others…".

[46] For instance, 4Q386 1 ii 3-4 and 4Q390 frag. 2 l. 4 mention the "dominion" of Belial, and 4Q390 frag. 1 l. 11; frag. 2 col. ii l. 7 refer to the "rule" of evil spirits; cf. Wright, "Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism," 156 n. 74.

[47] Stuckenbruck explains the viability of this concept in the Watcher myth, stating "[w]e may infer that, being jealous of humanity who have survived the cataclysm with their bodies intact, these [bastard] spirits instinctively attempt to rejoin themselves to a corporal existence that they once had and are especially inclined to afflict by attacking or entering the bodies of humans…"; Stuckenbruck, "The Demonic World of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Evil and the Devil* (eds. I. Fröhlich and E. Koskenniemi; vol. 481 of LNTS, ed. M. Goodacre; T&T Clark, 2013), 54. Wright acknowledges that if there is a parallel between the notion of demonic possession and Watcher demonology, it is a subtle connection. He states in "Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism, 159: "The possibility disclosed by [Book of Watchers] that logically, the spirits of the giants may wish to invade humans to regain what they have lost, a physical body, is not explicitly followed up in the Scrolls… However, as can be seen in Mark 5, it appears that the idea of physical possession of humans by evil spirits it taken up in the Gospels."

shackles in which people attempted to bind him (5.4)."[48] Another link between Mark's gospel and Watcher demonology is the description of the demon in Mark 5:2, 8, 13 as "unclean" which may be analogous to the nature of the spirits of the giants (cf. *1 En.* 10:9, 15:8-12; *Jub.* 10:1).[49] Finally, the demon's apparent awareness of God's authority (Mk. 5:7) evokes the divine economy in the Watcher tradition in which demons are subject to God and allowed to remain active for only a limited time (cf. *1 En.* 15; *Jub.* 10). On this point, Wright notes that in Matthew's version of the pericope the demons' question to Jesus – "Have you come here to torment us before the time?" (Mt. 8:29) – suggests an "already but not yet" eschatology similar to that found in the Watcher myth.[50]

Wright persuasively shows that Genesis 6 serves as a source for the demonology in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, and that the Watcher tradition has an influence upon some Qumran material. Wright also provides plausible points of comparison between the Watcher tradition and features of synoptic gospel demonology. However, he does not offer compelling evidence for a direct influence of the Watcher myth upon Mark 5. A demon's ability and/or desire to possess an individual is found in other ancient Near Eastern traditions and is not exclusive to Watcher demonology.[51] As Wright acknowledges, the majority of demonic afflictions depicted in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* are ethical (e.g. leading astray) or physical assaults such as disease or murder. If the concept of demonic possession has a specific connection to the Watcher myth, it is uncertain why this connection is not more explicit in early Jewish literature.

---

[48] Wright, "Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism," 145-146.

[49] Wright, "Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism, 157, considers the unclean nature of demons to be "the clearest connection of the Watcher tradition to the demoniac story in Mark 5."

[50] The demons' question in Matthew "suggests that the torment of the spirit by Jesus signaled the beginning of the destruction of the forces of evil (i.e. an 'already but not yet' eschatology – cf. 1En 15-16; Jub 10.8-9; T. of Levi 18.12; 1 En 55.4)." Wright, "Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism," 149.

[51] For instance, Edward Langton notes "that the belief in possession was rampant also in Babylonia and Assyria, and there is good reason to believe that both the Arab and the Jewish belief was influenced by that source." E. Langton, *Essentials of Demonology* (London: The Epworth Press, 1949), 9.

Additional features in Mark 5 which Wright attributes to the Watcher tradition are also portrayed in other demonologies. Both strength and violence, which are certainly characteristics of the giants, are likewise traits of the demonic in Mesopotamian traditions. Ida Fröhlich comments on "Lilith," the Babylonian and Assyrian demon that she is "dangerous, above all, for newborn babies, sucking their blood and eating their flesh."[52] Drinking blood and eating flesh are precisely the acts of violence attributed to the giants in *1 En.* 7:4-6. Regarding Babylonian demonology, Fröhlich notes how the demon *utukku* is "tall in stature,"[53] and Edward Langton explains that "[g]ods cannot be distinguished from demons merely by their possessing the attribute of power; for strength is also an attribute of demons."[54] Moreover, the issue of impurity is not unique to Watcher demonology. Fröhlich describes several ancient Near Eastern traditions: "Whatever contributes to the disintegration of the body is considered physically impure. Belief in demons and impurity are related to each other."[55] It is also possible that in Mark 5, given the Gentile region and burial ground setting, the language of impurity may simply refer to ritualistic and social issues. According to Wahlen, the "impurity" theme in the pericope conveys more about Jesus' approach to the Gentiles in Mark than about the origin of demons.[56] Thus, if the context of impurity in the gospel pericope reflects an influencing demonology, it does not specifically or solely connect to the Watcher tradition.

---

[52] Ida Fröhlich, "Invoke at Any Time: Apotropaic Texts and Belief in Demons in the Literature of the Qumran Community" *BN* 137 (2008): 45; cf. idem, "Theology and Demonology in Qumran Texts" *Henoch* 32 (2010): 102-103, 106; and Langton, *Essentials of Demonology*, 16, 46.

[53] Fröhlich, "Theology and Demonology," 106. It is also noted in ibid., 106-107, that the *utukku* "kill humans, shedding their blood and devouring their flesh, sapping their stamina, incessantly consuming blood…".

[54] Langton, *Essentials of Demonology*, 33.

[55] Fröhlich, "Theology and Demonology," 108-109.

[56] The demon in Mark 5 is "unclean," but so is the Gentile region, dwelling among the tombs, and the swine into which the demons are driven. Yet, Jesus cures the man who then becomes Jesus' missionary. The point, according to Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 107, is that "possession looks the same for both Jews and Gentiles; so does the deliverance. Beginning with the Gerasene demonic 'Gentile' regions are reclaimed and brought back within the orbit of a pure Israel…"; cf. ibid., 94-99.

Wright's assertion that the demon's recognition of authority (Mk. 5:7; cf. Mt. 8:29) is an expression of the divine economy and eschatology in the Watcher tradition is not convincingly demonstrated. Although these motifs in each tradition certainly share similarities, Wright does not engage with or consider the eschatological or theological framework of the evangelists. It may be that possession, exorcism, and demons serve a unique function in each gospel, and that the authority of God and the future judgment of demons is portrayed differently by each evangelist. These issues are not explored by Wright and, thus, a link between the exorcisms in the gospels and the eschatology in the Watcher myth is unclear.

In conclusion, Wright identifies significant features of early Jewish demonology, and demonstrates the development of these features from the Hebrew scriptures to the Dead Sea Scrolls. His discussion has implications for understanding the relationship between background traditions and synoptic gospel demonology. Although there may be an influence of the Watcher myth upon the depiction of demons in the gospels, the impact is probably not as strong as Wright suggests. The characteristics of the demons in the Watcher tradition which Wright connects to Mark 5 are also traits of the demonic in various ancient Near Eastern demonologies.[57] As Wright shows, the Watcher myth influenced the demonology in some Qumran passages. However, Mesopotamian demonology is also expressed at Qumran (e.g. "Lilith" appears in 4Q510 frag. 1).[58] Therefore, when considering the extent to which the demonology in early Judaism influenced the aetiology and portrayal of demons in the gospels, both the Watcher myth and other ancient Near Eastern traditions should be taken into account. Whatever the precise relationship, there is certainly continuity between demonology in the gospels and earlier traditions.

---

[57] Fröhlich, "Theology and Demonology," 116, concisely summarizes this point: "The Enochic giants have the same characteristics as the Mesopotamian demons: they are tall, and obtrusive beings, roaming in bands, attacking their victims indiscriminately. They ravage the work of humans, devour the flesh of animals and humans, and consume their blood. They are born from a sexual union of heavenly and earthly beings, considered in the Enochic story to be impure."

[58] The influence of Mesopotamian demonology upon certain Qumran texts is explored in §2.2 of the next chapter.

1.1.2 The Place of Satan and Demons in the Evangelists' Theologies

Addressing the role of demons in each gospel, especially in relation to Jesus and the disciples, is important for assessing human interaction with the demonic. Examining this topic entails a general consideration of Satanology and demonology in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Since many contributions have been made on the function and activity of Satan and demons in the gospels, an analysis of each contribution is far too large an undertaking for this thesis.[59] Instead, I will focus more broadly on major conclusions reached about perceptions held on the issues of synoptic gospel Satanology and demonology while also noting some conflicting views and unresolved issues.

In regard to the synoptic material a short word on the "synoptic problem" is necessary. The majority opinion that Mark's gospel is the earliest, and that the authors of Matthew and Luke used as their source Mark and the so-called "Q" material is not challenged here. This theory, that is the Two-Document Hypothesis, presupposes Markan priority and the existence of "Q" and is regarded by a significant number of New Testament scholars as the least troublesome and most probable solution to the "synoptic problem."[60] A chronology of the gospels

---

[59] Most recently, aspects of demonology in the gospels are given attention in articles from *Evil, the Devil, and Demons* and *Evil and the Devil*. An article by Derek R. Brown serves as a helpful summary of research on the topic of Satan in the Hebrew Bible, pseudepigrapha, and New Testament. Although research on Satan is the main focus of the article, the larger aspect of demonology is inevitably touched upon in some places; cf. Brown, "The Devil in the Details: A Survey of Research on Satan in Biblical Studies," *CBR* 9 (2011): 200-227.

[60] A good overview of the Two Document Hypothesis and its relationship to various historical-critical methods can be found in Clare K. Rothschild, "Historical Criticism," in *Methods for Luke* (ed. Joel B. Green; Cambridge University Press, 2010), 9-41; cf. W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *Matthew I-VII: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, vol. 1 (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 1-148; and Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2007), 94-95. For opposing views, see William R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964; A. M. Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q," in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot* (ed. D. E. Nineham; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967), 55-86; and B. Orchard, *Matthew, Luke and Mark: The Griesbach Solution to the Synoptic Question, vol. 1* (Manchester: Koinonia Press, 1977).

that asserts Markan priority followed by Matthew then Luke is accepted as the basis for the study to follow. Where relevant, "Q" is used as a standardly accepted term when referring to the common material in Matthew and Luke not present in Mark, although challenges to "Q" may be noted.

1.1.2.1 Mark: Satan and Demons

Ernest Best posits a particular view of demonology and the activity of Satan in Mark's gospel. He argues that that the Temptation narrative (Mk. 1:12-13) depicts the defeat of Satan by Jesus. According to Best, the exorcisms of Jesus' ministry are simply "mopping-up operations" subsequent to the conquest of Satan achieved in the Temptation. Thus, Satan is not active in Jesus' ministry in Mark, and the overthrow of Satan cannot be associated with Jesus' Passion.[61] He arrives at this conclusion after examining demonologically relevant passages including the Temptation narrative and the Beelzebul Controversy. Best explains that while the short description of the Temptation does not mention an explicit outcome, the result of the event is "gathered from the wider context" of the gospel.[62] He further reasons that Satan's defeat is achieved in the Temptation based on language in the Beelzebul pericope. Specifically, Mark 3:27 states: "But no one can enter a strong man's house and plunder his goods, unless he first binds the strong man; then indeed he may plunder his house." The "strong man" in the parable is identified with Satan, and the person who binds the "strong man" is Jesus. The form of the verb "to bind" (δέω) used in 3:27 is an aorist subjunctive (δήσῃ) which, according to Best, suggests a final, definite act; an act that must refer back to a binding of Satan by Jesus in the Temptation. However, the subjunctive is used because the verb appears after the protasis ἐάν μή ("unless," "except," or "if not"), and the

[61] The meaning of the cross for Mark is the judgment of God borne by Jesus for the forgiveness of sins; cf. Ernest Best, *The Temptation and the Passion* (SNTS 2; 2d ed.; Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1990), lxxiv.

[62] Best, *The Temptation and the Passion*, 4.

aspect of time for the aorist subjunctive is undefined.[63] This being the case, the verb may not be referring back to a specific act in the immediate past. One expects the aorist subjunctive to be used in this sentence even if the binding had not yet taken place and was being referred to abstractly by Jesus. Thus, the precise meaning of the verb in 3:27 is not so apparent. This feature in the Beelzebul Controversy is, perhaps, the strongest argument for Best's theory since he interprets it as an explicit reference to Satan's demise.[64] Since the interpretation of δήσῃ is debatable, Best's conclusions are open to disagreement.

Graham Twelftree holds an alternative view of Satan and demons in which the exorcistic activity of Jesus is part of his ongoing battle with Satan who is not defeated once and for all in the Temptation.[65] Not only is exorcism an integral part of Jesus' mission of establishing God's kingdom in Mark, it is an important aspect of discipleship and is to be continued by his followers (e.g. 6:7-13; 9:14-29; and

---

[63] A discussion of the aorist subjunctive may be found in William D. Mounce, *Basics of Biblical Greek* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2003), 288-294. Graham Twelftree also points to an ambiguity with regard to the aspect of time in this particular use of the aorist subjunctive; cf. G. H. Twelftree, *In the Name of Jesus: Exorcism Among the Early Christians* (Baker Academic, 2007), 133.

[64] In another argument for the absence of satanic activity after Mark's Temptation, the other two occurrences of the title Σατανᾶς are examined. In the Parable of the Sower (4:15), "Satan" snatches the word of God from those who receive it. In 8:33, Jesus utters a rebuke to Peter: ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ. In the first case, Best highlights that it is not Jesus but the recipients of the gospel who are affected. Although the passage may have implications for the early Christians, it does not signal any ongoing activity of Satan in relation to Jesus' ministry; cf. idem, *the Temptation and the Passion*, 28, 37, 44, 182-185. In the second case, Best interprets the words attributed to Jesus as something of a general comparison of Peter to Satan rather than an affirmation of Satan's presence or activity. He states in ibid., 29: "it seems better to see Peter behaving after the manner of Satan than as either indwelt by Satan or as his tool." Therefore, the two references to Σατανᾶς outside the Temptation do not indicate a continued satanic presence. Although Best may be correct in his interpretation of these passages, as proof of a defeated Satan they are ultimately arguments from silence; i.e., since a match-up between Jesus and Satan is not depicted by Mark after the Temptation, Satan must be a vanquished and innocuous figure. These arguments are not convincing enough to accept Best's view of demonology and Satanology in Mark.

[65] For a critique of Best, cf. Twelftree, *In the Name of Jesus*, 113.

16:17).[66] Susan Garrett expresses a similar understanding of Markan Satanology/demonology. The theme that righteous individuals are "tested" or "tempted" is common in the Hebrew scriptures and early Jewish literature, and this theme is a useful way of reading Mark's portrayal of Jesus.[67] There are three agents of temptation in Mark: (1) Satan; (2) human adversaries (both Jewish and Roman); and (3) the disciples. Throughout the gospel, Satan's involvement is alluded to or implied in episodes of testing from each of the three agents. The clearest and primary example of satanic temptation is in Mark's Temptation narrative. Garrett interprets Jesus as victorious in overcoming this initial test, though Satan remains very much present and active throughout the rest of Jesus' ministry.[68] Many of the impediments to the mission of Jesus come from his disciples. Due to their blindness and lack of understanding, which may be the result of satanic influence, they are, in some cases, "pawns in the struggle between Satan and Christ."[69] Jesus' rebuke of Peter (8:33) makes it clear that Satan, at least in part, is responsible for Peter's rebuke of Jesus.[70] Similarly, Mark seems to

---

[66] For instance, on the Mission of the Twelve (6:7-13) Twelftree, *In the Name of Jesus*, 117, states: "Mark understood the disciples to be preaching the kingdom of God, which on the basis of 3:23-27, we should expect, as indeed Mark spells out here in 6:13, involved exorcism. Again, this probably also conveyed to Mark's readers the significance of their exorcistic ministry – it was the casting out of Satan, the destruction of the kingdom of evil." Cf. ibid., 155-128.

[67] Susan R. Garrett, *The Temptations of Jesus in Mark's Gospel* (Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998). The theme of "testing" in the Jewish scriptures and Second Temple literature is the subject of the first chapter; cf. ibid,. 19-49.

[68] According to Garrett, *The Temptations of Jesus*, 59 n. 21, Best's theory of a decisive victory over Satan in the Temptation is "scarcely the case."

[69] Garrett, *The Temptations of Jesus*, 82.

[70] "Peter is a *satan* in the root sense of the word – he is an adversary, an opponent, one standing in the way." But this is not all. "Influenced in part by the story of Job, many ancient Jews (and Christians in their turn) assumed that Satan inflicts suffering *so as to cause the righteous to stumble on the path of righteousness*." Garrett, *The Temptations of Jesus*, 76-77. Thus, according to Garrett, Peter is the subject of a type of satanic manipulation which makes him the mouthpiece of Satan. This does not imply that Peter was "possessed," rather, like Job's wife Sitidos (as specified in the LXX), Peter was acting as Satan's proxy.

presuppose Judas' alliance with Satan in handing Jesus over to his enemies.[71] Therefore, explicit references to Satan (4:15; 8:33) and a comparison of Markan themes to surrounding traditions indicate Jesus' continuous battle with Satan and satanic forces.

Jan Dochhorn indicates that interpreting the role of Satan is essential for understanding Mark's Christology. Satan interacts with Jesus during key points in his ministry. The rebuke of Peter as Σατανᾶς occurs immediately upon Jesus' revelation to the disciples that he must suffer, die, and rise again. Peter's hostile response to Jesus is due to satanic inspiration.[72] Satan's opposition to Jesus, through Peter, functions as an attempt to deter the fulfillment of his messianic mission. Whereas messianic mission is the focus of Mark 8, messianic identity is at stake in the Temptation. In his assessment of this narrative, Dochhorn favors the motif of Jesus as the "new Adam." Additionally, Satan is viewed as an active presence beyond the Temptation.[73]

The Beelzebul Controversy contains extensive Satanological and demonological information which Dochhorn outlines in separate points, five of which are relevant here:

- ὁ Σατανᾶς and Βεελζεβούλ are two terms for the same figure.

---

[71] "Though Mark does not expressly mention that Satan inspired Judas…Judas' alliance with Satan seems to be presupposed by the woe that Jesus uttered in 14:21 ('It would have been better for that one not to have been born') – in other words, the 'one who gives Jesus over' is destined for perdition." Accordingly, "Judas' handing over of Jesus continues the Marcan theme of satanic intervention in the inner circle." Garrett, *The Temptations of Jesus*, 116.

[72] Jan Dochhorn argues: "Mk 8.33 presupposes a pneumatology resp. Satanology of inspiration." Idem, "The Devil in the Gospel of Mark" in *Evil and the Devil*, 99. This is a familiar concept to Mark and his audience. Dochhorn further explains in ibid., 100: "We learn by Mk 8.33 that for Mark – as with other Jews and Christians – Satan is able to act as the *ego* of another being, especially a human being."

[73] This can be inferred from the statement: "In both texts [Mk 1:13; 8:33] Christ is confronted with Satan, and this means Satan is active where the two central aspects of the Son of Man are concerned." Dochhorn, "The Devil in the Gospel of Mark," 103.

- "In Mk 3.23 the word σατανᾶς is used in a generic sense (the definite article is missing). This presupposes that *the* Satan is also *a* satan..."[74]
- Satan is the lord or chief of demons in a way similar to *Jubilees* 11 where the angel Mastema is chief of the evil spirits. Also, there are "good reasons to assume that for Mark Beelzebul=Satan is also a demon himself."[75]
- One message of the Beelzebul Controversy is that Jesus has overcome Satan and can therefore expel demons.[76]
- "The Beelzebul pericope...associate[s] a defeat of Satan with Jesus' life on earth.[77]

The last two points in particular demonstrate the challenge of establishing precisely the time and nature of Satan's defeat in Mark. At one level there is certainly a victory of Jesus over Satan in the Temptation. At another level, Satan remains an active adversary and his defeat is further advanced with each exorcism. This emphasizes the ongoing importance of Jesus' encounters with Satan and demons in Mark.

In spite of the ambiguity surrounding the exact time and manner in which Satan is vanquished, the points of Satanology/demonology highlighted by Dochhorn are informative, and some of them are also found in the Satanology/demonology of Matthew and Luke. The interpretations argued by Best,

---

[74] Dochhorn, "The Devil in the Gospel of Mark," 104 (italics his).

[75] Dochhorn, "The Devil in the Gospel of Mark," 104. Understanding Satan as the chief of demons is similar to Garrett, *The Temptations of Jesus*, 125, who refers to demons as the "demonic hosts of Satan."

[76] This idea does not appear to be an acceptance of Best's theory that Jesus vanquished Satan in the Temptation. Dochhorn never refers to the Temptation as the moment when Jesus overcame Satan, and he further views Satan as active elsewhere in Mark (e.g. 8:33).

[77] Still, Dochhorn acknowledges the difficulty in accepting this statement as reflecting a consistent Satanology in Mark. He states in "The Devil in the Gospel of Mark," 105: "There remains the question if for Mark a deprivation of Satan dated in the time of Jesus' stay on earth excludes the notion that Satan continues to be active in the time between his deprivation and Easter as well as after that. According to Mk 4.15 Satan disturbs missionary activity... As a consequence, Mk 4.15 probably presupposes that Satan before and after Easter is capable of opposing the Church. Is the defeat of Satan by Jesus, according to Mark, only intermediate, limited to some days in which the Son of Man, who endured temptation by Satan, proved superior to him? Or does the defeat of Satan only take place when an exorcism is successful?"

Twelftree, Garrett, and Dochhorn offer insights into the major issues discussed in regard to Mark's portrayal of Satan and demons.[78] Moreover, exorcisms are seen as an especially important framework for contextualizing the function and activities of Satan and demons. Setting aside the more nuanced features of Markan Satanology/demonology, there are two basic conclusions that may be reached. First, Mark portrays Jesus as successful in his contest with Satan in 1:12-13 and conveys that Satan remains an adversarial figure throughout Jesus' ministry. Second, to a certain extent, opposition to Satan, encounters with demons, and exorcism reveal the identity and messianic mission of Jesus in Mark.

1.1.2.2 Matthew: Satan and Demons

Robert Branden suggests that Jesus' conflict with Satan is central to the plot of Matthew's gospel.[79] Branden prefaces his exploration of this conflict by assessing demonology in early Jewish literature which provides a backdrop for the function and activities of Satan and demons in Matthew. There are three "themes" in early Jewish demonology which influence Matthew's demonological construct: (1) a divine council; (2) apocalypticism; and (3) the legend of Satan's fall. The concept of a divine council or heavenly assembly is present in the Hebrew scriptures. Various passages depict a heavenly council (e.g. 1 Kgs. 22:19) in which the "holy ones" (קדשים) (e.g. Ps. 89:7) or the "sons of God" (בני האלהים) (e.g. Job 1:6) are members and Yahweh is its head. Among the various purposes of the council is a

---

[78] See also: A. B. Taylor, "Decision in the Desert: The Temptation of Jesus in Light of Deuteronomy," *Int* 14 (July, 1960): 300-309; H. A. Kelly, "The Devil in the Desert," *CBQ* 26 (1964): 190-220; H. C. Kee, "The Terminology of Mark's Exorcism Stories," *NTS* 14 (1968): 232-246; J. B. Gibson, *The Temptations of Jesus in Early Christianity*, JSNT Supplement Series 112 (ed. Stanley E. Porter; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995); J. W. Van Henten, "The First Testing of Jesus: A Reading of Mark 1:12-13," *NTS* 45.3 (July, 1999): 349-366; C. A. Evans, "Inaugurating the Kingdom of God and Defeating the Kingdom of Satan," *BBR* 15.1 (2005): 49-75; and J. P. Heil, "Jesus with the Wild Animals in Mark 1:13," *CBQ* 68 (2006): 63-78. See also the works pertaining to Mark's gospel in Brown, "The Devil in the Details," 209-211.

[79] Robert C. Branden, *Satanic Conflict and the Plot of Matthew* (SBL 89; New York: Peter Lang, 2006).

judiciary aspect. It is out of this legal context that an "accuser" or "adversary" (שטן) arose. In Job 1-2 and Zechariah 3:1-7, the figure שטן assumes the role of a prosecutor who accuses the righteous before God. These early characterizations of שטן are the basis for later depictions of a malevolent foe.[80]

Because the term "apocalypse" is interpreted differently by various scholars, Branden turns to John Collins (et al.) for a working definition:

> "Apocalypse" is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by another worldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another supernatural world.[81]

The activities of angels and demons are important components in many works belonging to the category "apocalypse." It is a construct that is also expressed by Matthew in two ways: (1) the eschatological "kingdom of God" motif, and (2) Matthew's "fascination with the angelic realm, angels and demons, which is somehow an invisible hinge connecting heaven and earth."[82] Thus, to understand the place of spiritual beings in Matthew a familiarity with Jewish apocalyptic motifs is necessary.

The importance of early Jewish apocalypticism provides an avenue for assessing the demonological traditions in pseudepigraphic works and Dead Sea

---

[80] Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 17, summarizes: "The best conclusion regarding the material on the adversary in the Old Testament is that the word in the human sphere refers to enemies or adversaries in the human realm. When used in the heavenly sphere, the background is the divine council and the adversary has a role in this assembly without necessarily implying evil in the member of the council fulfilling this role. However, the key passages (Job 1-2; Zech. 3:1-10; 1 Chron. 21:1) do not strictly rule out the possibility of identifying the adversary as the personal Satan of the intertestamental literature of the New Testament."

[81] John J. Collins, ed., *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*, Semeia 14 (Missoula: SBL, 1979), 9; cf. Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 18. Collins' definition is accepted as a working definition of "apocalypse" for this study as well.

[82] Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 19. The points are brought to bear on the plot of Matthew in such a way: "Jesus has brought the kingdom of God but there is something in the way: Satan, a rival kingdom. This forms the plot of Matthew and there is no part of Matthew's message which cannot be related to it." Ibid.

Scrolls. Demonological terminology in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is discussed and, where applicable, points of comparison between the *Testaments* and Matthew are noted.[83] Like Wahlen and Wright, Branden considers that features in *1 Enoch* may have influenced the synoptic tradition.[84] Other demonological traditions are found in passages from the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*, *Jubilees*,[85] and the *Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah*. In passages from Qumran there are demonological figures and themes including an "Angel of Darkness" who rules over those outside the Qumran community (cf. 1QS iii 20-22; CD-A v, viii), and the forces of "Satan"/"Belial"/"Melkiresha" which aid the "sons of Darkness" in their opposition to God and the "sons of Light" (e.g. 1QS i-iii; and 1QM xiii, xviii). Branden concludes: "Demonology, scarce in the Old Testament, plays an important and fundamental role in apocalyptic thought… [i]f apocalyptic Judaism provides at least some of the conceptual background to the gospel of Matthew it would scarcely be conceivable that demonology would not play a crucial role in this gospel."[86]

Psalm 82 is important for tracing the legend of Satan's fall. The setting of this psalm is the heavenly courtroom where the judgment of God is proclaimed upon an angelic host: "I say, 'You are gods, sons of the Most High, all of you; nevertheless, you shall die like men, and fall like any prince'" (Ps. 82:6-7). For Branden this represents a "malfunction" in the heavenly hosts which gives rise to the tradition of fallen angels and an adversary of God.[87] There is a further

---

[83] E.g., the depiction of Satan as one who tempts or leads people astray is similar to Matthew's Temptation narrative (4:1-11); cf. Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 21.

[84] Cf. Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 22-23.

[85] *Jubilees* especially expresses features of a developed demonology, including the ruler of demons "Mastema" who is equated with "Satan" (10:12). Mastema's activities include accusing the children of Israel (48:9, 15) and testing Moses (48:1-4). Mastema's role as one who tests Moses is compared to Satan's testing of Jesus in Matthew (4:1-11); cf. Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 23-24.

[86] Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 27.

[87] Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 27, states: "somewhere there is a 'malfunction' in the council and not all the angelic host is trustworthy. Psalm 82 indicates this malfunctioning…[and] is a good point of contact to begin the trace of the development of demonology and the fall of Satan from the Old Testament through the apocalyptic material."

development of this legend in pseudepigraphic apocalyptic traditions based on the interpretation of Genesis 6:1-4 depicting fallen angels ("sons of God") who marry "daughters of men." Interpretations of this passage produce the myths of the giants and Watchers in *Jubilees*, Enochic literature, and the writings of Josephus.[88] The development of the fallen angel myth continues with passages in *1 Enoch* 86:1-6, 88, and 90:20-21 which portray a single "star" (angel) who falls before the others. In *2 Enoch* [J] 7 the figure Satanail is a prince, and in the *Life of Adam and Eve* 15:3 (cf. Isa. 14:12-14) he vies to exalt his throne to the level of God. This is the progression of a myth which witnesses the evolution of a figure from a prosecutor in the divine court to a hostile opponent of God and leader of the fallen angels. The Satanological and demonological structure found in these and other early Jewish works provides a context for similar beliefs expressed in Matthew.

Branden focuses on two pericopae in Matthew's gospel: (1) the Temptation (4:1-11) and (2) the Beelzebul Controversy (12:22-32). According to Branden, because of the influence of early Jewish demonology "the original readers of Matthew's gospel would not have been surprised to meet Satan, the prince of demons, fallen from heaven and opposed to the works of God, confronting and tempting Jesus in Matthew chapter four."[89] There are parallels between Satan's initial appearance in the gospel and early Jewish tradition including the title Σατανᾶς, the LXX translation of the Hebrew שטן, which is used as a personal name,[90] and Satan's request that Jesus worship him (cf. *Life of Adam and Eve* 14:3). For Branden, these parallels are "support for a reading of Matthew's

---

[88] Cf. *Jub.* 5:1; *1 En.* 6-16; and Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, I, 3:1. For an overview of the three current interpretations of "sons of God" in the Genesis passage, cf. Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 39 n. 91. While Branden delves into the fallen angel myth and the development of Satan from Genesis 6:1-4, *Jubilees*, and *1 Enoch*, and its relevance to Matthew, he does not provide a substantive discussion of either the aetiology of demons in pseudepigraphic writings, nor their impact, if any, on Matthean demonology.

[89] Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 32.

[90] Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 43, states: "Thus while Satan certainly is acting as an adversary, he is also a personal being who reveals himself to be evil by arguing with Jesus and even seeking to have Jesus worship him." I tend to think it is the *content* of Satan's arguments with Jesus that cast him as evil rather than the mere fact of his arguing.

demonology through the lens of the intertestamental literature."[91] It is a reading in which the kingdom of Satan is in opposition to the kingdom of God.

The temptations in the wilderness initiate the conflict between Satan and Jesus in Matthew, and Branden gathers several observations from the account. First, the exchange focuses on a key Christological theme; Jesus, υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, chooses "humble obedience to the Father" when confronted by Satan.[92] Second, the purpose of Satan is to oppose Jesus' plan of salvation, and this is a function he continues to serve throughout the gospel (e.g., 12:34; 13:39; 16:22-23). Finally, the depiction of Satan is consistent with demonologies in the apocalyptic literature of some pseudepigrapha and the Dead Sea Scrolls. These observations each help to characterize the relationship between Jesus and demonic evil in Matthew.

The motivation for the dispute reported in the Beelzebul Controversy is Jesus' performance of an exorcism. Branden accepts Twelftree's view that exorcism, for Jesus, is "a battle with Satan" and a "realization of the kingdom of God in the face of the defeat of Satan."[93] In response to Jesus' exorcism, while the crowds wonder if this is "the Son of David" (12:23), the Pharisees accuse him of being in league with "Beelzebul" (12:24). Branden writes: "The specific charge is that Jesus is operating by the power of Beelzebul, the prince of demons. Thus, the fundamental issue is the source of Jesus' power." [94] The use of both Σατανᾶς and Βεελζεβούλ for the chief of demons shows that the two terms are equivalent for Matthew (cf. Dochhorn's point for Mark 3 above). Jesus responds to this charge with an analogy (a kingdom and a house cannot be divided against itself, cf. 12:25) and two questions: (1) why would Satan cast out Satan, and (2) "by whom do your sons cast [the demons] out?" (12:27). The point made by the first question is that,

---

[91] Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 43.

[92] The theme of Jesus' sonship and its nature arises again in 16:16-23 with Peter's confession followed by Jesus' rebuke of Peter "in Satanic terms." Branden connects the rebuke of Peter to the Temptation scene as another example of satanic opposition to Jesus; cf. Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 55.

[93] Twelftree, *Jesus the Miracle Worker* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1999), 263; cf. idem, *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus* (WUNT II. Reihe 54 Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1993), 170; Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 57.

[94] Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 61.

as a matter of strategy and common sense, Satan would not give Jesus power to cast out demons. Branden argues that the identity of "your sons" refers to the disciples, thereby associating their exorcistic activity with Jesus'.[95]

Jesus offers a parable in 12:29 in which Satan is depicted as a "strong man" who is bound and his house plundered. The "strong man's" house is Satan's kingdom, and the "property" (i.e., the plunder) represents people in Satan's kingdom, presumably those demonically possessed or in some other way under satanic influence.[96] An important aspect for interpreting this parable is understanding the manner in which the strong man is bound. In Branden's view, the binding of the strong man does not necessarily refer to the total vanquishing of Satan, nor is it explicitly tied to a specific event.[97] Branden considers that questions relating to the exact nature and time of Satan's defeat miss the point of the parable; the point being "Jesus is stronger than Satan and able to set free his captives at will, not that Satan can no longer function."[98] Further in the Beelzebul pericope Jesus refers to himself as "Son of man" (12:32). This title is interpreted in light of its meaning in Ezekiel, Daniel, and Enochic passages.

In summary, Branden explains that features of early Jewish apocalyptic literature, which include aspects of demonology, serve as a backdrop to Satanology and demonology in Matthew. Branden's examination of two key pericopae reveal the adversarial role of Satan in Matthew. Both the Temptation and the Beelzebul controversy have points of contact with early Jewish apocalyptic and demonological traditions, and depict an ongoing conflict between

---

[95] While Branden acknowledges that most commentators identify "your sons" as other Jewish exorcists of that time, he offers three reasons for interpreting the phrase as a reference to the disciples. The first reason is rhetorical, the second is that it best explains the judgment of the Pharisees by the exorcists in 12:27, and finally "there is not apparent logic to Jesus identifying unknown Jewish exorcists as proof of His own good standing." Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 63.

[96] Cf. Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 64.

[97] "Matthew does not explicitly state when this binding occurred. Perhaps binding is a metaphor meaning defeated but not completely vanquished. If this is the case, then within the gospel itself this would most likely refer to the temptation narrative (4:1-11)." Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 64-65.

[98] Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 81 n. 162. Branden, ibid., interprets that there are a series of defeats "along the way to Satan's ultimate demise" and the Temptation would be one of these defeats.

Jesus and Satan. The nature of this conflict is one in which Jesus has the upper hand and exerts authority over Satan, yet a complete cessation of satanic opposition is not affirmed in either narrative. Branden convincingly argues that satanic opposition to Jesus is a recurrent feature throughout Matthew and a central aspect of the plot of the gospel.

Key aspects of Branden's view of Satan and demons in Matthew are found in other treatments of Matthean Satanology/demonology. Wahlen interprets Jesus' exorcisms in Matthew as signaling the establishment of God's kingdom as well as contributing to Satan's downfall.[99] For Wahlen, the Beelzebul Controversy is especially descriptive of the conflict between Jesus (and God's kingdom) and Satan (and Satan's kingdom of demons).[100] According to Twelftree the point of the "strong man" parable is that Satan suffers defeat at the hands of Jesus via his exorcistic activity.[101] Twelftree contends that the defeat of Satan by means of exorcizing demons extends beyond the ministry of Jesus and is part of the early Christian mission.[102]

Thus, there are at least three clear points regarding Matthean Satanology and demonology that are accepted here. First, similar to Mark, in Matthew Satan is depicted as an opponent of Jesus throughout the gospel. The adversarial role of

---

[99] E.g., "For Matthew, the exorcisms are a potent sign of the kingdom's arrival and of Satan's overthrow." Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*,138.

[100] "Matthew's version of the Beelzebul controversy is the clearest of the three in depicting a 'kingdom' of demons headed by Satan (v. 26) – a kingdom which is suffering defeat by the Spirit at work in Jesus (v. 28). The conclusion seems inescapable that in replying to the Beelzebul charge, Jesus announces the bringing in of God's eschatological salvation through the overthrow of Satan's kingdom." Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 126.

[101] In the "strong man" parable, "the strong man obviously represents Satan being cast out by [Jesus'] exorcisms. In this, Matthew follows his received tradition, linking the exorcisms of Jesus with the first of what was understood to be a two-stage defeat of Satan." Twelftree, *In the Name of Jesus*, 169.

[102] For instances, describing the task given to the disciples in the Great Commission (10:5-15), Twelftree, *In the Name of Jesus*, 167, states: "Their exorcisms are part of the destruction of Satan's kingdom and the realization of the powerful presence of God." Similarly, the directive by Jesus to the disciples in 28:20 to teach and observe "all that I have commanded you" implicitly includes exorcism; cf. ibid., 160-161.

Satan is manifest particularly in the Temptation scene and the Beelzebul Controversy. Second, based on interpretations of the "strong man" parable in 12:29, the exorcism of demons helps to bring about the gradual defeat of Satan who is the ruler of demons. Third, depictions of demonic/satanic activity, such as Satan's testing of Jesus as υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (4:3, 6), and Jesus' exorcisms of possessed individuals which bring about the eschatological kingdom (12:28), are essential for understanding the identity and mission of Jesus in Matthew.[103]

1.1.2.3 Luke: Satan and Demons

The role of Satan and demons in the writings attributed to Luke is the subject of a monograph by Garrett.[104] In Luke's gospel and Acts, the activity of Satan and his demonic forces, as well as the "pushback" against Satan and demons from Jesus and his followers, is an essential component of the actualization of Jesus' salvific mission and the ministry of the early faithful after the ascension. For Garrett, there are three passages in Luke's gospel that characterize the role of Satan and the demons: (1) the Temptation[105] (4:1-13); (2) the Beelzebul Controversy (11:14-23); and (3) Jesus' description of Satan's fall (10:17-20).

---

[103] Additional discussions of Satanological/demonological features in Matthew include: Kelly, "The Devil in the Desert," 190-220; J. T. Fitzgerald, "The Temptation of Jesus: The Testing of the Messiah in Matthew," *ResQ* 15 (1972): 152-160; B. H. Kell, "An Exposition of Matthew 4:1-11," *Int.* 29 (1975): 57-62; Simon J. Kistemaker, "The Lord's Prayer in the First Century," *JETS* 21/4 (December, 1978): 323-328; Gibson, *The Temptations of Jesus*, 83-118; Evans, "Inaugurating the Kingdom of God," 63-78; idem., "Jesus and Evil Spirits in the Light of Psalm 91," *BT* 1 (2009): 43-58; Andrei A. Orlov, *Dark Mirrors: Azazel and Satanael in Early Jewish Demonology* (State University of New York Press, 2011), 107-112; David Mathewson, "The Apocalyptic Vision of Jesus According to the Gospel of Matthew: Reading Matthew 3:16-4:11 Intertextually," *TB* 62.1 (2011), 89-108; and E. Koskenniemi, "Miracles of the Devil and His Assistants in Early Judaism and their Influence on the Gospel of Matthew" in *Evil and the Devil*, 84-97. See also the works pertaining to Matthew in Brown, "The Devil in the Details," 209-211.

[104] Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989).

[105] Garrett emphasizes that πειράζω in Luke 4 is better translated "test" rather than "tempt." It is in the sense of being "tested" that Jesus' confrontation with Satan parallels with similar scenarios,

In the Temptation Satan asserts that he has been given authority over "all the kingdoms of the world" (4:5-6). This suggests a feature of particular relevance for Garrett: idolatry. The authority and glory of all the kingdoms under Satan's rule is promised to Jesus in return for his worship. Garrett notes in Luke a strong link between idolatry and the demonic.[106] Indeed, the desire for worship casts Satan in the mold of the king of Babylon whose hubris and aspiration for divine status is his eventual downfall (cf. Isa. 14:4-20).[107] As Luke discloses in 10:18, Satan's downfall is likewise assured.

Luke concludes the pericope with this statement: "And when the devil had ended every temptation, he departed from him until an opportune time" (4:13). For Garrett, the phrase ἄχρι καιροῦ ("until an opportune time") indicates that Satan does not disappear completely.[108] Furthermore, the ending of "every temptation" (πάντα πειρασμὸν) is not absolute and refers only to the wilderness trial. Garrett compares the manner of Satan's departure from Jesus in Luke 4 to a passage from the *Testament of Job* which describes Satan like a wearied wrestler who is defeated by Job's enduring fidelity to God.[109] It is in this sense that Jesus is

---

such as Abraham's testing with Isaac (Gen. 22; cf. *Jub.* 17:16) and the Israelites testing in the wilderness; cf. Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 127 n. 2.

[106] Garrett refers to Acts 26:18 in which the Gentiles are described as being under the authority of Satan. She explains in *Demise of the Devil*, 40: "Implicit here is the common notion that Satan and the demons motivate idolatry, in which they themselves receive tribute." She further argues in ibid., "Luke probably regarded the unrepentant Jews as well as the idolatrous Gentiles as subject to the Prince of Darkness: the evangelist emphasizes the Jew's habitual idolatry, acceptance of (satanic) false prophets, and rejection of (divine) true ones (Luke 6:22-23, Acts 7:39-43, 51-52; 13:4-12)."

[107] "Accordingly, Luke 4:6-7 ought to be paired with the remark in 10:18 about Satan's fall." Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 40. The Isaiah passage is offered as a precedent for associating the arrogance of Satan with the depiction of his fall in Luke 10:18.

[108] Pace Hans Conzelmann who argues that Luke 4:13 initiates a "Satan-free" ministry of Jesus; cf. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (trans. Geoffrey Buswell; London: Faber and Faber, 1960), 28. For Garrett's critique of Conzelmann, cf. Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 41-42, 131 n. 30.

[109] *T. Job* 27:2-5 is translated: "[Satan] wept saying, 'Look, Job, I am weary and I withdraw from you, even though you are flesh and I a spirit. You suffer plague, but I am in deep distress. I became like one athlete wrestling another, and one pinned the other… But because he showed endurance and did not grow weary, at the end the upper one cried out in defeat. So you also, Job, were the one blow and in a plague, but you conquered my wrestling tactics which I brought on you.'" R. P.

victorious over Satan in the wilderness episode. Jesus' resistance to Satan's tests causes the devil to retreat in defeat, but, as Garrett states, "[i]t is likely that in saying that Satan withdrew 'for a while' Luke was indeed hinting that the devil was not yet finished with Jesus."[110] Satanic opposition to Jesus continues beyond the Temptation, even if it is not as overt.

The Beelzebul Controversy in Luke expresses many of the same points found in Mark and Matthew's version of the pericope. The issue being challenged is not exorcism in general but the power-source by which Jesus exorcizes (11:15-16). Also similar to Mark and Matthew, Σατανᾶς and Βεελζεβούλ in Luke are corresponding titles for the ruler of demons (11:18-19), and Satan and his demons are discussed using kingdom imagery. The parable of the strong man (11:21-22) portrays how the kingdom of God, manifest in Jesus' exorcisms, advances against the kingdom of Satan. Garrett, like Twelftree, takes this to mean that "whenever Jesus exorcises or heals, he takes spoil from Satan's kingdom and adds it to God's own."[111] However, while Satan is the "weaker man" and his kingdom suffers blows at the hands of Jesus, neither Satan's failure in the Temptation nor the success of Jesus' exorcisms constitute a complete defeat of Satan. Thus, according to Garrett's reading of Luke's Beelzebul Controversy, Satan and his demons serve as an opposing kingdom which experiences gradual conquest by means of Jesus' exorcistic ministry.

In Luke 10 Jesus sends seventy of his followers out into various towns and places to prepare people for his arrival and ministry. It is reported in 10:17-20:

Spittler, "Testament of Job," in *OTP, vol. 1*, 851. Similarly, a passage in *Hermas Mandate* 12.5.2 depicts a wrestling devil who cannot overcome those who resist him.

[110] Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 42. Garrett further explains in ibid., 42-43: "But Satan, even if he has temporarily ceased to attack Jesus directly, is not completely absent; he has only retreated to lick his wounds and plan his next assault."

[111] Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 45. To put it another way: "Whenever Jesus exorcises, he as 'the stronger one' (cf. Lk. 3:16) is entering and plundering the domain of the conquered Satan." Ibid. This view is echoed by Twelftree, *In the Name of Jesus*, 135, when he characterizes the "strong man" parable in this way: "As this is most probably a parable of exorcism, and it also associates the coming of the kingdom of God and the defeat of Satan, for Luke, this defeat of Satan was taking place in Jesus' exorcisms."

> 17 The seventy returned with joy, saying "Lord, even the demons are subject to us in your name!" 18 And he said to them, "I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven. 19 Behold I have given you authority to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall hurt you. 20 Nevertheless do not rejoice in this, that the spirits are subject to you; but rejoice that your names are written in heaven."

Two important features in this passage are: (1) the description of Satan's fall and (2) the authority over demonic beings given to the seventy.[112] Regarding Satan's fall, Garret interprets that Jesus is recounting a vision of an event that has not yet occurred. She argues that in the report of the seventy, the demons "are subject" (here the present passive ὑποτάσσεται is used), not "were subject" to them, implying an ongoing and perhaps future authority over the demonic.[113] Garrett is not entirely persuasive on this point. It may be that Luke's use of the present passive ὑποτάσσεται in 10:17, 20 simply describes a transformation that has occurred; namely, now that Satan has fallen/is falling, "the demons are subject to us." However, Garrett shows that the language in 10:17-20 does not explicitly describe the fall of Satan as concurrent with the disciples' mission.

Garrett considers it most likely that Satan's demise takes place at Jesus' resurrection and ascension, and numerous passages from surrounding material

---

[112] Aspects of Lk. 10:17-20 are further discussed in §§3.1.3.1; 3.3.1. For interpretations of this pericope, cf. Christopher F. Evans, *Saint Luke* (TPI NTC; London: SCM Press, 1990), 453-455; Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 43-44; John Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34* (WBC 35b; Nelson Reference & Electronic, 1993), 564-566; Samuel Vollenweider, "'Ich sah den Satan wie einen Blitz vom Himmel fallen' (Lk 10 18)," *ZNW* 79 (1988): 187-202; David Crump, "Jesus, the Victorious Scribal-Intercessor in Luke's Gospel," *NTS* 38 (1992): 51-65; Dietrich Rusam, "Sah Jesus wirklich den Satan vom Himmel fallen (Lk 10.18)? Auf der Suche nach einem neuen Differenzkriterium," *NTS* 50.1 (2004): 87-105; M. Theobald, "'Ich sah den Satan aus dem Himmel stürzen…' Überlieferungskritische Beobachtungen zu Lk 10, 18-20," *BZ* 49.2 (2005): 174-190; and M. E. Sousa, "The 'Johannine Thunderbolt' in Luke 10:22: Toward an Appreciation of Luke's Narrative Sequence," *JTI* 7.1 (2013): 97-113.

[113] Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 49, also argues that Jesus' promise in 10:19 should reflect the ongoing promise "that the Enemy…'will in no way harm you.'" Cf. ibid., 135 n. 52.

linking these two events are cited.[114] A particularly fitting analogy, one which Luke may have had in mind, is the restoration of Israel and the fall of the king of Babylon in Isaiah 14. Just as the Babylonian king is brought down, the same will happen to Satan. Garrett writes: "Jesus' enthronement at the resurrection is herein proposed as the probable occasion when Satan's fall is thought to take place."[115] This translates into a three-stage struggle between Satan and Jesus portrayed in Luke: (1) Jesus conquers Satan in the Temptation and with subsequent exorcisms; (2) Satan briefly gains the upper hand during the passion and death of Jesus (cf. 22:53); and (3) Jesus' resurrection and ascension to heaven represent the "ultimate rescue by God and victory over Satan" when the devil is cast from his lofty place in heaven.[116] Still, the devil remains active in earthly matters, and this is why the disciples' authority over evil is important.

The disciples' authority over the demonic raises the issue of why they need to combat demonic evil in the early church if Satan is dethroned by Jesus' resurrection and ascension. To address this issue Garrett turns to the Book of Revelation which depicts a "star" (i.e., Satan) that falls to the earth and unleashes evil for a limited period of time (Rev. 9). Only the faithful, those marked with God's "seal" (Rev. 9:4), possess the power of immunity from demonic assault (e.g. Rev. 9:4; 13:7-8). According to Garrett, "[t]hese ideas found in Revelation about Satan's fall, his continuing authority over humans in the period after the fall, and the exemption of the faithful from this satanic authority are compatible with Luke's understanding of the fall of Satan…".[117] Certainly there are parallels between the two texts, such as the description of the devil's power being like "scorpions" (σκορπίος) (Lk. 10:19; Rev. 9:3, 5) and safety for those whose names are "written" (γραφή) in "heaven/book of life" (οὐρανός/βιβλίον τῆς ζωῆς) (Lk. 10:20; Rev. 13:8). Thus, while Jesus is victorious over Satan in his ministry, and though his resurrection and ascension brings about the fall of Satan, a conflict with

---

[114] These include Jn. 12:31-33; 1 Pt. 3:21-22; and passages from Revelation; cf. Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 50-55.

[115] Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 53-54.

[116] Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 55.

[117] Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 56-57.

the demonic is still a reality for the followers of Jesus in the early church.[118] It is for this conflict that Jesus promises to the faithful the authority over demons by the power of his name.

Unlike Garrett, Twelftree holds that in Luke 10 the description of Satan's fall corresponds to the mission of the seventy. The imperfect ἐθεώρουν (10:18) "denotes a continuous, protracted action" which leads to Twelftree's translation of 10:18: "I have been seeing Satan falling like lightning from heaven."[119] Although Garrett demonstrates that there is no explicit connection between Satan's fall and the disciples' mission, there is also no explicit internal evidence that Luke links Jesus' resurrection and ascension with Satan's demise. Twelftree's argument is, perhaps, more fitting based on the content of Luke 10:17-20. However, regardless of whether Satan's fall is aligned with the disciples' mission or Jesus' resurrection and ascension, Satan's defeat is an ongoing event and the disciples' authority over the demonic is efficacious in the battle against evil.

To summarize, Luke portrays a conflict between Satan and Jesus that is present throughout Jesus' mission. Like Branden, Garrett views this conflict as central to understanding the purpose of Jesus' ministry.[120] Principal features of this struggle, which provide insight into Luke's Satanology/demonology, are found in the Temptation, the Beelzebul Controversy, and Jesus' description of Satan's fall. These passages suggest that Jesus is the "stronger man," his exorcisms contribute to Satan's downfall, and he endows his authority over demons to his followers.

---

[118] This concept of ongoing demonic conflict is present in, for example, Pauline Christianity. Eph. 6:11-12 urges the faithful to "put on the whole armor of God" for they "are not contending against flesh and blood" but against the devil and the spiritual forces of darkness. Weapons used for protection against the demonic include prayer and "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God" (vs. 17). See especially the discussions in Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians* (WBC 42; Nelson Reference and Electronic, 1990), 429-460; and E. Best, *Ephesians* (ICC; T&T Clark, 2006), 584-611.

[119] Twelftree, *In the Name of Jesus*, 140. Twelftree, ibid., explains: "In other words, Luke saw both that Satan's downfall was ongoing and that it was linked to the exorcistic ministry of the early Christians." Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 49, translates ἐθεώρουν "I was watching."

[120] Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 101, states in her conclusion: "the ministry of Jesus is from its inception a struggle with Satan for authority." This authority is what determines the fate of humanity.

Although Twelftree and Garrett disagree regarding the moment of Satan's fall, both interpret Satan as continuously active during and beyond Jesus' ministry, and exorcism is a successful response to this activity.[121]

1.1.3 Demonic Possession and Exorcism in the Synoptic Gospels

In light of the preceding analysis, the topic of human interactions with demons can now be considered. As §1.1.2 highlights, Jesus' and the disciples' conflict with the demonic is made especially clear in passages that portray or refer to exorcisms. Exorcisms frequently feature in the synoptic gospels as a common response of Jesus and the disciples to encounters with the demonic. Therefore, a review of this theme is necessary in order to characterize the way in which this particular anti-demonic technique is expressed. Two aspects of exorcism are addressed in this section. First, the historicity of Jesus' exorcisms are evaluated. This is important in order to establish the extent to which the historical Jesus responded to the demonic in a way similar to surrounding traditions. Second, the concept of possession and exorcism in the gospels in light of the history of traditions is presented. This helps to demonstrate features of continuity and discontinuity between the gospels and background traditions vis-à-vis human interaction with demons.

1.1.3.1 Exorcism and the Historical Jesus

[121] For additional conversations which touch upon demonologically relevant features or passages in Luke, see: Kelly, "The Devil in the Desert," 190-220; Gibson, *The Temptations of Jesus*, 83-118; S. Gathercole, "Jesus' Eschatological Vision of the Fall of Satan: Luke 10.18 Reconsidered," *ZNW* 94.2 (2003): 143-163; D. Rudman, "Authority and Right of Disposal in Luke 4.6," *NTS* 50.1 (January, 2004): 77-86; D. Rusam, "Sah Jesus wirklich den Satan vom Himmel fallen (Lk 10.18)? Auf der Suche nach einem neuen Differenzkriterium," *NTS* 50.1 (January, 2004): 87-105; Evans, "Inaugurating the Kingdom of God," 63-78; idem., "Jesus and Evil Spirits in the Light of Psalm 91," *BT* 1 (2009): 43-58; and M. Cserháti, "Binding the Strong Man: Demon-Possession and Liberation in the Gospel of Luke" in *Evil and the Devil*, 108-115. Cf. the works pertaining to Luke in Brown,"The Devil in the Details," 209-211.

Twelftree's work *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus* offers insights for understanding synoptic gospel exorcism accounts.[122] Twelftree critically examines the exorcistic activities attributed to Jesus and his disciples in order to determine whether the gospels' exorcism claims originate with the historical Jesus and are based on historical events. For Twelftree, uncovering the original material consists of applying traditional historical critical methods, specifically redaction criticism, to the gospel accounts, with emphasis on separating tradition from redaction for exorcistic activities and sayings.[123] The result is a convincing argument for the historicity of Jesus as an exorcist.

Twelftree begins his study by engaging with the background of exorcism in first century Palestine. He provides a working definition of "exorcism" which describes the term "in a first century milieu":

> Exorcism was a form of healing used when demons or evil spirits were thought to have entered a person and to be responsible for sickness and was the attempt to control and cast out or expel evil spiritual beings or demons from people.[124]

This definition, in general, is useful for discussing depictions where demons are cast out of possessed or afflicted individuals. It is a functional definition of convenience, however, and as Twelfree clarifies it does not fit every scenario.[125]

---

[122] Some helpful reviews of Twelftree's work are: Mark Harding, *JRH* 21.2 (1997): 110-112; James L. Jaquette, *CBQ* 57.1 (Jan., 1995): 194-195; James E. Lanpher, *JR* 76.1 (Jan., 1996): 103-105; Helge Kjar Nielsen, *JTS* 45 (1994): 646-647; R. A. Piper, *TBR* 6.3 (1994): 42; and Graham Stanton, *RBL* (Jan,. 2000).

[123] Twelftree is extremely thorough in his approach to each pericope, making use of textual, form, and redaction criticism when necessary. He explains in *Jesus the Exorcist*, 55: "the earliest recoverable traditions are not obtained merely by taking into account the redaction of the Gospel writers. The form critics have established that the Gospel traditions had an oral and probably, in many cases, a written tradition-history before they were known to the Gospel writers. Therefore, we need to take into account not only possible modifications by the Gospel writers but also Christian redaction as we seek to reconstruct the earliest possible reports of Jesus as an exorcist."

[124] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 13.

[125] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 13, points to the definition's omission of "specific techniques" for cultic or communal ceremonies and "references to exorcism of evil spirits from places." As we

Suitable qualifications are made for cases that are not entirely appropriate to the definition.

Twelftree's assessment on background traditions is relevant here because it highlights influences on synoptic gospel demonology and suggests sources of anti-demonic responses to evil. The main question which motivates his chapter on background traditions is: "What material should be used in an attempt to set Jesus the exorcist within his own milieu?"[126] Both Jewish and Hellenistic writings are cited as relevant, with emphasis on the similarities and distinctions between Hellenistic, Palestinian, and Galilean culture. Twelftree briefly mentions texts including *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, Tobit, the works of Philo and Josephus, the *LAB*, the Papyri Graecae Magicae (PGM), and rabbinic literature which help "to reconstruct first century understandings of spirits, demons, possessions, magic, healing, healers, exorcism, and exorcist."[127] However, for the assessment of the claims that exorcistic activities go back to the historical Jesus a more focused group of related material is consulted. Among these is the *Prayer of Nabonidus* (4Q242 or 4QPrNab ar) from Qumran which is given attention due to the portrayal of a Jewish גזר, translated "diviner" or "exorcist," who heals a Babylonian king afflicted with an evil sickness. After establishing the linguistic significance of גזר, Twelftree dismisses the importance of 4Q242 for exorcistic tradition due to the absence of an evil spirit or demon and the ambiguity of גזר.[128] To a limited extent the *Testament of Solomon* and some material from the *New Testament Apocrypha* are useful "in confirming the continuation of some techniques of exorcism that were used in the first century [and later] Palestine."[129]

Within the literature attesting to exorcism there is a "three-pointed pattern" that appears. A successful exorcism can be attributed to one or more of the

---

shall also see in this study, types of demonic influence include but are not limited to "sickness" or "illness."

[126] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 14.

[127] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 16-17.

[128] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 18, states: "the Prayer of Nabonidus was probably not understood as an exorcism story and therefore will be excluded from consideration when we attempt to reconstruct a first century Palestinian understanding of exorcism and exorcists."

[129] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 21.

following three features: (1) "the *exorcist*," that is, the powerful, authoritative, or charismatic status of the individual practitioner; (2) "a source of *power-authority*"; and (3) "*the ritual or form of application* of that power-authority against the offending spiritual being."[130] The first of these factors is subdivided into two types of exorcists; historical and legendary figures. Of the historical kind, Twelftree reviews a wide range of rabbinic,[131] classical Greek,[132] and early Christian[133] material. These examples contain depictions where works of wonder (sometimes exorcisms) are ascribed to prominent individuals or an exorcism is effective because of the figure's status. A "legendary" or "non-historical" figure is the second kind of exorcist common to early Jewish and Hellenistic literature. Here, the association of Solomon with authority over demons is highlighted. Solomon's portrayal in the *Testament of Solomon* is seen as important to this particular tradition, as is a passage from Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* where Solomon's name and techniques are used by a Jewish exorcist.[134] Josephus also regarded Solomon's father David as an exorcist based on a retelling of 1 Samuel 16 (cf. *Ant.* 6.66-69). Twelftree notes from Qumran the attribution of anti-demonic songs (11Q5 xxvii 9-10) and an incantation (11Q11 v 4) to David.[135] Solomon and David

---

[130] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 22 (italics his).

[131] Figures in rabbinic literature include Hania ben Dosa (cf. especially *b. Pesah.* 112b) and rabbi Simeon ben Yose in later tradition (cf. *b. Me'il.* 17b); cf. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 22-23.

[132] The depiction of Apollonius in Philostratus' *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana* and the "wandering priests" in Plato's *The Republic* (364b-365a) are referred to. Also included are passages from Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*. Cf. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 23-27.

[133] Included here are Origen (*Contra Celsum* I.6, 68) and Justin Martyr (*Apology* 1.6). A number passages from the New Testament are also cited, including reference to the sons of Sceva (Acts 19:13-19) and the implied Jewish exorcists (Mt. 12:27; Lk. 11:19). Cf. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 27-34.

[134] Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 8.46-49; Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 35-36. In addition to the *Testament of Solomon* and Josephus' passage, I would also include the presence of the name שלומה in an incantation from Qumran (11Q11 ii 2). This feature in 11Q11 and the tradition of Solomon as an exorcist is touched upon in §2.2.4.3 of the next chapter.

[135] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 37-38. The presence of David's name in col. i, which Twelftree asserts, is unclear. Further, I am not in agreement with his reconstruction of the name "Belial" in

are offered as the examples of "legendary" exorcists who were credited with such an ability due to their character.

The second feature of first century exorcism tradition focuses on the source of authority. Twelftree explains: "*Some exorcisms were thought to be successful* not because of who performed them but *because of what was said or done* in the ritual or form of supplication of the power-authority against the offending spiritual being."[136] Namely, the deity or powerful name by which a person expressed an incantation could bring about a successful result. This is demonstrated in some magical papyri where a god is invoked to help expel a demon.[137] In the passage from Josephus (*Ant.* 8.46-49) Eleazar is successful not because of who he is but because of his method which includes the implementation of Solomon's name and techniques. Several examples from the gospels are given, including the Jewish exorcists (Mt. 12:27; Lk. 11:19) who cast out demons in the name of God,[138] and the "strange exorcist" (Mk. 9:38-39; Lk. 9:49-50) who exorcizes in the name of Jesus.[139]

---

col. v, though the reconstruction is possible. This manuscript is examined more thoroughly in §2.2.4.3 of the next chapter.

[136] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 38 (italics his).

[137] This phenomena is further broken down into cases where the identity of a particular god is called upon to assist in the expulsion (e.g. PGM V 99-171), where a god is identified (and perhaps threatened) into assistance (e.g. PGM V 247-304), where the exorcist used a god or the name of a god to expel a demon (e.g. PGM IV 3033; V 122-133), and where, after expulsion, the exorcist takes measures against the demon's re-entry (PGM IV 1248). Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 39, describes these cases as a "fourfold pattern of *invocation*, *identification* of the power-authority, *command*, and *protection*...". In addition to this "fourfold pattern," the use of objects or physical aids (e.g. the incense of fish liver in Tobit 8:2-3) is also mentioned as an action or device which can effect a successful exorcism. Measures taken against demon re-entry, as in PGM IV 1248, are discussed further in §3.3.

[138] Jesus answers the charge that he casts out demons by the power of Beelzebul and asks: "by whom do your sons cast them out?" (Mt. 12:27). Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 40, deduces: "The context of this verse limits the source of the power-authority to either God or Beelzebul... As the latter is excluded by the context, Jesus is said to assume that God is their source of power-authority."

[139] This incident is also compared to Acts 19:13 which depicts Jewish exorcists addressing demons with the formula "I adjure you by the Jesus whom Paul preaches." The exorcism in this particular

The final feature is present in an exorcism that is successful because of both who the exorcist is and what he does. Twelftree's example of this is the story in *1QGenesis Apocryphon* xx 28-29 where Abraham banishes an evil scourge or spirit that is afflicting Pharaoh. This portrayal of Abraham's exorcism is notable for two reasons. First, there is no reference to a source of power-authority and thus the success of the exorcism is attributed to Abraham's own prayers. Second, the prayer is accompanied by Abraham laying his hands upon the Pharaoh's head.[140] These two features depict a ritualistic exorcism made effective by a famous Jewish figure.

This comprises the survey of exorcism traditions which form a background to early Christian accounts, and Twelftree concludes that there are very few stories or traditions from Jewish material about historical exorcisms or exorcists. However, this does not signal a disinterest in or indifference to demons and demonic influence. On the contrary, the first century literature suggests "it was widely believed that the world was infested with beings hostile to man, against which protection or relief was sought."[141] Another insight is that exorcisms depicted in literature take on various forms yet typically share common features which are demonstrated in Twelftree's "three-pointed pattern." One example is the importance for the exorcist to have knowledge of the demon he is adjuring and the

---

episode is not successful, but rather the formula attests to a method of exorcizing with a powerful name. Cf. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 40-43.

[140] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 44, states: "This is probably the first instance of healing through the laying on of hands found in Jewish material." Cf. Todd E. Klutz, "The Grammar of Exorcism in the Ancient Mediterranean World," in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrew's Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (eds. C. C. Newman, J. R. Davila, and G. S. Lewis; vol. 63 of *Supplements to JSJ*, ed. J. J. Collins; Brill, 1999), 156-165; David Flusser, "Healing Through the Laying-On of Hands in a Dead Sea Scroll," *IEJ* 7 (1957): 107-108; repr. in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (The Hebrew University: The Magnes Press, 1988). *1QGenesis Apocryphon* is discussed at greater length in §2.2.5.

[141] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 50. This assertion is a rebuttal to the view of Wesley Carr who argued against a widespread belief in hostile spiritual forces in the first century world; cf. Wesley Carr, *Angels and Principalities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 43, 147.

god (or power-authority) by which he adjures.[142] Although the "three-pointed pattern" does not correspond directly to apotropaic prayer, it is significant for adjudicating apotropaisms in the gospels to the degree that it links Jesus' activities to early Jewish responses to demonic evil which include apotropaic techniques.

Two contributions made by Twelftree, relevant to the discussion of the gospels' portrayal of Jesus' interaction with the demonic, are: (1) an engagement with exorcism narratives from a historical critical perspective, and (2) a consideration of the eschatological implications of exorcism. First, Twelftree analyzes the synoptic gospel exorcism pericopae in addition to some passages that are not straightforwardly exorcistic but contain pertinent demonological features (e.g. the Temptation in Mt. 4:1-11; Mk. 1:12-13; and Lk. 4:1-13).[143] Ultimately, Twelftree finds the majority of Jesus' exorcism activities to be historically reliable in whole or in part. For instance, the historicity of the Demoniac in the Synagogue (Mk. 1:21-28; Lk. 4:31-37) is explained:

> ...having set aside Christian redaction we can see what can be confidently said to belong to the very first reports of this event. From our discussions the following elements should probably be included: (1) a demoniac is said to confront Jesus in the synagogue at Capernaum, (2) there is a report, faithfully transmitted in Mark, of a dialogue between Jesus and the demoniac and possibly (3) the crowd is amazed.[144]

The dialogue faithfully reported in Mark includes Jesus' exorcistic command to the demon.

Following the authentication of the earliest portrayals of Jesus' exorcism activities Twelftree further develops the understanding of the historical Jesus as an

---

[142] As we shall see throughout this study, knowledge of the name, identity, and/or nature of the demon and the source of authority is a recurrent theme in many anti-demonic methods in early Jewish and synoptic gospel literature, and Twelftree rightfully emphasizes this feature.

[143] In this examination of the gospel material Twelftree accepts "the traditional solution" to the synoptic problem; i.e., he accepts Markan priority and the existence of the common sayings source "Q." See the discussion in Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 53-55.

[144] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 71.

exorcist.[145] This is done in part by considering the distinctive elements of the historical Jesus' exorcistic techniques[146] and the message of exorcism within Jesus' ministry.[147] Twelftree's inquiry results in a portrait of the historical Jesus who is an exorcist, which is not out of place in first century Palestine, but is different in his unique exorcistic method and message. This conclusion places the historical Jesus in close proximity with early Jewish anti-demonic tradition and establishes him as one who utilizes and adapts early Jewish responses to the demonic.

Twelftree's second contribution is the demonstration of a connection between exorcism and eschatology. The argument is that Jesus' exorcisms, though they are miracles and healings, are also "eschatological" actions which are part and parcel of Jesus ushering in the eschaton.[148] As Twelftree explains, exorcisms

---

[145] In his search for the historical reliable material, Twelftree employs a number of criteria to the exorcism accounts. These include the criterion of multiple attestation, the criterion of embarrassment, the criterion of "incidental transmission," and the "witness of extra-canonical material." The use of these and other criteria (and their limitations) is the subject of §15 of chapter 4 in Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 130-135. These criteria are brought to bear on the gospel material in, for instance, §16 of the same chapter. Here, the question is whether the historical Jesus was regarded as an exorcist. Twelftree concludes that this was indeed the case. In *Jesus the Exorcist*, 138, he cites, among other reasons, the Pharisees' accusations against Jesus in the Beelzebul Controversy (Mt. 12:22-29; Mk. 3:22-27; and Lk. 11:14-22) which are "among the indisputably historical elements of the Jesus tradition…". This passage, according to Twelftree, ibid., "presupposes a ministry of exorcism." Also, the use of Jesus' name as a source of power-authority preserved in extra-biblical material (e.g. Origen, *CC.* i.6; PGM IV 3019) attests to the general association of Jesus with the ability to exorcize demons. On this point Twelftree, ibid., 140, argues: "one of the strongest pieces of evidence that the historical Jesus was thought to be an exorcist is the variety of material showing that Jesus' name was being used by other exorcists."

[146] For instance, Jesus does not invoke a power-authority, nor does he "adjure" (ὁρκίζω) the demons; he simply casts them out with mere words seemingly by his own power; cf. §18 in Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 157-165.

[147] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 171, concludes: "Jesus' exorcisms were not simply 'healings' but were the coming of the kingdom of God."

[148] "Eschatology" in this context refers to the inauguration or coming of the kingdom of God. The term is not explicitly defined and one could, as Lanpher comments, disagree with Twelftree on the

are not "preparatory to the coming of the kingdom...*in themselves the exorcisms of Jesus are the kingdom of God in operation.*"[149] The eschatological dimension of these exorcisms is seen most clearly in the Beelzebul Controversy (Mt. 12:24-29; Mk. 3:22-27; and Lk. 11:15-22) where Jesus proclaims to his accusers "But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you" (Mt. 12:28). While Matthew and Luke use "spirit" and "finger" respectively to illustrate the source of exorcistic power, Twelftree explains the similar meaning of the terms as both have precedents in the Jewish scriptures for describing the direct activity of God.[150] Therefore, according to the pericope, Jesus casting out demons by the direct power of God signifies the coming of the kingdom.

Not only is exorcism linked to the inaugurating kingdom, it also indicates the eschatological downfall of Satan. In order to understand exactly how exorcisms and victory over Satan are connected, one must conceive of the way in which the gospel writers view Satan's defeat. Whereas Best sees the binding or destruction of Satan as taking place definitively in Mark's Temptation, Twelftree claims Satan's ruin is ongoing throughout Jesus' ministry and is particularly advanced in each exorcism.[151] Unlike Best, Twelftree argues "there is victory in Mark's Temptation... but it is not *the* binding or overthrow of Satan: *it is Jesus' overcoming Satan in relation to his mission.*"[152] This mission includes numerous exorcisms which contribute to the defeat of Satan yet his total destruction is reserved for the eschatological judgment. To understand this tension of a defeated but not yet destroyed Satan, Twelftree turns to the binding and eschatological destruction in *1 Enoch* 10 where Azaz'el is bound in preparation for a future

---

various definitions of the term. However, such a dispute would most likely be regarding style rather than content; cf. Lanpher, review of Twelftree, 103-105.

[149] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 170 (italics his).

[150] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 108.

[151] Best, *The Temptation and the Passion*, 15, states: "the demonic exorcisms of the remainder of the ministry represent the making real of a victory already accomplished [in the Temptation]. The exorcisms are mopping-up operations of isolated units of Satan's hosts and are certain to be successful... The defeat of Satan is thus attached to the Temptation rather than to the Passion."

[152] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 117 (italics his).

judgment. A two-stage conquering of Satan is well reflected in the gospels' view of exorcism; Jesus equates "the first or preliminary stage of the defeat of Satan with his exorcisms," while the "final stage of the defeat was to take place in the last judgment."[153]

The association of exorcism with God's kingdom and the defeat of Satan establishes an eschatological "framework" for this particular response to demonic evil. It is a feature that Wright touches upon in his comparison of the portrayal of demons in Mark 5 with the Watcher tradition. While the specific relevance of eschatology to apotropaisms is not presently apparent, it is necessary to keep in mind the eschatological implications of exorcisms in order to contextualize fully the meaning of Jesus' interactions with the demonic. Furthermore, an understanding of Satan's activity or inactivity in each gospel is important for determining whether potential anti-demonic actions or prayers are in fact directed toward demonic evil.

While Twelftree makes a significant contribution to the study of exorcism and demons in the synoptic gospels, there are two points in which he is not fully persuasive. First, he insists that Jesus is the first to portray exorcism as an eschatological action.[154] In light of the Qumran material this is not convincing.[155] There are a number of anti-demonic texts (e.g. 4Q510-511 and 11Q11) that suggest an eschatological framework for demonic activity and exorcism in early Jewish thought. The eschatological elements of certain Dead Sea Scrolls are considered in the following chapter. Some relevant Qumran material was only

---

[153] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 223-224. Twelftree arrives at his conclusion of a two-stage defeat of Satan and evil in light of historically reliable material present in all four gospels. Essentially, each gospel conveys the belief that demonic and/or satanic activity is present throughout and beyond Jesus' ministry (e.g. Mt. 8:29, 13:36-43; Mk. 6:7-12; Lk. 22:3 (also Acts 16:16-18); Jn. 17:15) while also (except for John) associating exorcisms with their defeat (Mt. 12:25-29; Mk. 3:27; and Lk. 11:17-22). Cf. ibid, 220-222.

[154] "Jesus was the first one to link the relatively common phenomenon of exorcism with eschatology." Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 173; cf. ibid, 220.

[155] Lanpher also calls attention to the potential need for a revision of Twelftree's conclusion against the backdrop of the Qumran scrolls. Lanpher, review of Twelftree, 104-105.

made available after the publication of his monograph.[156] A second and related limitation centers on the use of source material. Twelftree provides a background of traditions connected to exorcism during the first century in Palestine and surrounding areas, yet a detailed discussion of these sources is largely absent and a critical presentation of more recently discovered Qumran scrolls is not offered.[157]

Twelftree briefly suggests the possible presence of preventative (or "apotropaic") traditions in the synoptic gospels. The cryptic expression τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί ("what have you to do with us?") is attributed to demoniacs in several places (Mt. 8:29; Mk. 1:24; and Lk. 4:34; the equivalent τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί occurs in Mk. 5:7 and Lk. 8:28) when they are confronted by Jesus who then proceeds to cast the demons out from their human victims. The saying is interpreted in light of both Hebrew Bible and Hellenistic uses of the idiom, and Twelftree holds that the demoniac's words "were most likely understood as defence mechanisms against Jesus the exorcist."[158] If Twelftree is correct and the expression is meant as a "warding off" of Jesus, there may be reason to view an apotropaic tradition underlying the speech of the demoniacs. The apotropaic aspect of these words is not elaborated upon by Twelftree, and interest in apotropaisms does not arise in his treatment of demonic activity and responses to it.[159] However, his passing

---

[156] The manuscripts Twelftree does examine in relation to demonic influence are: *Damascus Document*, *1QGenesis Apocryphon*, 1QS, 11Q5, and 4Q242.

[157] While Twelftree does explain that a more in-depth examination of these sources can be found in an earlier work, *Christ Triumphant: Exorcism Then and Now* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1985), these materials are relevant to the discussion in *Jesus the Exorcist* and should be included to a greater extent. This applies also to Twelftree's cursory treatment of relevant available Qumran material. For instance, he states in *Jesus the Exorcist*, 46: "Excluding the Prayer of Nabonidus…the Qumran material has one story from which we can draw conclusions about exorcism in first century Palestine…". While there may only be one "story" about exorcism (i.e., the *Genesis Apocryphon*), there are other texts (e.g. 4Q560) which may contain insights into beliefs about exorcism and demonic influence during the period. In a similar observation focusing on the PGM, Lanpher, review of Twelftree, 103, argues that Twelftree "could discuss the use of the Magical Papyri since he does employ them."

[158] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 64.

[159] The appearance of the word "apotropaic" is found only once in a quotation of scholar T. Alec Burkill; cf. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 62.

observation on this topic raises intriguing possibilities related to the type of anti-demonic features portrayed in the synoptic gospels.

Twelftree's study is particularly relevant here in relation to source material and the assessment of synoptic gospel exorcism accounts. Twelftree is an early contributor to the topic of the Jewish background of demon possession in the gospels. His demonstration of the historical Jesus as a practitioner of exorcism shows that an exorcistic response to demonic evil is not a product of later church redaction, but rather it can be traced to the historical Jesus and is best situated in relationship to early Jewish responses to evil. Moreover, his elucidation of demonological issues (i.e., his definition of "exorcism," exorcisms' link to God's kingdom and the downfall of Satan, etc.) helps better to define the concepts of demonic evil and responses to it which are present in the synoptic gospels.

1.1.3.2 Demonic Possession and Exorcism in the Synoptic Gospels

Eric Sorensen examines the role of exorcism, and therefore possession, in early Christian self-identity.[160] More precisely, he engages with early Christian literature in order to determine how exorcism functioned within the Christian mission to the Greco-Roman world. His proposal is that the practice of Christian exorcism was accepted by and flourished within Greco-Roman culture "through three principal means: cultural adaptation, authoritative tradition, and innovative theological interpretations applied to that tradition."[161] He notes that exorcism is particularly important to the Christian movement due to the emphasis placed upon it by "the portrayal of Jesus in the gospels" as well as the command to the disciples to continue the ritual.[162] Sorensen's approach is to compare possession and exorcism

---

[160] Eric Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity* (WUNT II.157 Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2002). Useful reviews of this work include: David Brakke, *JR* 84.3 (July 2004): 450-451; John J. Pilch, *CBQ* 66 (2004): 331-332; J. M. Shepherd, *JSOT* 28.5 (2004): 218-219; and Christoph Stenschke, *EJT* 13 (2004): 61-63.

[161] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 222. Shepherd, review of Sorensen, 218, sums up *Possession and Exorcism* nicely, stating: "[Sorensen's] primary focus is the early Christian adaptation and practice of exorcism in non-Christian Greek and Roman contexts."

[162] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 223.

in the ancient Near East, including early Judaism, with conventions in Greek thought. He then examines the development of the practice of exorcism in the New Testament, its role in the emerging Christian church, and its integration with Hellenistic culture. Although the way in which Christian exorcism adapted to Greco-Roman society is not relevant to this study, there are key features of Sorensen's work that inform the discussion of an exorcistic response to demonic evil in the synoptic gospels.

Sorensen begins by exploring possession and exorcism in Mesopotamian and Zoroastrian traditions in order to highlight their influence on possession and exorcism in early Judaism and Christianity. The Mesopotamian texts include Sumerian, Akkadian, Assyrian, and Babylonian traditions. Three examples demonstrate what were thought to be various reasons for spiritual affliction. In each of the three cases the role of a human mediator/healer (the *āšipu*), who resembles the "exorcist" of later traditions, is considered. The first text is the *Šurpu*, an early Akkadian work written on clay tablets.[163] The belief conveyed in the *Šurpu* is that a victim suffers spiritual affliction, perhaps illness or disease, due to personal transgression (i.e. the victim in some way offended the afflicting deity). An important detail included in Tablet 2 shows that the intervention of divine authority was a component of the healing ritual.[164] The second text, the *Udug-hul* ("Evil Demons"), Sorensen describes as "a serialized composition of apotropaic rituals against demons and the sorcerers who manipulate them."[165] This text depicts the *āšipu* in a way that resembles the early Christian exorcist in the "attribution of affliction to demons," the "dependence upon divine powers to treat those afflictions," and in the *āšipu*'s "role as mediator between that divine assistance and the human victim which includes a confrontation with the demonic antagonist."[166] Unlike the *Šurpu* which describes human transgression as the cause

---

[163] Sorensen's discussion on this text is found in *Possession and Exorcism*, 20-25.

[164] The *Šurpu* text depicts "the importance of divine authority in the *āšipu*'s craft. Marduk is 'the patron-god' of the *āšipu*, and it is primarily from him that the *āšipu* derives his own power to heal." Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 25.

[165] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 25. For the examination of *Udug-hul*, cf. ibid, 25-28.

[166] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 25-26.

of affliction, the wicked demons are at fault in the *Udug-hul*. Finally, the *Maqlû* ("burning") is a large composition in which affliction is caused by maleficent sorcerers or witches using magic.[167] Here the *āšipu* serves as a mediator between the spirit-realm and the victim in order to alleviate the individual's suffering. Though the causes of demonic affliction are different in the *Šurpu*, *Udug-hul*, and *Maqlû*, a human agent is instrumental in bringing divine relief to the victim. Regarding the type of affliction, "exterior torments" are the norm rather than the indwelling possession of a person by demons.[168]

A counterpart to the beliefs expressed in the Mesopotamian tradition, Sorensen explains that Zoroastrianism is significant for: "[1] the principles of dualism with its discrete good and evil spirits, [2] the choice that has to be made between the two, and [3] an eschatology that includes final judgment followed by reward and punishment."[169] Sorensen sees the dualistic worldview as providing the framework for this religion. According to this principle good and evil spirits rule the world in eternal conflict, and by their own efforts and choices human beings align themselves with either spirit.[170] The cosmology created by this dualism results in all creation, including humanity, engaging in continuous battle between good and evil.[171] In this cosmology evil "pollutes" good and the purification from pollution is a characteristic of Zoroastrian eschatology. It is clear from some writings that an ultimate triumph of good over evil is expected.[172] Sorensen also

---

[167] Cf. Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 28-29.

[168] One exception to this rule is a line in *Udug-hul* (7.674) which describes demonic possession. Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 32, translates this as: "...bring out the censer and torch for him, so that the Namtar demon existing in a man's body, may depart from it."

[169] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 34.

[170] On the feature of dualism, cf. Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 35-37. Regarding the impact of this feature on human choice, Sorensen, ibid., 37, states: "In the choice between good and evil, Zoroastrianism offers guidance in the decision between right and wrong behavior, and so offers an ethic by which the faithful may live their lives."

[171] "There are no passive beings in creation. Each must make a choice to serve good or evil, and each thereby joins in the cosmic struggle between the two." Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 37. For the discussion on Zoroastrian cosmology, cf. ibid, 37-40.

[172] Cf. Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 40-43.

refers to passages that petition a deity for assistance in the struggle against evil and request a powerful name in order to fend off malignant powers.[173]

Ancient Near Eastern traditions, in particular Zoroastrianism, likely influenced early Jewish writings, especially apocalyptic works.[174] Mesopotamian and Zoroastrian features such as personified evil and ethical dualism are probably reflected in early Jewish literature (e.g. Tobit, Daniel, some Qumran scrolls). Due to the importance of early Jewish demonology for a study of early Christian demonology, understanding the influences on early Jewish demon traditions is beneficial. For instance, outlining the role and tactics of a human mediator in Mesopotamian writings may help to establish points of continuity with early Jewish and early Christian interactions with demonic evil.

Sorensen also contributes to a better understanding of ancient Israelite and early Jewish notions of possession and exorcism. He engages with three groups of Jewish writings: the canonical books of the Hebrew Bible and LXX, non-canonical pseudepigrapha, and "the sectarian texts from Qumran."[175] The themes of possession and exorcism in the Hebrew Bible and LXX are subtle.[176] There are some references to spirits that possess an individual, including the "evil spirit" (רוח הרעה) set upon Saul in 1 Samuel 16:14 and several instances of divine possession. The two passages that most closely resemble exorcism are David's song for Saul in 1 Samuel 16:23[177] and God's rebuke of Satan in Zechariah 3:1-

---

[173] Among the passages cited that rely on divine assistance against evil are the *Vendidad* 8.21 and *Yashts* 19.80-81. Also from the *Yashts* (1.6) is a request for a powerful name to use as protection; cf. Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 42-43.

[174] This influence is discussed in Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 43-46.

[175] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 47.

[176] "One reason for the more subdued character of possession and exorcism in the Hebrew Bible is that demons rarely appear as visible entities that either act beyond divine supervision or are subject to conjuration." Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 49.

[177] David plays the lyre whenever Saul is troubled by an evil spirit. Sorensen characterizes David's playing as having an "exorcistic function." He states in *Possession and Exorcism*, 53: "From this story we see how exorcistic psalms were attributed to David among the scrolls from Qumran. David's own reputation for soothing the soul, combined with his successor's vast wisdom, led to Solomon's reputation as the exorcist *par excellence*."

2.[178] In the LXX, the book of Tobit portrays demonic assault against an individual,[179] and the Greek word δαίμων is used to translated a number Hebrew terms for spiritual beings.[180] The themes of possession and exorcism are more evident, though not extensive, in early Jewish literature. Works such as *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch* are cited as having a more structured demonology than is present in the Hebrew Bible and the LXX, and important components of exorcistic rituals, such as knowledge of a demon's name and use of an adjuration, are found in a few texts.[181]

There are several works from Qumran that feature in Sorensen's study, he refers to passages from *1QRule of the Community* (1QS), *11QPsalms*[a] (11Q5), and *4QSongs of the Sage*[a] (4Q510) to show that the main form of demonic influence is not physical possession but ethical manipulation.[182] At least five documents attest to the tradition of exorcism. The first is the *Genesis Apocryphon*. A passage in 11Q5 (col. xxvii ll. 9-10) attributes exorcistic songs to David. Exorcistic psalms in *11QApocryphal Psalms* (11Q11) contain the names of David and Solomon. Sorensen describes the *Hymn against Demons* (4Q560) as an "important fragment…which includes references to indwelling possession and its relief

---

[178] This scene in Zechariah plays out like a courtroom drama, with Satan (השטן) as the prosecutor of the high priest Joshua. Here, God proclaims (3:2) "The Lord rebuke you, O Satan!" (יגער יהוה בך השטן). Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 54, compares this language to similar occurrences in the New Testament, and the passage also has parallels with exorcism accounts in that they "appeal to the Lord's higher authority in controlling the offending presence." One difference that I would emphasize is that the Satan in Zechariah is not "possessing" Joshua, but rather "standing at his right hand to accuse him" (3:1).

[179] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 54, contends that the demon Asmodeus is defeated by "an apotropaic ritual." Whether the scenario in Tobit is exorcistic or apotropaic is discussed in §2.2.1.3.

[180] For this and other relevant LXX translations, see Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 55-59.

[181] Sorensen cites several passages in *1Enoch* and the *Apocalypse of Abraham* (14.5-8) where the angel Iaoel tells Abraham how to subjugate Azazel; cf. Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 63-64.

[182] He states in *Possession and Exorcism*, 65: "the language of demonic possession tends to be associated with ethical behavior." The one exception he highlights is in 11Q5 xix 15-16 in which "both physical and ethical influences upon the human being by demonic forces" are illustrated; cf. ibid.

through exorcism."[183] Finally, he sees the *Prayer of Nabonidus* as relevant due to its depiction of "divine healing through human agency." [184] Like Twelftree, Sorensen dismisses an explicit notion of exorcism contained in the text based upon the lack of a clear demonic presence and the ambiguous nature of the Jewish גזר ("diviner").[185]

In contrast to the sparse treatment of possession and exorcism in the Hebrew Bible and LXX, the early Jewish literature offers a cosmological construct that allows for the expression of these particular concepts. This expression is evident in select passages from Qumran where examples of demonic influence upon humanity and exorcistic remedies to that influence are present. The depictions of possession and exorcism in early Jewish writings are considered especially influential in laying the foundation for early Christian conceptions of possession and exorcism.

Since Greek culture influenced the milieu of the synoptic gospels, understanding possession and exorcism in Greek tradition informs the study of synoptic gospel demonology. Sorensen discusses textual evidence for beneficent and maleficent possession, including remedies for maleficent possession in first century A.D. Greek society. Although there is little attestation in early Greek tradition of demonic possession as it is portrayed in New Testament accounts, there are examples from written sources of external spiritual influence.[186] Most possessing entities in Greek literature are deities or spirits in the service of the divine. The word δαίμων, as used in the New Testament, is different from classical uses where it is a neutral term applied to an array of spiritual beings both bad and

---

[183] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 69. 4Q560 is examined in greater detail in §2.2.4.1.

[184] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 70.

[185] Sorensen likewise favors the translation "diviner" for גזר; cf. Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 70-73.

[186] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 76, explains: "Malevolent *daimones* enter the literary sources as early as the Classical period, but the clearest evidence for the idea that such entities actually possess a human body doesn't begin to accumulate until a much later time, and the examples most often cited for exorcism outside of the New Testament date almost exclusively from the Common Era."

good.[187] Among the δαίμονες are destructive beings that pose a threat to individuals.[188] The different ways in which spiritual possession is manifested vary from positive influences, such as prophetic inspiration and divination, to illness and madness.[189] Various treatments are prescribed for harmful possession, and Sorensen examines four popular curative methods: (1) binding the victim;[190] (2) providing the victim with medicinal treatments to counteract the symptoms of possession; (3) healing by cultic practice as a divine and miraculous cure when a doctor's skill failed;[191] and finally (4) applying ritual laws for purification as a result of pollution or impurity (from, for instance, an act of sacrilege). Point four is, perhaps, germane for the study of early Jewish and Christian beliefs, even if fundamental differences are observed.[192]

---

[187] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 80-81, clarifies that "'*daimon*'...says nothing of the entity's good or evil intentions or qualities" and then gives several examples: "In Homer it even served as a synonym for *theos*, or to indicate a generic Divine power." And further, Hesiod "defined [*daimones*] as the departed heroes of the Golden Age, whose spirits oversaw the welfare of the generations that followed." Cf. ibid, 80-84.

[188] These "avenging spirits" include, among others, certain Olympian gods, the "alastor," and the "Erinyes"; cf. Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 85-91.

[189] In the early Greek literature examined by Sorensen, Madness is considered to be a far more frequent result of harmful spiritual influence than illness or disease; cf. Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 91-103.

[190] "Binding and releasing are also integral to the terminology and symbolism of demonic possession and exorcism in the Jewish and Christian traditions. Conceptually, however, the intention of the exorcist works in a way opposite to the social treatment of those believed to be possessed. Whereas society bound the possessed person, the exorcist...releases the victim of possession." Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 104.

[191] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 108, explains: "cultic healing in the Greek world lay in the spiritual realm with divinity as the source of healing..." While cultic healing differed from medicinal approaches to possession, both were "compatible enough to operate within the same sanctuaries."

[192] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 113, at one point notes: "The ritual laws of the Greek world reveal a cultural environment at home with the idea of purification from demonic oppressors, and thus receptive to analogous Christian ideas." Yet while the general ritualistic framework is similar, there are important distinctions to be made. It mainly is a difference between Greek purification and Christian exorcism. For the Greek approach, since "the victim of divine anger was judged culpable of some wrongdoing, exorcism in the New Testament sense of gaining authority

Sorensen shows that the idea of possession by a spiritual entity is well represented in Greek tradition. However, this is where, generally speaking, the parallels with early Christian beliefs cease. The effects of possession in Greek thought are diverse and, in some cases, positive. There are several responses to possession, although there is no direct equivalent to the exorcisms in the synoptic gospels. Sorensen states: "What discourages exorcism per se in early Greece is the non-dualistic world-view in which harmful agents…operate under divine jurisdiction, and are occasionally considered deities in their own right."[193] Thus, while Greek culture absolutely influenced the synoptic gospels, the understanding of possession and exorcism portrayed in the gospels is more an extension of early Jewish, Zoroastrian, and Mesopotamian traditions than Greek tradition.

After Sorensen's appraisal of background traditions he addresses issues related to the depiction of possession and exorcism in the New Testament material. Since the only explicit portrayals of exorcism occur in the writings of the synoptic authors, Sorensen's conversation here is especially informative for the topic of responses to the demonic in the gospels. An initial observation relates to the demonological framework of the New Testament. Sorensen argues that writings in the New Testament "presupposes the Jewish demonology of the intertestamental period."[194] The dualistic cosmology exhibited in some early Jewish writings (e.g. *Jubilees*, *1Enoch*) also finds expression in the two opposing kingdoms of God and Satan found in the gospels. It is within this demonological construct that the notion of demonic possession and, thus, exorcism naturally flourishes. This point is relevant for the study not only of possession and exorcism but any interactions with the demonic in the gospels.

Sorensen also describes characteristics of exorcism in the gospels that may or may not be in continuity with background traditions. He, like Twelftree and

---

over and casting out the plaguing spirit was an inappropriate means by which to bring an end to the affliction." Ibid, 114.

[193] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 117.

[194] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 118.

Wright, underscores the eschatological component of exorcistic actions.[195] The eschatological significance of exorcism is not linked to any specific early Jewish work, but rather it echoes similar cosmology reflected in early Jewish "apocalyptic writings."[196] Conversely, formulae or references to a source of authority are absent from Jesus' exorcistic technique, and this is distinct from early Jewish and ancient Near Eastern exorcistic procedure. The varying exorcistic expressions attributed to Jesus in each synoptic gospel emphasize that Jesus relies on his own authority rather than a set formula or ritual. This is an important aspect for the gospel writers since it attests to the character and identity of Jesus.[197] The issue of authority has repercussions beyond Jesus' ministry in that the disciples and early Christians rely on Jesus' name as a source of power in their confrontations with demons.

Another feature of possession and exorcism in the New Testament which Sorensen highlights is the presence of exorcism within the early Christian mission. This includes the performance of exorcisms by the disciples and the unique dynamic which arose when this mission encountered Greek culture. Significant here is the point that, even after the ascension, the disciples continue responding to the demonic by following Jesus' mandates and example. Other features related to the gospels' treatment of possession and exorcism, including terminology (e.g. ἐξέρχομαι and ἐκβάλλω) and social implications (e.g. social separation/reintegration, purity issues), are also given attention. These points are helpful for delineating the interactions of Jesus with possessed individuals.

---

[195] The exorcism accounts, according to Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 131, "invite complementary interpretations that range from soteriological issues of personal healing and social reintegration, to larger political struggles, to the eschatological context of cosmic conflict." Elsewhere he states in ibid., 128-129: "Exorcisms serve as visible signs that accompany the spoken word of the eschatological overthrow of the kingdom of Satan." Twelftree is also referenced in relation to exorcism and eschatology; cf. ibid, 129, 131.

[196] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 129.

[197] This is acutely portrayed in the Beelzebul Controversy where the dialogue between Jesus and the Jewish scribes focuses precisely on the authority by which Jesus casts out demons; cf. Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 140-143.

Sorensen's insistence that New Testament writings rely on the demonology of early Judaism requires further nuance and caveats.[198] While I am sympathetic with this view, the demonologies expressed in Enochic literature, *Jubilees*, and numerous Qumran scrolls appear to contain several strata of demonological traditions and, in some cases, may even preserve competing narratives.[199] I am reticent to use the definite article as applied to a singular demonology (*the demonology*) when referring to the multiplicity of traditions under discussion. Also, Sorensen expresses categories of "ethical behavior" and "ethical possession" which are not sufficiently clear. For instance, he explains that the language in certain Dead Sea Scrolls used to describe demonic influence (e.g. "I will not keep Belial in my heart" in 1QS and the "evil inclination" in $1QH^a$ and 11Q5) relates to "ethical behavior."[200] Demonic influence of "ethical behavior" could imply anything from the encouragement of a person's own moral weakness to a more insidious manipulation leading to idol worship or abandoning the torah. Although some examples are given, the exact nature of "ethical behavior" remains slightly ambiguous in Sorensen's discussion. Similarly, the phrase "ethical possession" is used to describe one form of demonic influence,[201] however this category is vague and it is unclear if it refers to other types of demonic influence.[202]

---

[198] Cf. Sorensen, *Possession*, 118.

[199] E.g., Orlov highlights the presence of competing demonological mythologies by focusing on the figures Azazel and Satanael in early Jewish apocalyptic text; cf. Orlov, *Dark Mirrors*. See also Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (Cambridge University Press, 2005), 110-113; and Todd R. Hanneken, "The Watchers in Rewritten Scripture: The Use of the *Book of the Watchers* in *Jubilees*," in *The Fallen Angels Traditions: Second Temple Developments and Reception History* (eds. Angela K. Harkins et al.; CBQMS 53; The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2014), 25-68.

[200] Cf. Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 65.

[201] Sorensen refers to the pericope of the Return of the Unclean Spirit (Mt. 12:43-45; Lk. 11:24-26) as appearing in the same "context of ethical possession" as some passages from Qumran (e.g. 11Q5 xxiv 12-13).

[202] For example, if every individual is created with a good and evil spirit (e.g. 1QS iii) and a demon simply arouses man's natural evil orientation, is this "ethical possession?" The issue is also significant for determining the extent of demonic influence in cases where the evil "inclination"

Although Sorensen offers a critical and valuable presentation of important Qumran scrolls, his engagement with the material is now dated.[203] As other scholars writing at the time he assumes that any Qumran manuscript not represented in the Hebrew Bible, LXX, or pseudepigrapha is therefore a "sectarian" writing. While the language of "sectarian" to describe *Yahad* works has been rightly problematized (e.g. 1QS, 1QpHap, 1QM, 1QH^a, 4QMMT), the concern here is more about classification (esp. for 4Q560, 4Q242).[204] Also absent from the section dealing with the Qumran texts is any serious treatment of genre; indeed, there is no differentiation between apotropaic and exorcistic scrolls.[205] In this study, genre is important insofar as it relates to the nature and purpose of the Qumran materials.

Despite Sorensen's concern to explore possession and exorcism, he occasionally comments on the topic of apotropaic tradition. One observation is that some scholars perceive the use of oil in Christian pre-baptismal ceremonies as having an apotropaic quality.[206] Elsewhere, Sorensen compares passages from the

---

("*yetzer*") is referenced. The evil inclination and demonic influence is discussed especially in the *Plea for Deliverance* section in §2.2.2.2.

[203] The demonologically significant scrolls assessed by Sorensen are: 1Q*Genesis Apocryphon*, 1QS, 4Q242, 4Q510, 4Q511, 4Q560, 6Q18, 11Q5, 11Q11, and 11Q13. Additional scrolls are discussed, but mostly in relation to issues other than demonic affliction.

[204] Any criteria or justification for categorizing the material as "sectarian" is lacking. Conversely, Sorensen refers generally to the scrolls as "Qumran's sectarian writings" or "sectarian works of Qumran." For this terminology, see Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 64, 72, and 172.

[205] The difference between apotropaic and exorcistic materials may say a great deal about how demonic activity was understood in ancient Judaism. This distinction should at least be noted and given consideration. On a less specific note, Brakke, review of Sorensen, 451, comments that Sorensen's work "relies too much on a neat compartmentalization of cultures." Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 7, observes "the title is somewhat misleading as more than half of the work deals with possession and exorcism in the ancient Near East, in Israel up through the STP, and in the Graeco-Roman world." However, these particular critiques do not alter the contributions of Sorensen to this study.

[206] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 13-16. Sorensen, ibid., 120 n. 5, also refers to an article by Otto Böcher which examines "the origins of Christian baptism in earlier Jewish and pagan apotropaic water rituals to ward off demons"; cf. Böcher, *Christus Exorcista: Dämonismus und Taufe im Neuen Testament* (BWANT 16; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1972). Sorensen, ibid., 218,

Udug-hul, some of which are composed like an apotropaic plea, to the treatment of demons and the nature of exorcists depicted in the New Testament. Part of one incantation (3.220-225) that carries an apotropaic tone is translated: "the evil Udug, evil Ala demon, evil ghost…Lil, (female Lil), and maiden Lil demons…may they not approach me."[207] While Sorensen characterizes the *Udug-hul* as "apotropaic," he examines it in relation to the theme of exorcism and no distinction is made between the two anti-demonic approaches. Sorensen does not equate apotropaism with exorcism, yet "apotropaic" is never defined or substantively discussed and this reflects the tendency to view demonic activity and human responses in early Jewish literature through the emphasis present in the synoptic tradition.

1.1.4 Summary of Reviews

This review of key studies on demonology and the New Testament serves to highlight many of the significant perspectives regarding demonological issues found especially in the synoptic material. Wahlen and Wright address the nature of demons in the gospels, and Wahlen assesses demonological terminology and its meaning for the evangelists. He demonstrates that although "demon" and "unclean/impure spirit" are usually equivalent terms they may have different connotations in each gospel. Wright understands that the nature of demons has implications for how one responds to demonic evil and, while there may not be a direct influence of the Watcher tradition upon synoptic gospel demonology, there is a close relationship between synoptic demonology and demon beliefs in the ancient Near East and early Judaism. This may suggest a similar continuity between anti-demonic techniques in background traditions and responses to the demonic in the gospels.

---

additionally notes Böcher's recognition of apotropaic activities in early Christian asceticism. While these are interesting points, a study of early Christian baptism and rites of initiation are beyond the scope of this thesis.

[207] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 27 n. 43.

There are numerous discussions of the place of Satan and demons within the evangelists' theologies, and at least seven features of synoptic gospel Satanology and demonology are generally agreed upon by most scholars:

1) The conflict with Satan and demons is central to understanding Jesus' identity and mission.
2) In the synoptics there are two pericopae that provide the most information about the role of Satan, demons, and their conflict with Jesus and the faithful. These are the Temptation and the Beelzebul Controversy. Jesus' Statement about Satan's fall in Luke 10:17-20 is equally informative.
3) The pericopae in point 2, in addition to other demonological material, depict Jesus as stronger than (and having authority over) Satan and demons. At the same time satanic/demonic activity continues beyond the ministry of Jesus and is present in the early church.
4) It is notable that Σατανᾶς (and the equivalent Βεελζεβούλ) is a personal title for the chief of demons. This figure has authority on earth and his power, and the demonic host over which he rules, is sometimes described using "kingdom" imagery (e.g. Mt. 12:26; Mk. 3:24-26; and Lk. 11:18).
5) The majority of Satanological/demonological insight is gathered from passages dealing with exorcism. The notable exception to this is the Temptation narrative.
6) Most, although certainly not all, of the demonological material in the New Testament is found in the synoptic gospels.
7) To a large extent New Testament Satanology/demonology can be more fully understood in light of early Jewish traditions.

Moreover, in this review attention is given to one of the ways in which humans and the demonic are depicted as interacting with each other, namely: possession and exorcism. Twelftree demonstrates the importance of exorcism for the historical Jesus. He also studies the features of Jesus' exorcisms within the context of early Jewish tradition which highlights connections between an exorcistic response to demons in the gospels and early Judaism. Sorensen further delineates the themes of possession and exorcism in the synoptic writings by examining them against the backdrop of ancient Near Eastern, Hellenistic, and early Jewish traditions relating to human responses to demonic evil.

1.2 Conclusion, the Task of this Study

On the topic of human interaction with demonic evil in the synoptic gospels this review clearly shows that exorcism (and, by implication, possession) is the primary subject of examination and source of information. The reason for this, to a large degree, is that depictions of exorcism are the most explicit confrontations between a human and a demon. Indeed, while the demonic origin of temptation and even illness can sometimes be ambiguous, possession and exorcism reflect an overt and distinct clash between an individual and one or more demons. It is not surprising that there are entire studies devoted to this issue (e.g., Twelftree and Sorensen). However, given the influence of early Jewish traditions there is more to say about human interaction with demons.

Some early Jewish material, predominantly in the Dead Sea Scrolls, directly addresses human responses, proactive and reactive, to demonic evil. In addition to exorcism, apotropaism is depicted as an effective method for protection from demons. Perhaps the most systematic approach to the prayer type "apotropaic" in early Jewish literature is offered by Esther Eshel. In two articles Eshel helps not only to explicate features of apotropaic texts, but does so in contrast to exorcistic works and thereby demonstrates the complexities of both anti-demonic traditions.[208] Eshel's work builds on an article by Flusser and widens the analysis of apotropaic prayer to a greater number of texts.[209] Yet, while Eshel, Flusser, and others apply the term "apotropaic" to various material containing specific features, a clear definition properly nuanced and consistently applied is

---

[208] Cf. Esther Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers in the Second Temple Period," in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Esther G. Chazon; Vol. 48 of *STDJ*, ed. F. García Martínez; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 69-88; idem., "Genres of Magical Texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Die Dämonen: die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt* (eds. Hermann Lichtenberger, Armin Lange, and K. F. Diethard Römheld; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2003), 395-415. These two articles pick up on themes discussed in Eshel's doctoral work: "Demonology in Palestine in the Second Temple Period" (PhD diss., Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1999) [Hebrew]. See also the summary of Eshel's contributions to this topic in B. H. Reynolds, "Understanding the Demonologies of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Accomplishments and Directions for the Future," *RC* 7.4 (2013): 103-114.

[209] Cf. David Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish 'Apotropaic' Prayers," *IEJ* 16 (1966): 194-205; repr. in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*.

needed. Any examination of "apotropaic" features requires carefully constructed categories and, therefore, it is to definitions, terms, and structures that we turn to in the next chapter. Additionally, in chapter two, the primary literature of anti-demonic passages is examined in order to identify and assess firsthand examples of "apotropaic" prayer. The result of this analysis is a better understanding of early Jewish apotropaic tradition and more precise terminology for discussing various occurrences of the tradition. It will be shown that, just as anti-demonic methods can be divided between apotropaic and exorcistic types, the category "apotropaic" can be further subdivided based on its petitionary or non-petitionary form.

Since early Judaism is important for understanding early Christian themes, and because apotropaic tradition is a feature of early Jewish demonology, it shall be considered to what extent, if any, apotropaic responses to demons are present in the synoptic gospels. Although some scholars have recently engaged this issue,[210] to date there is no significant study on apotropaism in the synoptic material. Thus, the topic of chapter three is an assessment of demonologically-oriented passages in which non-petitionary apotropaic elements might be present. This includes identifying potential apotropaisms and considering the implications of such features in relation to the overall demonology of a given gospel. Finally, chapter four analyzes the potential presence of apotropaisms in the gospels and their implications by examining pleas and petitions. Throughout the following study it is important to keep in mind the overall value of these conversations which is to address a specific type of interaction with demonic evil depicted in some of the earliest Christian writings.

---

[210] For instance, Stuckenbruck asks if an apotropaic petition is present in John's gospel; cf. idem, "'Protect Them from the Evil One' (John 14:15): Light from the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *John, Qumran, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Sixty Years of Discovery and Debate* (eds. Mary L. Coloe and Tom Thatcher; *Early Judaism and Its Literature* 32; Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 139-160. Benjamin Wold discusses the similarities between apotropaic pleas and the Matthean Lord's Prayer; cf. B. Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer and the Matthean Lord's Prayer," in *Evil, the Devil, and Demons*, 101-112; cf. Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 202.

Chapter 2: Anti-Demonic Traditions in Early Judaism

The previous chapter highlights significant themes and perspectives relating to synoptic gospel demonology. It shows the need for a substantive study on demonology in the gospels against the backdrop of early Jewish apotropaic tradition. One lacuna that this study seeks to fill is to identify potential synoptic gospel apotropaic features and analyze them in light of early Jewish apotropaisms. The first step in this endeavor, and the purpose of this chapter, is to assess early Jewish anti-demonic traditions in order to establish the nature of apotropaic prayer.

When considering the variety and nature of early Jewish prayers, significant attention is given to pseudepigraphic writings and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Especially with regard to the discovery of both previously known and unknown works at Qumran, some scholars make concerted efforts to arrange the multitude of prayer material into certain categories based upon the apparent function and contents of a given text. The presence of demonological features in some prayers often result in an "anti-demonic" classification of those prayers. It is useful to inquire into the methods of categorization and specific language which scholars use concerning these demonologically oriented prayers. Certainly the terminology varies, as does the interpretation of any given text, however, a survey of the classification of anti-demonic prayers greatly enlightens our discussion of early Jewish demon traditions. In addition, the study provides a catalogue of passages that contain anti-demonic features.

The structure of this chapter is twofold. First, observations are made about the way in which some contributors have organized and categorized demonologically relevant prayers.[1] Second, the primary literature used by these scholars is examined in order to present and analyze types of early Jewish anti-demonic traditions. Due to the complexities of early Jewish demonology in

[1] Of course, any classifying description is a modern one and useful only insofar as it enables scholars to explore and better understand the nuances and characteristics of various texts. For example, "apotropaic," as it is presently employed, is a recent term applied to ancient prayers, but the term is useful in distinguishing those prayers from others that may possess a more "exorcistic" function.

pseudepigrapha and at Qumran, not every mention of a demon, evil spirit, or evil influence is examined here. Instead, this study focuses on specific occurrences in prayers that reveal the relationship between humans and demons in early Jewish tradition. The term "prayer" is used throughout in a very general sense to describe a non-narrative written or spoken expression, whether it be ritualistic, petitionary, liturgical or otherwise. A "petition" is a more specific prayer in the form of an appeal or request usually, but not necessarily, directed to God.

There are two key, overarching questions that this chapter seeks to address: (1) what is an "apotropaic approach" to demonic evil in early Judaism, and (2) how is such an approach implemented or expressed? The intentions of the discussion below are not only to gain a clearer understanding of early Jewish responses to demonic evil, but to provide a framework for assessing similar features in the synoptic gospels in the chapters to follow.

2.1 Anti-Demonic Traditions in Early Jewish Prayer: Categories and Terminology

Within the spectrum of early Jewish prayer a select number of works are often referred to as belonging to a broad category of "magical texts."[2] This classifying

[2] Philip Alexander divides "magical texts" into two groups: (1) "texts concerned with defences against demons and evil spirits," and (2) "texts concerned with divination, augury and predictions of the future." P. S. Alexander, "'Wrestling against Wickedness in High Places': Magic in the Worldview of the Qumran Community," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. S. E. Porter and C. A. Evens.; JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 319; cf. idem., "The Demonology of the Dead Sea Scrolls" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years* (vol. 2; eds. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999), 331-353. Esther Chazon refers to "magical incantations" as one category of prayer at Qumran, and this group includes prayers for protection against demons, magical formulae, and "hymnic incantations" among others; cf. E. G. Chazon, "The Function of the Qumran Prayer Texts: An Analysis of the Daily Prayers (4Q503)" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery* (eds. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; Israel Exploration Society: Jerusalem, 2000), 217-225; idem., Hymns and Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years* (vol. 1: 1998), 244-270. In Bilhah Nitzan's important work on prayer and poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls a section is devoted to "magical poetry" in which she refers to "the genre of anti-demonic songs

term includes works relating to divination, augury, or other magic practices that do not intersect with the demonic. Another subcategory of "magical texts" consists of works that articulate in some way references to demonic beings or demonic influence. These may be pleas for safety from the demonic, anti-demon formulae, or narratives expressing a petitionary pattern or ritual engaging the demonic. Philip Alexander notes that works belonging to this subgroup are "concerned with defense against demons and evil spirits."[3] Similarly, in her catalogue of Qumran hymns and prayers, Esther Chazon distinguishes between incantations meant to "dispel demons" versus "magical formulae which address the demons exclusively."[4] She comments further on the apotropaic function of certain prayers that seek protection from demonic harm via pleas addressed to God.[5]

While there appears to be general agreement on the basic understanding of some descriptions, (e.g. "apotropaic," "exorcistic," etc.) the precise terminology applied to these prayers can vary from one scholar to another. For example, in the context of early Jewish magic Gideon Bohak defines "exorcism" as "driving a demon or group of demons out of a certain physical space and... driving it or them

---

and incantation" in Qumran writings; cf. B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (*STDJ* 12; eds. F. García Martínez and A.S. Van Der Woude; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 227, 272; cf. idem., "Hymns from Qumran – 4Q510-4Q511," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Forty Years of Research* (eds. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; vol. 10 of *STDJ*, eds. F. García Martínez and A.S. Van Der Woude; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 53-63. For similar classifying terms and descriptions of demonologically oriented Qumran texts, see also Russell C.D. Arnold, *The Social Role of Liturgy in the Religion of the Qumran Community* (*STDJ* 60; ed. F. García Martínez; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 165-168; Florentino García Martínez, "Texts from Qumran Cave 11," in *Forty Years of Research*, 18-26; idem., "Magic in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Metamorphosis of Magic from Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period* (eds. J. N. Bremmer and J. R. Veenstra; Peeters Publishers, 2002), 13-33; and Armin Lange, "The Essene Position on Magic and Divination," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues* (eds. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; vol. 23 of *STDJ*, eds. F. García Martínez and A. S. Van Der Woude; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 377-435.

[3] Alexander, "Wrestling Against Wickedness," 319.

[4] Chazon, "Hymns and Prayers," 263.

[5] In particular, Chazon, "Hymns and Prayer," 263, describes 4Q510-511 as incantations that, based on their content and use of Psalm 91, display a "prophylactic function" and may have been used in either public or private rites.

out of a human being."[6] He also describes "apotropaic" prayers as "designed to scare away the demons before they approach their victims."[7] Although many scholars assume practically identical definitions of "exorcism" and "apotropaic" as those offered by Bohak, there is disagreement as to which Qumran and pseudepigraphic works are designated as apotropaic or exorcistic.[8] There is further inconsistency in determining which features warrant the ascription of a prayer as "apotropaic" or "exorcistic." The challenge faced in the first part of this chapter is to delineate several serious organizational approaches to relevant prayers in order to ascertain an acceptable method of categorization for these texts, and to obtain useful definitions of the terms. Regarding the methods of classifying the "magical texts" concerned with demons, Eshel offers the first substantive discussion. Since Eshel perceives Flusser as an important catalyst for her conversations on this topic, a brief summary of Flusser's contribution is first offered.

2.1.1 David Flusser

Looking at the history of Jewish prayer, Flusser comments on the unique features of three Qumran petitions and their adaptations of similar prayers in the Hebrew Bible.[9] He then compares these to later Jewish prayers of private devotion. The Qumran works include *Prayer of Levi* (4Q213a 1 i 10-18), *Plea for Deliverance* (11Q5 xix), and the Syriac Psalm (11Q5 xxiv). Flusser finds a petitionary pattern in the texts that includes a plea to be distanced from evil. In *Prayer of Levi* and *Plea for Deliverance*, an element of the demonic is present in the expression "let not (any) satan rule over me" (4Q213a 1 i 17; and 11Q5 xix 15). Flusser recognizes the plea in both passages as "the specific interpretation of Ps. 119:133b: 'Let all iniquity not rule over me.'"[10] Hence, the later Qumran works

---

[6] Gideon Bohak, *Ancient Jewish Magic* (Cambridge University Press, 2008), 88.

[7] Bohak, *Ancient Jewish Magic*, 106.

[8] One brief example is Lange's description of passages in 4Q510-511 as "exorcistic rituals" and Eshel's categorization of the document as "apotropaic"; cf. Lange, "Magic and Divination," 431; and Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 81.

[9] Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 194-205.

[10] Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 196.

employ a personification of "iniquity," attributing it to or identifying it as a demonic being. Perhaps less explicit is the request for purification from "(the) evil scourge" (נגע רע) in the Syriac Psalm (l. 12). Despite the differences in terminology, all three Qumran passages seek God's deliverance from evil forces and thus display a common prayer pattern. According to Flusser, this pattern belongs to the "apotropaic" category of prayer. Although the nature and general characteristics of apotropaic prayers are mentioned, an exact definition of the category and an explanation of the classification's essential components are lacking.[11]

The common patterns of the Qumran works are also compared to three later rabbinic prayers of private devotion. While only one rabbinic prayer contains a reference to "satan" (שטן), all three petition God for protection from the "evil inclination" (יצר רע).[12] Flusser presents a comparative table highlighting the similarities and differences between the Qumran petitions and the rabbinic prayers. The rabbinic material includes a variety of non-spiritual maladies in addition to spiritual dangers from which the praying person seeks protection. These expressions reveal a "gradual enlarging of the frame of the apotropaic prayers" which is found by Flusser to be "quite natural."[13] Therefore, it would seem that the category "apotropaic" is a fluid one, reflecting different stages of utilization for a variety of prayers. In essence, Flusser's article demonstrates a development upon petitions in the Hebrew scriptures made by the Qumran works, and a further

---

[11] Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 201, states: "these [three Qumran] prayers belong to a type which can be called 'apotropaic'." It is then commented in ibid.: "[t]he theme of these prayers is the asking from God to avert personal dangers and that He may grant heavenly bliss" Flusser refrains from defining specifically what is meant by "personal dangers," nor is it made clear whether or not a petition for deliverance is necessary for an "apotropaic" classification. This is precisely Wahlen's point when he states in *Impurity of Spirits*, 42 n. 112: "Flusser's definition of 'apotropaic' is too vague… In one sense any prayer for God's protection is apotropaic: but this does not seem to be what Flusser means since he distinguishes between the plea of Ps. 51 and prayers from Qumran."

[12] For the presentation and translation of the rabbinic material, cf. Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 198-199.

[13] Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 204.

expansion in rabbinic prayers upon the Qumran traditions. These developments convey an early Jewish worldview in which harmful demonic influence is part of a present spiritual reality. It is out of this milieu that apotropaic prayers and their common petitionary patterns against the demonic arise.

2.1.2 Esther Eshel

In two important articles Eshel engages demon traditions within early Jewish literature. Her treatment of apotropaic prayer is shaped significantly by the apotropaic "elements" identified in Flusser's article. These elements, it appears, are mainly comprised of the characteristics isolated by Flusser in his comparative table, which consists of eight topics present in various apotropaic prayers, including "deliverance from Satan," "protection against sin," and a request for purification.[14] Another topic, "understanding the torah," is apparently what Eshel is referencing when she points to "the Law of God" as an element occurring in certain prayers. However, her appeal to "knowledge" or "the knowledge of God" as an element is interesting as it is not one of Flusser's eight topics, though he does mention it elsewhere in his article as a common pattern in some prayers.[15] Eshel's summary illustrates that Flusser does not present a systematized set of criteria for determining a classification of prayer. Rather, he simply highlights a number of recurring themes that appear in prayers described as "apotropaic." Therefore, when Eshel refers to Flusser's "typology [of 'apotropaic' prayer] based on certain shared elements," these should be regarded as contributing to the understanding of the nature of apotropaic prayer, but not as definitive criteria.[16]

In Eshel's approach to "magical texts" that respond to the demonic she focuses on two types of prayers: exorcisms, sometimes called "incantations," and apotropaic petitions.[17] Of the first group, several informative works exist in the

---

[14] Cf. Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 223.

[15] Eshel cites "knowledge" or "knowledge of God" as an apotropaic element; cf. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 74, 75, 77, 80, and 83; and idem, "Genres," 406, 409.

[16] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 74; cf. idem, "Genres," 406.

[17] Cf. Eshel, "Genres," 395.

Qumran documents and the intention of these prayers is "to exorcize or drive out evil spirits or other evil forces...".[18] Three manuscripts (4Q560; 8Q5; 11Q11) are presented as belonging to this type of prayer and upon examination of these Eshel notes six shared characteristics. First, the words of the prayer address the demonic beings directly, indeed in at least one case (11Q11 v 6) it is demanded that the demon reveal its identity. This first element reflects the purpose of exorcisms which is to coerce a demon into action. The second characteristic relates to the terminology in exorcistic works. The participle "to adjure" (משביע) is found in 11Q11 i 7, iii 4, iv 1, and reconstructed in 8Q5 fragment 1 line 1. The equivalent Aramaic expression "I adjure you" (אומיתך) is found in 4Q560 1 ii 6. Again, this speaks to the grammatically imperative nature of this type of prayer. Third, adjurations or commands may be given in the name of God, as is the case in 11Q11 ii 8 and 8Q5 1 1. The fourth characteristic is that there may be certain threats made against a demon. These threats include confinement to the abyss and Sheol (11Q11 iv 7-8). According to Eshel, this language indicates the influence of the Watcher tradition upon the Qumran prayers.[19] Fifth, the use of the tetragram appears frequently in 11Q11 and once in 8Q5. The final element found in exorcistic texts is the occasional reference to the deeds of God. Though fragmentary, 4Q560 1 ii 7 is most likely creation imagery, which also appears in 11Q11 ii 10-12.

Eshel compares her six elements to other non-Qumran exorcism texts and observes similarities, differences, and developments made by later incantations.[20] Important to note is that not every one of Eshel's elements is present in all three works examined, though with the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts it is difficult to be certain. It is also reasonable to interpret some of Eshel's elements as more crucial to the exorcistic category than others. For example, passages containing an adjuration addressed to a demonic being would likely be classified by Eshel as exorcistic, even if it lacked creation imagery or a threat of the

---

[18] Eshel, "Genres," 395.

[19] Eshel, "Genres," 404.

[20] Eshel brings into conversation exorcism passages in the Greek and Aramaic Magical Papyri; cf. idem, "Genres," 405-406.

abyss/Sheol (cf. 8Q5). Hence, like Flusser's "apotropaic elements," some of Eshel's characteristics of exorcisms should be viewed as recurring themes and not criteria, albeit some characteristics, particularly elements one and two, are more significant.

"Apotropaic" is the second prayer type that engages the demonic. These are hymns or petitions that "request God's protection from evil spirits."[21] Eshel examines apotropaic passages in pseudepigraphic and Qumran writings, in addition to two biblical antecedents. The biblical prayers are the Priestly Blessing in Numbers 6:24-26, referred to by Eshel as the "oldest Jewish apotropaic prayer," and Psalm 91.[22] Although both passages lack explicit reference to demonic beings, Eshel appeals to the adaptation and use of the biblical prayers in several later apotropaic contexts as evidence of their original apotropaic intention. She argues that "these later sources, like those from Qumran, recognize the apotropaic power of the Priestly Blessing and witness to its ongoing function as an apotropaic prayer."[23]

Prayers are subdivided into two groups: "non-sectarian" and "sectarian." The "non-sectarian" works are the *Prayer of Levi* (4Q213a), *Plea for Deliverance*, *Psalm 155* (11Q5), and two prayers from *Jubilees*. In *Prayer of Levi*, the plea for protection from a demonic being (4Q213a 1 i 17) contributes to the apotropaic classification. The prayer also contains several elements mentioned by Flusser.[24] From 11Q5, there are two psalms categorized as "apotropaic." *Plea for Deliverance* (xix) expresses an explicit request for safety from demons in line 15: אל תשלט בי שטן ורוח טמאה. The Syriac Psalm (xxiv) contains the less straightforward

---

[21] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 69; cf. idem, "Genres," 406.

[22] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 70.

[23] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 71. In another place, the Priestly Blessing and Psalm 91 are held as "biblical models" of a "genre" of apotropaic prayer; cf. ibid., 74. Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 197, also comments on the relationship of Num. 6:24-26 to early Jewish apotropaic petitions. The two passages are again approached as biblical antecedents to apotropaic texts in Eshel, "Genres," 407.

[24] These elements are: "a request for the knowledge of God, a plea for protection from sin and evil spirits, a request to be distanced from unrighteousness, and a plea for salvation." Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 75.

petition in line 12: "Purify me, O Lord, from (the) evil scourge and let it not turn again upon me" (טהרני יהוה מנגע רע ואל יוסף לשוב אלי), which Eshel interprets as seeking protection from an evil force.[25] The apotropaic passages from *Jubilees* are found in the prayers of Noah (10: 1-6) and Abraham (12: 19-20). Both prayers seek protection from demons and extol the greatness of God's deeds. Eshel states that the *Jubilees* passages are "apotropaic prayers of a different genre" than that of the "non-sectarian" Qumran texts.[26] However, neither the way in which the various prayers differ, nor the precise meaning of the description "genre," is elaborated upon.

The five manuscripts containing "sectarian" apotropaic prayers are *Songs of the Sage* (4Q510-511), 4Q444, 6Q18, and 1QH^a (frag. 4). 4Q510 and 4Q511 are intended for use by the sage (משכיל) in order to "'frighten and terrify' evil spirits."[27] Following the directive title in 4Q510 fragment 1 line 4 is a list of various demonic beings against which the prayer seeks protection (cf. 4Q511 frag. 10 ll. 1-6). The beginning of 4Q444 fragment 1 line 1 reads: "and as for me, because of my fearing God..." (ואני מיראי אל).[28] Eshel argues for a translation of מירא as "to exorcise" based on the appearance and context of מירא in 8Q5 1 1 and 4Q511 35 6. Another passage considered to be apotropaic is 6Q18, and fragment 2 line 4 is reconstructed: ו]ושך תשוקתנ[ך אל.[29] Eshel interprets the line as an utterance of demonic beings. She also notes that the term תשבחות in line 8 "is found in the titles of some later incantations" and inscriptions used for apotropaic purposes.[30]

---

[25] An exact interpretation of "evil scourge" (נגע רע) is not given and, therefore, it is unclear whether or not Eshel identifies a demonic being to be present in the passage.

[26] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 77.

[27] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 79. The intention of the document is stated in 4Q510 1 4: ואני משכיל משמיע הוד תפארתו לפחד ולב[הל]; cf. Maurice Baillet, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VII: Qumran Grotte 4. III (4Q482-4Q520)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 216.

[28] Chazon et al., *DJD XXIX: Qumran Cave 4. XX (Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 372-374.

[29] It is translated: "...veres les té]nèbres (va) no[tre] penchant..." ; cf. Baillet et al., *DJD of Jordon III: Les 'Petite Grottes' de Qumran (2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 133.

[30] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 81; cf. idem, "Genres," 409-410.

The final "sectarian" apotropaic prayer is in 1QH^{a} 4 xxii. Eshel understands a segment of line 6 (תגער בכול שטן משחית) as a plea for safety from demonic harm.

In summary, Eshel discusses the nature of twelve prayers which she classifies as "apotropaic." Two of these prayers are biblical antecedents (the Priestly Blessing; Psalm 91) and the rest are found in Qumran and pseudepigraphic writings. There are four observations regarding Eshel's examination of apotropaic traditions. First, of the twelve texts described as apotropaic, eight contain an explicit reference to one or more demonic beings, usually in the context of a petition for safety from the demon(s). These are: *Prayer of Levi*, *Plea for Deliverance*, the prayers of Noah and Abraham, 4Q510, 4Q511, 4Q444, and 1QH^{a}. If Eshel's interpretation is correct and 6Q18 contains a statement attributed to demons, then this manuscript may also be counted as referring to the demonic.

A second observation is that in six of the prayers Eshel highlights some apotropaic elements which Flusser mentions.[31] Again, these elements are a demonstration of common themes and patterns that often appear in apotropaic works, but they are not a system of criteria. Third, Eshel notes the possible influence of Enochic literature (i.e. the Watcher tradition) on five of the passages. In the prayer of Noah, the evil spirits are clearly identified as descendants of the Watchers (*Jub.* 10:5), and in 4Q510, 4Q511 and 4Q444 the demon moniker ממזרים is a potential indication of Enochic background. The demonology in *Plea for Deliverance* suggests to Eshel the influence of the Watcher material.[32]

The fourth observation of Eshel's articles is the comparison of apotropaic traditions to exorcistic works. Eshel presents four points of contrast in order to illustrate the subtle differences between the two categories. Although she never

---

[31] Elements including requests for God's knowledge and/or his law, pleas for safety from sin and evil spirits, seeking distance from unrighteousness, desire for salvation, and requests for forgiveness and/or purification may be found in *Prayer of Levi*, *Plea for Deliverance*, Psalm 155, 4Q510, 4Q511, and 1QH^{a}; cf. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 75, 77, 80, and 83; and idem, "Genres," 406-407 and 409.

[32] On the demonic influence exerted over individuals portrayed in *Plea for Deliverance*, Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 76, states: "a combination of control over both body and mind is well attested in other sources, among them the early references to the deeds of the Watchers...as described in *1 Enoch* and the *Book of Jubilees*."

explicitly offers criteria for the classification of prayers, her four points of contrast display the nature and characteristics belonging to texts described as "exorcistic" or "apotropaic." The points are presented as follows:

1) The incantations in general, and those of 11Q11 in particular, are directly addressed to the demon; he sometimes has a particular name while in other cases only general designations, such as "the demon" are found. In the apotropaic prayers, on the other hand, one finds non-vocative references to evil forces in the world, such as "the demon, Lilith, the howlers" etc., who are said to "strike suddenly."
2) The formal terminology used in the apotropaic prayers also differs from that of the incantation texts. While in the latter the most common word used is משביע, "adjure," this phrase is absent from the apotropaic prayers, which favors such verbs as ירא or פחד, בהל, and גער.
3) Another significant difference in terminology is in designations for God. In the incantation texts found at Qumran, the *Tetragrammaton* is frequently used... In the apotropaic prayers from Qumran, the *Maskil* invokes God's powers by means of God's praise. The absence of the *Tetragrammaton* may be explained by the sectarian origin of these apotropaic texts.
4) In an incantation, the exorcist tries to stop the harm done by the evil forces "from now on and forever," but the sectarian apotropaic prayers, as noted by [Bilhah] Nitzan, ask for the destruction of the evil powers, "not for all eternal time, but at the age of their dominion" (4Q510 1:7-8).[33]

In order to better visualize the elements and common features belonging to each category, the figures below consist of the exorcistic and apotropaic works examined by Eshel. Each table organizes the characteristics that, according to Eshel, belong to the exorcistic or apotropaic texts. In addition to the features mentioned in her four points of contrast, several other significant elements (i.e. references to the deeds of God and invoking the name of God) are mentioned. To begin, the features found in exorcism prayers are:

Figure 2.1

	4Q560	8Q5	11Q11
Direct address to demons	X	X	X
Adjuration terminology	X	X	X

[33] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 87-88; cf. idem, "Genres," 412-413.

Said in the name of God		X	X
Threats to demons			X[34]
Tetragram		X	X
The deeds of God	X[35]		X
Eschatological language[36]			X

The apotropaic works examined and the characteristics found in them are presented in *figure 2.2* below. In addition to the themes mentioned in Eshel's four points, the two other observations made above (i.e. the presence of Flusser's elements and a possible Enochic background) are also listed. Therefore, Eshel's apotropaic texts and their features are:

Figure 2.2

	Reference to demons	Apotropaic terminology[37]	Tet.[38]	Eschatological language	Flusser's elements	Enochic Background

[34] The demon(s) is threatened with destruction in col. iv l. 4 and confinement to the abyss and sheol in col. iv ll. 7-9.

[35] Though fragmentary, the appearance of the "earth" and "clouds" in frag. 1 col. ii l. 7 may be creation imagery and, thus, the mighty act of creation is recalled. In relation to the works of God, Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 86, comments that apotropaic and exorcistic works both "make reference to God's mighty deeds in the past, apotropaic hymns as part of their thanksgiving to God, and incantations by way of forecasting the doom of the evil forces." Although this is an interesting similarity, Eshel does not reference it in her four comparative points listed above.

[36] The term "Eschatological language" in *figures 2.1* and *2.2* relates to any feature in a text referring to a timeframe for the destruction of evil (i.e. a temporal versus an eternal action against demonic beings). In exorcistic texts, "the exorcist tries to stop the harm done by the evil forces 'from now on and forever.'" Eshel, "Genres," 413. Though Eshel does not reference this display of eschatology, it is presumably her interpretation of 11Q11 iv 10.

[37] Apotropaic terms offered by Eshel include ירא (to be feared). A form of this verb (מירא) meaning "to terrify" is also translated by Eshel as "to exorcize"; cf. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 81; and idem, "Genres," 401-402. Other terms are variations of the verbs פחד (with the prepositional prefix ל the term is translated "to frighten"), בהל ("frighten"), גער ("to rebuke"), and כנע ("to submit"); cf. "Apotropaic Prayers," 87; and idem, "Genres," 412.

[38] The tetragram as an apotropaic characteristic is mentioned by Eshel only insofar as its absence in apotropaic texts is contrasted to its frequent use in some exorcistic works. As point three above indicates, the presence or lack of the tetragram may suggest for Eshel the provenance of a text.

Priestly Blessing						
Psalm 91						
Prayer of Levi	X				X	
Plea for Deliverance	X				X	X
Psalm 155	X				X	
Prayer of Noah	X					X
Prayer of Abraham	X					
4Q510-511	X	X		X	X	X
4Q444	X	X				X
6Q18		X				
1QH[a]	X	X			X	

To conclude, the above tables demonstrate the common features in each respective category of prayer according to Eshel. Although "exorcistic" and "apotropaic" function as two distinct classifying terms to be applied to early Jewish "magical texts," there are overlaps and similarities between them. The most common feature found in both types of texts is the reference, to some extent, to a demonic being. Although the precise nature of personified evil may be somewhat ambiguous in certain cases (e.g. 6Q18 and Psalm 155), it is apparent that the presence of a demon or evil force in a prayer is a basic and necessary attribute for an exorcistic or apotropaic classification. Therefore, by outlining numerous characteristics in a selection of Qumran and pseudepigraphic works Eshel helps to delineate and demonstrate the application of "exorcistic" and "apotropaic" to relevant early Jewish anti-demonic prayers.

2.1.3 Loren Stuckenbruck

Loren Stuckenbruck comments on the emergence of petitions seeking safety from malignant spiritual forces in early Jewish literature.[39] This emergence arises in contrast to the absence of anti-demonic petitionary prayers in the Hebrew

[39] Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance from the Demonic in Early Jewish Texts," in *Studies in Jewish Prayer* (eds. Robert Hayward and Brad Embry; Oxford University Press, 2005), 55-73.

scriptures, thus bringing about a unique component of early Jewish writings deserving a careful, organizational approach. Alongside these prayers there also appears "the recitation of songs or certain words within songs [that] can provide effective protection from demonic disturbance."[40] Stuckenbruck arranges the demonologically oriented prayers into three classes: (1) adjurations directed at demonic beings; (2) prayers or songs intended to counteract demonic harm; and (3) petitions that praise the nature and/or works of God in unison with an appeal to God for protection from demons.[41] Examples belonging to the first group are found in 11Q11 and 4Q560. According to Stuckenbruck, adjurations address demons in order to "compel them to certain activity."[42] This is clear in 4Q560 1 ii 5-6 where spirits are "adjured" with the Aramaic מומה and אומיתך. As seen previously, a form of the Hebrew root שבע (משביע) appears in 11Q11 iv 1, however Stuckenbruck cites only column iv lines 4-6 and column v lines 6-11 as examples of adjurations.

The second category is further subdivided into three subgroups: (1) prayers that extol the nature of God and his activities; (2) prayers in which encouragement is given to faithful/righteous individuals that God will come to their aid; and (3) praise directed to God which comes before or follows an assertion by the author that he (the author) holds a certain position and thereby possesses the ability to inhibit demonic assault. An example of a prayer belonging to subgroup (1) is the version of Psalm 91 found in 11Q11 vi. The psalm praises God, demonstrating trust in his protective care from a variety of evils. 4Q511 10 7-12 is a passage which assures the righteous ones of God's favor and is offered as suitable to subgroup (2). Also situated in (2) is 11Q11 ii-iv. Notable in one passage are the references to "the demons" (השדים) (col. ii ll. 3-4). Lastly, several examples are

---

[40] Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 55. Stuckenbruck notes these songs, particularly 4Q510-511 and 11Q11, are categorized by Nitzan as "magical incantations." Cf. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 227-272.

[41] The three classes are initially referred to by Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 55-56, as "forms," then elsewhere described as "categories." For our purposes we will refer to the forms as "categories," "classes," or "groups" of anti-demonic texts.

[42] Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 56.

given of songs/chants proper to subgroup (3).[43] These include passages describing the actions of the "sage" (משכיל) (4Q510 1 4; 4Q511 8 4) which are to spread "fear of God" (מירא אל, 4Q511 frag. 8 l. 4; frag. 35 l. 5) and "terrify" (בהל, 4Q510 1 4 and פחד, 4Q510 1 4; 4Q511 frag. 8 l. 4; frag. 35 l. 6) evil spirits.

The third and final category of prayers engaging the demonic is described as petitions that praise the nature and/or works of God in unison with an appeal to God for protection from demonic beings. These prayers are "along the lines of more conventional Jewish prayers of petition."[44] The majority of the article is concerned with examining works belonging to this last category. These prayers, Stuckenbruck contends, "reflect an adaptation of a form that is widespread in biblical tradition," the adaptation being the component of demonic activity.[45] It is worthwhile to highlight precisely what Stuckenbruck sees in each of these prayers as a development of early Jewish petitions.

The first passage in the third category is *Plea for Deliverance* (11Q5 xix). Stuckenbruck describes this as the "most classic of prayers against the demonic," and the opening begins with the typical patterns of praising and thanking God.[46] However, there is the presence of spiritual beings in the plea for safety from "satan" (שטן) and an "unclean spirit" (רוח טמאה) in line 15. Stuckenbruck finds a background of Zechariah 13:2 and Enochic aetiology which leads him to interpret "unclean spirit" as denoting a demon. The term "satan" is not identified as a proper name or a biblical reference, but rather "functions as a general designation for a demonic being whose activity is not subservient to YHWH."[47] Here, then, is

---

[43] The examples given are: 4Q510 frag. 1 ll. 2-8; 4Q511 frag. 8 ll. 4-10; frag. 35 ll. 1-8; frags. 48-51 ll. 1-6; and 4Q444 2 i//4Q511 1 21; cf. Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 56.

[44] Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 56.

[45] Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 56. This is similar to Eshel's and Flusser's observations of the Priestly Blessing and Psalm 91 appropriated for apotropaic purposes in later works.

[46] Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 57. Stuckenbruck also notes that *Plea for Deliverance* contains an element familiar to biblical prayers, i.e., an appeal against death so that the petitioner may praise God is found in Isa. 38:18-19 and Ps. 6:4-5; cf. Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 58.

[47] Stuckenbruck, "Plea for Deliverance," 59.

a prayer in some ways familiar to traditional pleas, but different in that it petitions God for protection from demons.

Another prayer containing a similar plea is the *Prayer of Levi* (4Q213a 1 i).[48] After an appeal to God to purify iniquity and grant him a holy spirit and knowledge, Levi asks to be protected from "any satan" (כל שטן, l. 17). Like the occurrence of שטן in 11Q5, Stuckenbruck interprets it here as a demon. One variance, however, is the presence of כל in the Aramaic text. The similarity between "let not (any) satan rule over me" in 4Q213a and 11Q5 to a phrase in Psalm 119:133 (ואל תשלט בי כל און) is considered by some to convey a possible influence of the latter expression upon the formula in both *Prayer of Levi* and *Plea for Deliverance*.[49] Stuckenbruck sees this as unlikely. As per Armin Lange's argument, it is doubtful, he says, that both Qumran passages "would have independently substituted 'iniquity' with 'Satan,'" but rather, "the Aramaic petition depends on [the] formulation in the 'Plea for Deliverance.'"[50] A more plausible parallel may exist in the plea of Moses in *Jubilees* 1:20 that God "let not the spirit of Beliar rule over them."[51] For Stuckenbruck, the presence of the same basic formula in *Plea for Deliverance*, 4Q213a, and *Jubilees* 1:20 suggests a particular tradition of anti-demonic petitions extant in early Judaism. Though the formula may be adapted by the authors to fit their own narrative contexts, they are drawing from an accepted pattern of prayer used to safeguard oneself or others against demonic influence.

Stuckenbruck also examines two other prayers from *Jubilees*, those of Noah and Abram. Noah's prayer (*Jub.* 10:3-6) begins by acknowledging God's

---

[48] The original Aramaic text is presented by Michael E. Stone and Jonas C. Greenfield in *DJD XXII: Qumran Cave 4. XVII (Parabiblical Texts, Part 3)* (Oxford; Clarendon Press, 1996), 25-36. A more complete version of the prayer used by Stuckenbruck was reconstructed by Stone and Greenfield based on a similar Greek manuscript; cf. ibid., 28-29.

[49] This influence is asserted by Flusser in "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 196-197; cf. Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 61.

[50] Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 61; cf. Armin Lange, "Considerations Concerning the 'Spirit of Impurity' in Zech 13:2," in *Die Dämonen*, 262.

[51] O.S. Wintermute, "Jubilees (Second Century B. C.): A New Translation and Introduction," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 2* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Doubleday, 1985), 53.

faithful preservation of Noah and his sons from the flood and thus, as Stuckenbruck notes, "the prayer initially assumes a posture of thanksgiving and praise."[52] The remaining part of the prayer is Noah's petition to God. The entreaty includes an appeal to God for judgment against evil spirits that they "not rule over the spirits of the living."[53] The evil spirits are clearly identified in the narrative as descendants of the Watchers who bring destruction upon humanity. Subsequent to Noah's petition, God binds a majority of the evil spirits leaving only a tenth of them to remain in activity upon the earth. Stuckenbruck views the petition of Noah against the evil spirits as crucial to the narrative. He remarks that the content of the plea "has been made to reflect the preceding and following narrative in Jubilees."[54] This may or may not be an instance of a formula adapted to fit an author's narrative.[55]

The prayer of Abram (*Jub.* 12:19-20) follows a similar pattern to that of Noah's prayer (i.e., initial praise of God followed by a petition). The prayer includes the plea: "Save me from the hands of evil spirits which rule over the thought of the heart of man."[56] Like *Jubilees* 10, Abram's prayer is important for the larger narrative. The use of demonology in the Abram story is perhaps more general, at times being related to idolatry and, possibly, astrology.[57] Ultimately, the two prayers in *Jubilees* demonstrate to Stuckenbruck the presence of petitionary prayers for deliverance tailored to and functioning within specific narrative frameworks.

---

[52] Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 64.

[53] Wintermute, "Jubilees," 76.

[54] Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 65.

[55] On the one hand Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 66, contends: "[The] strong link to the literary context means that the prayer is here really conceived as *Noah's* prayer, and in its present form does not draw on a prayer that would have been uttered by anyone." On the other hand, almost immediately after this assertion it is commented, in ibid., that the conclusion of Noah's petition "implies a familiarity with this sort of prayer among the readers, who perhaps may have been accustomed to reciting it to ward off evil spirits." Although the prayer of Noah itself may have been unique, it attests to the use of similar anti-demonic pleas.

[56] *Jub.* 12:20 in Wintermute, "Jubilees," 81.

[57] Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 67-68. For the connection to astrology see Lange, "Magic and Divination," 383.

The final passage in this third category is from Tobit. Since Tobias' prayer (cf. 8:4-8) explicitly asks for deliverance, and given the narrative's context, Stuckenbruck views it as a petition "for deliverance *post eventum*."[58] Stuckenbruck's assessment and the anti-demonic features in Tobit are analyzed in §2.2.1.3.

In conclusion, Stuckenbruck offers three similar yet distinct categories for classifying early Jewish prayers which engage the demonic. The outline immediately below helps to visualize these groups along with the passages in each category:

1. Adjurations directed at demonic beings:
    - *11QApocryphal Psalms* (11Q11 iv 4-6; v 6-11)
    - *4QExorcism ar* (4Q560 1 ii 6)
2. Songs, chants or hymns intended to counteract demonic harm
    A. Declarations focused on God:
        - *11QApocryphal Psalms* (Psalm 91 in 11Q11 vi)
    B. Prayers addressed to the righteous reminding them of God's help:
        - *4QSongs of the Sage*^{b} (4Q511 10 7-12)
        - *11QApocryphal Psalms* (11Q11 ii-iv)
    C. Declarations of God, the role of a specific individual and his ability to counteract demonic powers:
        - *4QSongs of the Sage*^{a} (4Q510 1 2-8)
        - *4QSongs of the Sage*^{b} (4Q511 8 4-10; 35 1-8; 48-51 1-6)
        - *4QIncantation* (4Q444 2 i)
3. Praise directed at God, followed by a petition for safety against demonic beings:
    - *Plea for Deliverance* (11Q5 xix)
    - *Prayer of Levi* (4Q213a 1 i 17)
    - Moses' intercession (*Jub.* 1:20)
    - Noah's prayer (*Jub.* 10:1-6)
    - Abraham's prayer (*Jub.* 12:19-20)

[58] Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 72.

- Tobit (8:4-8)

Three observations are made in regard to these categories and their prayers. First, some Qumran texts possess more than one category of prayer. Several passages in 11Q11 contain language that addresses evil spirits directly and therefore are classified as adjurations in category (1), but in the same document there is also a very different approach to the demonic. The version of Psalm 91 petitions God for safety from evil in general and therefore is classified in the second group. Likewise, 4Q510-511 contain passages that are put into categories 2(b) and 2(c). Stuckenbruck's highly nuanced categorization demonstrates that: (1) these documents are quite complex; and (2) Jewish anti-demonic prayers take a wide variety of forms.

The second observation is that Stuckenbruck's classifications are meant to be general groupings rather than rigid categories. He avoids explicit definitions for each category and does not impose strict criteria for the exclusion or inclusion of a prayer. Instead, "forms" are offered to which prayers of a certain nature might belong. There are more precise descriptive terms including "apotropaic," "magical incantations," and "exorcistic," and Stuckenbruck briefly mentions these in relation to prayers concerned with demons.[59] However, the organizational boundaries in Stuckenbruck's article are broader than these exclusive descriptions. This differs from Eshel's treatment of the passages where the terms "exorcistic" and "apotropaic" are defined and applied to the prayers. Put simply, for Stuckenbruck the form and nature of a prayer determine its categorization while specific technical features or characteristics do so for Eshel. Both methods have their advantages. The system used by Eshel allows for clearer and rather precise classifying terms, which then assist in comparing and contrasting the function and characteristics of prayers. Stuckenbruck's technique results in an expression of the various intricacies that are displayed in deliverance prayers. Ultimately, neither

[59] It is stated "[n]ot all prayer-texts concerned with demonic spirits are apotropaic, 'magical' incantations, or even exorcistic"; Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 73.

scholar asserts ridged criteria. Eshel's approach to the prayer material may be more categorical, but it is less nuanced than that of Stuckenbruck.

The third and final observation is in regard to the relevance of anti-demonic prayers for early Jewish religious practice. Questions arise as to how well known these prayers were to an early Jewish audience. Noting the variety of uses for the common plea pattern in *Plea for Deliverance*, *Prayer of Levi*, Noah's prayer (*Jub.* 10:3), and Moses' intercession (*Jub.* 1:20), Stuckenbruck concludes that these prayers may have had a wide audience. Additionally, the prayers of Noah and Moses contain inclusive language that may have resonated with the early Jewish hearer/reader.[60] These factors are by no means concrete evidence that prayers for deliverance from the demonic were a part of day to day religious praxis. However, one of the purposes of Stuckenbruck's article is to demonstrate that demonic spiritual realities were in fact a part of the early Jewish worldview.[61] The passages examined by Stuckenbruck within his categories of prayer seem to suggest precisely this worldview.

2.1.4 Summary of Scholarly Observations

In regard to the organizing methods of the scholars reviewed above, four major similarities emerge. The first and most fundamental similarity is that each scholar interprets demonic beings to be present in the works categorized. Three exceptions are Eshel's inclusion of 6Q18 and two biblical passages, the Priestly Blessing and Psalm 91, in her classification of anti-demonic prayers.[62] In the instance of 6Q18

---

[60] E.g., "the children of the righteous henceforth and forever" (*Jub.* 10:6) and Abram's seed "henceforth and forever" (*Jub.* 12:20).

[61] This is clearly articulated when Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 73, comments: "alongside and perhaps even prior to the development of adjurations and recitations... [a worldview] came, quite naturally, to include malevolent forces within the framework of traditional prayers for deliverance provided through biblical tradition." Psalm 91 in 11Q11 vi is a perfect example of said traditions of prayer that include a demonic component in its overall address.

[62] It is also noted that Flusser includes petitions dealing with non-demonic maladies and later non-demonological rabbinic prayers in his discussion of "apotropaic" texts. However, this does not

the designation "apotropaic" may be justified if fragment 2 line 4 is identified as a statement made by demons. As for the biblical texts, if an "apotropaic" classification is warranted it should be qualified so as to differentiate the earlier works from the further developed anti-demonic texts of the Second Temple period. In all other cases the presence of a demonic being is quite explicit. The representation of demons vary; in some places specific names are found (שטן, בליעל, לילית, etc.) while elsewhere more generic terms are used (רוח טמאה, רוח רשע, שדאים, etc.). Regardless of the moniker or designation, the references are understood by the above scholars to denote a being spiritual in nature and harmful to humanity. Eshel and Stuckenbruck both posit, to some degree, that an aetiology of evil spirits from the Watcher tradition influenced the demonology found in these prayers.

A second similarity is the basic division by Eshel and Stuckenbruck between expressions or formulae directed to demons and prayers addressed to God. Eshel's classifications appear to center on whether the intention of the prayer is either to remedy an existing demonic affliction or to prevent future assault.[63] As such, the separation of prayers between those directed to demons or to God is more of a resultant feature highlighted by her primary method of organization. Alternatively, the issue is emphasized more so by Stuckenbruck who interprets the addressee of a prayer as an organizational lynchpin. For instance, whether God or the demons are the intended objects of the formulae is expressed in the descriptions provided for Stuckenbruck's groups (1) and (3). Although attention is drawn to the recipient of a prayer through varying approaches to the texts, it is clear that the topic is of significance for the classification of a given work. Indeed, when cataloguing possible anti-demonic prayers for any purpose, the addressee of the passage should be taken into consideration.

A third similarity is that Flusser and Stuckenbruck each observe a developing tradition in early Judaism when they compare later prayers that engage

---

have tremendous bearing on the current conversation since an organizational approach to prayer texts is not the primary intention of Flusser's article.

[63] This is implied in the statement: "Based on their *content* and *purpose*, the incantations and exorcism texts can be divided into two categories" (italics mine); cf. Eshel, "Genres," 396.

the demonic with the Hebrew scriptures where they are absent. For Flusser, the demonization of sin is found in the *Prayer of Levi* and *Plea for Deliverance*, opposed to the earlier biblical psalms, which signals the emerging articulation of demonic powers during the later period. Stuckenbruck also maintains that the Qumran and pseudepigraphic pleas against the demonic attest to the growing presence of a developed demonology within Jewish religious beliefs of the time. Therefore, these scholars contend that the demonologically oriented passages categorized above bear witness to a new aspect of prayer arising in early Judaism.

This brings us to a fourth similarity. It has been observed that, while the component of demonology in these prayers appears to be a distinct development, the structure of the petitions for deliverance is an adaptation of earlier biblical patterns. Flusser argues for a specific utilization of the biblical psalms and a replacement of the original term "iniquity" with "Satan" in certain cases. Eshel describes a close connection between earlier biblical passages and later anti-demonic texts. She goes as far as to describe the Priestly Blessing and Psalm 91 as "biblical models" of apotropaic prayers.[64] Stuckenbruck comments on the related prayer patterns in biblical, pseudepigraphic, and Qumran petitions and explains that certain anti-demonic passages "follow the framework of traditional prayers for deliverance provided through biblical tradition."[65] Thus Flusser, Eshel, and Stuckenbruck each hold that the unique development of engaging the demonic is expressed, in certain cases, using established petitionary patterns of biblical prayers.

2.1.5 Issues for Further Consideration

While the categorization of relevant early Jewish prayers offered above is significant for shaping this study, four issues arise which need to be addressed before a useful analysis of the primary literature can take place. These issues relate to: (1) the precise nature of a demon; (2) the various interpretations of demonic influence; (3) the definition of "incantation"; and (4) the acceptable terminology

[64] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 74.

[65] Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 73.

and method for the classification of prayers. Though it is important to be aware of these issues before delving into the primary literature, it is acknowledged that a satisfactory resolution to some of these matters may only be reached when considering the context of the actual prayers. Even then, one can only speculate as to the original meaning of the ancient, fragmentary works. Nevertheless, these issues should be taken into account and clarified to whatever degree possible.

Concerning the first point, since the presence of a demon is a primary feature of an anti-demonic text, the titles of demons and the nature of the demonic need to be considered. The description of demons and their activities throughout Flusser's work is brief. "Satan," "impure spirits," and "unclean spirits" are used as practically interchangeable terms for demonic beings in general. "Impure" and "unclean" are qualified as having ritual connotations in later rabbinic prayers, however the titles are, Flusser says, "synonymous with 'evil spirit' in the popular trend of Jewish piety at the time of Jesus." [66]

Eshel refers to these beings as "threatening external evil forces."[67] The more "sectarian" texts express the ongoing struggle between Belial and his lot (i.e. the demons) versus the Sons of Light. Terms like "unclean," "impure," or "evil" spirits are interpreted by Eshel as referring to demonic beings, along with the more descriptive "bastard" spirits which reflect Enochic influence. At one point she mentions "evil spirits or other evil forces" but does not elaborate on the difference between the two expressions.[68] Also unclear is whether she identifies the "evil scourge" in Psalm 155 as a demon. According to Stuckenbruck, pleas for deliverance are used for the defense against "malevolent beings" or "any other assortment of single or multiple evil spirits."[69] Like Flusser and Eshel, Stuckenbruck understands "satan" and "unclean spirit" as epithets for demons. Therefore, each scholar renders both descriptive names (e.g. "bastards" or "Belial") and more generic titles (e.g. "unclean/evil spirits") as references to

---

[66] Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 205.

[67] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 69.

[68] Eshel, "Genres," 396. In this case, perhaps she is referring to demons and their evil/harmful influences, but this should be clarified.

[69] Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 55.

wicked spiritual beings. Regarding more indefinite expressions, such as "evil scourge" in Psalm 155, the context of the passage must be studied in order to determine if the phrase is referring to a demon or not.

Eshel and Stuckenbruck address the origins of demons and contend that the demonology of the passages examined is informed by the Watcher tradition. Therefore, the Watcher aetiology of evil spirits provides a framework for the interpretation of the various demonic beings found in the Qumran and pseudepigraphic prayers. As per the Watcher myth, demons are viewed as disembodied spiritual descendants of the union between the fallen angelic Watchers and mortal woman. These spiritual creatures operate within a particular eschatological timeframe and wreak havoc upon humanity until the final judgment of God. Accordingly, until the destruction of evil by God, demons pose a danger to humanity. Although titles of demons and the Watcher aetiology of evil spirits may be explicit in some instances, it is unlikely that there is a monolithic demonology represented in the prayers.[70] Thus, possible demon titles and the nature of demons are individually assessed in each passage classified below.

While the first point addresses the titles and nature of demons, the second issue relates to demonic activity. Specifically, since anti-demonic formulae and prayers for deliverance are meant to counter demonic affliction, it is important to understand the ways in which demons are portrayed as influencing individuals. For Flusser, apotropaic prayers are intended to "avert personal dangers" including both demonic and non-demonic maladies.[71] Demons may harm a person physically (i.e. disease and pain) or spiritually (i.e. temptation and sin). Similarly, Eshel interprets some prayers to describe physical and non-physical influence from demons. In *Plea for Deliverance*, demons cause bodily and mental harm in the form of pain and sin. Eshel notes that these two forms of demonic affliction are attested in other sources as well, including Enochic literature, *Jubilees*, and 4Q560.[72] For Eshel, one way in which evil spirits cause an individual to sin is by temptation. Therefore, portrayals of, or allusions to, demonic influence in the prayers may

---

[70] A helpful article on this point is Stokes, "What is a Demon," 259-272.

[71] Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 201.

[72] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 76.

either refer to a physical attack resulting in pain or disease, or an enticement to stray from the righteous path.

Stuckenbruck observes several ways in which demons influence humans. Their main agenda is to lead people away from worshipping/following God. Through temptation demons cause individuals to commit sin, to become impure, and, possibly, to worship idols.[73] Demonic affliction may also be physical, at least in the case of Tobit where the demon Asmodeus kills the bridegrooms of Sarah.

The third point of clarification concerns the word "incantation," which, along with "apotropaic" and "exorcistic," is important in this study and will be used throughout.[74] Yet, while a general meaning of "apotropaic" and "exorcistic" is accepted by many scholars, the same cannot be said for "incantation." Eshel's use of the word is indeterminate, although it probably describes exorcistic passages.[75] She notes the presence of לחש (translated "incantation") in 11Q11 v 4, but no formal definition is offered. Aside from noting Nitzan's characterization of anti-demonic songs as "magical incantations," Stuckenbruck avoids using the term and applies more descriptive expressions that reflect a prayer's nature ("hymnic prayers," "songs," "adjurations," etc.).

In Nitzan's discussion of the incantation-like structure of *4QSongs of the Sage* she compares the document with general/ordinary "incantations," which she describes as "magical formulae and amulets...which are direct or explicit in that the magician addresses the evil spirits, commanding them to go away."[76] This is problematic in that it only includes overt addresses to demons with an exorcistic

---

[73] Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 67-68.

[74] Since going forward in this study we are concerned with demonologically oriented works, the category "magical texts" is too broad and will not be employed to any significant extent. Concerning the description "magical texts" along with select uses of the term, see n. 2.

[75] At the beginning of one conversation "incantations" appear to describe apotropaic works. Eshel, "Genres," 395, refers to "Jewish incantations and exorcism texts." Shortly thereafter she states in ibid., 396, "incantations or spells [aim] to exorcize or drive out evil spirits..." thus ascribing the term to exorcism texts. Likewise, in the four points of contrast between exorcistic and apotropaic prayers, "incantation" is used strictly to refer to the former.

[76] Nitzan, "Hymns," 54. Elsewhere in *Qumran Prayer*, 229, she refers to "various formulae and models of incantations."

intention. Texts with an apotropaic purpose are excluded from Nitzan's definition which is why she qualifies 4Q510-511 as "not pure and simple incantations" when exploring the manuscripts' "incantation" features.[77]

While Nitzan provides a helpful description of the category, it should be slightly revised for our purposes here. Henceforth, the term "incantation" in the study to follow is used for a formula, powerful word, or repetitive expression (incl. a chant, song, or adjuration) directed toward a deity or demon with the purpose of counteracting or preventing demonic influence. In this way "incantation" may either refer to prayers categorized as "apotropaic," "exorcistic," or otherwise and will thereby serve to reflect the nature of a given work while distinguishing it from a petitionary plea. Therefore, a passage may be an "apotropaic incantation" if it is formulaic. Yet if a work is apotropaic in nature but does not display the characteristics of an "incantation," it may still be referred to as an "apotropaic" prayer within the broader category of anti-demonic texts. This approach to the definition of "incantation" ensures a consistent application of the term while not excluding other relevant prayers from the discussion. Whether the term may be applied to specific works can only take place after an assessment of the primary literature. The term's definition may also be revisited or revised if necessary.

A final issue to consider relates to the method of categorization best suited to this study. Both Stuckenbruck's and Eshel's approaches are valuable and will guide the study. Stuckenbruck's organization especially emphasizes the complexities of documents such as *4QSongs of the Sage* and highlights the multivalent contents of each prayer, thus allowing for a more complete analysis. This is very helpful when comparing various prayers with each other. Eshel's

---

[77] Nitzan, "Hymns," 54. Wright also suggests a definition of "incantation," though the problem is with his *application* of the term which runs the risk of being too general. For Wright, an incantation has two features: (1) it must be used with authority, either by a name or a powerful word and (2) it is a repetition of certain formulae given to a person by a power figure and directed to a spirit or divinity; cf. Wright, "Prayer and Incantation in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Studies in Jewish Prayer*, 75. This definition applies to a particular type of passage, yet Wright uses the term as a broad category for anti-demonic prayers which could result in excluding other prayers, such as the *Prayer of Levi*, from the conversation.

system of organization results in a specific classification of passages based on their function. The basic purpose of a prayer as either preventative ("apotropaic") or remedial ("exorcistic") is of primary importance for the assessment of early Jewish demon traditions. Consequently, the classification of the primary literature below closely follows Eshel's method and pays particular attention to the prayer features laid out in her four points of contrast. Relevant anti-demonic passages are thereby described as "apotropaic" or "exorcistic," while at the same time bearing in mind their subtle nature which is outlined by Stuckenbruck's classifications. The term "incantation" is also applied where appropriate. Therefore, bearing in mind the four observations discussed in §2.1.4, along with the four issues of consideration in this section, we now turn to the early Jewish prayer material.

2.2 Anti-Demonic Traditions in Early Jewish Prayer: Assessment of Primary Literature

The contributions of Flusser, Eshel, and Stuckenbruck to the study of early Jewish anti-demonic prayers, taken together, point to the ancient literature relevant here. A total of twenty manuscripts and passages are referred to as "apotropaic," "exorcistic," or in some other way as demonologically oriented prayers or incantations.[78] The task at hand is to analyze this literature in order to delineate the demon traditions within them with the purpose of arriving to a system of classification for the study of the gospels. For each work three questions will sequentially lead the assessment. First: to what extent, if any, are demonic beings

[78] Since we are at the moment only interested in early Jewish texts, other works mentioned (i.e. later rabbinic, Hellenistic, and early Christian anti-demonic prayers) are not discussed here. The twenty works provided by scholarly contributions and explored in this chapter are: The Priestly Blessing, Psalm 91, *Genesis Apocryphon* (*1QapGen ar*), *1QRule of the Community* (1QS), *1QHodayot*^{a} (1QH^{a}), *Prayer of Levi* (*4QAramaic Levi*^{b} (1Q213a)), *4QIncantation* (4Q444), *4QSongs of the Sage*^{a} (4Q510), *4QSongs of the Sage*^{b} (4Q511), *4QExorcism ar* (4Q560), *6QHymn* (6Q18), *8QHymn* (8Q5), *Plea for Deliverance* (*11QPsalms*^{a} (11Q5) xix), *Syriac Psalm* (*11QPsalms*^{a} (11Q5) xxiv), *11QApocryphal Psalms* (11Q11), *Moses' Intercession* (*Jub.* 1:19-20), *Prayer of Noah* (*Jub.* 10:3-6), *Prayer of Abram* (*Jub.* 12:19-20), *Abraham's Blessing* (*Jub.* 19:28), and Tobit 8:4-8.

or demonic influences depicted in the passage? Second: are features related to the demonic approached in a preventative (apotropaic) or curative (exorcistic) manner? Third: what form does the anti-demonic action take; that is, is the passage a plea to God, an adjuration, a ritual, or some other expression? Biblical passages are analyzed first (§2.2.1) followed by apotropaic petitions (§2.2.2), apotropaic incantations (§2.2.3), exorcistic incantations (§2.2.4), and an exorcistic narrative (§2.2.5).

2.2.1 Biblical Antecedents

2.2.1.1 The Priestly Blessing (Num. 6:24-26)

Presentation and Translation

24 יְבָרֶכְךָ֖ יְהוָ֑ה וְיִשְׁמְרֶֽךָ׃
25 יָאֵ֨ר יְהוָ֤ה ׀ פָּנָיו֙ אֵלֶ֔יךָ וִיחֻנֶּֽךָּ׃
26 יִשָּׂ֨א יְהוָ֤ה ׀ פָּנָיו֙ אֵלֶ֔יךָ וְיָשֵׂ֥ם לְךָ֖ שָׁלֽוֹם׃

24 The Lord bless you and keep you: 25 The Lord make his face to shine upon you, and be gracious to you: 26 The Lord lift up his countenance upon you, and give you peace.

Justification for Classification

Numbers 6:24-26 contains a blessing for the people of Israel given to Aaron and his sons by God. Each of the three lines in this poetic exhortation contains two clauses bestowing blessings and favors upon the recipients. Proclamation of the benediction is a priestly duty (cf. Num. 6:22-23; Lev. 9:23), and the prayer itself serves as a basic formula for divine blessing.[79] In several extra-biblical works, including texts from Qumran and several very early amulets, the blessing is

[79] The blessing is represented in Ps. 67:1, and features of the blessing are found elsewhere throughout the psalms. Cf. E. W. Davies, *Numbers* (NCBC; London: Marshall-Pickering; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 66-69.

adapted for apotropaic purposes.[80] Yet identifying the biblical passage as an anti-demonic prayer is not so straightforward. To begin with, an explicit mention of a demonic being or evil force is absent from the blessing and the generally recognized lack of such themes in the Pentateuch make an implicit reference unlikely. One possible allusion to an apotropaic function may be found in the word שמר. The term, which has several possible meanings (e.g. "to keep," "to guard," "to protect," etc.), could beg the question: protect from what or whom? However, though a promise of protection from demonic beings would make some measure of

---

[80] A version of the benediction can be found in 1QS ii 2-4. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 70, refers to the language of col. ii ll. 5-9 as the Priestly Blessing "inverted into a curse pronounced by the Levites against 'the people of Belial's lot.'" For a significant discussion on the use of the Priestly Blessing in Qumran literature, see Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 145-171, and 357-358. An explicit rendering of the blessing as an anti-demonic text is found in the later *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* which translates Num. 6:24: "May the Lord bless you and guard you in all your endeavor *from (the demons of the) darkness and from frightening demons and midday demons and morning demons and destroyers and night demons*." E. G. Clarke, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Numbers* (*The Aramaic Bible* vol. 4; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995), 205; cf. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 71. Attention is also drawn to the amulets found at Kuntillet 'Ajrud and Ketef Hinnom which attest to an early use of the Priestly Blessing. The archaeological finds at Kuntillet 'Ajrud include an inscription containing a version of the blessing in the Hebrew language (in Phoenician script) dating to around the 7th to the 8th century B.C.; cf. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 70; and B. A. Mastin, "The Inscriptions Written on Plaster at Kuntillet 'Ajrud," *VT* 59 (2009): 99-115. Two silver amulets discovered in Jerusalem (Ketef Hinnom I and Ketef Hinnom II) most likely date from the 6th to the 7th century B.C. The Priestly Blessing is quoted in Ketef Hinnom I (ll. 14-18) and, possibly, in Ketef Hinnom II (l. 6). Both amulets contain Hebrew inscriptions etched into a small silver scroll and rolled up. Each scroll requests God's protection from "evil" (רע). Interestingly, in Ketef Hinnom I and (possibly) Ketef Hinnom II the word רע appears with the definite article, leading some to interpret a request for protection from "not just anything evil, but rather *all* Evil." G. Barkay et al., "The Amulets from Ketef Hinnom: A new Edition and Evaluation," *BASOR* 334 (May, 2004): 68. The phrase הגער ברע (translated "the rebuker of Evil") is found in Ketef Hinnom II (ll. 4-5) suggesting possible exorcistic connotations. Although there is no explicit reference to demons in any of these amulets, an anti-demonic context and purpose of the amulets is cautiously accepted by some scholars; cf. G. Barkay, et al., "The Challenges of Ketef Hinnom," *NEA* 66:4 (2003): 162-171; Barkay, et al., "Amulets from Ketef Hinnom," 41-71; Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 70; and Joseph Angel, "The Use of the Hebrew Bible in Early Jewish Magic," *RC* 3.5 (2009): 785-798.

sense given the possible connotations of שמר, this would be nothing more than conjecture. The verb is not specific in the Priestly Blessing, and the Hebrew word is also used to request protection from non-demonic threats and to describe obedience to the torah and observance of the Sabbath.[81]

Eshel's categorization of Numbers 6:24-26 as apotropaic appears to be based solely on the use of the passage in non-biblical passages. Her references to early Jewish amulets and rabbinic material (esp. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*) clearly demonstrate the presence of the blessing in anti-demonic contexts. Yet, while the amulets and later works provide insight into the developing tradition of demonologically oriented prayers, they do not reflect the original formulation of this biblical passage. Thus, since the presence of a demonic being or influence cannot be verified in the original text a classification of the Priestly Blessing as an apotropaic prayer must be rejected.

2.2.1.2 Psalm 91

Presentation and Translation

1 יֹשֵׁב בְּסֵתֶר עֶלְיוֹן בְּצֵל שַׁדַּי יִתְלוֹנָן׃
2 אֹמַר ׀ לַיהוָה מַחְסִי וּמְצוּדָתִי אֱלֹהַי אֶבְטַח־בּוֹ׃
3 כִּי הוּא יַצִּילְךָ מִפַּח יָקוּשׁ מִדֶּבֶר הַוּוֹת׃
4 בְּאֶבְרָתוֹ ׀ יָסֶךְ לָךְ וְתַחַת־כְּנָפָיו תֶּחְסֶה
צִנָּה וְסֹחֵרָה אֲמִתּוֹ׃
5 לֹא־תִירָא מִפַּחַד לָיְלָה מֵחֵץ יָעוּף יוֹמָם׃
6 מִדֶּבֶר בָּאֹפֶל יַהֲלֹךְ מִקֶּטֶב יָשׁוּד צָהֳרָיִם׃
7 יִפֹּל מִצִּדְּךָ ׀ אֶלֶף וּרְבָבָה מִימִינֶךָ
אֵלֶיךָ לֹא יִגָּשׁ׃
8 רַק בְּעֵינֶיךָ תַבִּיט וְשִׁלֻּמַת רְשָׁעִים תִּרְאֶה׃
9 כִּי־אַתָּה יְהוָה מַחְסִי עֶלְיוֹן שַׂמְתָּ מְעוֹנֶךָ׃
10 לֹא־תְאֻנֶּה אֵלֶיךָ רָעָה וְנֶגַע לֹא־יִקְרַב בְּאָהֳלֶךָ׃
11 כִּי מַלְאָכָיו יְצַוֶּה־לָּךְ לִשְׁמָרְךָ בְּכָל־דְּרָכֶיךָ׃

---

[81] Ps. 140:4 and 141:9 request God's assistance to guard/protect (שמר) the praying person from wicked *human* enemies. שמר is also used when describing the "keeping" of God's covenant/commandments (cf. Gen. 17:9; Exod. 20:6; Lev. 19:19; and Deut. 4:2) and the "keeping" of the Sabbath (cf. Exod. 31:16; Lev. 19:3; and Deut. 5:12). Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 144, does note that in 1 Chr. 4:10 and Ps. 121:7 adaptations of the Priestly Blessing add the word "evil," and thus read "keep me from evil" and "keep you from all evil" respectively. Still, "evil" (רע) in these cases is nonspecific; cf. §4.3.

12 עַל־כַּפַּיִם יִשָּׂאוּנְךָ פֶּן־תִּגֹּף בָּאֶבֶן רַגְלֶךָ׃
13 עַל־שַׁחַל וָפֶתֶן תִּדְרֹךְ תִּרְמֹס כְּפִיר וְתַנִּין׃
14 כִּי בִי חָשַׁק וַאֲפַלְּטֵהוּ אֲשַׂגְּבֵהוּ כִּי־יָדַע שְׁמִי׃
15 יִקְרָאֵנִי וְאֶעֱנֵהוּ עִמּוֹ־אָנֹכִי בְצָרָה אֲחַלְּצֵהוּ וַאֲכַבְּדֵהוּ׃
16 אֹרֶךְ יָמִים אַשְׂבִּיעֵהוּ וְאַרְאֵהוּ בִּישׁוּעָתִי׃

1 He who dwells in the shelter of the Most High, who abides in the shadow of the Almighty, 2 will say to the Lord, "My refuge and my fortress; my God, in whom I trust." 3 For he will deliver you from the snare of the fowler and from the deadly pestilence; 4 he will cover you with his pinions, and under his wings you will find refuge; his faithfulness is a shield and buckler. 5 You will not fear the terror of the night, for the arrow that flies by day, 6 nor the pestilence that stalks in darkness, nor the destruction that wastes at noonday. 7 A thousand may fall at your side, ten thousand at your right hand; but it will not come near you. 8 You will only look with your eyes and see the recompense of the wicked. 9 Because you have made the Lord your refuge, the Most High your habitation, 10 no evil shall befall you, no scourge come near your tent. 11 For he will give his angels charge of you to guard you in all your ways. 12 On their hands they will bear you up, lest you dash your foot against a stone. 13 You will tread on the lion and the adder, the young lion and the serpent you will trample under foot. 14 Because he clings to me in love, I will deliver him; I will protect him, because he knows my name. 15 When he calls to me, I will answer him; I will be with him in trouble, I will rescue him and honor him. 16 With long life I will satisfy him, and show him my salvation.

Justification for Classification

Classification of the psalm by Eshel is less clear than her identification of the Priestly Blessing as apotropaic. Rather, she discusses the adaptation of Psalm 91 for apotropaic purposes in Aramaic incantations, rabbinic prayers, and 11Q11 vi.[82]

---

[82] Along with the Priestly Blessing, passages from Psalm 91 appear in Aramaic incantation bowls and amulets which date from Late Antiquity to the early Middle Ages; cf. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 71-72; L. H. Schiffman and M. D. Swartz, *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts from the Cairo Genizah: Selected Texts from Taylor-Schechter Box K1* (Semetic Texts and Studies 1; Scheffield: JSOT Press, 1992); and Angel, "Early Jewish Magic," 789-790. The context of these incantations and amulets is apotropaic. In one instance it is noted that the psalm "was known in the early Jewish magical tradition from Talmudic times onward as an anti-demonic psalm." Schiffman and Swartz, *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts*, 39; cf. Langton, *Essentials of Demonology*, 23. On the adaptation of Psalm 91 in 11Q11 and rabbinic texts, see Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 71-74; and Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 359-365. While the apotropaic use of the psalm in later texts is emphasised and demonstrated, Eshel still refers to the biblical text of Psalm 91 and the Priestly

The same vagueness and lack of overt demonic references encountered in the Numbers passage are present also in Psalm 91. In verse 14 the verb used for "protect" is שגב ("to protect," to make high") and no connection to the demonic can be inferred by the presence of this word alone.[83]

A possible reference to a demon may be the word ישוד in verse 6. The LXX sees this as coming from the root שד and translates δαιμόνιον ("demon"), however the word is most likely a verb from שדד or שוד, meaning "to destroy" or "to lay waste."[84] Given the uncertainty of the root and the context of the passage, the NRSV translation of verse 6b ("the destruction that wastes at noonday") is more probable than the interpretation of ישוד as a demonic being.

Several other terms may have demonological connotations. Fröhlich describes דבר ("pestilence") and קטב ("destruction") in verses 3 and 6 as "demonic representatives of the plague."[85] Andrew Schmutzer observes the similarity between the "flying arrow" (חץ יעוף) in verse 5 and the Canaanite god "Resheph" whose symbol was an arrow. He comments: "While these demonic identities may be depersonalized in Israel's theology, the same identities were not dismantled in the antecedent pantheons and practices surrounding Israel."[86] This and other terminology is discussed in greater length below (§2.2.2.4).

While these terms may indeed be associated to some degree with the demonic, and though Psalm 91 is concerned with harmful forces, there are no explicit occurrences of demons. Therefore, since possible demonologically

---

Blessing as "models" of apotropaic prayer, thus giving the impression that both texts are classified as such; cf. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 74.

[83] As one commentator observes, the verb means "to make inaccessibly high...out of the way of harm." Marvin E. Tate, *Psalms 50-100* (WBC 20; Nelson Reference & Electronic, 1990), 450. The verb appears elsewhere in the psalms with the same general context (cf. Ps. 20:2; and Ps. 69:30).

[84] Tate, *Psalms*, 448. See also the translation in C. A. and E. G. Briggs, *The Book of Psalms* (CEC vol. 2; T & T Clark, 1907), 208, and, alternatively, the discussion in Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms II 51-100* (AB; Doubleday & Company, 1968), 332.

[85] Fröhlich, "Evil in Second Temple Texts," in *Evil and the Devil*, 45.

[86] A. J. Schmutzer, "Psalm 91: Refuge, Protection and its Use in the New Testament," in *The Psalms: Language for All Seasons of the Soul* (eds. A. J. Schmutzer and D. M. Howard Jr.; Moody Publications, 2013), 96; cf. ibid., 94-105.

relevant features of Psalm 91 are ambiguous, it is most prudent to refrain from an anti-demonic classification. Eshel and others convincingly show the importance of the psalm and the Priestly Blessing in later apotropaic works and, in this way, the passages may be referred to as "apotropaic" in their reception. However, the biblical passages, in themselves, are not apotropaic.

2.2.1.3 Tobit

Description

Tobit is generally dated to the third or early second century B.C.[87] Most hold Aramaic to be the original language of Tobit, although some have argued it is Hebrew; as Joseph Fitzmyer comments: "the matter is still unresolved."[88] Modern translations are usually based on one or more of the Greek recensions, and parts of the text are represented at Qumran in four Aramaic manuscripts (4Q196-199) and one Hebrew manuscript (4Q200).[89]

---

[87] Joseph Fitzmyer leans towards a date between 225 and 175 B.C. in J. A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit* (CEJL; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), 52; cf. Amy-Jill Levine, "Tobit," in *The New Oxford Annotated Apocrypha: New Revised Standard Version* (ed. Michael D. Coogan; Oxford University Press, 2010), 10. On the canonicity of Tobit, see Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 55-56; idem, "Tobit," in *The Oxford Bible Commentary: The Apocrypha* (ed. Martin Goodman; Oxford University Press, 2001), 14; and Levine, "Tobit," 10.

[88] Fitzmyer, "Tobit," 14; cf. Levine, "Tobit," 10. Alexander A. Di Lella notes that the later Greek versions "are themselves translations of a Semitic original." Idem, "Tobit," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (eds. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright; Oxford University Press, 2007), 458. For a detailed discussion surrounding the original language and the opinions of various scholars, see Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 18-27.

[89] Among the numerous early Greek and Latin MSS there are three main Greek traditions: (1) the "Long" recension represented *Codex Sinaiticus*; (2) the "Short" recension represented in *Codex Vaticanus*; and (3) the "Third" or "Intermediate" recension represented in the Ferrara text. The Latin traditions include the "Long" recension in *Vetus Latina* and the "Short" recension in the Vulgate. The Qumran fragments of Tobit are closest to the Greek "Long" recension, as is the Latin *Codex Regius*. The "Short" recension is represented in most Greek texts as well as the *Codex Vaticanus*. The relationship between these MSS is complex, and while the discovery of the Qumran fragments is indeed a boon for textual critics, there are still many unanswered questions. For a

A "Post-Eventum" Deliverance Plea?

Discussed previously (cf. §2.1.3), Stuckenbruck regards the prayer offered to God by Tobias in 8:4-8 as a *post eventum* deliverance plea. This is based on two main points:

First, verse 4 of the *Codex Sinaiticus* states: "...My sister, get up and let us pray and beg our Lord to grant us mercy and deliverance [σωτηρία]."[90] σωτηρία appears also in verse 5 of the same recension, and verse 4 in Stuckenbruck's presentation of the "Third"/"Intermediate" recension. In Stuckenbruck's "Intermediate" recension, verse 7 is translated: "Now, Lord, you know that I am taking this woman of mine not out of lust, but according to the righteous decree of your law, so that we may be shown mercy, Lord, she and I, and *that you put a curse on the unclean demon*, even giving us children, Lord, and blessing."[91] Thus, the prayer asks for "deliverance" in two Greek versions, and mentions God's curse upon a demon in one recension.

Second, according to Raphael's instructions to Tobit in 6:8, the smoking of the fish heart and liver will cause demons to flee and "they will never stay with the person any longer."[92] According to Stuckenbruck, one of the purposes of Tobias'

---

critical edition of these and additional MSS, cf. Stuart Weeks, Simon Gathercole, and Loren Stuckenbruck, eds., *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions with Synopsis, Concordances, and Annotated Texts in Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Syriac* (FoSub 3; Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004). See also Fitzmyer, "Tobit," 13; *Tobit*, 3-15; and Di Lella, "Tobit," 456-458. Stuckenbruck's article, which is discussed in this section, presents and engages with Fitzmyer's translations of the codices *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus*, along with Stuckenbruck's translation of the "Intermediate/Third" recension; cf. Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 70.

[90] Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 238; cf. Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 70.

[91] Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 70 (italics his). The "Long" and Short" recensions are typically given priority over the "Intermediate" recension, and the latter is a composite of the other two Greek recensions; cf. Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 5-6; Di Lella, "Tobit," 456-457; and Weeks, Gathercole, and Stuckenbruck, *Tobit*, 10-20.

[92] This is Fitzmyer's translation of the "Long" recension; cf. idem, *Tobit*, 200.

prayer is to articulate and fulfill these effects.[93] That is, the prayer for deliverance in 8:4-8 is a component of the anti-demonic ritual in 6:8 that ensures the demon will never return.

Although Stuckenbruck offers an intriguing interpretation, the marriage prayer of Tobias is not an explicit anti-demonic passage. Regarding the first point, the presence of σωτηρία in the two Greek recensions is not related to the demonic in any outright manner. An association between "deliverance" and demonic affliction is possible given the context of the narrative,[94] yet, σωτηρία, which also means "salvation," could simply refer to a more general request for God's guardianship of the marriage. Regarding the second point, Raphael expresses that burning the fish heart and liver is sufficient to cause a demon to depart and not return; an accompanying prayer is not necessary. A more convincing link could be made between the prayer and 6:18 where Raphael instructs Tobias: "...When you are about to go to bed with her, both of you should first stand up and pray, begging the Lord of Heaven that mercy and deliverance be granted you."[95] In this instance, the deliverance prayer is at least prompted by Raphael's instructions for a successful marital union. Still, the directive to request deliverance is given after Raphael assures Tobias that "[t]he demon will smell it [i.e., the immolated fish parts] and flee, and never will it be seen near her again."[96]

Essentially, the only way to view the prayer in 8:4-8 as an anti-demonic plea is if Tobias and Sarah fear the return of Asmodeus or other demons. If this is the case, a petition for refuge from future demonic affliction is apotropaic. It is possible that the wedding prayer in Tobit carries this meaning, however in 6:8 and

---

[93] Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 72, explains: "the marriage [of Tobias and Sarah] is the result of two acts on the part of Tobiah: the application of a magical recipe and the utterance of a plea for deliverance which, like the recipe, is said to ensure that the defeat of Asmodeus stays that way."

[94] Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 244, interprets "deliverance" in v. 4 to mean "release from the influence of Asmodeus."

[95] This is Fitzmyer's translation of the "Long Recension" in *Tobit*, 202. According to Fröhlich, the ritual and Tobias' prayer are both part of the method of exorcism; cf. Fröhlich, "Second Temple Texts," 38.

[96] This is Fitzmyer's translation of the "Long Recension" (Tob. 6:18) in *Tobit*, 202.

6:18 Raphael states that the ritual, on its own, will prevent the demons' return from happening. Furthermore, after Tobias performs the ritual in 8:3 Asmodeus is bound in Egypt by Raphael. Therefore, due to the confidence demonstrated in the effectiveness of the ritual and given the lack of explicit demonologically relevant language in the two major Greek recensions, I am not convinced that the prayer in Tobit 8:4-8 should be classified as "anti-demonic." However, Stuckenbruck draws attention to the anti-demonic ritual in Tobit, and this passage is relevant here.

The Anti-Demonic Ritual in Tobit: Justification for Classification

The ritual used against Asmodeus is significant for understanding early Jewish anti-demonic traditions. A description of the rite is found in a discussion in 6:7-9 between Tobias and Raphael who is disguised as Azariah:

> 7 Then the boy asked the angel, "Brother Azariah, what medicine is there in the fish's heart, liver and gall?" 8 He answered, "As for the fish's heart and liver, you can smoke them in the presence of a man or woman afflicted by a demon or an evil spirit, and the affliction will depart; they will never stay with the person any longer. 9 The gall is for anointing the eyes of a human being, where white films have appeared, or for blowing it on such white films, and the eyes will get better."[97]

The implementation of the rite by Tobias is then portrayed in 8:2-3:

> 2 Tobiah recalled the words of Raphael and brought with him the fish's liver and heart from the sack where he had them and put them on the incense-coals. 3 The odor from the fish hindered the demon, and it ran off up into parts of Egypt. Raphael went and bound it there, shackling it at once.[98]

Smoking the fish heart and liver is an act specifically intended to counteract a demon.[99] Although the demon is not named in these accounts, it is

---

[97] The translation is from Fitzmyer's "Long" recension in *Tobit*, 200.

[98] The translation is from Fitzmyer's "Long" recension in *Tobit*, 238.

[99] This is contrasted with the fish gall which is "for anointing the eyes of a *human being*" (italics mine) (6:9). As to the fumigation of the fish parts, Fröhlich, "Second Temple Texts," 37, explains:

made clear elsewhere in the narrative that the afflicting being is called "Asmodeus."[100] Clearly, the ritualistic immolation performed by Tobias is "anti-demonic," but it is less straightforward to determine whether it is exorcistic or apotropaic. The instructions given by Raphael denote that the purpose of the ritual is for "a man or woman afflicted by a demon" (6:8) and, in the narrative, Sarah is portrayed as presently suffering the destructive consequences Asmodeus' activity.[101] Additionally, the fact that the scent of the burning fish causes Asmodeus to flee (8:3) implies that he is already occupying the bridal chamber.[102] These points suggest that the ritual enacted by Tobias has a "curative" or "exorcistic" effect, and it is "preventative" only in the sense that it halts the

---

"Fumigation as a means of exorcism is not known from Jewish tradition; on the other hand, according to several incantation texts, it was generally practiced in Mesopotamia. Incense was used in a ritual context, in ceremonies, in the ancient Near East and in Israel. Their use was aimed at stalling off harmful demonic beings."

[100] Regarding the provenance of "Asmodeus" (Ασμοδαῖς), Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 150, details: "The name is usually explained as Old Persian or Avestan, equaling *aēšma daēva*, "demon of wrath," an associate of Ahriman, the god of evil, known from Avestan literature. The Persian origin of the name, however, has been contested, and some would rather explain it as derived from Hebrew שמד, "destroy, exterminate," i.e. the one who destroys..."; cf. Fröhlich, "Second Temple Texts," 37.

[101] Early in the narrative it is noted that the demon has taken the lives of seven men who were given to Sarah in marriage (3:8). At one point, Sarah contemplates hanging herself "because of her troubles" (3:10); cf. Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 147. Although she may not be suffering direct pain (6:15), she is overtly ill-effected by the demon. It is not specified whether Asmodeus exerts his influence while acting as an external entity or if Sarah is demonically possessed. Fröhlich, "Second Temple Texts," 37, notes that both scenarios are possible, stating: "[t]he demon resides either in his victim Sarah's body or in her immediate surroundings, in the bridal room." Either way, it seems that the intent of the anti-demonic ritual is to remedy the demon's current influence over Sarah.

[102] Interestingly, Asmodeus flees to Egypt where he is "bound" by Raphael; thus demonstrating a parallel to *1 En.* 10:4.The imagery of Raphael binding Asmodeus in Tobit and Azazel in *1 Enoch* is a striking similarity. It is difficult to determine if this possible parallel speaks to a relationship between the two texts. For Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 69 n. 40: "It is not clear whether the prayer in Tobit 8 is reminiscent of the Enochic tradition (and, therefore, links Asmodeus to the fallen angel tradition)." Unfortunately, the book of Tobit goes no further than 8:3 in describing an eschatology of its demonology.

demon's influence before Tobias could become his next victim. Therefore, Tobit 8:2-3 contains a portrayal of an exorcistic ritual set within a narrative.

A final noteworthy feature are the two mentions of a dog accompanying Tobias on his journey (5:16; 11:4). In an article assessing ancient Near Eastern artifacts Takayoshi Oshima explains that in Mesopotamian tradition anti-demonic abilities are possibly attributed to dogs. He states:

> "[A]rchaeologists at the palace of Assurbanipal at Nineveh found five figurines of dogs under a floor, each one with a different cuneiform inscription reading: '*The one who chases out evil*;' '*Conqueror of the enemy*;' '*Bark without hesitation*;' '*The one which bites his foe*;' and '*Its bark is powerful.*' These inscriptions clearly indicate a belief that dogs in general, and these dog figurines in particular, had the magical power to expel malevolent agents such as illnesses, demons, ghosts, sorcerers, and curses."[103]

The figurines are dated to around 645 B.C. Also recorded is that a dog was the symbol of Gula, the Mesopotamian goddess of healing.[104] There is no indication that an exorcistic or otherwise anti-demonic significance is attached to the dog in Tobit, although in 11:4 the dog is referred to alongside the fish gall which is later used to heal Tobit's eyes (11:11-15). If the figurines attest to a wider association between dogs and anti-demonic or curative functions in the ancient Near East, it may suggest a reason for the inclusion of Tobias' dog in this narrative.

2.2.2 Apotropaic Petitions

2.2.2.1 *Prayer of Levi* in *4QAramaic Levi*^{b} (4Q213a 1 i)

Reconstruction and Translation

---

[103] Takayoshi Oshima, "A Neo-Assyrian Cylinder Seal with a Healing Scene in a Reed Hut," BLER S/1 (2013): 3 (italics his); cf. J. E. Curtis and J. E. Reade, eds., *Art and Empire: Treasures from Assyria in the British Museum* (British Museum Press, 1995), 116-117.

[104] Cf. Oshima, "A Neo-Assyrian Cylinder Seal," 3; Curtis and Reade, *Art and Empire*, 116.

10]אמרת מרי אנתה
11 א]נתה בלחזדיך ידע
12]אֹרחת קשט ארחק
13 ב]איש וזנותא דחא
14 ח]כמה ומנדע וגבורה
15 לא]שכחה רחמיך קדמיך
16]דשפיר ודטב קדמיך
17 ו]אל תשלט בי כל שטן
18 ע]לי מרי וקרבני למהוא לכה

10] I said, 'O Lord, you
11 y]ou alone understand
12] paths of truth. Make far
13 e]vil [ ] and fornication turn away
14 w]isdom and knowledge and strength
15 to f]ind favour before you.
16] that which is pleasant and good before you.
17] let not any satan have power over me
18 up]on me, my Lord, and bring me forward, to be your...'[105]

Description and Comments

This Aramaic manuscript is dated to the middle of the first century B.C.,[106] and is significant because Levi is depicted as petitioning God for blessings and safety. Michael Stone and Jonas Greenfield reconstruct the passage more fully based on comparison with a later version of the prayer found in a Greek manuscript of *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.[107]

Line 10, especially אמרת, indicates that the subsequent content is an address by the speaker directed to God. In line 13 there is a request for "evil" to be turned away, and with the corresponding Greek version Stone and Greenfield

[105] The Aramaic text and translation is taken from Stone and Greenfield, *DJD XXII*, 28-29; cf. M. E. Stone and J. C. Greenfield, "The Prayer of Levi," *JBL* 112.2 (1993): 225-256.

[106] Stone and Greenfield, *DJD XXII*, 3. Brian Webster, *DJD XXXIX: Indices and an Introduction to the* DJD *Series* (ed. Emanuel Tov; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 403, suggests the dates 50 – 25 B.C.

[107] Stone and Greenfield, *DJD XXII*, 31-32. For a detailed account of the relationship between the Aramaic and Greek texts, see Stone and Greenfield, "Prayer of Levi," 247-266.

interpret lines 12(b)-13: "Make far from me, O Lord, the unrighteous spirit, and evil thought and fornication, and turn pride away from me."[108] This is followed by an appeal in line 14 for a holy spirit (in the Greek), wisdom, knowledge, and strength. According to Stone and Greenfield, "this is certainly one of the oldest passages in which two spirits are contrasted."[109] It is clear, even without the Greek, that "evil" and "fornication" in line 13 are set against "wisdom," "knowledge," and "strength" in line 14, thus depicting the terms as personal attributes and not independent spiritual beings.

Context suggests that the request for God not to let "any satan have power over me" in line 17 is referring to demonic beings. The word שטן is most certainly a demonic title and has biblical precedent as both a proper name and a general term applied to a being opposing God (e.g., Num. 22:22; 1 Sam. 29:4; Zech. 3:1-3).[110] Since שטן appears with כל it is interpreted as a general title for demons and not a personal name.[111] The appeal is to God that the demons should "not have power" over the praying person. תשלט is the second person singular imperfect meaning "to give power" or "to let rule", and suggests that Levi is not currently afflicted by demons, but rather concerned about possible future demonic harm. This is aptly reflected in the English translation. The root שלט is fairly nondescript and does not itself hint at the type of power that demons may have over an individual. The Greek version of the prayer includes "let not any satan have power over me, *to make me stray from your path*."[112] Straying from the path of God implies demonic temptation, but this is a later addition.

---

[108] Stone and Greenfield, *DJD XXII*, 31.

[109] Stone and Greenfield, "The Prayer of Levi," 252.

[110] For the interpretation of "satan" as a demonic being, see Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 341-344; Lange, "Spirit of Impurity," 260-262; and Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 59. For other Hebrew Bible references to שטן and השטן, cf. Peggy L. Day, *An Adversary in Heaven: śāṭān in the Hebrew Bible* (HSM 43; ed. by F. M. Cross; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988); and Antti Laato, "The Devil in the Old Testament," in *Evil and the Devil*, 1-22.

[111] Stone and Greenfield, "The Prayer of Levi," 262, explain that in this instance שטן "is the name of a type or class of evil spirit, and not of Satan."

[112] Stone and Greenfield, "The Prayer of Levi," 259 (italics mine).

A critical issue for classifying this prayer is determining whether or not the petition for refuge from שטן is a request for safety from demonic beings. Lange raises an alternative possibility. In line 15 of *Plea for Deliverance* the word שטן in the phrase "let not Satan rule over me" is paired with "spirit of impurity" (רוח טמאה). A "spirit of impurity" could possibly have ritualistic implications relating to a personal disposition. According to Lange, the parallel expressions in *Plea for Deliverance* and *Prayer of Levi* may be requesting from God "a different mental attitude, i.e. 'a spirit of faith and knowledge.'"[113] If this is the case, the request calls into question the appropriateness of an "apotropaic" classification. Still, Lange interprets both "satan" and "spirit of impurity" as demonic beings. Conversely, Benjamin Wold argues that in the case of *Plea for Deliverance* and, thus, *Prayer of Levi*, the request for safety is directed at the cause (i.e., the demons) in order to circumvent harmful spiritual and physical affects.[114] Since the desire for a different internal orientation is not explicit in the request "let not any satan have power over me," it is most probable that the phrase expresses a plea for preservation from demons and some type of demonic affliction.

Justification for Classification

Prayer of Levi refers to a demonic being or beings (כל שטן) and demonic influence (תשלט בי). Given the context of the passage and the imperfect nature of שלט, the appeal for safety from demonic harm is preventative and, therefore, apotropaic. The apotropaic line is in the form of a petition for protection addressed to God. These considerations lead to a classification of *Prayer of Levi* as an apotropaic plea for deliverance from unspecified demonic harm. Stone and Greenfield remark that the formula in 4Q213a "clearly stand[s] toward the head of the line of

[113] Lange, "Spirit of Impurity," 262. As Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer," 106, observes, Lange's view is not of a petition for safety from demons but rather "a petition for assistance in overcoming an *orientation*" (italics his).

[114] Cf. Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer," 106-107.

development of Jewish apotropaic prayers."[115] Therefore, the *Prayer of Levi* is an archetypal Jewish apotropaic plea for deliverance.

2.2.2.2 *Plea for Deliverance* in *11QPsalms*[a] (11Q5 xix 1-18)

Reconstruction and Translation

13 ...סלחה יהוה לחטאתי
14 וטהרני מעווני רוח אמונה ודעת חונני אל אתקלה
15 בעווה אל תשלט בי שטן ורוח טמאה מכאוב ויצר
16 רע אל ירשו בעצמי כי אתה יהוה שבחי ולכה קויתי

13 ...Forgive my sin, O Lord,
14 and purify me from my iniquity. Vouchsafe me a spirit of faith and knowledge, and let me not be dishonoured
15 in ruin. Let not Satan rule over me, nor an unclean spirit; neither let pain nor evil inclination
16 take possession of my bones. For thou, O Lord, art my praise, and in thee do I hope[116]

Description and Comments

The *Plea for Deliverance*, a previously unknown psalm, is found in *11QPsalms*[a] (11Q5 xix 1-18) and partially preserved in *11QPsalms*[b] (11Q6 4-5 2-16). A date of the beginning of the first century A.D. is suggested.[117] The prayer, in typical hymnic fashion, praises God and petitions for his protection. There is a strong similarity between *Prayer of Levi* and *Plea for Deliverance*. Both petitions address

---

[115] Stone and Greenfield, "The Prayer of Levi," 264. Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 196-197, comments on the similar pattern of this request to that of Ps. 119:133b. While the exact relationship between the two petitionary patterns remains open to debate, Stuckenbruck and Lange argue convincingly that the Qumran passage is not a direct adaptation of the psalm expression; cf. Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 61; Lange, "Spirit of Impurity," 262.

[116] The Hebrew text and English translation are from James A. Sanders, *DJD of Jordon IV: The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave11. (11QPs[a])* (Oxford; Clarendon Press, 1965), 77-78.

[117] Webster, *DJD XXXIX*, 426, places the date between 1 and 50 A.D.; cf. Sanders, *DJD IV*, 9.

God, asking him for blessings: "wisdom, knowledge, and strength" in *Prayer of Levi* and "a spirit of faith and knowledge" in *Plea for Deliverance*. This appears alongside a request for help to avoid evil: "make far... evil and fornication" in the former and "let me not be dishonoured in ruin" in the latter. In *Plea for Deliverance* there is, perhaps, a greater emphasis on sin. Lines 13-14 ask for the purification from iniquity and the forgiveness of sins.[118] Additionally, the word בעוה ("in ruin") in line 15 may also be read as בעויה, thus rendering the expression "let me not be dishonored in *transgression*."[119]

Whether or not the concern for sin/impurity in *Plea for Deliverance* indicates a slightly different focus than is articulated in *Prayer of Levi*, both passages contain the nearly identical petition; "let not satan rule over me." Unlike *Prayer of Levi*, the title שטן appears here without the qualifying כל. The terms שטן and כל שטן designate, respectively, a general demonic opponent and a class of demons.[120] Regardless of whether שטן, in this case, is meant to denote a generic entity or a proper name, it is clear that a demon is being referenced. The petitionary expression in *Plea for Deliverance*, like that of *Prayer of Levi*,

---

[118] Although line 14 of the Greek version of *Prayer of Levi* states "Purify my heart, Lord, from all impurity," this language is not preserved in the Qumran text. Cf. Stone and Greenfield, "The Prayer of Levi," 259.

[119] Italics mine. As Lange, "Spirit of Impurity," 260 n. 32, points out, "the third character of the word is significantly smaller in shape than its second character and should thus represent a different character"; cf. F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 Vols.; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997-1998), 1174-1175. Consultation of the infrared image 43.787 verifies Lange's observation.

[120] Cf. §2.1.3 and §2.2.2.1 above. Regarding 11Q5 xix, Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 58, argues that the use of "satan" alongside "unclean spirit" suggests a generalized meaning of שטן; cf. idem, "Protect them from the Evil One," 149. Lange, "Spirit of Impurity," 261, contends that "satan" in *Plea for Deliverance* is indeterminate, and therefore describes a type or class of demons rather than a proper name. However, both Stuckenbruck and Lange note the use of "Satan" as a proper name in *Jub.* 10:11; cf. Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 58 n. 17; and Lange, "Spirit of Impurity," 261. Sanders, *DJD IV*, 76, appears to accept this latter understanding of the title. Instead of "Belial," which one would expect in a Qumran text, we find the Satan of "rabbinic literature." Given these arguments it does seem more probable that the word שטן in 11Q5 xix is a general term for a demonic being. However, reading "satan" as a proper name, though unlikely, should not be ruled out.

resembles the biblical plea in Psalm 119:133 (ואל תשלט בי כל און). As mentioned above (cf. §2.2.2.1), although a direct adaptation in the Qumran passages from the biblical psalm is doubtful, the similar expressions indicate the common acceptance of a particular petitionary pattern in early Judaism.

In the request for safety in line 15, שטן is accompanied by רוח טמאה ("unclean spirit"). The phrase could refer to an ethical condition since the adjective טמאה ("unclean" or "impure") can be used to describe moral or ritual states. Also, fear of ritual or moral impurity would fit within the tone of the prayer, especially given the similar language in lines 13-15 (חטאת, עון, etc.). However, the construction of the word with רוח and the phrase's appearance with שטן suggest that רוח טמאה is probably a demonic being.[121] At the very least, "satan" and "unclean spirit" are connected in the passage. If "unclean spirit" does refer to an ethical state, its proximity to "satan" might signify that the rule of a demon leads one into a condition of uncleanness.

This deliverance prayer continues with "neither let pain nor evil inclination take possession of my bones" (מכאוב ויצר רע אל ירשו בעצמי). What is meant by "pain" and "evil inclination" is difficult to decipher. The nature of the terms can be identified in one of three ways. The first possibility is that they refer to natural troubles and have no connection to demons. This is probably not the case since the words occur within the context of a petition in which safety from demonic harm is explicitly invoked. Likewise, the verb from the root ירש ("to

---

[121] Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 58, comments on the "functional equivalence here between 'satan' and unclean spirit'." Similarly, he explains in "The Demonic World," 59, that the "coupling of spirit of impurity with 'satan' suggests that the spirit is being treated as at least an external power that threatens the human being." So too Lange, "Spirit of Impurity," 260-261, translating רוח טמאה as "spirit of impurity," asserts that, due to the appearance of both words together, "there can be no doubt, that in the Plea for Deliverance the 'spirit of impurity' designates a demonic being and not a state of mind"; cf. Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 205. Alternatively, Miryam Brand argues, contra Flusser and Lange, that רוח טמאה is an "expression of internal quality" contrasted with the good spirits in line 14. M. T. Brand, *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature* (JAJ Supplements 9; eds. A. Lange, B. M. Levinson, and V. Noam; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 209. However, because of the pairing of רוח טמאה with שטן, Flusser's, Stuckenbruck's, and Lange's interpretation is more likely.

seize," "to possess") does not appear to characterize the behavior of normal illness or personal sinfulness.[122] A second option is that "pain" and "evil inclination" are themselves referring to demonic beings. Fröhlich discusses instances where demons were called, not by their name, but by their manifestations.[123] However, this is also an inadequate account of the terms' identity. "Pain" (מכאוב) seems too broad to refer to a specific aggressor. The expression "evil inclination" (יצר רע), although vague, nowhere else describes a particular demon in the Qumran literature. Further, it is doubtful that after the nondescript "satan" and "unclean spirit" two additional and distinct demons would be depicted.

The third and most reasonable explanation for "pain" and "evil inclination" is that they refer to the types of demonic influence caused by the "satan" and the "unclean spirit." The syntax of lines 15-16 suggests מכאוב is paired with שטן, and יצר רע with רוח טמאה. It is well attested that demons were thought to be a source of pain and, thus, a correlation between מכאוב and a demon (in this case שטן) in line 15 would not be out of the ordinary.[124] The relationship between "evil inclination"

---

[122] It may be, as Greenfield argues, that ירשו is from רשה meaning "to acquire, have control/power over" and further, that רשה is "a virtual synonym" of שלט (cf. l. 15); cf. Greenfield, "Two Notes on the Apocryphal Psalms," in *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (ed. M. Fishbane and E. Tov; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 311. See also Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 213-215. In the context of the *Plea for Deliverance* the connotations of רשה versus ירש vis-à-vis "pain" and "evil inclination" are not drastically different.

[123] "In many cases demons are simply known by the name of a symptom of disease such as Headache or Fever." Fröhlich, "Theology and Demonology," 106. If "pain" and "evil inclination in *Plea for Deliverance* are descriptions of separate demons, this would be similar to the scenario found in 4Q560. For example, Eshel's translation "male shudder and female shudder" of לחלחיא דכרא וחלחלית נקבתא (4Q560 i 3) refers to the demons, not with a name, but by describing the harmful effects cause by them; cf. Eshel, "Genres," 397. Similarly, see Joseph Naveh, "Fragments of an Aramaic Magic Book from Qumran," *IEJ* 48 (1998): 259.

[124] On the physical effects of demons, cf. Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 345-348. According to Fröhlich, the ancient Mesopotamian belief that demons inflict pain, disease, and other physical harm upon humans influenced the development of this idea in early Jewish demonology; cf. Fröhlich, "Theology and Demonology," 102-108, and 121-126. For Eshel, the dual power (i.e., physical and spiritual) over individuals displayed in *Plea for Deliverance* is indicative of Enochic

and a demon (here, רוח טמאה) is not as immediately apparent. Yet, since demons are thought to cause pain, and because יצר רע is associated here with pain, it suggests that "evil inclination," in this instance, is listed as an effect of demonic affliction.

Interpreting "Yetzer Ra" (יצר רע)

To better contextualize the meaning of יצר רע in *Plea for Deliverance* it is necessary to consider the expression in broader terms. The phrase "evil inclination" occurs with and without the definite article (יצר הרע/יצר רע). The biblical meaning of יצר is generally accepted as "thought," "disposition," or "plan," though in some places (cf. Gen. 6:5; 8:21) the word describes a tendency toward sin.[125] As Menahem Kister explains, the biblical יצר itself is a neural term that "indicates what is in the heart of man" [לציין מה שבלב האדם].[126] The יצר in rabbinic literature is conceived of as a reified being and in some cases is described with demonological language. The evolution of the יצר from biblical to rabbinic traditions is addressed by numerous scholars, most of whom accept the Qumran usage of the term as a transitional period that is crucial for understanding the term's processes of development.[127]

---

influence upon the petition in 11Q5; cf. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 76. For other Qumran parallels where demons bring physical harm to a person, cf. 1Qap Gen xx 16-17 and 4Q560 1 i.

[125] Cf. Tigchelaar, "The Evil Inclination in the Dead Sea Scrolls, with a Re-Edition of 4Q468I (4QSectarian Text?)," in *Empsychoi Logoi: Religious Innovations in Antiquity: Studies in Honor of Pieter Willem van der Horst* (eds. A. Houtman, A. de Jong, and M. Misset-van de Weg; AJEC 73; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 352; and Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 44.

[126] Kister, "'The Yetzer of Man's Heart," 250 (translation mine).

[127] Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 44, contends "that at Qumran *yetzer* occupies a middle ground between the biblical 'thought' and the reified rabbinic being." Examining the Qumran יצר is not only an important endeavor in itself, it is necessary for contextualizing the rabbinic יצר in light of earlier Jewish thought. Thus, major sections of Rosen-Zvi's study are devoted to exploring the Qumran יצר as a "middle ground." The numerous discussions that are written on the variety and development of יצר and יצר רע in biblical, Qumran, and rabbinic texts are not mentioned here but they are noted and/or engaged with in these more recent works on the subject: Tigchelaar, "The Evil Inclination," 347-357; Kister, "The Yetzer of Man's Heart," 243-284; Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic*

It is difficult to be certain of the role of יצר at Qumran. Ishay Rosen-Zvi comments:

> It is impossible to say to what extent yetzer functions as a technical term at Qumran. On the one hand, it is detached from the biblical "heart" and "thoughts," forms a set phrase, yetzer ra, and is featured in a demonological semantic field (temptation, dominion, and banishment). On the other hand, yetzer still betrays its biblical roots in many Qumranic texts, and more often than not its meaning is quite fluid.[128]

Indeed, there are several meanings attached to יצר found in various documents. Rosen-Zvi identifies an anthropological context of the יצר in the *Thanksgiving Scroll*. In this document the meaning of the יצר is similar to the biblical sense of the term and can be a neutral, positive, or negative component of humanity.[129] The variety of connotations is not evenly divided; a negative association of יצר is more common. The term is used to describe humanity's sinful or guilty proclivities (e.g. 1QH^a xix 20) and is even associated with Belial's activities (e.g. 1QH^a xv 3-4). Rosen-Zvi notes that associating the יצר with one's opponents is parallel to *Jubilees* 35:9 "in which the *yetzer* of Genesis 8 is attributed specifically to Esau."[130]

There is at least one example in the *Thanksgiving Scroll* in which the word יצר may not signify a purely anthropological feature. In1QH^a xiii 6 the individual

---

Desires; Brand, *Evil Within and Without*; and B. Wold, "Demonizing Sin? The Evil Inclination in *4QInstruction*," in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity* (eds. L. T. Stuckenbruck and C. Keith, WUNT II; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming).

[128] Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 48.

[129] According to Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 49, the negative contexts of the יצר are reflections of the community's "famously pessimistic anthropology." Rosen-Zvi continues in ibid.: "*Yetzer* in the Thanksgiving Scroll is thus not essentially evil, but an expression of the basic shameful state of humans, creatures of clay." Tigchelaar, "The Evil Inclination," 348, notes: "the noun יצר is found seventy-six times in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls… of which more than half are found in one manuscript, 1QH^a."

[130] Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 50. This idea is also found in CD-A ii 16-17 where the guilty יצר is a characteristic of individuals who abandon the covenant; cf. ibid., 49-50.

praises God: "...nor did you abandon me to the plottings of my inclination..."[131] Miryam Brand describes this occurrence of the יצר as "at least partially independent of the speaker."[132] Brand comments on the meaning of this occurrence and places it within the wider development of the יצר concept by stating: "[t]he main effect of this portrayal of the yēṣer as an independent force is to demonize the desire to sin and to distance it from the speaker. As noted by I. Rosen-Zvi, it may represent the beginning of the later, more demonic version of the evil inclination in rabbinic literature."[133]

A passage in *Barkhi Nafshi* is also significant for understanding the transition of the meaning of יצר from an anthropological feature in Genesis to an independent demonized force. A segment of 4Q436 1 i 10 is reconstructed: יצר רע גער[תה ("evil inclination [you] have rebuked").[134] Mention of the יצר רע in line 10 is part of a larger description of various vices, such as "adulterousness of the eyes," yet it appears in connection with the verb גער which Tigchelaar interprets as the technical term "rebuke." Based largely on the exorcistic term גער and an intertextual relationship of the *Barkhi Nafshi* passage with the rebuke of שטן in Zechariah 3, Tigchelaar concludes that in this case "the 'evil inclination' is something extraneous to man, that can enter its body, but also can be rebuked."[135]

However, Brand argues convincingly that the יצר רע in this text is an internal force, like the biblical יצר, and thereby interprets גער metaphorically.[136]

---

[131] García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 171.

[132] She further explains: "[t]he depiction of the speaker's inclination as an independent entity that seeks to mislead him into sin is unlike other references to sin in the *Hodayot*, and somewhat similar to the depiction of the inclination in the *Plea for Deliverance*..."; cf. Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 65.

[133] Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 66; cf. Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 44-64.

[134] The reconstruction and translation is from Tigchelaar, "The Evil Inclination," 351; cf. Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 44.

[135] Tigchelaar, "The Evil Inclination," 352.

[136] Brand points out that in the same line (4Q436 1 i 10) the verb גער also describes the replacement of the person's "heart of stone" with a "pure heart." In this context גער likely has the meaning "remove" rather than the technical "rebuke"; cf. Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 47. Tigchelaar acknowledges in this instance that גער potentially serves as a synonym for הסיר ("remove") or שלח ("send away"); cf. Tigchelaar, "The Evil Inclination," 351; and Wold, "Demonizing Sin," 2-4.

Both Tigchelaar and Brand demonstrate an intertextual relationship between the *Barkhi Nafshi* passage and Zechariah 3; namely, the removal of Joshua's soiled apparel and replacement with clean garments in Zechariah is paralleled by the removal of vices and replacement with virtues in *Barkhi Nafshi*, as is the rebuke/removal (גער) of satan/stone heart/evil inclination in the respective works.[137] Thus Brand concludes: "rather than 'demonizing' sin, the author of 4QBarkhi Nafshi creates an abstraction of the śātān [of Zech. 3]... the śātān is transformed into a wholly internal evil inclination that is the abstract representation of the human desire to sin."[138] Therefore, while the יצר רע in *Barkhi Nafshi* is internal, its association, even in abstract form, with an external demonic force is a development upon the biblical יצר.

The *Plea for Deliverance* similarly, and, perhaps, more clearly, attests to the association of יצר רע with the demonic. As Wold explains, "the yetzer ra in these lines [11Q5 xix 15-16] is not an inward part of a person, or at least exclusively, but parallel to 'satan' and 'unclean spirit' and therefore also an outward force."[139] Lange describes the inclination as an indication of demonic influence, stating: "both 'satan' and 'spirit of impurity' manifest their rule over the praying person not only by his 'pain' but also by his 'evil inclination' in the form of his 'sins,' 'iniquity,' and 'transgression'."[140] Lange's characterization of יצר רע is comparable to the concept of "demonizing sin" mentioned by others. The point at which Wold and Lange agree is that, to whatever extent the יצר רע is naturally

---

[137] From a textual standpoint some of the terminology found in both texts is the same (e.g. הסיר, העביר, הלביש, and שים). Cf. Tigchelaar, "The Evil Inclination," 351-352; and Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 47-48.

[138] Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 48. On the internal aspect of יצר רע in *Barkhi Nafshi*, cf. Kister, "The Yetzer of Man's Heart," 256; Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 47; and Wold, "Demonizing Sin," 2-4.

[139] Wold, "Demonizing Sin," 3.

[140] Lange, "Spirit of Impurity," 262. Likewise Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 47, explains: "[s]everal scholars have correctly suggested that Satan and the spirit of defilement should be differentiated from pain and *yetzer ra*, due to the verbs associated with them; the latters seem to be the result of the 'rule' of the formers over humans. The *yetzer* here appears as a trait rather than a thing, just like 'pain' with which it is grouped." Hence, Lange and Rosen-Zvi argue that יצר רע in *Plea for Deliverance* describes a "manifestation" of demonic assault.

internal, it is here associated with the demonic and described in terms of demonic manipulation. "Pain," to some degree, is a "personal" feature, yet in this instance it is caused by demons. So too the יצר רע in *Plea for Deliverance* is not entirely an external being (like רוח טמאה ,שטן, or another demon) nor is it a purely anthropological feature, but rather it is a manifestation of outward demonic influence.

Justification for Classification

When classifying *Plea for Deliverance* it is first noted that the passage refers to one or more demonic beings. While רוח טמאה is likely a demonological epithet, שטן most certainly is. In addition, "pain" and "evil inclination" appear to be descriptions of the influence associated with "satan" and "spirit of impurity." Considering the form of the prayer, it is structured as a petition directed to God. The imperfect tense of שלט implies fear of future, rather than current, demonic rule on the part of the praying person.[141]

Whether it is appropriate to classify *Plea for Deliverance* as "apotropaic" depends on an issue similar to that encountered when classifying *Prayer of Levi*; namely, the request of the petition. Relevant here is Lange's aforementioned interpretation that these requests are appeals for a different orientation which, in turn, counters demonic harm, pain, and sin (cf.§2.2.2.1). According to this argument the request for blessings (i.e., a spirit of faith and knowledge, purification, etc.) is made so as to avoid demons and the subsequent implications of their rule. These spiritual gifts are needed in order to prevent demonic affliction. Thus, the petition in *Plea for Deliverance* is not for God's protection from demons, but rather the petitioner asks for a righteous orientation which, through his own power, allows him to avoid demons and situations that encourage demonic affliction.

---

[141] Moreover, Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 77, highlights several features present in the passage as belonging to Flusser's apotropaic elements, including "requests for the knowledge of God and for forgiveness, pleas for purification, and appeals for protection against evil forces." Cf. Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 203.

Yet, Lange's view is not what is suggested by the context of the passage. Beginning in line 13 God (יהוה) is addressed by evoking the tetragram, and following this invocation are various requests; included in these requests are a plea for safety from two specific demons or types of demons, the verbs that characterize their malicious intent (שלט and ירש), and two subsequent descriptions of demonic harm. Indeed, if God's refuge from these demonological elements was not being sought, it is unclear why multiple demons and demonic maladies are explicitly expressed. There is no reason to assume that, whereas God is petitioned for the blessings, the demonological language is not part of the petition.[142] Therefore, in addition to appeals for spiritual gifts, the petitioner seeks God's protection from the future affliction of demons. In this way, *Plea for Deliverance* contains an apotropaic petition for safety from demonic harm.

2.2.2.3 *Syriac Psalm* in *11QPsalms*^{a} (11Q5 xxiv 3-17)

Reconstruction and Translation

11 חטאת נעורי הרחק ממני ופשעי אל יזכרו לי
12 טהרני יהוה מנגע רע [ו]אל יוסף לשוב אלי יבש
13 שורשיו ממני ואל ינצו ע[ל]יו בי

11 The sins of my youth cast far from me
and may my transgressions not be remembered against me.
12 Purify me, O Lord, from (the) evil scourge,
[and] let it not turn again upon me. Dry up
13 its roots from me,

---

[142] As Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer," 106, points out, safety from demons as the *cause* of affliction is of chief concern for the purveyor of this prayer: "*Plea for Deliverance* should not be interpreted as a request to overcome an orientation, but rather a request for protection from demonic beings who cause one to sin and inflict pain and suffering." Thus, Wold's understanding of the prayer sees the petitioner relying on God (not on himself) for the avoidance of demonic harm. Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 149, offers a grammatical argument for viewing the prayer as requesting safety from demons: "'do not allow' = *hiph.* verb + 'satan' and 'unclean spirit' as direct objects."

and let its le[av]es not flourish with me.[143]

Description and Comments

11Q5 xxiv preserves a portion of Psalm 155. Until the discovery at Qumran, the earliest version of this apocryphal text was a Syriac manuscript from the twelfth century A.D.[144] Psalm 155 is characteristic of a person requesting blessings and favor from God in hymnic fashion. There is familiar language in lines 11 and 12 where deliverance from sin, forgiveness from transgressions, and purification is beseeched. When considering whether the passage is also a plea for safety from demonic harm, the identity of the "evil scourge" is of primary importance. Along with "scourge," the word נגע can be translated "punishment," "plague," leprosy," or "pestilence."[145] Even when constructed with רע, the nature of "evil scourge" is rather ambiguous.

If "evil scourge" denotes a demonic being then line 12 begins by asking God to "purify" the individual from the demon. In order to be purified of something it is implied that one is currently tainted and, thus, appealing for God's purification from the evil entity is equivalent to asking for an exorcistic action. This is followed by the expression "do not [let it] again return upon me" (אל יוסף לשוב אלי). Such a request articulates the fear of future affliction and asks for the re-intrusion of the demon to be prevented. To seek God's protection from future demonic harm is characteristically apotropaic. Hence, if "evil scourge" represents a demonic being, the preceding and subsequent phrases would locate נגע רע between an exorcistic and apotropaic plea.

---

[143] The Hebrew text and English translation are from Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 77; cf. Sanders, *DJD IV*, 71.

[144] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 77; cf. Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 201.

[145] "Plague" is preferred by García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1177, while "scourge" is used by Sanders, *DJD IV*, 71, and Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 201. Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 38 n. 4, translates נגע as "affliction" and explains: "*nega'* in its biblical sense does not denote a plague; *nega'* is used to denote disease or general pain."

Justification for Classification

Despite the interesting exorcistic/apotropaic structure, context suggests נגע רע is not a demon. The tone of the prayer conveyed in line 11 and the preceding lines displays an overt concern for sin. With this framework in mind, the imperative of the root טהר ("purify") makes more sense when connected to a negative personal feature (i.e., sin) than it does as an exorcistic term. The imagery of roots and leaves in lines 12-13 suggests this interpretation as well; it could be said that sin takes root and flourishes within someone, but this description does not seem appropriate for a demon.[146] Flusser and Eshel also do not interpret "evil scourge" explicitly as a demonic being.[147] In essence, the nature of the phrase נגע רע is ambiguous, and the context does not support a demonological interpretation. Therefore, without an anti-demonic element, Psalm 155 cannot be classified as either exorcistic or apotropaic.

2.2.2.4 Psalm 91 in *11QApocryphal Psalms* (11Q11 vi)

Reconstruction and Translation

מפֿחד לילה מחץ יעוף יומם מקטב ישוד[צ]הרים מדבר[בא]פל	7
[ ]פתן [ואפעה תד]רוך תרמו[ס כפיר] ותנין [ביהוה ח]שקתה ו[יפלטך] *hole*	12
[*v*]*aca*[*t* *vac*]*at* [תו סלה]אך בישוע[ויר ו[ישגבך *hole*	13
[*v*]*aca*[*t* *vaca*]*t* סלה [נו אמן אמן]ויע	14

[146] Sanders, *DJD IV*, 73, adopts this view, stating "here the image is internalized and the roots and leaves, while remaining metaphors, refer to what sin does inside a man." Similarly, Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 39, states that the plant metaphor indicates "the desire to sin"; cf. ibid., 38-41.

[147] Flusser does not identify נגע רע as demonic but instead associates the word with later rabbinic expressions of general, non-demonic harm. This fits within his category "apotropaic," which includes as a criterion the aversion of "personal dangers"; cf. Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 201. Eshel's brief examination of Psalm 155 does not include a discussion of נגע רע. In Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 77, she refers to the prayer containing an appeal "for protection against evil forces" and, thus, her precise interpretation of the word is not provided.

7 [You shall not fear] the dread of night or the arrow that flies by day, the plague that rages at [no]on or the pestilence that [in dark]ness

12 cobra [and viper shall you s]tep, you shall tramp[le lion] and dragon. You have [lo]ved [YHWH] and [he will rescue you]
13 and [protect you and sh]ow you [his] salvation. [Selah] *va*[*vat v*]*aca*[*t*]
14 And [t]he[y] shall an[swer: Amen, amen.] Selah *va*[*cat v*]*aca*[*t*][148]

Description and Comments

11QApocryphal Psalms is comprised of six columns and an approximate date of composition between 50 and 70 A.D. has been suggested.[149] The final column preserves a version of Psalm 91.[150] As previously discussed (§2.2.1.2, cf. n. 82), this psalm appears in various demonological contexts, most notably apotropaic formulae. In the case of 11Q11, language of God's deliverance and protection (vss. 14-15 in the MT) is not preserved. However, columns i-v are likely exorcistic (cf. §2.2.4.3) and it is therefore possible that certain terminology in column vi carries a more nuanced anti-demonic meaning.

In line 7, fear of "night" may recall a period of demonic activity, especially if לילה is reconstructed in column v line 5.[151] "Plague" (קטב) and "pestilence" (דבר) as terms denoting suffering have, on occasion, been viewed as having demonological connotations (note the Aramaic equivalency in *1QGenesis Apocryphon*, §2.2.5). The relation of דבר to "darkness" (אפל) possibly reiterates the

[148] García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and Van Der Woude, *DJD XXIII: Qumran Cave 11. II (11Q2-18, 11Q20-31)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 203-204.

[149] Webster, *DJD XXXIX*, 434

[150] For a detailed comparison of Psalm 91 in 11Q11 to the MT, see James A. Sanders, "A Liturgy for Healing the Stricken (11QPsAp^a = 11Q11)," in *Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; PTSDSSP 4A; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1997), 230-233. Variations between the two texts are also listed by García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 205.

[151] Ida Fröhlich notes that "'night' refers to a nocturnal time, a time of demonic attacks under the veil of the darkness." Fröhlich, "Magical Healing at Qumran (11Q11) and the Question of the Calendar," in *Studies on Magic and Divination in the Biblical World* (ed. H. R. Jacobus et al.; *Biblical Intersection* 11; Gorgias Press, 2013), 42; cf. Langton, *Demonology*, 6.

theme of nighttime as an occasion of vulnerability. However, both קטב and דבר are non-specific terms and could just as easily refer to natural, non-spiritual harm. That "night" and "darkness" potentially evoke a demonic tone is lessened by the presence of "by day" (יומם) and the reconstruction "noon" (הרים[צ]).[152] Thus, line 7 is not explicitly demonologically oriented.

The words פתן ("poisonous snake") and תנין are preserved in line 12. These, along with the reconstructions אפעה ("viper") and כפיר ("lion" based on the MT), are certainly intended to be depictions of evil or danger (cf. Isa. 59:5), but again, it is not specified that these are images of the demonic.[153] Yet, assuming that demons are being referred to, the imperfect form of רמס ("to tread," "to trample") simply articulates an affirmation of eventual victory. There is no discernible plea for safety, nor is there a formulaic measure enacted against the supposed demons. A similar conclusion is reached regarding the protection and salvation of God reconstructed at the end of line 12 and in line 13; namely, this is an assertion of God's faithfulness and not a petition or invocation. Therefore, due to the ambiguity of terms along with a lack of clear apotropaic or exorcistic expressions, Psalm 91 in column vi is not, on its own, overtly anti-demonic.

Justification for Classification

In order to classify a passage as a type of anti-demonic prayer, both the intent depicted and the context in which it appears must be taken into account. Accordingly, it is relevant to consider the function of column vi within the larger framework of *11QApocryphal Psalms*. Columns i-v, analyzed below, are likely exorcistic incantations. This begs the question: if Psalm 91 is not anti-demonic, why is it included in what is apparently a collection of anti-demonic hymns? Scholars have noted the apotropaic use of Psalm 91 in later incantations and amulets, as well as the possible anti-demonic qualities of the prayer in earlier

[152] Fröhlich, "Magical Healing at Qumran," 45, observes that the two plagues "are both rendered as 'pestilence,'... apparently a widespread illness since it strikes both in darkness and at noon."

[153] According to Fröhlich, "Magical Healing at Qumran," 45, "[t]hese terms may designate physical perils or they are metaphors."

contexts.[154] Additionally, the inclusion of סלה [אמן אמן] in column vi line 14 probably signifies a ritual or liturgical aspect of the prayer. This could indicate that its recitation along with the exorcistic incantations resulted in a co-functioning relationship; that is, exorcism rituals are performed to rid an individual of a demon, then Psalm 91 is prayed to ensure safety from future demonic harm.[155]

The only way to justify this psalm as anti-demonic is if it is used alongside demonologically oriented measures. Given the prayer's presence in *11QApocryphal Psalms*, this may be an instance of just such an occurrence. To this extent, the claim may be offered that *11QApocryphal Psalms* contains exorcistic incantations along with an apotropaic version of Psalm 91.

2.2.2.5 Petitions in the *Book of Jubilees*

The original language of the *Book of Jubilees* is Hebrew, although the most complete version of the work, and the basis for most modern translations, is Ethiopic.[156] There are several passages in *Jubilees* that are described as petitions

---

[154] Wright, "Prayer and Incantation," 80-81, contends: "It appears likely that this biblical psalm was adopted by the Qumran community as an apotropaic prayer of protection against evil spirits; however, it is difficult to determine the function of Psalm 91 during biblical times." See also Schiffman and Swartz, *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts*, 39, 78; Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 359-365; Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 71-74; and Schmutzer, "Psalm 91," 98-99.

[155] This is a "symbiotic relationship" between two anti-demonic prayer types. Without referring to it as such, Eshel, "Genres," 398, allows for the pairing of the two prayer types when she describes the "apotropaic" Psalm 91 within her discussion of the "exorcistic" 11Q11. The interpretation of Psalm 91 in 11Q11 as intended to counteract demons also results in Stuckenbruck's placement of the prayer in his group 2(a).

[156] According to James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (GAP; Scheffield Academic Press, 2001), 14, *Jubilees* was written in Hebrew, translated from Hebrew into Greek and (possibly) Syriac, and translated from Greek into Latin and Ethiopic. A number of Hebrew manuscripts of *Jubilees* were discovered at Qumran, including: 1Q17-18; 2Q19-20; 3Q5; 4Q176; 4Q216-24; and 11Q12. On the original language and a history of the translations of *Jubilees*, see Wintermute, "Jubilees," 41-43; and VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 13-17.Wintermute's English translation, which is the translation cited in this study, is from the Ethiopic. On the authorship of *Jubilees*, see Wintermute, "Jubilees," 45; Gene L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, (StPB 20; Leiden:

for deliverance from the demonic: *Moses' Intercession* (1:20); the *Prayer of Noah* (10:1-6); *Abram's Prayer* (12:20); and *Abraham's Blessing* (19:28).[157]

Moses' Intercession (Jub. 1:20)

20 O Lord, let your mercy be lifted up upon your people, and create for them an upright spirit. And do not let the spirit of Beliar rule over them to accuse them before you and ensnare them from every path of righteousness so that they might be destroyed from before your face.[158]

Description and Comments

Verse 20 is the beginning of Moses' intercessory prayer to God on behalf of the Israelites. Like petitionary passages from Qumran, this plea begins with requests for blessings (i.e., mercy and an upright spirit) and is followed by a phrase that bears a similar pattern to *Prayer of Levi* and *Plea for Deliverance* (cf. Ps. 119:133): "do not let the spirit of Beliar rule over them." Orval S. Wintermute equates "Beliar" with "Satan," and the name is one of the two descriptions in *Jubilees* for the chief of the evil spirits.[159] The exact identity of "Beliar" is not

---

Brill, 1971) 1-5. *Jubilees* is dated between 160 and 150 B.C.; cf. Wintermute, "Jubilees," 44; and VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 21.

[157] Eshel classifies Noah's prayer (*Jub.* 10:1-6) and Abraham's prayer (*Jub.* 12:19-20) as apotropaic; cf. idem, "Apotropaic Prayers," 77-79. Stuckenbruck refers to the following passages as petitions from the demonic: *Jub.* 1:20; 10:1-6; 12:19-20; 15:30-32; and 19:28; cf. Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 64-69; and idem, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 153-159. Although Stuckenbruck mentions *Jub.* 15:30-32 in his discussion of deliverance petitions, the passage is not analyzed here since it is not a prayer *per se*. Rather, in narrative form, it contrasts God's establishment of Israel with the nations, emphasizing his protection of his people from the effects of evil spirits. The passage does affirm God's protection of the Israelite nation from spirits who "rule" and "lead astray" (*Jub.* 15:31-32). However, since this is not a prayer or request, it is not presented here as an apotropaic petition.

[158] Wintermute, "Jubilees," 53. Unless otherwise indicated, all English translations of *Jubilees* are taken from Wintermute.

[159] Wintermute, "Jubilees," 53. VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 127, explains: "The leader of the evil forces *may* go under two names in *Jubilees*: Belial and more often (the Prince of) Mastema who is

expounded upon in Moses' prayer, but the name indicates an evil being. This is true whether "Beliar" is a demon or an angelic evil leader of the demons. Moses' language of the "spirit" of Beliar contrasts the entity's evil influence with the "upright spirit" of God which is desired; thus, the prayer seeks a righteous spirit rather than an evil one to rule over the people.

The way in which Beliar's spirit "rules" or exerts influence is two-fold. First, he "accuses" the people before God, an activity which echoes Zechariah 3:1 where Satan stands before God as accuser of the high priest Joshua. The scene in *Jubilees* most likely signifies that the people will be accused on the basis of their sinfulness and infidelity which is enumerated upon by God in foregoing passages (cf. *Jub.* 1:7-14). Yet, whereas God offers forgiveness and peace (*Jub.* 1:15-18), Beliar stands ready as an opponent to the Israelites' restoration. This type of influence attributed to Beliar's spirit is external; that is, the accuser plays third party to the people's relationship with God and serves as a barrier to their union. In this way, it is clear that "the spirit of Beliar" does not represent a sinful internal inclination, but rather is an outside force intent on bringing indictment upon God's people. Related to this is the second form of influence by which Beliar will "ensnare them from every path of righteousness so that they might be destroyed" (*Jub.* 1:20). The leading away from righteousness which ultimately brings about a person's destruction probably signifies temptation.[160] Therefore, the two types of influence attributed to Beliar's spirit are non-physical and relate to a person's spiritual condition.

---

identified as a satan." As the preceding quotation makes clear, VanderKam does not interpret "satan" here as a proper name, but rather as a general term for "opponent" or "adversary." Thus, in *Jubilees*, Belial/Beliar appears to execute a role similar to his function in the Dead Sea Scrolls as the chief of demons (e.g. 1QS ii; 1QM xiii). For a discussion on the nature of Belial, as well as the equivalency of "Belial" to "Satan" and "Mastema," see Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 341-344; cf. Langton, *Demonology*, 124-128; and idem, *Satan, A Portrait* (London: Skeffington & Sons, LTD, 1946), 16-17. See also the examination of the "Prince of Animosity" in 11Q11 ii (§2.2.4.3).

[160] Given the particular context of *Jubilees* 1, this temptation not only implies straying from the law, but also idolatry and even killing God's prophets (cf. 1:8-12).

Justification for Classification

The essential question for determining if *Jubilees* 1:20 is an apotropaic petition is whether or not Moses' address to God is for safety from an evil being. The name "Beliar" is clearly associated with the demonic and he is depicted in connection with future harm that he may inflict.[161] Yet, it must be determined whether the contrast between the upright spirit and Beliar's spirit indicate that the former is requested so as to avoid the latter. Noteworthy is Lange's prospect of a request for a holy disposition to combat potential demonic influence. If this is the purpose of Moses' appeal, then it is not an anti-demonic petition. However, as in the case of *Prayer of Levi* and *Plea for Deliverance*, the context of the passage does not support this interpretation and the plea against Beliar and the ensuing harm brought by his rule is a separate petition. While an upright spirit is contrasted with Beliar's spirit, viewing the former as an antidote for the latter is neither explicit nor implicit in the prayer.[162] Therefore, *Jubilees* 1:20 is an apotropaic petition.

Noah's Prayer (Jub. 10:3-6)

3...God of the spirits which are in all flesh, who has acted mercifully with me and saved me and my sons from the water of the Flood and did not let me perish as you did the children of perdition, because great was your grace upon me, and great was your mercy upon my soul. Let your grace be lifted up upon my sons, and do not let the evil spirits rule over them, lest they destroy them from the earth. 4 But bless me and my sons. And let us grow and increase and fill the earth. 5 And you know

[161] The nature of Beliar may require some qualification. Namely, can a prayer for safety from Beliar be classified as "anti-demonic" if Beliar is not a demon? To state that Beliar is not a "demon" means simply that he is not identified as a spirit of a giant; cf. Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 341. Notwithstanding his proper status, which is unclear, Beliar's identity as a spiritual creature opposed to God and intent on bringing harm upon God's faithful is sufficient to characterize an anti-Beliar petition as "anti-demonic." If, however, Beliar was a holy angel who simply carried out the just punishment of God, the petition would not be anti-demonic. Yet, a negative interpretation of Beliar in *Jubilees* is quite apparent.

[162] Lange's view would be more tenable if the text stated, for example, "create for them an upright spirit *so as to* not let Beliar's spirit rule over them...". As the translation stands, the request "do not let" signifies another distinct petition addressed to God.

that which your Watchers, the fathers of these spirits, did in my days and also these spirits who are alive. Shut them up and take them to the place of judgment. And do not let them cause corruption among the sons of your servant, O my God, because they are cruel and were created to destroy. 6 And let them not rule over the spirits of the living because you alone know their judgment, and do not let them have power over the children of the righteous henceforth and forever.

Description and Comments

Noah addresses God when, after the flood, "the polluted demons began to lead astray the children of Noah's sons and to lead them to folly and to destroy them" (*Jub.* 10:1). The prayer begins with praise to God followed by petitions for blessings intertwined with requests for safety from evil spirits. The requests for protection are constructed with familiar language: do not let the spirits "rule over" Noah's sons (vss. 3, 6); let them not "cause corruption" (v. 5); and let them not "have power over" the righteous (v. 6). The phrases which specify that the demons not "rule over" or "have power over" are parallel to and demonstrate a consistency with other petitions (cf. *Prayer of Levi*, *Plea for Deliverance*, and *Jub.* 1:20).

In this passage the spirits are first referred to as "polluted demons." Since these beings are explicitly identified as the progeny of the Watchers (v. 5), the description "polluted demons" carries a meaning akin to the "bastard spirits" of Enochic literature and related traditions. By referring to the Watchers as the fathers of the demons in *Jubilees* 10 the author of this passage demonstrates an aetiology of evil spirits analogous to the Enochic literature.[163] The type of

---

[163] This is one of several points at which a dependence of *Jubilees* on *1 Enoch* is revealed; cf. VanderKam, "The Angel Story in the Book of Jubilees," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. G. Chazon and M. Stone; Vol. 31 of *STDJ*, eds. García Martínez and Van Der Woude; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 152; VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 131, 137; and idem, "The Demons in the *Book of Jubilees*," in *Die Dämonen*, 341. However, despite the borrowed traditions used in *Jubilees*, marked differences between the works occur. For example, in *Jubilees* the Watchers descend upon the earth with positive motives; i.e., "to teach the sons of man, and perform judgment and uprightness upon the earth" (*Jub.* 4:15); cf. Wintermute, "Jubilees," 62. Yet *1 En.* 6:2-7 describes a sinful intention behind the descent; i.e., the Watchers propose to "choose wives for ourselves from among the daughters of men." E. Isaac, "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch (Second Century B.C.-First

influence wielded by these evil spirits is rather nonspecific. Verse 3 states that one of the consequences of demonic rule is the "destruction" of the faithful which may denote physical destruction (i.e., death) since the murder of Noah's grandsons by demons is mentioned earlier in the passage (*Jub.* 10:2), and because it is one of the activities of the giants found in Enochic tradition (cf. *1 En.* 7:4-6).[164]

The evil spirits are also the source of "corruption," a description which has overtones of demonic temptation insofar as the demons are twice depicted as "leading astray" the faithful (*Jub.*10:1-2). Moses' intercession portrays Beliar's spirit ensnaring the faithful "from the path of righteousness" (*Jub.* 1:20) which, perhaps tellingly, also leads to "destruction." In light of this similarity it may be that "destruction" is the ultimate consequence of corruption. If "destruction" is related to "corruption," the former word potentially points to something like a "spiritual death" or rupture from the covenantal life with God. One way in which demonic temptation may manifest itself is the worshiping of idols.[165]

Century A.D.)," in *OTP, vol. 1*, 15. Ultimately, it is concluded that the author of *Jubilees* presents one of the several versions of the angel story found in *1 Enoch*; cf. VanderKam, "The Angel Story," 151-156. For this and other difference between the works, cf. Hanneken, "The Watchers in Rewritten Scripture," 25-68; Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 84-121; and VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 132-134. In light of the parallels and variations between *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*, VanderKam, "The Angel Story," 170, summarizes: "It is reasonable to conclude, therefore that the writer of Jubilees was familiar with the [Book of Watchers], borrowed heavily from it, but transformed the material to meet the goals for which he was writing his book."

[164] The physical assault of the evil spirits upon humanity is described elsewhere in *Jubilees*. Regarding *Jub.* 10:12-13, VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 128, explains: "One way the spirits harmed humans was by causing diseases; so God ordered the angels to teach Noah medicines to counteract their influence."

[165] In *Jub.* 1:11 God warns Moses of the Israelites' impending idol-worshiping activities. Citing this passage, VanderKam, "The Demons in *Jubilees*," 340, states: "Already in this early stage in the book a fundamental point emerges, viz. the demons are associated with idolatry, with foreign religious practices which would seduce the Israelites." Further in *Jub.* 11:4 demons inspire the Israelites to create and worship idols: "And [the people] began making graven images and polluted likenesses. And cruel spirits assisted them and led them astray so that they might commit sin and pollution." Thus, one way in which the demons lead the faithful astray from God is through idolatry, and this might be implied in Noah's prayer.

The context of *Jubilees* 10:4 suggests to James VanderKam that the demons are obstructing God's command to "be fruitful and multiply" (cf. Gen. 9:1).[166] Although this is not explicit, there does not appear to be anything in the passage to contradict VanderKam's interpretation. Whatever the precise effects of demonic influence, it is evident from the language in *Jubilees* 10 that the evil spirits pose a spiritual and, possibly, physical danger to the righteous sons of Noah.

In the last line of the prayer Noah expresses his desire that the evil spirits not have power over the righteous "henceforth and forever" (*Jub.* 10:6). When this type of eschatological feature is present in a Qumran passage, Eshel describes it as an exorcistic element.[167] Since exorcisms seek to eternally impede demonic harm through the power of the incantation, whereas apotropaic techniques render the destruction of demons as an activity proper to God alone, phrases like "henceforth and forever" are usually found in exorcistic works. However, given that Noah's words are a petition to God, there is deference to God as the ultimate judge. This is in line with Noah's earlier request that God "shut [the demons] up and take them to the place of judgment" (*Jub.* 10:5). Thus, Noah's prayer submits the fate of the demons to God's authority and does not contradict the apotropaic eschatology described by Eshel.

It is worthwhile to consider God's response to Noah's petition since it helps to characterize the demonology of *Jubilees*. In reaction to the preceding appeal, God proposes to bind the evil spirits in a place of judgment so as to render them inactive. When this intention is made known, the figure Mastema makes an appeal to God (10:8):

8...O Lord, Creator, leave some of [the evil spirits] before me, and let them obey my voice. And let them do everything which I tell them, because if some of them

---

[166] VanderKam, "The Demons in *Jubilees*," 343, argues: "It is interesting that here Noah connects the work of the demons / evil spirits...with the issue of fulfilling the divine command to 'be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth' in Gen 9:1, 7. If they kill Noah's descendants, it would be impossible to carry out that repeated order from God himself."

[167] See point 4 in Eshel's four points of contrast (§2.1.2 above); cf. idem, "Apotropaic Prayers," 87-88; Nitzan, "Hymns," 54-55.

are not left for me, I will not be able to exercise the authority of my will among the children of men because they are (intended) to corrupt and lead astray before my judgment because the evil of the sons of men is great.

In response to Mastema's request, God commands that nine-tenths of the demons be bound (*Jub.* 10:9), while one-tenth remain "so that they might be subject to Satan upon the earth" (*Jub.* 10:11). This passage introduces Mastema into the book of *Jubilees* and the entity appears as the ruler of the evil spirits, assuming a role similar to that of Belial/Beliar.[168] The depiction of God's binding some demons and sanctioning others illuminates the eschatological worldview of the author. This narrative, which VanderKam calls a "dramatic departure" from *1 Enoch*, envisages a reality in which demons are permitted by God to test and influence humanity, yet their reign is temporary and God is ultimately sovereign.[169]

Justification for Classification

Demonic beings are clearly present in this passage. Their harmful influence is described as both physical (i.e., killing the grandsons of Noah) and spiritual (i.e., corruption). In Noah's prayer to God, he requests God's protection from the

---

[168] VanderKam holds that Mastema, based on the description in *Jub.* 10:8, is the chief of the evil spirits; see idem, *Jubilees*, 127; cf. Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 341. Mastema's status as a leader is reiterated further in the narrative (cf. *Jub.* 11:5), and the character appears several other times throughout *Jubilees*, always in an adversarial role. In one place he is blamed for sending crows to eat the seed planted by farmers (*Jub.* 11:11). In the *Jubilees'* version of the Aqeda, it is Mastema, not God, who instigates the tempting of Abraham (*Jub.* 17:16-18). Regarding the presence of "satan" in *Jub.* 10:11, VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 128, states: "the context implies that he [i.e., Mastema] is identified with the satan." Alternatively, Davenport, *The Eschatology of Jubilees*, 39 n. 1, interprets "satan" as a proper name and explains that "[a] distinction is implied between Satan and Mastema." In either case, Mastema is depicted as a ruling figure with demons under his command.

[169] On the unique aspect of this story compared to *1 Enoch*, see VanderKam, "The Demons in *Jubilees*," 344; cf. idem, *Jubilees*, 127. Stuckenbruck emphasizes the importance of this passage for eschatology in *Jubilees*, arguing that it "functions to set on course the temporary position of evil spirits until the eschatological judgment." He further explains in "Protect Them from the Evil One," 155-156: "evil spirits are but defeated powers whose complete destruction is assured."

continued and future affliction of these demons. Therefore, Noah's prayer in *Jubilees* 10:3-6 is an apotropaic petition.

Abram's Prayer (Jub. 12:19-20)

19...My God, the Most High God, you alone are God to me. And you created everything, and everything which is was the work of your hands, and you and your kingdom I have chosen. 20 Save me from the hands of evil spirits which rule over the thought of the heart of man, and do not let them lead me astray from following you, O my God; but establish me and my seed forever, and let us not go astray henceforth and forever.

Description, Comments, and Justification for Classification

Verses 19-20 are set within a narrative recounting the earlier days of Abram before he was called to the Promised Land. Abram acknowledges his error in practicing astrology (*Jub.* 12:16-18) and turns to God and offers this prayer. The passage follows the usual petitionary pattern: initial praise is followed by a request that God rescue Abram "from the hands of the evil spirits." In *Jubilees*, "evil spirits" is synonymous with "demons" (cf. *Jub.* 10:1-6) and mention of the "hands" of the spirits is metaphorical, referring to the threat of demonic affliction.[170]

Here, as in the apotropaic prayers of Moses and Noah, the demons are said to "rule over" and "lead astray." The expression "the thought of the heart of man" may indicate an individual's inward orientation to either good or evil (a similar idea is found in 4Q444 1 3; cf. §2.2.3.3). Thus, if demons are thought to rule over this aspect of a person it could signify a provocation toward evil. The appearance of this language along with the fear of being "led astray" suggest that demonic temptation is the particular type of affliction with which Abram is concerned. Some speculate that the context of the prayer suggests demonic activity is

[170] This is much like the many Hebrew Bible references to the "hand" of God. Such imagery is used to describe various things, from God's salvific and creative works (e.g. Deut. 5:15; Ps. 95:4) to his acts of judgment (e.g. Isa. 40:2).

connected to astrology.[171] Whatever the case, the passage depicts Abram petitioning God for safety from future demonic harm and, therefore, *Jubilees* 12:20 is an apotropaic plea.

Abraham's Blessing for Jacob (Jub. 19:28)

28 And may the spirit of Mastema not rule over you or over your seed in order to remove you from following the Lord who is your God henceforth and forever.

Description, Comments, and Justification for Classification

In this passage Abraham asks God's blessing over Jacob and his descendants and requests safety from "the spirit of Mastema." One subtle difference between this and the other petitions in *Jubilees* is that Abraham acts as an intermediary; that is, he is petitioning God's blessing and protection not for himself, but rather on behalf of Jacob. The result is that Jacob is addressed in the second person and God in the third.[172] However, this does not significantly alter the nature of the prayer since God is still the source of protection and the request is ultimately sought from him.

The form of the plea in verse 28 is nearly identical to the prayers from *Jubilees* discussed above. Instead of the spirit of Beliar in Moses' prayer or the evil spirits in Noah and Abram's pleas, Abraham requests that "the spirit of Mastema" not "rule over" Jacob and his seed. Although the exact terminology is either specific ("Beliar" or "Mastema") or general ("evil spirits"), each phrase denotes fear of an evil/demonic being ruling over a faithful person or group of

[171] Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 157, contends: "As Lange rightly argues, since the prayer occurs while Abram is gazing at the stars by night (12.16), these spirits must be the stars linked with 'astrology'"; cf. Lange, "Magic and Divination," 383. However, it is unclear if the passage necessitates this interpretation. Elsewhere in *Jubilees* demons are overtly connected with idolatrous practices (cf. 1:11; 11:4; and 22:17), yet the relationship between demons and astrology is not explicit in *Jub.* 12.

[172] Although Moses and Noah are also intercessors on behalf of the Israelites and their descendants respectively, their petitions are addressed to God directly and the intended recipients of God's protection are referred to in the third person.

people. It is not completely evident why different demon titles are used for various petitions. Perhaps each title simply fits the context of a given prayer.[173] In any case, similar phrases and expressions are used which demonstrates a consistency of petitionary forms in *Jubilees*.

Verse 28 states that Mastema's spirit intends to "rule over" his subject in order to "remove you from following the Lord." This is comparable to "leading astray," a demonic activity that indicates temptation. The inclusion of Jacob's seed in this prayer of blessing and protection takes into account Abraham's earlier concern for the chosen progeny (cf. *Jub.* 12:20), and the prayer also includes the eschatological qualification "henceforth and forever." Therefore, Abraham's plea seeks God's protection from future demonic rule for the safety of Jacob and his descendants and, thusly, is an apotropaic petition.

2.2.3 Apotropaic Incantations

2.2.3.1 *1QRule of the Community* (1QS ii 5-9)

Reconstruction and Translation

5 גורל בליעל וענו ואמרו ארור אתה בכול מעשי רשע אשמתכה יתנכה
6 אל זעוה ביד כול נוקמי נקם ויפקיד אחריכה כלה ביד כול משלמי
7 גמולים ארור אתה לאין רחמים כחושך מעשיכה וזעום אתה
8 באפלת אש עולמים לוא יחונכה אל בקוראכה ולוא יסלח לכפר עוניך
9 ישא פני אפו לנקמתכה ולוא יהיה לכה שלום בפי כול אוחזי אבות

5 the lot of Belial. They shall begin to speak and shall say: «Accursed are you for all your wicked, blameworthy deeds. May God hand you over
6 to terror by the hand of all those carrying out acts of vengeance. May he bring upon you destruction by the hand of all those who accomplish

[173] For example, "Beliar" and "Mastema" each represent the heads of all the active demons and these terms may be useful for pleas against demonic harm in general. Alternatively, the narrative containing Noah's petition describes certain afflictions from particular demons enacted upon Noah's progeny. Yet, this reasoning does not account for all terms used in *Jubilees'* petitions (e.g. *Jub.* 12:20).

7 retributions. Accursed are you, without mercy, according to the darkness of your deeds, and sentenced
8 to the gloom of everlasting fire. May God not be merciful when you entreat him. May he not forgive by purifying your iniquities.
9 May he lift the countenance of his anger to avenge himself on you, and may there be no peace for you by the mouth of those who intercede».[174]

Description, Comments, and Justification for Classification

Eshel refers to a potentially apotropaic use of the Priestly Blessing in *1QRule of the Community*, and lines 5-9 contain elements of the blessing inverted into a curse directed toward the lot of Belial.[175] The passage reverses certain favorable exhortations; blessing is replaced by curse, a vengeful countenance of the Lord instead of a benevolent one is invoked, mercy, forgivingness, and peace are withheld. This curse is to be pronounced by the Levites and is most likely part of a communal ceremony.[176]

The curse in 1QS is not convincingly an apotropaic prayer. The name "Belial" (בליעל) occurs and is a demonic figure.[177] However, lines 4-5 specify the recipients of the curse are men belonging to Belial's lot (אנשי גורל בליעל) and not Belial or demons. According to Nitzan this is characteristic of the sectarian and dualistic themes prevalent in the document.[178] Even if the words were directed toward spiritual beings, they are general pronouncements of ill will and the element of warding off the demons or seeking refuge from them is absent.

In 1QS ii 2-4 is a version of the Priestly Blessing pronounced over the members of the community which precedes the curse. According to Stuckenbruck, "the larger context [of *1QRule of the Community*] makes clear that the Qumran

---

[174] The Hebrew text and English translation is from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 72-73.

[175] Cf. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 70, 83-84; and idem, "Genres," 410. While Eshel does not explicitly classify 1QS ii 5-9 as an apotropaic prayer, her discussions leave the impression that the inversion of the Priestly Blessing in the passage should be interpreted as having an apotropaic function. The suggested date of this scroll is between 100 and 50 B.C.; cf. Webster, *DJD XXXIX*, 392.

[176] Cf. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 148-154.

[177] Cf. Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 341-344.

[178] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 151.

blessing is concerned with divine protection from Belial."[179] The framework for the liturgical recitation of blessing and curse is set forth in column i lines 16-18: "And all those who enter in the Rule of the Community shall establish a covenant before God in order to carry out all that he commanded and in order not to stray from following him out of any fear, dread, or testing (that might occur) during the dominion of Belial."[180] Stuckenbruck suggests that since the blessing and curse are set against the backdrop of "Belial's dominion," the exhortation that God "protect you from anything bad" (col. ii l. 3) implies the demonic.

Although Stuckenbruck's conclusion is possible, it is never expressed in the passage that sin, transgression, or evil is the result of demonic influence or activity. Indeed, the only individuals described as belonging to Belial's lot are human. Therefore, although the communal recitation of the blessing and curse responds to Belial and his lot, they are not anti-demonic in a straightforward sense.

2.2.3.2 *1QHodayot*[a] (1QH[a] 4 xxii 1-14)

Reconstruction and Translation

]גת[	1.
]אשר[	2.
ער]ב ובוקר עם מ[וצא	3.
מנגי]עי גבר וממכ[אוב	4.
]ורת יצפו ועל משמרתם [יתיצבו	5.
[תגער בכול שטן משחית ומר[	6.
]בה ואתה גליתה אוזני כי[	7.
[אנוש וברית פותו בם ויבוא[ו	8.
תו]כחות לפניכה ואני פחדתי ממשפטכה[	9.
מי יצדק לפנ]יכה ומי יזכה במשפטכה ומה אפה [ואדם	10.
תבי]אנו במשפט ושב אל עפרו מה[	11.
א]ל[י] פתחתה לבבי לבינתכה ותגל אוז[ני	12.
]להשען על טובכה ויהם לבי[	13.
[ולבבי כדונג ימס על פשע וחטאה	14.

1. [...]
2. [...] which [...]

[179] Stuckenbruck, "Protect them from the Evil One," 145.

[180] García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 71.

3. [...ev]ening and morning with [...]
4. [...from plagues of a] man and from pa[ins...]
5. [...] they watch, and upon their courses
6. [they shall stand...] You rebuke every adversary who ruins and [...]
7. [...] and You have uncovered my ear. For [...]
8. [...] the men of the covenant were deceived by them. And [they] shall go[...]
9. [...reb]ukes before You. I have feared Your judgment [...]
10. [...who can be justified bef]ore You, and who shall stand blameless in You judgment? And what [...]
11. [...you will bring] him in the judgment. The one who returns to his dust, what [...]
12. [...my G]o[d], You have opened my heart to Your understanding, and You open [my] e[ars...]
13. leaning upon Your goodness. But my heart groans [...]
14. [...] and my heart melts as wax because of transgression and sin.[181]

Description, Comments, and Justification for Classification

Eshel offers three reasons that this passage from the *Thanksgiving Scroll* should be classified as "apotropaic." The first two reasons are that the passage: "begins with [1] a request for protection from evil spirits, and [2] for their reproof."[182] The third reason relates to the presence of several of Flusser's apotropaic elements which are identified in the passage.

In regard to the first reason, Eshel's contention that the passage begins with a plea for protection from demons is not specified, but is most likely her interpretation of line 4. Unclear is whether a demonic being should be interpreted in this line. Although "plague" (נגע) and "pain" (מכאב) may have demonic connotations, there is no context in this poorly preserved fragment to support such a reading.[183] Furthermore, that "plagues" is constructed with the noun "man" (גבר)

---

[181] The Hebrew reconstruction and English translation is from Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 82; cf. E. L. Sukenik, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1955); and Hartmut Stegemann, "The Number of Psalms in *1QHodayot*[a] and Some of their Sections," in *Liturgical Perspectives*, 191-234.

[182] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 83.

[183] The terms נגע and מכאב are appear in different contexts. Both can be associated with the demonic (נגע = 1QS iv 12, 11Q11 vi 10; מכאב = 11Q5 xix 15), but מכאב can be ambiguous and נגע can refer to leprosy (e.g., 4Q270 2 ii 12).

suggests that an implication of the demonic is even less likely. Yet even if these terms were descriptions of demons, there is no explicit request for protection in this line nor in the preceding or subsequent lines.

The second issue is whether a request for God to reprove demons is present in line 6.[184] The appearance שטן with the qualifier "every" (בכול) indicates that, similar to the *Prayer of Levi* (§2.2.2.1), the proper name of a specific being is not meant, but instead "every destroying demon" is the object of God's reproof in this instance. The word גער can be translated "rebuke" and often carries an exorcistic tone.[185] תגער may be taken as a second masculine singular imperfect indicating that "you [God] will rebuke."[186] Given the context and grammar of line 6 there is not a request, but simply an affirmation, that God does or will rebuke demons.

Lastly, mention of God's knowledge in line 12 (בינה) and an acknowledgment of sin in line 14 (פשע and חטאה) correspond with Flusser's apotropaic elements, but these are simply common themes appearing in some apotropaic prayers and are not themselves classifying features. It can only be acknowledged that the *1QHodayot* passage refers in one place to demonic beings and affirms the exorcistic ability of God. Since there is neither a request for protection nor the invoking of God's power over demons, the passage is not apotropaic. Similarly, God's rebuke in line 6 does not in itself warrant an exorcistic classification since it is merely a statement about an attribute of God. There is, after all, no adjuration or address to the demons. Therefore, despite the reference to שטן and the use of גער, the nature of the passage is that of thanking

---

[184] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 83, reconstructs תגער בכול שטן משחית ("You rebuke every adversary who ruins"). The passage is also translated "you threaten every destroying and murderous adversary" in García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 197; cf. Sukenik, *DSSHU*, frag. 4, pl. 54.

[185] The Greek translation of גער is ἐπιτιμάω and it is used in the synoptic gospels (cf. Mk. 1:25; 9:25; and Lk. 4:39). The word has similar exorcistic connotations in the *Genesis Apocryphon* (cf. §2.2.5). On the translations of גער, see A. A. Macintosh, "A Consideration of Hebrew גער," *VT* 19 (Oct., 1969): 471-479.

[186] תגער is a likely reconstruction. The photograph of frag. 4 shows the faded word תגר with a faint ע inserted above the word after the ג and before the ר.

God and praising his glorious qualities and deeds rather than countering a specific demonic influence.[187]

2.2.3.3 *4QIncantation* (4Q444 1-4 i + 5 col. i)

Reconstruction and Translation

1	ואני מיראי אל בדעת אמתו פתח פי ומרוח קודשו]◦
2	אמת לכ[ו]ל[אל]ה ויהיו לרוחי ריב במבניתי חוק[י אל
3	ב]תכמי בשר ורוח דעת ובינה אמת וצדק שם אל בל[בבי
4	]◦◦ וה ותתחזק בחוקי אל ולהלחם ברוחי רשעה ולוא[
5	ל[ ]ת דיניה *vac* ארור[
6	רון האמת והמשפט[
7	ה עד תום ממשלתה[
8	מ]זרים ורוח הטמאה
9	◦◦ קל והגנב[ים]
10	צ]דיקים ארו[
11	◦ ת תועב[ה]◦

1 And as for me, because of my fearing God, he opened my mouth with his true knowledge; and from his holy spirit
2 truth to a[l]l[the]se. They became spirits of controversy in my (bodily) structure; law[s of God
3 in]blood vessels of flesh. And a spirit of knowledge and understanding, truth and righteousness, God put in [my] he[art
4] And strengthen yourself by the laws of God, and in order to fight against the spirits of wickedness, and not [
5] its judgements. *vac* Cursed be
6] of the truth and of the judgement
7] until the completion of its dominion
8 ba]stards and the spirit of impurity
9] and the thieve[s?
10 ri]ghteous ones [
11] abominate[on[188]

Description and Comments

---

[187] For a detailed commentary on the nature and character of *1QHodayot*[a] cf. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 321-355.

[188] The Hebrew text and English translation is taken from Chazon, *DJD XXIX*, 372, 374.

There are six poorly preserved fragments attributed to this manuscript, which have been dated to between 30 B.C. and 68 A.D.[189] Chazon notes "two distinct literary units" which comprise 4Q444 fragments 1-4 column i + fragment 5 column i lines 1-11: the first (ll. 1-4) are hymnic in nature and the second (ll. 5-11) contain "a series of curses evidently invoked against the various classes of demons mentioned in these lines."[190] She demonstrates significant parallels between *4QIncantation* and *4QSongs of the Sage*^{ab} which are examined more thoroughly in §2.2.3.4.

The opening address ואני מיראי אל can be interpreted "and because of my fearing God" or "and I exorcise [*in/by the name of* is implied here] God."[191] If מיראי is understood as "I exorcize" it does not necessarily mean that the passage is an exorcism formula or adjuration. After all, the opening line is not a direct address to demons and what follows is not an overtly exorcistic context. Therefore, either translation of מיראי ("I exorcize" or "because of my fearing") serves to characterize the subject of the expression as one who has a special role or position in relation to God. Neither translation, in itself, necessitates an apotropaic or exorcistic reading of the passage.

God's knowledge and his holy spirit (cf. Flusser's elements) are mentioned in line 1, and in line 2 occurs "spirits of controversy" (רוחי ריב) within the individual.[192] Given that "spirits of controversy" appears just prior to favorable

---

[189] Webster, *DJD XXXIX*, 425.

[190] Chazon, *DJD XXIX*, 368.

[191] On the one hand, מיראי could be interpreted as an infinitive construct of ירא. In this case, the preposition מ and the first person singular pronominal suffix י would render a translation along the lines of "from/of my fearing." The status of the speaker as one who fears God is adopted by Chazon and García Martínez and Tigchelaar. On the other hand, Joseph Baumgarten asserts that "מירא is a technical term for exorcising evil spirits"; cf. J. M. Baumgarten, "On the Nature of the Seductress in *4Q184*," *RevQ* 15 (1991): 136. Eshel follows Baumgarten's interpretation, explaining that the term may be a *piel* participle of ירא. Here, the final *yod* would be standing in as a *tsere* and the meaning would be closer to "to cause fear" or "to exorcize." Cf. Eshel, "Genres," 402; idem, "Apotropaic Prayers," 81, 84-85; and Chazon *DJD XXIX*, 374. This interpretation seems to be intended in the instance of ואני מירא אל in 4Q511 35 6 and אני מירא 8Q5 1 1 (cf. §2.2.3.4 and §2.2.4.2).

[192] On identifying the noun במבניתי with the speaker in 4Q444, see Chazon, *DJD XXIX*, 375.

spirits placed in the heart of the speaker by God in line 3 (רוח דעת ובינה אמת וצדק שם אל בלבבי), it is likely that natural, internal proclivities are the subject of the passage rather than outside spiritual forces. Based on similar language found in *Songs of the Sage* (cf. 4Q511 28-29 4-5; 48, 49 + 51 4-8) Chazon is open to the possibility that "spirits of controversy" refer to "opposing spirits possessed by the speaker...the spirit bestowed by God and the evil/impure spirit."[193] This interpretation fits within the dualistic view of human nature set forth in some Qumran material, however, the ambiguous reference in line 2 to רוחי ריב in itself does not constitute a concrete reference to demonic beings or demonic influence.

There is a possible demonological orientation to the "spirits of wickedness" (רוחי רשעה) in line 4. Chazon posits that this line refers to an individual who is strengthened by God's precepts for the purpose of battling against "evil spirits."[194] Guarding oneself against demons by adherence to the law may be similar to a passage found in CD-A xvi 5 where observance of the torah aids in rebuffing the demonic figure Mastema.[195] Yet this is only relevant if רוחי רשעה are demonic beings and, given the context of the passage, it is possible that they are non-demonic inclinations which the spiritual gifts mentioned in line 3 are intended to combat.

Line 5 transitions into the second literary unit proposed by Chazon, commencing with what she calls a "curse formula."[196] In *DJD XXIX*, the passive participle ארור ("cursed") is reconstructed after a *vacat* in line 5, and a

---

[193] Chazon, *DJD XXIX*, 375.

[194] Chazon, *DJD XXIX*, 376.

[195] The example of Moses and adherence to the torah are important in the *Damascus Document*. William Horbury includes the *Damascus Document* among works which "give express prominence to the covenant as Mosaic." W. Horbury, "Moses and the Covenant in the Assumption of Moses and the Pentateuch," in *Herodian Judaism and New Testament Study* (WUNT 193; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 34; repr. from *Covenant as Context* (eds. A. D. H. Mayes and R. B. Salter; Oxford, 2003). For the possible link between CD-A xvi 5 and apotropaism, cf. Best, *The Temptation and the Passion*, 50; and Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer," 109-110.

[196] Chazon offers a substantive discussion on the curse formula in 4Q44 and in parallel Qumran manuscripts; cf. Chazon, *DJD XXIX*, 369.

pronouncement of curse against one's adversaries, demonic or otherwise, is attested to in other instances at Qumran (cf. 1QS ii 5). Alternatively, the final letter could be a *dalet* which would render the word ארוד and the translation "I will subdue."[197] In either case it seems that the measure enacted in line 5 is directed toward or meant to include the "bastards and the spirit of impurity" in line 8. The term "bastards" (ממזרים) is a demon title which scholars interpret as a reference to the perverted dual origin (i.e. half angelic, half human) of the giants in the Watcher tradition, thus displaying an influence of the Watcher aetiology of evil spirits.[198]

Likewise, the spirit of "impurity" or "uncleanness" (רוח טמאה) is also identified as a demonic being and, for Lange, the phrase is a parallel biblical term (cf. Zech. 13:2) for the non-biblical "bastard" spirit.[199] Although רוח טמאה could conceivably refer to spiritual or ritualistic uncleanness, the pairing with ממזרים suggests an interpretation related to the demonic. In a similar vein, the contents of line 7 may suggest an eschatology congruent with Enochic literature and *Jubilees*. As Chazon explains, if the third person feminine singular pronominal suffix of ממשלתה agrees with רוח טמאה in line 8, "the entire phrase [in line 7] would then refer to the apocalyptic idea of the limited duration of the dominion of evil and its culmination in the eschaton."[200] However, the subject of "its dominion" is not

---

[197] Cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 924-925. Consultation of the infrared photographs of this fragment confirms the difficulty in discerning the final letter of the word. It is therefore unclear if a curse is meant to be invoked or if the speaker is cast into the role of one who "subdues."

[198] Lange, "Spirits of Impurity," 256, explains that in some cases, usually those involving an interpretation of a biblical passage, the term ממזרים may refer to "people of doubtful origin connected to pagans." However, given the context of 4Q444, ממזרים "should be understood as referring to the demonic offspring procreated by the fallen watchers with human woman" which is the more frequent use of the term in the Dead Sea Scrolls; cf. ibid., 259. For similar interpretations, see Baumgarten, "The Seductress," 134; Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 333; and Stuckenbruck, "Giant Mythology and Demonology: From the Ancient Near East to the Dead Sea Scrolls" in *Die Dämonen*, 336.

[199] Lange, "Spirit of Impurity," 256.

[200] Chazon, *DJD XXIX*, 377. The activity of demons (i.e. the spirits of the giants) is limited to a specific period of time set within an eschatological structure in *1 Enoch*. For example, *1 En.* 16:1-2

definitive due in large part to the poorly preserved nature of 4Q444. Yet, while the precise connotations of line 7 are unclear, it is likely that the terms in line 8 represent demonic beings which are the objects of the pronouncement in line 5.

Justification for Classification

The contents of *4QIncantation* are generally understood as a defensive measure against demonic beings. Eshel unequivocally refers to 4Q444 as apotropaic, going so far as to suggest that "Apotropaic prayer" is a label preferable to "Incantation."[201] Chazon does not use the term "apotropaic" but describes the passage as "warding off evil spirits," which is essentially the same. She also uses the word "prophylactic." Three characteristics are put forth as demonstrating the preventative nature of 4Q444: (1) the use of the formula ארור "to curse the spirits of bastards and impurity;" (2) the character and role of the speaker "in the struggle against evil spirits;" and finally (3) the close parallels of the text to *Songs of the Sage* "which suggest a similarity of function...for frightening and subduing evil spirits."[202] As to the first point, it is uncertain if a curse formula is indeed present since the final letter of the Hebrew word is ambiguous. The other two points contribute to, but do not in themselves necessitate, an apotropaic classification of the manuscript.

Lines 5-8 contain demonologically relevant features including two titles of demons in line 8 and the action taken against those beings in line 5. To interpret the action as "I will subdue" would be apotropaic, denoting the intention of asserting control over the evil beings in a preventative manner. If the measure is an invocation of a curse it might be considered apotropaic since it is directed toward specific demonic beings. Although cursing an adversary is similar, to a degree, to cursing Belial's lot in *1QRule of the Community*, the context is different. In 1QS ii

---

states: "[the spirits of the giants] will corrupt until the day of the great conclusion, until the great age is consummated, until everything is concluded (upon) the Watchers and the wicked ones." Isaac, "Enoch," 22; cf. *Jub.* 10: 7-9.

[201] Eshel, "Genres," 409; and idem, "Apotropaic Prayers," 81.

[202] Chazon, *DJD XXIX*, 369.

blessings are invoked upon the "men of God's lot" in unison with a curse upon those outside of the congregation. In this case, the nature of the curse appears to highlight the favorable position of those inside the community versus those excluded from or opposed to them. This is more likely the intention of the curse in *1QRule of the Community* rather than a straightforward "warding off" of evil.

In view of the demonic and likely apotropaic elements in 4Q444 fragments 1-4 column i + fragment 5 column i lines 1-11, it should be classified as an anti-demonic passage. The proper form of the prayer is not immediately clear. Chazon refers to the manuscript as an "incantation." To revisit the suggested definition of the term (§2.1.5), an incantation is a formula, powerful word, or repetitive expression (incl. a chant, song, or adjuration) directed toward a deity or demon with the purpose of counteracting or preventing demonic influence. The passage in 4Q444 does not contain a repetitive expression, and whether or not a curse formula is present is open to debate. Lines 5-8 seem to have the tone of a hymnic curse or hymnic assertion of power over demons, but this is uncertain due to the fragmentary nature of the text. Hence, it is prudent to refrain from describing the passage as an "incantation." Similarly, it is not an apotropaic petition since God is not directly addressed. Therefore, this passage in *4QIncantation* should be referred to as a prayer or hymn possessing apotropaic elements.

2.2.3.4 *4QSongs of the Sage*

Manuscripts 4Q510 and 4Q511 preserve a single document and are therefore discussed together in this section. Based on palaeographical analysis Eshel suggests dating these manuscripts to the first century B.C.[203] Their overall contents appear to be hymns of praise and thanksgiving proclaimed by the sage or "maskil" (משכיל) and addressed to God. Woven into these rather conventional hymns are demonological features which lead many scholars to list 4Q510-511 among prayers of protection from demons. Nitzan arranges the passages into "poetic

[203] Eshel, "Genres," 407; cf. Joseph L. Angel, "Maskil, Community, and Religious Experience in the *Songs of the Sage* (4Q510-511)," *DSD* 19 (2012): 1.

units" of either "thanksgiving," "praise," or "incantation,"[204] language that shall be drawn upon in the assessment here.

Reconstruction and Translation of 4Q510 1 1-9

1)] תשבוחות בר[כות למ]לך הכבוד דברי הודות בתהלי [
2 [ ] לאלוהי דעות תפארת ג[בור]ות אל אלים אדון לכול קדושים וממשׁ[לתו]
3 על כול גבורי כוח ומכוח גבורֹ[ת]ו יבהלו ויתפזרו כול ויחפזו מהדר מע[וז]
4 כבוד מלכותו *vacat* ואני משכיל משמיע הוד תפארתו לפחד ולבֿ[הל]
5 כול רוחי מלאכי חבל ורוחות ממזרים שד אים) לילי(ת אחים ו[ציים ...]
6 והפוגעים פתע פתאום ל)תועת רוח (בינה ולהשם לבבם ונ ···תם ב)קץ ממשל[ת]
7 רשעה (ותעודות תעניות בני או[ר] באשם)ת קצי נגוע[י] (עוונות ולוא לכלת עול)ם
8 [כי א]ם לקץ (תעניות פשע[*vacat*] רננו צדיקים) באלוהי פלא
9 ולישרים תהלי *vac.* (ול[... י)]רוממו[ה]ו כ[ו]ל תמימי דרך

1 [...] praises. Bless[ings to the Ki]ng of glory. Words of thanksgiving in psalms of
2 [splendour] to the God of knowledge, the glory of the po[werful] ones, God of gods, Lord of all the holy ones. [His] rea[lm]
3 is above the powerful mighty, and before the might of his powe[r] all are terrified and scatter; they flee before the radiance of
4 of his glorious majestic strong[hold]. *Blank* And I, a Sage, declare the splendour of his radiance in order to frighten and terr[ify]
5 all the spirits of the ravaging angels and the bastard spirits, demons, Lilith, owls and [jackals...]
6 and those who strike unexpectedly to lead astray the spirit of knowledge, to make their hearts forlorn. And you have been placed in the era of the rul[e of]
7 wickedness and in the periods of humiliation of the sons of lig[ht], in the guilty periods of /[those] defiled by/ iniquities; not for an everlasting destruction
8 [but ra]ther for the era of the humiliation of sin. [*Blank*] Rejoice, righteous ones, in the wonderful God.
9 My psalms are for the upright. *Blank* And for [... May] a[l]l those of perfect behaviour praise [h]im.[205]

Description and Comments

[204] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 239-243. For our assessment of 4Q510-511 it is convenient to refer to Nitzan's poetic units while keeping in mind that her definition of "incantation" differs in some respects to that of this current study (cf.§2.1.5).

[205] Baillet, *DJD VII*, 216; and García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1027, 1029.

Maurice Baillet describes lines 1-4 of the passage as "titre et louange à Dieu" while Nitzan refers to them as a unit of "praise."[206] Language is found for glorifying, among other things, the knowledge and mightiness of God, and in line 4 the passage transitions to a unit of "incantation." After the *vacat* in line 4 the sage-speaker proclaims the splendor and radiance of God (ואני משכיל משמיע הוד תפארתו). The purpose of this declaration is not to honor God as in the preceding lines, but rather to "frighten" (פחד) and "terrify" (בהל). Joseph Angel describes lines 4-6 as "a sort of 'methodological statement' that reveals how the *Songs* were thought to bring about protection."[207] According to Nitzan, proclaiming God's glory for this unusual reason serves as a "word of power" which is an element of an incantation.[208] A notable difference between this occurrence and more typical incantations is that the latter usually contain an adjuration or formulae spoken, perhaps, in the name of God. However, in 4Q510 fragment 1 "the 'word of power' is the praise itself."[209] If Nitzan is correct on this point, the statement of the sage in line 4 may constitute a formulaic expression. Indeed, since the intended recipients of the verbs פחד and בהל are demons, as discussed below, Nitzan's argument is certainly plausible.

---

[206] Baillet, *DJD VII*, 217; and Nitzan, *Qumran Poetry*, 240.

[207] Angel, "Maskil, Community, and Religious Experience," 4. Angel, ibid., 2-3, further describes the hymns as "apotropaic" and a "communal ritual"; cf. Lange, "Magic and Divination," 431.

[208] For Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 244, there are three components of an incantation: (1) the "word of power" which is an adjuration or an authoritative command, (2) "the banishing of the demons" and demonic influence, and (3) "the time of action," meaning the period or chronological aspect of the incantation; cf. idem, "Hymns," 54. Likewise, Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 147, argues: "The *maskil's* declarations about God, told in third person (not in the second person in the form of prayer addressed to God), are regarded as potent enough to diminish or counteract demonic powers...". Regarding elements of Babylonian exorcism, Langton describes the importance of "words of power." He states in *Demonology*, 26, "the name of some divine person or thing is invoked because it is believed to possess peculiar power in controlling or banishing demons." Langton, ibid., 27, further explains that "[m]agical rites and ceremonies have no inherent power of their own. They depend for their efficacy on supernatural power which is utilized by the magician." This emphasis on a word of power, Langton, ibid., 28, argues, was adopted by the Jews by their implementation of the "Divine Name."

[209] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 250.

The objects of the sage's verbal polemic are listed in lines 5 and 6. Appearing first are "all the spirits of the ravaging angels" (כול רוחי מלאכי חבל).[210] The identity of these "ravaging" or "destroying" angels is somewhat ambiguous. Contexts suggests they are to be interpreted as demonic beings, yet the designation "angel" (מלאך) allows speculation as to whether there is a connection between the beings mentioned and the fallen angels or Watchers. If, as some scholars assert, demons are entities different from the fallen angels or Watchers, then how one should interpret מלאך is at issue.[211] In a similar discussion involving the terms מלאכי חבל and מלאך משפטה ("Angel of Enmity") in 1QS iv 12 and 1QM xiii 11, Alexander suggests that in these instances when an evil being is referred to as an angel, the designation should be understood "in its basic lexical sense of 'messenger' or 'agent' and as referring to demons."[212] Hence, the term in line 5 could be understood as a "ravaging agent."

Following the "ravaging angels" are the "bastard spirits" (רוחות ממזרים). As noted in the assessment of 4Q444 (§2.2.3.3), "bastards" is a demon title that denotes the influence of the Watcher myth. The appearance of ממזרים immediately after רוחי מלאכי חבל supports the view that the latter phrase describes beings distinct from angels as per the Watcher aetiology of evil spirits. Next in the list is the rather generic term "demon." The words שד אים are presented by Baillet.[213] It is possible that the plural form of the word is intended here (compare with שדים), otherwise אים could be the adjective meaning "terrible" or "formidable" thus

---

[210] García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1029. Baillet, *DJD VII*, 216, translates "tous les esprits d'anges corruption."

[211] This understanding of a demon as different from an angel presumes the Enochic aetiology evil spirits. See especially Wright, *Origin*, 152-157.

[212] Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 334. Wright echoes this interpretation, noting certain nuanced uses of ἄγγελος and מלאך; cf. Wright, *Origin*, 100.

[213] García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1028, reconstruct the words without a space: שדאים. However, consultation of the full color spectrum image and the infrared image confirm the likelihood of Bailliet's reconstruction of two separate words with a space between them.

rendering the translation "a terrible demon."[214] In either case the term is interpreted by scholars as a general, non-descript name for an evil being.[215]

The subsequent terms in line 5 are "Lilith" (לילית), "owls" (אחים), and "jackals" (ציים). The name לילית is a familiar demonic title and often identified as a female night demon. Alexander comments: "the term clearly denotes a demonic figure or type of demon, widely attested in ancient Near Eastern magic, and going back to Babylonian and possibly Sumerian demonology."[216] In keeping with the Mesopotamian background of לילית, the terms אחים and ציים are also used to refer to demons.[217] All three names also appear in Isaiah 34:14, though the specific identity of the terms and their characteristics are slightly vague in the biblical passage.

Completing the demon catalogue in line 6 are "those who strike unexpectedly" (הפוגעים פתע פתאום). The plural פוגעים from the infinitive פגע ("to strike" or "to attack") is paired with the adverbs פתע and פתאום (from פתאם), both

---

[214] Baillet, *DJD VII*, 217, allows for this possibility, suggesting "la racine אים signifiant 'avoir peur.'"

[215] Cf. Baumgarten, "The Seductress," 135; Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 335; and Fröhlich, "Theology and Demonology," 102-103. These scholars note that, unlike ממזרים which is from early Jewish literature, the term שד has its roots in Assyrian and Mesopotamian folklore; cf. Baillet, *DJD VII*, 217; Baumgarten, "The Seductress," 135, and Fröhlich, "Theology and Demonology," 102-103, 123. שד also occurs twice in the Hebrew Bible (Deut. 32:17 and Ps. 106:37), the context of both being the negative depiction of sacrificing to "demons" or idols.

[216] Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 335. Fröhlich also provides a thorough background of the Lilith demon and its characteristics, noting that liliths are often attested to in Mesopotamian lore as night demons notorious for attacking and killing new-born babies especially. She explains in "Theology and Demonology," 102-103 that "Lilith is well known in Talmudic and later Jewish tradition", and is the subject of various Jewish apotropaic texts; cf. Baillet, *DJD VII*, 217; and Baumgarten, "The Seductress," 135. The Babylonian, Assyrian, and Hebrew traditions of Lilith are also discussed in Langton, *Demonology*, 16, 39, and 143.

[217] According to Fröhlich, "Theology and Demonology," 103, אחים ("owls") and ציים ("jackals") "are generally connected to death and the demonic" in Mesopotamian tradition; cf. Langton, *Demonology*, 25. Noting the animalistic character of the terms, Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 335, translating "howlers" and "yelpers" respectively, states "in the Qumran list they are taken as names for some kind of demon or demons; but it is unclear whether one class of demons or two is envisaged." Cf. Baillet, *DJD VII*, 217.

meaning "suddenly" thereby describing a certain group of beings as "the ones attacking suddenly." Nitzan contends that since the הפוגעים has a *vav* prefix, "the *waw*... ought to be understood as an expletive *waw*, whose sense is like 'that is to say' (that is to say, they who strike)."[218] This view, for which Nitzan appeals to biblical and extra-biblical linguistic parallels, does not envisage a separate class of demons in line 6, but rather a characteristic (i.e., the propensity to suddenly attack) of the demons previously listed. While Nitzan's argument is persuasive, the precise interpretation of והפוגעים פתע פתאום as a class of demons or a demonic characteristic is open to debate.[219]

In line 6 a method of influence attributed to the demons is "to lead astray the spirit of knowledge, to make their hearts forlorn" (לתועת רוח בינה ולהשם לבבם). The dual effect of "leading astray" or "seducing" the positive "spirits of understanding" with the purpose of inflicting or "making forlorn their hearts" does not appear to be a physical attack. Since the heart (לב) is the spiritual center of an individual and is supposed to be oriented to God,[220] its leading astray conveys a spiritual demonic influence.[221]

If 4Q510 fragment 1 is divided into parts or sections (i.e., Nitzan's approach) then there are three components examined so far: (1) hymnic praise to

---

[218] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 240 n. 53.

[219] Baillet notes the appearance of פגועים in an exorcistic context in *11QPsalms*[a] xxvii 10 and suggests that this type of demon may hint toward demonic possession. He offers "possédés" as one possible translation of the term in *11QPsalms*[a]. In light of this, he asks of the terminology in 4Q510 1 6 "des esprits 'frappeurs' ou qui 'frappent' de possession?" Baillet, *DJD VII*, 217.

[220] Birger Gerhardsson states: "the 'heart' (לבב, לב) is used as an inclusive term for man's inner nature, not only as the 'seat' of the animal instincts but also as the 'seat' of faith and knowledge of God." B. Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son* (trans. J. Toy; Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1966), 48.

[221] In addressing the overall tone of *Songs of the Sage*, Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 272, reflects this view stating "the present struggle [in 4Q510-511] is only concerned with protecting the children of light from being misled toward the ways of iniquity and from 'afflictions of transgression.'" In a more specific assessment of the demonic influence portrayed in 4Q510 1 6, Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 66, contends: "what the demons affect in this case is not the body, but the mind and its capacity to make sound judgments." This view contrasts with Baillet's exorcistic parallel of פגועים with *11QPsalms*[a] (cf. n. 219).

God (ll. 1-4); (2) a possible incantation/formulaic proclamation (l. 4); and (3) a catalogue of demonic beings and their influence (ll. 5-6). A fourth and final feature is an element of eschatology in lines 6-8 referred to by Nitzan as the "time of activity."[222] The end of line 6 mentions בקץ ממשלת ("in the era of the rule of"),[223] and this terminology may be a subtle allusion to the time or period of power afforded by God to the evil spirits according to some traditions.[224] This interpretation is strengthened because the line ends with the construct form of משלה, which then connects בקץ ממשלת to what immediately follows in line 7: "wickedness" (רשעה). Similar language continues and the next phrase in the line is תעודות תעניות. Although תעודה usually means "statute" or "custom," context suggests that a more likely translation is "periods."[225] Further descriptions include אשמת קצי ("periods of guilt") in line 7, and a pairing of תעניות ("humiliation") with פשע in line 8 meaning "era/period of humiliation and sin" in line 8.

The use of these phrases, especially following a demon catalogue which includes ממזרים and an account of demonic influence, point to an eschatological structure in 4Q510 fragment 1 which is dependent upon the concept of the limited activity of evil spirits found in Enochic demonology. In keeping with this eschatology, the expression in line 7 "and not for an everlasting destruction" (ולוא לכלת עולם) reflects the temporal efficacy of the anti-demonic purpose of the passage; that is, the sage seeks merely to prohibit demonic activity temporarily and

---

[222] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 245-247. See the discussion on eschatology in idem, "Hymns," 58-62.

[223] García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1029. Baillet, *DJD VII*, 216, translates "au temps de l'empire de."

[224] A certain period or timeframe in which demons are allowed to be active is consistent with the demonology present in Enochic literature and in *Jubilees*. For consideration of this tradition in *Songs of the Sage*, see especially Wright, *Origin*, 188; Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 251-252; and Angel, "Maskil, Community, and Religious Experience," 5. For Angel in particular, the eschatological and apocalyptic worldview contained in the document is central to its anti-demonic effects.

[225] This is according to Baillet, *DJD VII*, 217: "Le parallélisme avec בקץ ממשלת confirme que תעודה peut bien signifier 'période.'"

reserves the eternal destruction of the demons to be carried out by God in the eschaton.[226]

4Q511 frags. 1-3, 8, 10 Description and Comments

4Q511 reflects and elaborates upon the contents of 4Q510 fragment 1. There are numerous extant fragments of this manuscript, many of which are well preserved. In fragment 1 line 6 are the designations משחית ("destroyer") and רוחי רשע ("evil spirits"), presumably terms for demonic beings. Fragment 2 column i opens with the address למשכיל שיר ("to the maskil, a song") in line 1 and mentions "dominions" (ממשלות) in line 3. Fragment 2 column ii line 3 contains the phrase "congregation of bastards" (עדת ממזרים). The expression קצי רשעתה in fragment 3 line 3 is translated by García Martínez and Tigchelaar as "periods of her wickedness."[227] In these three fragments there is no discernible anti-demonic language and the passages are concerned with glorifying God. Yet, despite the vague usage of the aforementioned terms, they align with more structured eschatological and demonological features found further in subsequent passages.

Nitzan finds in 4Q511 fragment 8 two units, labelling lines 4-5 "incantation" and lines 6-10 "thanksgiving."[228] Line 4 is reconstructed]יר שני לפחד מיראיו[למשכיל ש and translated "For the Instructor.] Second [s]ong to startle those who terrify..."[229] Here, as in 4Q510 1 4, there is an introduction assigning the proclamation of the hymns to the sage. The beginning of this

---

[226] Angel, "Maskil, Community, and Religious Experience," 5, states: "The Maskil's hymns provide protection during the present era in anticipation of the final elimination of the demons at the eschatological judgment known from *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*." This is also explained by Nitzan and echoed by Eshel; cf. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 248; and Eshel, "Genres," 409. For a detailed discussion on the eschatology of 4Q510-511, see Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 253-259.

[227] García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1031. Though the case ending (תה) attached to רשע does appear to be feminine, Baillet, *DJD VII*, 223, translates the phrase "les temps de son impiété."

[228] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 241-242.

[229] Baillet, *DJD VII*, 224-225, provides the Hebrew reconstruction and the translation: "[*Du sage*]. Deuxième [can]tique, pour effrayer ceux qui *lui* inspirent la crainte...". The English translation is from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1031.

fragment is described as a "second song," the opening of the hymn with שיר שני supports Nitzan's suggestion that the original document contained numbered songs to be used by the sage and his community.[230]

The stated purpose of the song (i.e., "to startle those who terrify") is expressed slightly different from 4Q510 fragment 1 where the intention is to frighten and terrify particular demons. In 4Q511 fragment 8 the object of the sage's combative measure are only portrayed as elements or beings that/who inspire fear. Evil beings certainly fit with this description, but no terms denoting a demon occur in fragment 8. In line 5, the recurrence of the qualification "not for eternal destruction" (לוא לכלת עולם) characterizes this hymn with the same eschatological and demonological connotations as that of 4Q510 fragment 1. The remaining lines in the fragment contain language of thanksgiving.

The next substantive passage is in fragment 10. Although the reconstruction of this fragment is uncertain, it appears to correlate with the content in 4Q510 1 5-9.[231] Some phrases and terms in 4Q511 10 1-6 are preserved (e.g. לילי, reconstructed as "Lilith," in l. 1 and קץ ממשלת רשעה, "the era of the rule of wickedness," in l. 3), but much of the contents in these beginning lines are damaged or missing. The reconstruction of lines 1-6 is largely based upon 4Q510 fragment 1 yet, whereas 4Q510 fragment 1 ends with psalmic praise in line 9, the glorification hymn is more complete in 4Q511 10 7-12. Comparison of the language in the two fragments suggests that they were possibly verbatim copies of the same work. Therefore, the demon inventory was likely represented at least twice in the document, though 4Q511 fragment 10 adds no new demonologically relevant insight.

Reconstruction and Translation of 4Q511 35 6-8

6 ואני מירא אל בקצי דורותי לרומם שם דבר[תי לפחד]
7 בגבורתו כו[ל]רוחי ממזרים להכניעם מירא[תו ולוא לכול]
8 [מ]ועדי[עולמים כי אם ל]קץ ממשלתם[

[230] Cf. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 239.

[231] Cf. Baillet, *DJD VII*, 226; and Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 236, 240.

6 And as for me, I spread the fear of God in the ages of my generations to exalt the name [...and to terrify]
7 with his power al[l] spirits of the bastards, to subjugate them by [his] fear, [not for all]
8 [eternal t]imes, [but for] the time of their dominion [...][232]

Description and Comments

In 4Q511 fragment 35 there is a unit of "praise" (ll. 1-5) followed by a unit of "incantation" (ll. 6-9).[233] Line 6 opens with ואני מירא אל; the same phrase found in 4Q444 1 1 (cf. §2.2.3.3). Baumgarten's translation of the formula as an exorcistic expression is based upon the appearance of מירא here in 4Q511.[234] In the case of 4Q511 35 6, context suggests that the phrase itself describes an anti-demonic action ("I spread/cause fear of God" or "I exorcize [by] God") rather than being simply a characteristic of the speaker ("I am of the ones fearing God"). After describing the timeframe of the action (בקצי דורותי), its purpose is stated. While לרומם שם ("to exalt the name") is clearly present, Baillet also reconstructs דברתי לפחד, revealing the intention of the opening phrase which is to exalt the name *and to terrify*.[235]

The "spirits of the bastards" (רוחי ממזרים) appear in the next line. These demonic beings are the direct objects of the action in line 6 and are also subjugated

---

[232] The Hebrew is from Baillet, *DJD VII*, 237 and the translation is from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1033.

[233] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 242-243. A note of clarification: while frag. 35 is immediately assessed after frag. 10, this is not to say that no demonic language occurs in frags. 11-34. For instance, frag. 11 preserves]יפגעו לענות ב[("ils frappent pour affliger") in l. 4 and]ערו מיראיו[("deux qui lui inspirent la crainte") in l. 5; cf. Baillet, *DJD VII*, 227-228. In addition, terms that have an eschatological character may be found in a given fragment. However, a significant examination of these occurrences is prevented due to the poor condition of the manuscript.

[234] Baumgarten, "The Seductress," 136, asserts "we know from *4Q511* that מירא is a technical term for exorcising evil spirits." In agreement with Baumgarten, Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 242-243 n. 65, offers additional biblical and non-biblical occurrences of the *piel* form of ירא.

[235] The reconstruction of this last part of l. 6 is based on 4Q510 1 4-5; cf. Baillet, *DJD VII*, 237-238.

by "his fear" (מיראתו). The *hiphil* form of כנע is used to describe the result of the sage's efforts upon the bastards.[236] The eschatological designation "not for all eternal times" is reconstructed in lines 7-8 (cf. 4Q510 1 7 and 4Q511 8 5) followed by "their dominion" in line 8 (cf. 4Q510 1 6 and 4Q511 10 3).

4Q511 fragment 35 essentially describes a hostile formulaic action against demonic beings within a particular eschatological timeframe. Though specific terms may vary, this is a pattern that corresponds to 4Q510 fragment 1 and 4Q511 fragments 8, 10. It is also a pattern that, as Chazon demonstrates, has similarities with *4QIncantation*. Among the numerous parallels between the two documents outlined by Chazon, three are specifically related to their anti-demonic nature:[237] (1) the phrase אל (י)ואני מירא is only found in 4Q444 and 4Q511 35 6; (2), "the meaning of 'bastards' as a class of demons to be cursed or otherwise subdued" is found in both documents;[238] and (3), the counteractive demonic measures are set within "the limited duration of the dominion of wickedness."[239] These and other similarities display a shared approach for addressing demonic beings in separate Qumran manuscripts. Chazon suggests that "a direct literary relationship or a common author" is possible.[240] There are also marked differences between the two documents, including the presence of פחד and בהל in 4Q510-511 as part of a formula and the absence of the verbs in 4Q444.

Justification for Classification

Demonic beings and harmful demonic activity are of explicit concern in the text. As to the nature of demonic influence, it appears that spiritual temptation or similar afflictions are in view (cf. 4Q510 1 6 and 4Q511 10 2-3) as opposed to

---

[236] "Bastard spirits" are also "startled" (יפחד) and possibly "subjugated" (הכניע) in 4Q511 48, 49 + 51, yet the condition of these fragments prevents an in-depth examination for this study; cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1034-1035; and Baillet, *DJD VII*, 243 and plate lxv.

[237] Given the similarities between 4Q444 and 4Q510-511, Stuckenbruck considers the manuscripts to be parts of the same document; cf. idem, "Protect them from the Evil One," 146.

[238] Chazon, *DJD XXIX*, 370.

[239] Chazon, *DJD XXIX*, 371.

[240] Chazon, *DJD XXIX*, 371

bodily attacks. The variety of named demonic aggressors found in 4Q510 fragment 1 and 4Q511 fragment 10 is especially illuminating. Grouping titles such as "bastards" and "ravaging angels," both reflecting the Watcher myth, together with "lilith" and other Mesopotamian terms, seem to represent different strata or a collection of demonological traditions present in the passages. However, since specific characteristics of these beings are either not provided or not preserved, firm conclusions are difficult to reach. In any case it is evident that demons and their malevolent sway over individuals are feared by the author(s) of *Songs of the Sage*.

There are five reasons that the relevant passages in 4Q510-511 are preventative rather than remedial:

First, the eschatological elements displayed throughout the manuscripts are, according to Eshel's four points of contrast, proper to apotropaic prayer.[241] Angel likewise characterizes the passages as "prophylactic" due, in part, to their eschatology. For Angel, the entirety of the hymns exist within a ritual and eschatological framework. The praise is ritualistic, leading to an ontological transcendence in which the sage and his community participate alongside the angels in the glorification of God. This ritual produces an "apotropaic energy" which has the effect of warding off demons.[242]

Second, in two instances the anti-demonic expression is followed by a list of assorted demonic beings. More likely is that future protection from all these demons is being sought than that each being is at the same time the subject of an exorcistic command.

Third, no adjuration, direct address to demons, or invocation of God's name is present as is often the case in an exorcistic formula.

---

[241] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 87-88.

[242] Cf. Angel, "Maskil, Community, and Religious Experience," 16 and 26. It is further stated in ibid., 21: "[b]y affording protection to the community now, the *Songs* offered a foretaste of the eschatological age." Angel, ibid., 5, also observes that "the norm in ordinary Jewish incantations" is an effort for "complete and eternal defeat of the wicked spirits." Yet, given its eschatological structure, it is an apotropaic action that is sought and achieved in 4Q510-511. Hence, Angel too sees the apotropaic and eschatological elements of 4Q510-511 as inexorably linked.

Fourth, there is no language to suggest that a person is currently undergoing physical or spiritual demonic attack. Instead of a command for the demons to vacate an individual or cease ongoing affliction, the praise and glorification of God appear to serve as an authoritative expression or "word of power." This is conveyed by the use of the verbs פחד and בהל which seem to describe "warding off" more so than expulsion or removal. Even the phrase ואני מירא אל, which may be translated "and I exorcize [by the name of] God," does not necessitate an exorcistic reading of 4Q511 fragment 35. As in *4QIncantation*, it may be simply an affirmation of power over demons which characterizes the role of the sage.

The fifth point relates to להכניעם (from כנע) in 4Q511 35 7 which is translated "to subjugate them."[243] Initially, the subjugation of demons may come across as an exorcistic activity, and in certain contexts this could very well be the case. However, the verb could also depict the demons as subject to the counteractive expression in the passage. In other words, to describe the demons as "subjugated" may simply mean that the demons are subject to or affected by the apotropaic/protective utterance of the sage. This would be similar to the word ארוד, possibly reconstructed in 4Q444 2 i 1, which conveys control over evil beings. Since demonic beings are not directly addressed, this latter interpretation of the verb is most likely the case. Therefore, while ואני מירא אל and כנע are in some instances exorcistic terminology, they are used in 4Q510-511 for preventative purposes. These five reasons, when taken together, demonstrate the apotropaic function of parts of 4Q510-511.

The apotropaic passages in *Songs of the Sage* are clearly not in the form of petitionary pleas for God's protection. After all, the characterization of the sage as the one who terrifies demons is specified throughout. Rather, the anti-demonic features in 4Q510-511 resemble an incantation. Nitzan differentiates between "conventional incantations" and 4Q510-511 (cf. §2.1.5), and notes two specific differences:

---

[243] García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1033. Baillet, *DJD VII*, 238, translates "afin de les assujettir."

1) In the general incantation, the magic power is the Name of God used in an oath or a spell; whereas the magic power employed by the Sage is "A Word of Glorification."
2) Generally, this magic power is used to expel the evil spirits, and to dissipate them forever. On the other hand, the Sage from Qumran only scares the evil spirits away, in a somewhat temporary fashion.[244]

Nitzan's definition and use of "incantation," which seems fit only for exorcism, proves to be too restrictive, excluding at one level the incantation-like 4Q510-511. Hence, the term is modified so that *Songs of the Sage* is referred to as a different type of incantation.

Regarding the definition used in this study, it is clear that the apotropaic phrases examined above are articulated in a formulaic fashion.[245] These expressive "words of power," while not adjurations, are hymnic in nature and directed toward demons with the intention of prohibiting demonic influence.[246] Even if, as Angel suggests, the hymns are seen within a ritualistic and communal framework, the effect of warding off demons is still brought about through a formulaic proclamation. Therefore, the language in 4Q510 fragment 1, 4Q511 fragments 8, 10, and 35 is to be classified as apotropaic incantation.

2.2.3.5 *6QHymn* (6Q18)

Description and Comments

[244] Nitzan, "Hymns," 54-55. For a more detailed explanation of these two points, see idem, *Qumran Prayer*, 248.

[245] These phrases especially include the declaration of God's glory (4Q510 1 4) and spreading the fear of God (4Q511 35 6), both for a stated anti-demonic purpose. In 4Q511 frag. 8 the "word of power" is not present, due possibly to the poor condition of the fragment. However, the description of the passage as a "song" (שיר) attests to its formulaic/incantation-like quality.

[246] In the instance of *4QSongs of the Sage*, the apotropaic expressions are not, strictly speaking, addressed to either God or demonic beings. Rather, they are directed towards the demons in the sense that they are intended to affect them.

6QHymn is preserved in 27 small to medium fragments which have been dated to between 30 B.C. and 68 A.D.[247] Eshel includes this manuscript in her group of "sectarian" apotropaic texts and describes the scroll as dealing with "the dualistic struggle between the 'Angels of Justice' and Belial."[248] The terms מלאכי צדק and בליעל appear in fragment 5 line 2 and fragment 3 line 3 respectively. According to Eshel, the battle between the good and evil angels "is characterized by the verb כנע in the *hiphil* 'to cause to submit'."[249] Indeed, the word להכני]ע is reconstructed in fragment 1 line 6, and the term could be taken as anti-demonic in some cases (cf. 4Q511 35 7). Unfortunately, להכניע in fragment 1 line 1survives without context.[250]

Reconstruction and Translation of 6Q18 2

2.	]חיי נצח וכב[וד
3.	]ול חושך ואפ[לה
4.	אל ח]ושך תשוקתנ[ו
5.	]לחי עולמים ויהי[
6.	]◦[] עד שמח[
7.	]מר בן ישחק [
8.	]בתשב'חות ע[ולמים
9.	]ל[

2. [...] eternal life and gl[ory...]
3. [...]...darkness and gl[oom...]
4. [...da]rkness is the inclination of [...]
5. [...] to whom lives for ever, And may [...] be [...]
6. [...] until joy [...]
7. [...]... son of Isaac [...]
8. [...] with ev[erlasting] praise [...]
9. [...] ... [...][251]

Description, Comments, and Justification for Classification

---

[247] Webster, *DJD XXXIX*, 425.

[248] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 81.

[249] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 81.

[250] For a reconstruction of rag. 1 see Baillet, *DJD III*, 133.

[251] The Hebrew reconstruction is from Baillet, *DJD III*, 133, and the English translation is from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1157.

In fragment 2 there are two features described by Eshel as "incantation language" which contribute to her classification of 6Q18 as apotropaic.[252] First is the phrase in line 4 which she interprets as an utterance of demons, although identifying demons as the subject of this statement is speculative. There are no names or titles of demons in fragment 2, nor is there any explicit indication by whom the phrase is spoken. As Baillet points out, the "longing" or "desire" (תשוקה) for darkness (חושך) may be a characteristic of demons or a human trait belonging to those opposing the Qumran community.[253] This is a feature that, along with the verb כנע, has parallels in other Qumran documents. In *1QWar Scroll* תשוקה and חושך are attributed to Belial and his angels on one occasion (xiii 10), and wicked men in another (xv 10). Similarly, להכניע appears in the framework of a battle against demonic and human enemies of the "sons of light" (cf. 1QM i 6; vi 5; xvii 5). The fragmentary condition of 6Q18 means that there is practically no context for להכניע, תשוקה and חושך. Thus it is impossible to be certain whether the terms are related to demons or not.

The second feature is the expression "with eternal praise" (l. 8), which is not unique to 6Q18. In particular, the word תשבחות appears in at least one later non-Qumran incantation text,[254] and yet, there is nothing specifically anti-demonic about the phrase itself and no perspective is offered from the language preserved in fragment 2.

Extant terminology in 6Q18, in some circumstances, may function as or be related to anti-demonic language. Furthermore, the mention of Belial in fragment 3 line 3 may confidently read as referring to an evil being. However, the manuscript is so poorly preserved and there is so little context provided that no explicit anti-demonic terminology, expressions, or formulae are apparent. Eshel's classification of 6Q18 as "apotropaic" relies upon the use of a few analogous terms in other texts. However, even the anti-demonic character of these terms in other works is

---

[252] Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 81.

[253] "La תשוקה, qui rappelle Gen 3:16, 4:7 (cf. Cant 7:11), désigne ici les mauvais instincts de l'homme, diriges vers la poussière en 1QS xi 22. Ils vont ici vers les ténèbres: cf. 1QM xiii 12 (a propos des mauvais anges) et xv 10 (a propos des ennemis de la secte)." Baillet, *DJD III*, 134.

[254] Cf. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 81; and idem, "Genres," 410.

uncertain.[255] Essentially, while the use of the aforementioned words and phrases in separate works is not unimportant, it cannot be the only reason for the classification of a passage. When considered on its own 6Q18 does not convey anti-demonic language in any form and, therefore, an apotropaic classification is not convincing.

2.2.4 Exorcistic Incantations

2.2.4.1 *4QExorcism ar* (4Q560)

Reconstruction and Translation

Column i:

2]יֵ֯ילדת{א}<ה> מרדות ילדן פקרֹ באיש ש[
3]עלל בבשרא לחלחיא דכרא וחלחלית נקבתא[ ]
4]בֹרֹא עואן ופשע אשא ועריא ואשת לבב[ ] די י/ת(ה)
5]ה בשנא פרכ דכר ופכית נקבתא מחתא דֹי (את)[ ]

Column ii:

5 ואנה רוח מומה[ ]
6 אומיתכ רוחא בֹ[אישא]
7 עֹל אֹרעא בעננין]

Column i:

2 […] the midwife, the chastisement of girls. Evil visitor… […]
3 […who] enters the flesh, the male penetrator and the female penetrator
4 […] …iniquity and guilt; fever and chills, and heat of the heart
5 […] in sleep, he who crushes the male and she who passes through the female, those who dig

Column ii:

5 And I, O spirit, adjure […]

---

[255] For example, 1QM xiii 12 reads: "…All the spirits *12* of his [Belial's] lot are angels of destruction, they walk in the laws of darkness [חושך]; towards it goes their only [de]sire [וקתמה[תש]]." García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 134-135. This sentence seems simply to be a description of demons and their inclinations rather than a preventive measure against the demons.

6 I enchant you, O spirit [...]
7 [o]n the earth, in clouds [...][256]

Description and Comments

Two fragments, written in Aramaic and dated to the middle of the first century B.C., are attributed to the manuscript *4QExorcism ar*.[257] Fragment 1 preserves two columns each containing demonologically relevant language. Douglas Penney and Michael Wise suggest that the fragment is the remnant of a larger "recipe book" that contained magic formulae to be used for a variety of purposes.[258] This recipe format makes sense given the character of the extant lines, yet the fragmentary nature of the manuscript prohibits any definite conclusion.

Many of the phrases in column i are interpreted as references to demonic beings and the results of demonic influence. Although the precise meaning of line 2 is unclear, Penney and Wise offer "a working hypothesis that this line contains a list enumerating concerns or evils pertaining to a childbearing woman."[259] The appearance of ילדתא, which probably refers to a woman in labor, along with מרדות ("chastisement") and ילדן ("child-bearers"), certainly gives that impression. Also in

---

[256] The Aramaic reconstruction is taken from Émile Puech, *DJD XXXVII: Qumran Grotte 4. XXVII (4Q550-4Q575a, 4Q580-4Q587, et Appendices)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009), 296, 300, and the English translation is from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1117. Cf. Robert H. Eisenman and Michael Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Dorset: Element, 1992), 264-265; Douglas L. Penney and Michael Wise, "By the Power of Beelzebub: An Aramaic Incantation Formula from Qumran (4Q560)," *JBL* 113.4 (1994): 631-632; and Naveh, "Fragments of an Aramaic Magic Book," 252-261.

[257] Eshel, "Genres," 397. Puech dates the manuscript to before 75 A.D.; cf. idem, *DJD XXXVII*, 295.

[258] Penney and Wise, "By the Power of Beelzebub," 650. Similarly, Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 345, states: "4Q560 is probably the remnants of a recipe book containing the texts of amulets..." Penney and Wise and Alexander also contend that the recipe book was used by a professional purveyor of magical formulae for clients' personal usage.

[259] Penney and Wise, "By the Power of Beelzebub," 634. Concern for a woman about to give birth was not unfamiliar in ancient magical texts; cf. ibid, 634-637.

line 2 the word פקר ("irreverence") is qualified with באיש ("evil") indicating a negative interpretation of the phrase which possibly refers to a demonic being.[260]

In following line 3 is a being (or beings) who "enters the flesh" (עלל בבשרא). The use of בשרא ("flesh") rather than פגרא ("body") is unique and may reflect a specific type of demonic influence.[261] Immediately after עלל בבשרא are "the male penetrator and the female penetrator" (לחלחיא דכרא וחלחלית נקבתא). Michael Wise and Robert Eisenman interpret the terms as male and female "poisoning-demons."[262] Eshel notes that one may also render לחלחיא (from חלחול) as "shudder" or "tremble," which would refer to a condition of the body caused by the demons.[263]Although Naveh favors חלחול to mean "poison" or "poisonous substance," he explains that "trembling" is also an appropriate interpretation and "enters the flesh" fits in either case.[264]

While translations vary, demons clearly bring physical harm to their victim. The act of "entering the flesh" could, perhaps, be understood as pain, sickness, or bodily possession. It is uncertain whether the evil irreverence (or "visitor"), the male and female demons, or all three demons, "enter the flesh." Also unclear is whether the description "male" and "female" implies that the

---

[260] Naveh, "Fragments of an Aramaic Magic Book," 256, 260, translates the phrase "evil irreverence" and Puech, *DJD XXXVII*, 296, translates "a envahi un mal." The exact meaning of the phrase פקר באיש is uncertain, and the functions of פקר as either an adjective ("un mal abondant") or a verb ("a fait irruption un mal [démoniaque]") are both offered as possibilities; cf. ibid., 297. Penny and Wise and García Martínez and Tigchelaar interpret the final letter as a *dalet*, thus reconstructing פקד. Penney and Wise, "By the Power of Beelzebub," 635-637, argue convincingly that פקד באיש would be a "demon designation." The distinction made by the scribe between the letters ד and ר is indeed subtle, but, based on the infrared image of the fragment, it is most likely that פק ends with a *resh* in l. 2. Due to the various interpretations of פקר באיש, it's identification as a demonic being is likely but not certain.

[261] Cf. Penney and Wise, "By the Power of Beelzebub," 637.

[262] Eisenman and Wise, *DSS Uncovered*, 266. Similarly, Puech, *DJD XXXVII*, 296, translates "le *poison* male, et le *poison* femelle." Penney and Wise, "By the Power of Beelzebub," 638, translate חלחליא as "wasting-demon," stating that the term functions "as a designation of a demon or perhaps a proper name."

[263] Eshel, "Genres," 397.

[264] Naveh, "Fragments of an Aramaic Magic Book," 259.

demons attack males and females, or if the demons themselves are gendered. If the latter is the case, this would be a rare occurrence of an explicitly gendered demon in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[265]

The meaning of "iniquity and guilt" (עוון ופשע) in line 4 is also ambiguous. On the one hand, Puech's reconstruction allows him to translate: "qui générera iniquité et péché."[266] This reading possibly identifies demonic beings as the cause of iniquity and guilt. On the other hand, Penney and Wise reconstruct the word הנשא ("he who removes") and interpret the line to refer to God's forgiveness of sin.[267] Alternatively, it may be that a particular sin or impurity is the cause of demonic affliction. As there are several possibilities, the exact relation of עוון and פשע to the demons in the previous line and the subsequent demonic afflictions is open to interpretation.

The rest of line 4 likely describes the physical symptoms of demonic attack. The two words אשא ("fever") and עריה ("chills") combine in numerous ancient Near Eastern amulets and incantation texts.[268] אשת לבב ("heat of the heart") probably refers to "heart-burn" or a similar physical ailment. Line 5 opens with

---

[265] At one point, Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 336, notes that demons (based on an Enochic aetiology) usually do not have a gender. He later revises his opinion slightly, stating that *1 Enoch* is "simply neutral on this point." Alexander, "Contextualizing the Demonology of the Testament of Solomon," in *Die Dämonen*, 630 n. 43. Some traditions appeal to the demon Lilith as a female; cf. Fröhlich, "Theology and Demonology," 102-103. Moreover, the seductress in *4QWiles of the Wicked Woman* has been regarded by some to be a female demon, possibly to be identified as Lilith. Baumgarten, "On the Nature of the Seductress," 143, states: "*4Q184*, we submit, is the description of the seductive demoness who resides in the darkness of the netherworld but issues forth stealthily to lure the unsuspecting to apostasy and perdition." More recently, cf. Tigchelaar, "The Poetry of the *Wiles of the Wicked Women* (4Q184)," *RevQ* 25 (2012): 621-633.

[266] Puech, *DJD XXXVII*, 296.

[267] Penney and Wise, "By the Power of Beelzebub," 631, also reconstruct in l. 4 an adjuration said in the name of God (יהוה). They comment further in ibid., 640: "[i]t is a general principle in incantation texts that an epithet should emphasize those attributes of the deity relevant to the disease mentioned or the demon adjured. Evidently, the particular attribute of the deity invoked in line 4 is the ability to forgive sin and so transmute its consequences."

[268] Cf. Penney and Wise, "By the Power of Beelzebub," 641; Naveh, "Fragments of and Aramaic Magic Book," 257-258; and Fröhlich, "Theology and Demonology," 126.

בשנא ("in sleep") followed by another description of beings as דכרא ("male") and נקבתא ("female"). While a demon who attacks at night or in dreams is familiar in ancient incantation texts, it is again uncertain whether the terms "male" and "female" are applied to demons or human individuals.[269] Whatever the case, certain demons who cause specific harm are mentioned in 4Q560 column i, and the physical ways in which they influence humans are also described.

Column ii lines 5-6 depict a direct adjuration of a spiritual being. Penney and Wise identify the root ימא in the words מומה (l. 5) and אומיתכ (l. 6).[270] They interpret מומה "to be a participle, since the first word, the 1st c. sing. subject pronoun [אנה], expects a subsequent participle."[271] This results in the translation of line 5 as "and I, spirit [רוח], adjure." The root ימא appears in line 6 with the first person common singular prefix and the second person masculine singular suffix: אומיתכ ("I adjure you"). Here again, the object of the verb is a "spirit" (רוחא) which, although a generic term, within an adjuration and within the larger demonological framework of fragment 1 suggests a demonic being is being referenced.[272] Therefore, 4Q560 column ii displays two separate adjurations which, probably, directly address a demonic spirit.

Justification for Classification

---

[269] The translation given by García Martínez and Tigchelaar suggests that the "male" and "female" refer to the subjects of demonic affliction. However, they do use the masculine and feminine pronouns "he" and "she" when denoting the demons. Penney and Wise, "By the Power of Beelzebub," 632, translate "the male Shrine-spirit and the female Shrine-spirit" and convey the masculinity and femininity of specific demons. Likewise, Puech, *DJD XXXVII*, 296, interprets the phrases as "une idole mâle, et la broyeuse \ l'idole femelle," thus reflecting demons possessing gender. Naveh, "Fragments of an Aramaic Magic Book," 257, 260, understands the demons as gendered beings and notes that the root פרך means "to crush" or "to crumble," translating the terms as "male and female crushing [demons]." On another note, demonic influence relating to sleep is discussed in Penney and Wise, "By the Power of Beelzebub," 642.

[270] Penney and Wise, "By the Power of Beelzebub," 647; cf. Puech, *DJD XXXVII*, 301.

[271] Penney and Wise, "By the Power of Beelzebub," 647.

[272] Following רוחא in l. 6 Puech, *DJD XXXVII*, 300-301, reconstructs the word ב[אישא which qualifies the spirit as "evil" or "bad," although this reconstruction is not visible in the photograph of col. ii.

The presence of demonic beings and demonic influence are clearly articulated in column i, and the male and female "penetrators" (or "poisoners") and "crushers" are the most explicit examples of demons.[273] While the exact type of demonic influence described in column i is difficult to discern, it seems to include physical affliction (e.g. עלל בבשרא and אשא ועריא). If column i and column ii are related, then the adjurations of the רוח in column ii lines 5-6 may be a remedy for the demons described in column i. Unfortunately, the precise relationship between the two columns is unclear, and identifying רוח as a demonic being is based solely on context. Therefore, references to demonic beings occur in column i and, possibly, in column ii.

The contents of *4QExorcism ar* are generally regarded as exorcistic, however a definite conclusion regarding the presence and type of an anti-demonic measure in fragment 1 is not possible due to the condition of the manuscript.[274] Although the description of demons and the afflictions caused by them are detailed in column i, there is no language that is overtly anti-demonic. While multiple theories about its function may be suggested, column i, alone, is neither exorcistic nor apotropaic. If this passage once possessed directive terms for the usage and implementation of formulae they have not survived.

If the spirits in column ii are evil and the adjuration is a prescription to be used against the demons/afflictions listed in column i, then column ii would preserve one or several "exorcistic incantations." If this were the case, it is unclear how the phrase עואן ופשע (i 4) would have fit within the exorcistic character of the passage. Whether "iniquity and guilt," which describe, presumably, moral features, could be subject to an adjuration in the same way as the demons is unclear. If this

---

[273] According to Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 70, *4QExorcism ar* is significant for at least two reasons: "[1] the evidence it brings to the idea of a demon that infiltrates the victim's body...and [2] for the role of an adjurer in controlling that demonic presence."

[274] The issue of classifying the nature and purpose of the passage is made difficult by the incomplete/fragmentary condition of the manuscript. As Naveh, "Fragments of an Aramaic Magic Book," 257, explains, "[o]ne may discuss the words and their relation to each other, but since the words are not defined by clear sentences, an unequivocal interpretation cannot be suggested."

is possible, exorcism would be depicted here as efficacious in more than one type of healing.

In column ii, the likely purpose of a direct adjuration of a demon is to counteract demonic influence. Since it is reasonable to interpret a demon as the object of the adjurations in lines 5-6, column ii then possesses what may be referred to as an "exorcistic incantation," yet only insofar as "spirit" is a demonic being. Therefore, while the function of column i is unclear and the relationship between columns i and ii is unknown, *4QExorcism ar* contains exorcistic language expressed by an incantation.

2.2.4.2 *8QHymn* (8Q5)

Reconstruction and Translation of 8Q5 1 1

1]בשמכה[הג]בור אני מירא ומש[ביע

[...] by your mighty name, o, I terrify and ad[jure...[275]

Description, Comments, and Justification for Classification

8QHymn is comprised of two small fragments dated between 30 B.C. and 68 A.D.[276] Eshel's classification of this work as exorcistic is based mainly on the interpretation of fragment 1 line 1. As noted in the discussions of *4QIncantation* and *4QSongs of the Sage*[b] (§2.2.3.3 and §2.2.3.4), various interpretations of מירא are possible. From the root ירא, מירא may be an infinitive construct ("to frighten") or a *piel* participle ("exorcizing") and, hence, the phrase אני מירא could mean "I terrify/spread fear" or "I exorcize." Eshel and Baumgarten interpret מירא in 8Q5 1 1 as an exorcistic term.[277] Conversely, the phrase is translated "I spread fear" by

[275] Eshel, "Genres," 401; cf. Baillet, *DJD III*, 161.

[276] Webster, *DJDXXXIX*, 426.

[277] Cf. Eshel, "Genres," 401-402; and Baumgarten, "The Seductress," 136.

García Martínez and Tigchelaar along with Baillet.[278] Both translations depict an activity that is applied elsewhere against demons, yet אני מירא itself is not intrinsically exorcistic or apotropaic. Only context can determine whether the phrase describes a person's ability to exert influence over demons at any time or an implementation of an exorcistic ritual.

In the case of *8QHymn*, אני מירא appears alongside the invocation of an authoritative name. The adjective גבור ("strong" or "mighty") is reconstructed with שם along with a prepositional prefix: "in your mighty name, I terrify/exorcize."[279] The declaration is very similar in tone to other anti-demonic expressions (cf. 4Q511 35 6). Directly following אני מירא Eshel reconstructs the participle משביע ("to adjure"). Pairing an adjuration with מירא certainly increases the likelihood that the subject of these verbs is enacting an aggressive measure intended for an opponent, however, Eshel's reconstruction is only theoretical.[280]

No direct object of the first person activity אני מירא survives, demonic or otherwise, and the only figure mentioned is האיש הזה ("this man") in line 2, though how the broken phrases in these two lines relate is unknown.[281] Therefore, while 8Q5 fragment 1 possesses terminology that is potentially exorcistic, the overall condition of the extant material prohibits a clear exorcistic or apotropaic classification. The absence of any reference to demons or demonic influence makes uncertain whether the passage is anti-demonic. *8QHymn* is therefore ambiguous and is not categorized in this study.

---

[278] García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1167. Baillet's translation ("je sème la crainte") conveys the same meaning; cf. idem, *DJD III*, 161.

[279] If גבור possessed a definite article, and is thus a noun, the translation in García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1167, ("in your name, o Hero…") is accurate.

[280] Rather than a ש, other translators interpret the final discernible letter in l. 1 as ע; cf. Baillet, *DJD III*, 161; Baumgarten, "The Seductress," 136; and García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1166. Baillet, *DJD III*, 161, pointedly comments: "Dernière lettre : '*aïn* plutôt que *sin/shin*." Consultation of the full spectrum color and infrared images of 8Q5 1 do little to assist in determining whether the word is ומש or ומע.

[281] Baillet, *DJD III*, 162, notes "האיש הזזה doit être l'adversaire du fidele." However, the Hebrew is not explicit. The phrase כול הרוחות appears in frag. 2 l. 6 but the context is vague.

2.2.4.3 *11QApocryphal Psalms* (11Q11 i-v)

11QApocryphal Psalms is among the most significant texts for understanding the demonological traditions at Qumran.[282] Contained within its six substantive columns appear to be several anti-demonic incantations and prayers.[283] In order to delineate and classify potentially demonologically relevant material in 11Q11, a column by column assessment is warranted.

---

[282] Important studies on *11QApocryphal Psalms* include Johannes P. M. van der Ploeg, "Le Psaume XCI dans une recension de Qumran," *RB* 72 (1965): 210-217; idem, "Un petit rouleau de psaumes apocryphes (11QPsAp[a])," in *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt, Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn zum 65. Geburstag* (eds. G. Jeremiah, J.-W. Kuhn, and H. Stegemann. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 128-139; É. Puech, "11QPsAp[a]: Un ritual d'exorcismes. Essai de reconstruction," *RevQ* 14 (1990): 377-408; idem, "Les deux derniers Psaumes davidiques du ritual d'exorcisme: 11Q11PsAp[a] IV 4-V14," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls:Forty Years of Research* (eds. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; vol. 10 of *STDJ*, eds. García Martínez and Van Der Woude; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 64-89; Sanders, "A Liturgy for Healing the Stricken," 216-233; and García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 188-189.

[283] It is generally regarded that the manuscript preserves four distinct anti-demonic "songs." These are listed by Fröhlich, "Magical Healing at Qumran," 40: (1) col. i ll. 1-4; (2) col. ii l. 1-v l. 3; (3) col. v l. 4-vi l. 3 and (4) col. vi ll. 3-14. 11Q5 xxvii 10 attributes to David four songs "to perform over the possessed" (לנגן על הפגועים ארבעה); cf. Sanders, *DJD IV*, 92. Following van der Ploeg, Puech, "Un ritual d'exorcismes," 399, proposed that the four songs in 11Q11 are the Davidic songs mentioned in 11Q5: "Qui qu'il en soit, ce rouleau a apparemment conservé des restes de 4 psaumes, *a priori* « à David », qu'on devrait très vraisemblablement identifier aux « 4 Psaumes à chanter sur les possédés » mentionnés en *11QPs[a]* XXVII 9-10." Cf. van der Ploeg, "Le Psaume XCI," 216; and idem, "Un petit rouleau de psaumes apocryphes," 129. (Note: although the division of the four songs listed by Fröhlich is equivalent to Puech's arrangement, Puech uses the older column designations in his article. A table displaying the two sets of column numbers is offered in García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 182. For this study, any reference to Puech's work on 11Q11 will follow the newer designations used in *DJD XXIII*.) This theory largely is based upon the presence of הפגועים and the ascription "of David" (לדויד) in the beginning of the third song (v 1,4). Puech, "Un ritual d'exorcismes," 386-387, reconstructs the first line of song 2 as: "A David. Au sujet des paroles d'incantation]au nom[de Yahvé" (יהוה]בשם[לחש על דברי לדויד). לדויד is also reconstructed at the beginning of song 4. While this is an interesting and conceivable hypothesis, it is impossible to be certain. For challenges to the 11Q11/11Q5 connection, see García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 183.

Reconstruction and Translation of column i

]ובוכהו [	2
]שבועה[	3
]ביהוה[	4
] תנין [	5
א]ת הארׄ[ץ	6
] משב[יע	7
]את ב[	8
]הזואת[	9
]את השד[	10
]ישב[	11

2]and the one who weeps for him [
3]oath[
4]by YHWH[
5]dragon [
6] the ea[rth
7] exor[cis]ing[
8] [
9]this[
10]the demon[
11]he will dwell[[284]

Description and Comments

Column i's poor state of preservation clearly limits comments that may be made. Examination of its terminology assists in establishing, or at least suggesting, possible themes in the column, especially when compared with subsequent sections in the manuscript. The term שבועה ("oath," "swearing," or "curse"), preserved in line 3, may be associated with משביע which, according to Eshel, is an exorcistic term.[285] Likewise, the authors of *DJD XXIII* regard שבועה as an

[284] The Hebrew and English are from García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 188-189.

[285] This is according to point 2 of Eshel's points of contrast; cf. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 87; and §2.1.2.

exorcistic word, stating that "[i]t seems this column, like those following, deals with the exorcism of a demon."[286]

In line 4 the tetragram appears with the prepositional prefix (-ב). The phrase "by YHWH" could be made sense of within an exorcistic formula. "Dragon" or "serpent" (תנין) appears in line 5. The word is used in several places in the Hebrew scriptures when describing God's or a righteous person's authority over evil.[287] Fröhlich picks up on this imagery and suggests that "the words 'by YHWH' and 'the dragon' might refer to YHWH's overpowering the dragon representing evil in general."[288]

The participle משביע ("adjuring" or "exorcising") is reconstructed in line 7 and the presence of this term supports the theory that שבועה in line 2 also has exorcistic connotations. Fröhlich postulates that the appearance of both words in column i "could be the introduction of the most important element of incantations…the expulsion of the demon from the human community."[289] In following line 10 is an additional demonological term; "the demon" (השד). Despite the condition of column i, its terminology is indicative of a passage that is concerned with countering the demonic.

Reconstruction and Translation of column ii

]שמ֯[	]	1
]ה שלומה[ ]ויקר֯[א	]	2
הרו]חות[ ]והשדים [	]	3
] אלה [הש]דים ו֯ש֯[ר המשט]מה	]	4
א]שר[ ]ל֯ תהו֯[ם]ך	]	5
]לש ֯[ ]הגד[ול]והי	]	6

[286] García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 189.

[287] Isa. 27:1 describes how, in the day of the Lord, God will slay the serpent (תנין). Ps. 74:13 conveys God's power over dragons (תנינים), while Ps. 91:13 assures that the righteous man will trample the serpent (תנין) under foot. Fröhlich, "Magical Healing at Qumran" 41, further notes the association between תנין and לויתן (Leviathan) (cf. Pss. 74:14; 104:26; Isa. 27:1; and Job 3:8). Sanders, "A Liturgy for Healing the Stricken," 219, translates the term in col. i as "the sea-monster," which is more akin to "leviathan."

[288] Fröhlich, "Magic and Healing at Qumran," 41.

[289] Fröhlich, "Magic and Healing at Qumran," 41.

7]]◦◦[ ]עמו תֹ◦ וֹ רפואה
8] על]שמך נשען וקרֹ[א]
9] יש]ראל החזק
10 [ביהוה אלוהי אלים אשר עשה] את השמים
11 [ואת הארץ ואת כול אשר בם א]שׁר הבדיל[בין]
12 [האור ובין החושך]◦ עדֹ[

1] [
2 [ ] Solomon, [ ] and he shall invo[ke
3 [the spirits, [ ] and the demons, [
4 [ ] These are [the de]mons. And the p[rince of enmi]ty
5 [w]ho [ ] the a[byss]
6 [ ] [ ] the gre[at]
7 [ ] [ ]his nation [ ] cure
8 [ ]relied [upon] your name. And invo[ke]
9 [Is]rael. Lean
10 [on YHWH, the God of gods, who made] the heavens
11 [and the earth, and all that is in them, w]ho separated[ ]
12 [light form darkness] [[290]

Description and Comments

The first partially discernible line mentions "Solomon" (שלומה) followed by the expression "and he shall invoke" (ויקרא). The term קרא could indicate that the passage is an incantation.[291] The invocation together with Solomon's name corresponds to the tradition in later works where Solomon is a composer of exorcistic incantations, and where his name is invoked during an exorcism.[292]

---

[290] García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 189-191.

[291] Cf. Wright, *Origin*, 181 n. 54; and idem, "Prayer and Incantation," 77 n. 7. See also Fröhlich, "Magical Healing at Qumran," 41-42. Sanders, "A Liturgy for Healing the Stricken," 221, translates ויקרא in the past tense, reconstructing the line "[...the ac]t of Solomon when he invoke[ed the name of Yaweh...]." Given the visibility of the *vav* and *yod* in *DJD XXIII* plate xxiii, it is entirely possible that the word is a Vav Consecutive Imperfect.

[292] The *Testament of Solomon* is inundated with stories of King Solomon's encounters with demons; cf. Dennis C. Duling, "Testament of Solomon" (vol.1 of *OTP*; ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Doubleday, 1983), 935-987; and F. C. Conybeare, "The Testament of Solomon," *JQR* 11:1 (Oct., 1898): 1-45. According to this text, dated somewhere between the first and the third century A.D., the archangel Michael gives to Solomon a magical ring by which the king is able to imprison and

Bearing in mind the Solomon/exorcist tradition, and given the connotations of ויקרא, the interpretation of line 2 has two likely possibilities: (1) שלומה is being invoked as an authoritative name, or (2) the line is attributing an incantation to Solomon. This second option is favored by García Martínez et al., who offer the potential translation of line 2: "he shall utter a spell which Solomon made, and he shall invoke the name of YHWH."[293] In either instance, a revered biblical figure is

---

exert power over all demonic beings (cf. *T. Sol.* 1:6-7). The narrative relates encounters between Solomon and various demons, including Beelzeboul and Asmodeus (*T. Sol.* 3, 5-6). Solomon maintains power over these and other demons, forcing them to construct the Temple. Josephus writes that Solomon is a composer of exorcism hymns. Josephus also tells of an exorcism he witnessed in which a man (Eleazar) performed a successful exorcism using a ring and magical roots prescribed by Solomon, reciting incantations composed by Solomon, and invoking Solomon's name (Josephus, *Ant.* 8.45-47). Commenting on Josephus' account of events, Duling, "Testament of Solomon," 947, states: "Solomon's wisdom and greatness are so acknowledged that speaking his name and reciting his incantations help bring about exorcism" In ibid., 948, he further discusses Aramaic incantation bowls, of which "at least eighteen bowls refer to 'King Solomon, Son of David' and twelve or thirteen of them refer to his seal ring." While these particular bowls are dated quite late, a small metal amulet, dated to the second or third century A.D. is mentioned. This amulet possesses a Hebrew inscription referring to "the seal of Solomon." Ibid; cf. James A. Montgomery, "Some Early Amulets from Palestine," *JAOS* 31:3 (1911): 272-281. Since this amulet is intended to offer protection against future harm, it begs the question of whether the name of Solomon, in addition to having exorcistic efficacy, had apotropaic value. In addition, there is the possibility that the Solomon/exorcist tradition is present in the New Testament. Duling explores several theories that an "exorcistic Solomon" potentially is the background for "Son of David" titles in the synoptic gospels; cf. Duling, "Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David," *HTR* 68 3/4 (Oct.,1975): 235-252; cf. Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (rev. and ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman; vol. 3:1; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), 375-379. Of primary interest is Mt. 12:22-23 where, after Jesus performs an exorcism, the crowd wonders; "Can this be the Son of David?" However, a Solomon/exorcist tradition in the synoptic gospels is debated and, ultimately, not overtly apparent. If 11Q11 does connect Solomon with exorcism, it is perhaps the earliest existing text to do so. Cf. Fröhlich, "Magical Healing at Qumran," 42.

[293] García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 191.

associated with the power of exorcism. An authoritative name paired with an invocation could indicate that line 2 is introducing an anti-demonic formula.[294]

Line 3 mentions "the spirits" (הרוחות) and "the demons" (השדים). While שדים is a nondescript term denoting unnamed evil beings, use of the definite article implies a specific context. A negative interpretation of "the spirits" is likely due to the appearance of הרוחות alongside השדים. A possible reconstruction of the first part of this line, based on 4Q510 1 4-5, is]חות[לפחד ולבהל כול הרו] ("to frighten and terrify all the spirits").[295] The comparison of column ii with 4Q510 continues in line 4 where García Martínez et al. note "[t]he clause דים[הש] אלה... may suggest that the preceding sentence consisted of an enumeration of 'the demons.'"[296] אלה השדים is indeed a unique phrase and its connection to a demon list should not be ruled out.

The title שר המשטמה, which is a tentative reconstruction, appears to designate the head or chief of the demons.[297] If שר המשטמה, like Belial elsewhere (e.g. 1QS), is an evil angel who holds dominion over the lot of demons opposed to humanity, the construction of שדים with the definite article is put into sharper focus; namely, lines 3-4 could be referring to Prince Mastema and his army of evil

---

[294] This hypothesis is more probable if ויקרא is part of an apodosis; cf. García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 191. See also col. v l. 4.

[295] García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 191. A second reconstruction is וחות]הר לפלט מכול נגע ("pour qu'il délivre de tout fléau des esprits"); cf. Puech, "Un ritual d'exorcismes," 386-387.

[296] García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 191. A reconstruction of this demon list based on 4Q510 1 5 and 4Q511 10 1 is also suggested. Cf. Puech, "Un ritual d'exorcismes," 386,388.

[297] According to *Jub.* 10:8, Mastema is referred to as "the chief of [evil] the spirits"; cf. Wintermute, "Jubilees," 76. For a discussion of these terms and the function of the prince/chief of the demons, see Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 341-344; and Wright, *Origin*, 157-160. Also, in 1QM xiii 11, in reference to "Angel of Enmity," García Martínez and Tigchelaar reconstruct the word משפטה, while Alexander reconstructs משטמה, and in 11Q11 ii 4, while García Martínez and Tigchelaar translate שר המשטמה as "Prince of Animosity," García Martínez et al. in *DJD XXIII* render the Hebrew word as "Prince of Enmity." As seen in these in these instances, "animosity" and "enmity" are understood as an interchangeable description to be applied to the chief angel. These translations are found in the following: Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 334; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 134-135, 1200-1201; and García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 189-190.

spirits and the demons. The extant text, especially the "incantation-*esque*" character of line 2, conveys that specific demonic beings are singled out as objects within an aggressive conflict.

The word תהום ("the abyss"), reconstructed in line 5, could potentially be related to "Sheol," which is, in some cases, a place of judgment.[298] In line 8, trust in "your name," presumably the name of God, is asserted (על שמך נשען). The verb נשען is either a perfect or a participle and is present in the Hebrew scriptures within the context of reliance on God.[299] This is followed by another appearance of קרא which, in this case, is probably the simple imperative "invoke." Thus, reference to a reliance on God's name, together with a mandate to invoke, display continuity with incantation themes found in column i and at the beginning of column ii.

The phrases את השמים ("the heavens") and שר הבדיל ("who separated") in lines 10 and 11 lead commentators to reconstruct descriptions of God's creative acts.[300] Creation imagery along with mention of "the abyss" (l. 5) may hint at a Watcher aetiology of demons. In the Watcher tradition, according to Alexander, "demons originate from a perversion of nature which probably explains why so often in magical texts among the Scrolls the fallen angels and the demons are associated with the abyss and are reminded of the creative power of God."[301] In addition to a connection with Enochic tradition, Eshel includes the reference to creative acts as "a common part of various incantations."[302] Given these possible connotations, את הארץ in column i line 6 may have similar significance.

---

[298] Cf. *Jub.* 5:14; 22:22; 24:31. In *1 En.* 21, the abyss is described as the "prison house" of the rebellious angels; cf. Isaac, "Enoch," 24.

[299] Cf. Isa. 10:20, 50:10 and 2 Chr. 13:18, 14:10. García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 192, state: "The Name is a protection against demons…The use of the 2nd person suggests that this clause is part of a speech to God."

[300] Van der Ploeg, "Un petit rouleau de psaumes apocryphes," 132, states: "Les lignes 10-11 peuvent avoir contenu une allusion à la création (Gen. I) où Dieu sépara (הבדיל) la lumière et les ténèbres." García Martínez et al. offer their translation based on Puech's suggested reconstruction; cf. Puech, "Un ritual d'exorcismes," 386, 388, and 392.

[301] Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 341.

[302] Eshel, "Genres," 404.

Description and Comments for column iii

In column iii similar and yet more abundant creation language occurs. ארץ appears four times in lines 1-6, twice with the definite article (cf. ll. 2, 3, 6). The question "who made these portents and wonders on the earth?" is a partial reconstruction of the end of line 2 and beginning of line 3. While this type of rhetorical question emphasizes God as creator and has biblical precedent, Sanders holds that the inquiry here "would be directed at a demon or spirit to be exorcized."[303] If Sanders is correct, an assertion of God's creative power directed at demons with the intention of coercing them would be similar to the glorification of God for anti-demonic purpose in 4Q510-511. Whereas this method is used in an apotropaic manner in the *Songs of the Sage* (cf. §2.2.3.4), it would serve as an exorcistic adjuration in 11Q11 iii.

The answer to the question "who made these portents…?" begins with the tetragram.[304] יהוה appears three times in this column, perhaps invoked as an authoritative name. However, there is an obstacle to interpreting lines 2 and following as an exorcistic expression; namely, there are no demonological epithets or vocabulary preserved in the column. The lack of "spirits," "demons," or "dragons" (terms present in cols. i-ii) casts doubt upon the theory that the question is a direct address to demonic beings.[305] The only way to view the question in its

---

[303] Sanders, "A Liturgy for Healing the Stricken," 223 n. 20. Fröhlich adopts this exorcistic view of col. iii as well, but on the basis of the word משביע in l. 4; cf. idem, "Magic and Healing at Qumran," 42. Preceding the question, Puech, "Un ritual d'exorcismes," 387, reconstructs the directive "and say to him" (ואמרתה אליו). If this phrase was present, it would increase the likelihood that the following question was meant as an adjuration. For biblical examples of this type of question, see Isa. 40:12 and Job 38:4-11.

[304] "*3*…It is he, YHWH [who] *4* made [these through] his [strength]…" García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 194.

[305] The word משביע does appear toward the end of l. 4, but the context is uncertain. The last discernible letter of the line is a *mem*, leading most scholars to reconstruct the object of משביע as "angels" (מלאכיו); cf. Puech, "Un ritual d'exorcismes," 387; Sanders, "A Liturgy for Healing the Stricken," 222-223; García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 192,194; and García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1202-1203. García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 194, note the possibility that the object may be "the bastards" (ממזרים), offering the reconstruction: "God adjures the bastards and

extant form as part of an exorcistic incantation is to interpret the passage within the context of column ii. This unity between the columns is certainly tenable. Fröhlich contends that columns ii and iii are one song, and the similar language at the end of the former and beginning of the latter does not contradict this supposition.[306] However, while it is entirely reasonable to view columns ii and iii as a single hymn, an exorcistic formula is not explicit in column iii, and it is uncertain if one was ever present.

Description and Comments for column iv

Column iv opens in line 1 with the participle משביע which may be similar to the word's use in column iii line 4 (i.e., "angels" are the direct object) or, given the context of column iv, it may be directed at demons.[307] The passage goes on to describe the aggressive actions of God which include the verb יככה (l. 4), a double accusative of נכה found in a curse formula in Deuteronomy 28:22.[308] Further vocabulary, such as the "great abyss" (לתהום רבה), "deepest Sheol" (התחתיה [ולשאול]), and "darkness" (חשך) (ll. 7-8), alludes to the judgment of demons as depicted in *Jubilees* and Enochic tradition (cf. ii 5). "Abaddon" ("destruction," l. 10) appears as a title, but little else can be deciphered. Alexander writes, "it is unclear whether Abaddon is the name of an angel or demon, or a

---

the seed of evil to appear before him." However, since ממזרים would be out of place in col. iii, and since the term does not appear anywhere else in 11Q11, this latter reconstruction is doubtful.

[306] Fröhlich, "Magic and Healing at Qumran," 42, argues that col. ii l. 2 "substantiates Solomon's role as an exorcist. Subsequent lines mention a list of demons, the netherworld, the magical power of YHWH and his creation of the universe (11Q11 4 ii 4-[14]). The hymnic part enumerates YHWH's signs and wonders (11Q11 4 iii 1-5)." Thus, this view interprets the creation imagery of col. iii (including the question "who made…?") as simply an ensuing hymnic component a larger anti-demonic expression.

[307] It is, perhaps, the case that "YHWH summons an angel or angels to do something. However, since the next lines (4-6) address the demon, it is also possible that the text deals with the adjuration of a demon." García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 197.

[308] Cf. Puech, "Un ritual d'exorcismes," 395; Sanders, "A Liturgy for Healing the Stricken," 225; and García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 197.

name for hell."[309] The phrase "with the curse of Abaddon" (בקללת האבדון) probably implies that Abaddon is a description of a place of judgment since the title occurs within a larger discussion of the abyss and God's destruction.[310]

One serious challenge when interpreting this column is that, like column iii, no demonic being is explicitly mentioned. This makes it difficult to ascertain the precise object of משביע in line 1 or the recipient of the curse in line 4. Therefore, notwithstanding the terminology in lines 1-4, and even though lines 6-12 seem to be demonologically oriented, no complete exorcistic expression or incantation is present in the passage. Column iv is much like column iii; it is probably an extension or hymnic component of a larger incantation.

Reconstruction and Translation of column v

2 אשר[ ]הפגוע[ים]
3 נדבי א[ר]פאל שלמ[ם אמן אמן סלה] *vacat*
4 לדויד ע[ל ל]חש בשם יהו[ה קרא בכו]ל עת
5 אל השמ[ים כי]יבוא אליך בלי[לה וא]מרתה אליו
6 מי אתה [הילוד מ]אדם ומזרע הקד[ושי]ם פניך פני
7 [שו]ו וקרניך קרני חל[ו]ם חושך אתה ולוא אור
8 [עו]ל ולוא צדקה[ ]שר הצבה יהוה [יוריד]ך
9 [לשאו]ל תחתית [ויסגור דל]תי נחושת ב[אלה לו]א

2 which [ ]the possessed[
3 the volunteers of [Ra]phael has healed [them. Amen, amen. Selah.] *vacat*
4 Of David. A[gainst An incanta]tion in the name of YHW[H. Invoke at an]y time
5 the heav[ens. When]he comes to you in the nig[ht,] you will [s]ay to him:
6 'Who are you, [oh offspring of] man and of the seed of the ho[ly one]s? Your face is a face of
7 [delu]sion and your horns are horns of ill[us]ion, you are darkness and not light,
8 [injust]ice and not justice.[ ]the chief of the army, YHWH [will bring] you [down]
9 [to the] deepest [Sheo]l, [and he will shut the] two bronze [ga]tes thr[ough which n]o[311]

---

[309] Alexander, "Demonology," 341. Puech, "Un ritual d'exorcismes," 395, interprets אבדון as a place of judgment, stating "On lirait ici les conséquences des agissements des démons."

[310] This would also make sense given the relationship between אבד in l. 4 and the title אבדון.

[311] García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 198-200.

Description and Comments

Line 2 preserves הפגוע, which has been theoretically constructed as a masculine plural noun. Like the appearance of הפגועים in 11Q5 xxvii 10, the word probably describes people who are harmfully influenced in some way (i.e., "stricken" or "possessed"). Whereas the context of 11Q5 xxvii implies a particular interpretation of the term, the remaining context in 11Q11 is sparse. רפאל is reconstructed in the following line, and the tradition of Raphael as a healer of demonic affliction is congruent with reading הפגועים as a reference to stricken individuals.[312] Although the relationship between הפגועים in line 2 and רפאל in line 3 is not known, a connection between the two would imply an authoritative figure within a demonologically oriented context. Due to the theory that one song ends and another begins in this column, and given its presence in column vi, the expression אמן אמן סלה is reconstructed at the end of line 3.[313]

Line 4 opens with the attribution לדויד, the only extant reference to David in 11Q11.[314] Next, the word לחש is reconstructed which is generally translated as "incantation" or "charm." Although it could also be read as an imperative *piel*, the following phrase "in the name of YHWH" (בשם יהוה) qualifies לחש as a spell or song to be said in God's name.[315] The line ends by mentioning time (עת), which

---

[312] The infinitive רפא can mean "to heal," "to cure," or "to restore." For Raphael as healer, see Tob. 6:8; 11:8. Raphael's exorcism ritual is found in Tob. 6:7; 8:2-3.This Raphael tradition was known at Qumran, as several manuscripts of Tobit were found in cave four (4Q196 – 4Q200). Moreover, Raphael was a key player in Enochic tradition. In the Book of Watchers, it is Raphael who is charged with binding Azaz'el "into the darkness" so that "he may not see light" (*1 En.* 10:4-6); cf. Isaac, "Enoch," 17.

[313] Cf. Puech, "Un ritual d'exorcismes,"387,397; and García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 198, 200.

[314] Following "of David," the letter ע is preserved. Parallel to 11Q5 xviii 9-10, García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 200, suggest the possible reconstruction ע]ל פגוע, thus introducing the hymn as "of David, against/upon the possessed."

[315] While García Martínez et al. note the possibility of identifying לחש as an imperative *piel*, interpreting the word as "incantation" is favored in their translation; cf. idem, *DJD XXIII*, 199-200.

Fröhlich suggests functions as a "temporal reference" indicating "the occasion for the recitation of the song."[316] There are two reasons why "invoke" (קרא) is reconstructed in this line. First, there is precedent within the composition that an invocation is associated with the one who composed the hymn (cf. ii 2). Hence, invoking a Davidic incantation in column v is much like invoking a Solomonic hymn in column ii.[317] Second, the incantation is expressly linked to the divine name. The practice of relying on God's name, in this case for an effective implementation of a song, is consistent with the presence of the tetragram elsewhere in 11Q11 (e.g. i 4; iii 3; iv 4, 11). The introduction of a Davidic hymn in line 4 indicates that this is the beginning of another anti-demonic song, further supporting reading אמן אמן סלה in line 3.

In line 5 there is the expression "[when] he comes to you" (יבוא אליך). Since line 4 ends with עת, line 5 likely clarifies when the invocation should be used. The invading entity or the time of need is described in line 5 with בלי. Puech argues that the verb יבוא requires a subject and reconstructs the word "Belial" (בליעל).[318] Others reconstruct the phrase "in night" (בלילה), but both reconstructions are grammatically and syntactically feasible.[319] If בליעל is correct then 11Q11 v would have the unique distinction of containing a Davidic incantation against Belial. In addition, this reference would potentially correspond to the identity of שר המשטמה

Fröhlich, "Magical Healing at Qumran," 42, emphasizes this definition of the term: "It [לחש] clearly refers to a magical song used against demonic forces."

[316] Fröhlich, "Magical Healing at Qumran," 72.

[317] This supposition is further strengthened when we call to mind the parallels between 11Q11 v and 11Q5 xxviii, the latter of which explicitly attributes exorcistic songs to David.

[318] Puech, "Un ritual d'exorcismes," 381, 383; cf. Sanders, "A Liturgy for Healing the Stricken," 226-227.

[319] For those who reconstruct בלילה, cf. van der Ploeg, "Un petit rouleau de psaumes apocryphes," 135,137; García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 198; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1202; and Fröhlich, "Magical Healing at Qumran," 42. García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 200, summarize: "The choice between the two readings depends on the overall understanding of the text. בלי[לה is only possible if the subject was already mentioned in the text, e.g., in the heading. The mention of the night is perfectly possible as it is the most dangerous moment. Belial is not mentioned elsewhere in this psalm (except for col. VI 3...which is not pertinent), but nothing in the text opposes this reading."

in column ii line 4. However, the reconstruction בלילה is equally convincing. Since lines 4-5 appear to be introducing an incantation to be used "any time," it may not have been intended for one specific evil being. This, plus the association of demons with the night, indicates that בלילה is the more probable reconstruction.

Line 5 closes with the instruction "you will say to him/it" (ואמרתה אליו) and, presumably, אליו refers to the demonic addressee of the formula. This directive introduces words of confrontation beginning in line 6. When directed at a demon, the question "who are you?" (מי אתה) serves as an authoritative component of the incantation; that is, learning the identity of a being displays power over that being.[320] Part of the demon's identity is described as "seed of the holy ones" (מ[ושי]ח הקד[מזרע), and the occurrence of "man" (אדם) in connection with angelic lineage leads to the reconstruction of "offspring" (הילוד). Thus, "offspring of man and of the seed of the holy ones" places the demon within the framework of an aetiology of evil spirits from the Watcher tradition.[321] The "face" (פני) of the demon is characterized with the reconstruction שוו (from שוא, meaning "delusion" or "emptiness"),[322] followed by a reference to the demon's "horns" (קרני) as an

---

[320] Fröhlich, "Magical Healing at Qumran," 43, describes this as "a regular formula in any exorcism." Langton, *Demonology*, 28, notes that in Babylonian exorcisms, knowledge of the afflicting demon's name is another important element: "It was held that before a demon could be cast out its name must be known and mentioned. Knowledge of the name was believed to give the exorcist power over the unseen foe." Cf. Campbell Bonner, "The Technique of Exorcism," *HTR* 36 (1943): 39-49. Given Langton's observations, Wilfred Knox's conclusion that asking for a name in later magical papyri is "a reflection of Hellenistic magic" is unconvincing; cf. W. L. Knox, "Jewish Liturgical Exorcism," *HTR* 31.3 (July, 1938): 195. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 84, in his discussion on exorcistic language in the synoptic gospels, states: "the possession of someone's name was thought to include power over that person." There are also numerous examples of the importance of the name for incantations in the PGM (cf. I 160-162; IV 3037-3047; VIII 6); cf. Hans Dieter Betz, ed., *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, Including the Demotic Spells* (The University of Chicago Press, 1992).

[321] As noted by García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 201, this reference to the demon as a descendant of the angelic Watchers and humans "is not compatible with the reading of בל[על in the previous line." This is because Belial, while prince or chief of the demons, is not the spirit of a giant; cf. Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 341-342. This is another reason to reconstruct בלילה in l. 5.

[322] פני is the construct of פנה. Puech's translation of the phrase פניך פני in line 5 ("Ton visage est un visage de") is similar to that in *DJD XXIII*; cf. Puech, "Un ritual d'exorcismes," 382. Sanders, "A

"illusion." Although both שוו and חלום are theoretical reconstructions, they make sense of the surviving text.[323] If, as line 6 suggests, the demon is thought to be a spirit of a giant, the horns and face must be taken metaphorically. קרן could represent either "fear" or "power," while פני could simply refer to the entity's presence.[324] In any case, lines 6-7 are more than descriptions of demonic characteristics, indeed they are, as Alexander denotes, a "strategy of psychological counter-attack."[325] The practice of disparaging the demon's features is an element of the anti-demonic measure. The assertion "you are darkness and not light" (חושך אתה ולוא אור) at the end of line 7 is also included in this incantation technique.

The remaining lines of column v presumably continue along similar lines. A reasonably solid portrait of the column may sketched from an examination of lines 2-7. Essentially, the passage appears to be an anti-demonic expression attributed to David, complete with instructions for its implementation. Its performance or invocation includes reliance on the name of God and suggests remarks with which to address the demon. These include learning the identity of the being and mocking its attributes as useless. While certain aspects of the passage remain open to debate (e.g. the presence of "invoke" in l. 3 and the reconstruction of בלי in l. 5), column v probably functioned as a distinct anti-demonic hymn.

Liturgy for Healing the Stricken," 227, prefers "Your presence (is) the presence of." Both "face" and "presence" could be understood in a non-corporal/metaphorical manner, as is usually the case when interpreting "the face of God" (cf. Exod. 33:20; and Num. 6:25). On the reconstruction of שוו and alternative readings of line 7, see García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 201.

[323] In addition, "emptiness" (שוא) and "illusion" (חלום) appear together in Zech. 10:2. For a discussion on these and alternative reconstructions, see García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 201.

[324] Puech, "Un ritual d'exorcismes," 383, states: "Les cornes étant le symbole de la puissance." Fröhlich, "Magical Healing at Qumran," 43, recognizes the symbolism of the horns vis-à-vis other depictions of Mesopotamian demons and "semi-divine figures" in the ancient Near East. In doing so, she adopts a more literal interpretation of קרני and קרן, noting that these may be part of an "apparition" of the afflicting being in col. v.

[325] Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 346. Likewise, García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 201, contend: "Both the face and the horns inspire fear. By proclaiming these to be delusionary, the one who speaks these words negates their awesomeness."

Justification for Classification

References to demonic beings are found throughout *11QApocryphal Psalms* i-v, including the word תנין in column i and the more explicit שד in columns i and ii. שר המשטמה is also mentioned in column ii and, regardless of its exact identity, its association with "the demons" and "the abyss" renders "Prince Mastema" an evil entity. The occurrence of a demonic being, with the nature of a disembodied spirit of a giant, is inferred from the context of column v.

The clearest portrayal of demonic affliction may be "the possessed" (הפגוע) in column v, which possibly depicts physical demonic possession. The subsequent assertion that "Raphael has healed [them]" further suggests that bodily harm is in view. Another potential account of demonic influence is found in column v line 12 where the words לו הרע precede a reconstruction of שד. If הרע is a *hifil* form of רעע, it would then carry the meaning that a demon causes evil or harm to an individual.[326] Other than these fairly indistinct phrases in column v, the nature of demonic influence is not specified. However, the abundant judgment language, the descriptions of God's aggression and anger, and the overall theme of the passages suggest that demons are in conflict with the faithful and must be countered.

Although the columns' state of preservation prevent extensive analysis, the third person references to God (ביהוה) in column i line 4 and column ii line 10 suggest that any hymn or prayer in the columns are not addressed to God. In column ii Solomon is mentioned and demonic beings are introduced, though not in direct relation to God. Given the demonologically oriented language in the first two columns, if God is not the addressee it is likely that demonic beings are the ones addressed by the passages. Columns iii and iv contain multiple occurrences of the tetragram within a third person context. The hymnic nature of these columns gives the impression that they may have been words glorifying God to frighten demons (c.f. 4Q510 frag. 1), but this is not explicit. The addressee of the passage

[326] Along with this possibility, García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 202, point out that הרע may also be a noun with the definite article or an adjective. In any case, the meaning in l. 12 is vague resulting from the poor condition of the column.

in column v is specified as demonic, and the command "you shall say to him" (l. 5), the characterization "seed of the holy ones" (l. 6), and the charges of insult in the following lines imply that the content is addressed to demons.

The anti-demonic terminology in columns i-v is exorcistic rather than apotropaic. A word like מירא, which may mean "exorcize," can also have apotropaic connotations (cf. 4Q444 and 4Q511), though in *11QApocryphal Psalms* we encounter the participle משביע and שבועה meaning "swearing" or "exorcising." The appearance of the participle together with the demonological references and the phrase "by YHWH" (col. i) point toward an exorcistic function of the passage. משביע also appears in column iv, but in a less explicit context.

The occurrence of authoritative names throughout the work, including the tetragram, is significant. The name of Solomon is referenced in proximity with קרא in column ii. Raphael appears as a healer, possibly in connection to those possessed, and an incantation is attributed to David in column v. These authority figures could conceivably be referred to in an apotropaic manner, however, the presence of the names along with terms such as משביע and קרא, within passages likely directed toward demons, are more suitable to exorcism. Furthermore, if הפגוע in column v is translated as "the possessed ones," this then depicts a situation in which individuals are currently undergoing affliction.

Regarding the form of prayers in columns i-v, לחש occurs in column v. Defining the word as a type of charm, spell, or song would constitute a formulaic expression. Moreover, phrases used throughout the columns further support reading the contents as formulaic, including "exorcizing," "invoke," and an expression said "by YHWH" (col. i) or "in the name of YHWH" (col. v). The hymnic nature of columns ii and iii also characterize aspects of the passages as song-like. Since these formulaic expressions are probably directed at demonic beings for remedial purposes, 11Q11 i-v are to be classified as exorcistic incantations.

2.2.5 An Exorcistic Narrative in *1QGenesis Apocryphon*

Stuckenbruck offers a brief excursus on selected sections of the *Genesis Apocryphon* and asks whether column xx lines 12-16 contain a plea for deliverance.[327] Although he ultimately stops short of classifying the passage as such, there is relevant material which warrants a brief examination.

Reconstruction and Translation of column xx lines 16-17, 28-29

16 ארעא ובכית וחשית בליליא דן שלח לה אל עליון רוח מכדש למכתשה ולכול אנש ביתה רוח
17 באישא והואת כתשא לה ולכול אנש ביתה ולא יכל למקרב בהא ואף לא ידעהא והיא עמה

28 כול מדינת מצרין וכען צלי עלי ועל ביתי ותתגער מננה רוחא דא באישתא וצלית
על[וה]י[די] אסופא
29 הו וסמכת ידי ע̇ל̇ [ר]אישה ואתפלי מנה מכתשא ואתגערת [מנה רוח]
באישתע וחי וקם ויהב

16 of the earth." So I wept and was deeply troubled. During that night, the Most High God sent a pestilential spirit to afflict him, and to every person of his household an evil
17 spirit. It was an ongoing affliction for him and every person of his household, so that he was not able to approach her, nor did he have sexual relations with her. She was with him

28 every district of Egypt! But now pray over me and my household, that this evil spirit may be driven away from us. So I prayed over [hi]m, that I might heal
29 him, and I laid my hands upon his [h]ead. Thus, the affliction was removed from him, and the evil [spirit] driven away [from him]. The king recovered, rose up, and gave[328]

Description and Comments

[327] Cf. Stuckenbruck, "*Pleas for Deliverance*," 62-64.

[328] Daniel A. Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon* (vol. 79 of *STDJ*, ed. F. García Martínez; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 75-77.

1Qap Gen is written in Aramaic and belongs to, according to some, the genre of "rewritten Bible."[329] It is dated between 30 B.C. and 68 A.D.[330] A tradition preserved in column xx describes an encounter between Abraham, Sarai, and the Pharaoh. Pharaoh takes custody of Sarai and lines 12-16, which are the focus of Stuckenbruck's discussion, describe a prayer offered by Abraham to God for the safe keeping and preservation of Sarai. In answer to this prayer, God sends upon Pharaoh an evil spirit to afflict him. Pharaoh eventually petitions Abraham to pray over him that he might be healed and Abraham performs an exorcism-like ritual to relieve Pharaoh's suffering. It is precisely this description of an inflicting spirit and the liberation from that spirit vis-à-vis Abraham's action that is of interest here.

Qualified "spirits" are referred to in several lines (16-17, 28-29): רוח מכדש, רוח באישא, רוחא באישתא, and רוח באישתע. In line 16, "spirit" (רוח) is in construct with מכדש ("plague" or "pestilence"), while in the other three instances it is qualified with the adjective באיש ("evil" or "bad").[331] There is little debate that the terms, translated as "pestilential spirit" and "evil spirit," denote demonic beings. For Fitzmyer, this is indicated by Abraham's subsequent casting out of the entity.[332] Fitzmyer and others also cite the passage as a reflection of the belief that demons cause physical harm to a person.[333]

When the narrative of column xx is taken into account, it is clear for two reasons that demonic affliction is in view. First, רוח מכדש is sent as a punishing instrument in response to Abraham's prayer for protection. Although there are

---

[329] Fröhlich, "Theology and Demonology," 124, employs the term "rewritten Bible," describing it as "a paraphrase of biblical narratives." For a discussion of the literary nature of *Genesis Apocryphon* and the genre "rewritten Bible," consult Machiela, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 2-5.

[330] Webster, *DJD XXXIX*, 423.

[331] Cf. Machiela, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 261,284.

[332] Refuting Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin's translation of רוח מכדש as "a pestilential wind," Fitzmyer explains that Abraham's exorcism of the affliction in l. 29 demonstrates that the term refers to something other than a wind; cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: A Commentary* (2ed.; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971), 131.

[333] Cf. Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 131; Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 347; Fröhlich, "Theology and Demonology," 125; and Klutz, "The Grammar of Exorcism," 156-158.

instances of non-demonic afflictions such as sickness and disease being sent by God as punishment (cf. Deut. 29:15-68; Lev. 14-45; and 4Q504 1-2 iii l8-13), the term רוח paired with a negative qualifier (באיש/מכדש) suggests an evil spiritual being. Second, the harmful force is something effectively expelled by a ritual and prayer. In lines 28 and 29 the word גער is used to describe the expulsion or the "driving away" of the malignant entity. As Fitzmyer and others point out, this is a strong verb, sometimes translated "rebuke," and is often used in exorcistic contexts.[334] Therefore, רוח מכדש and רוח באיש should be seen as referring to a demonic being inflicting a physical malady on the Pharaoh and his household.

Justification for Classification

The counteractive measure against the demon in column xx is exorcistic in nature. Abraham confronts an evil spirit that is already assaulting Pharaoh. Here again, גער is important for the context of the ritual in that the afflicted individual recovers only after the evil spirit is "rebuked"/"driven out" by the efforts of Abraham. However, while one might expect to see an adjuration of the demon, possibly said in the name of God, any formulaic prayer is absent. The only mention of a prayer is the terse reference in lines 28-29: "so I prayed over him, that I might heal him." No specific details about the formula are given and one is left with mere speculation as to its contents.[335] Therefore, column xx is a narrative description of

---

[334] Regarding the verb, Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 138, states: "Its sense seems to be 'to exorcise' (i.e., drive out by a command)." Machiela, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 265, translates the verb "to rebuke, banish." Cf. Macintosh, "Hebrew גער," 471-479.

[335] A unique aspect is the laying on of hands accompanying the prayer (l. 29). This activity as a method of healing in Jewish ritual is exclusive to 1Qap Gen, but there are interesting parallels between the action and its use by Jesus in the synoptic gospels. Noting Flusser's similar observation, Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 140, states that the incident in 1Qap Gen "is the first time that the rite of healing by the laying on of hands has been found in Jewish sources, for it does not appear in the OT nor in rabbinical literature"; cf. Flusser, "Healing Through the Laying-On of Hands," 107-108. Likewise, Fröhlich, "Theology and Demonology," 125, contends that the laying on of hands "is not known from Mesopotamian practice." Both Fitzmyer and Adela Yarbro Collins draw attention to the similarity between Abraham's action in 1Qap Gen and the many instances in the synoptic gospels where Jesus heals people by laying his hands upon them; cf. Fitzmyer,

an exorcistic ritual. The portrayal of Abraham as an exorcist is indicative of the early Jewish practice of granting the authority over demons to influential and powerful figures.[336] While the tradition of Abraham in this role is unique to the *Genesis Apocryphon*, it is not surprising to learn that he is thought of as an authoritative figure.

2.3 Conclusions

The first part of this chapter (§2.1) notes four scholarly observations (cf. §2.1.4), which are illustrated by the examination of the primary literature:

First, demonic beings are in some way present in, if not the focus of, anti-demonic passages.

Second, passages are divided between prayers or expressions addressed either directly to God or the demons. It is evident from our assessment that, in general, demons are addressed by exorcistic expressions and God is the recipient of apotropaic pleas. An exception is the apotropaic incantations in *Songs of the Sage* in which the hymnic glorification of God is invoked with the purpose of warding off evil spirits. Here, neither God nor the demons are specifically addressed, although the demons are the intended "targets" of the formula. This has more to do with the form of an incantation than with the purpose of apotropaic prayer.

Third, there is a demonological component within early Jewish material compared with the relative lack of such language in the Hebrew scriptures. This is evident in the wealth of demonologically oriented terminology in the Qumran scrolls and *Jubilees* versus the absence of such components in the Priestly Blessing and Psalm 91, which suggests an emerging emphasis on the integration of demonic beings into the prayer life of early Judaism.

Genesis Apocryphon, 140; and Collins, *Mark*, 370. Note in particular Lk. 4:40-41 where Jesus lays his hands upon the possessed and rebukes (ἐπιτιμων) the demons.

[336] For example, Solomon, David, and Raphael are all connected to exorcistic activities in some degree in *11QApocryphal Psalms* (cf. §2.2.4.3).

Fourth, later anti-demonic prayers adapt earlier models of petition from the Hebrew scriptures. Generally, there is a familiar process first of praising God followed by a request for assistance; a method found in many of the Hebrew psalms. More specifically, it is apparent in the Qumran and other early Jewish apotropaic traditions that basic petitionary patterns are recurrent and similar to, for example, biblical Psalm 119:133.

The analysis and classification of primary literature also helps clarify issues discussed in §2.1.5. Demons are depicted as spiritual or, at least, non-corporal beings that have the capacity and desire to inflict harm upon human individuals. They are further described in some cases (*Jubilees*, *Plea for Deliverance*, etc.) as opposed to God and thus intent on the affliction of a righteous individual.[337] There appears to be no significant distinction between the terms "demon" and "evil spirit." A multitude of other names and epithets occur, often with a certain meaning implied by a particular term such as the "bastard spirits" (e.g. 4Q444, 4Q510-511), which signals the influence of the Watcher myth. On occasion, proper names (e.g. Belial, Mastema) are used and, although the precise nature of these named beings is vague, they often represent an individual arch or head evil being. The epithet שטן functions both as a proper name and as a general term for an adversarial being or class of demons. The influence of Enochic demonology upon the Qumran works and *Jubilees* is extensive, yet, this is not the only demonological paradigm present in early Jewish literature. There are definite instances not only of the influence of Mesopotamian demon traditions, but also of the presence of ancient Near Eastern anti-demonic features. In essence, complex demonologies are found in early Jewish literature and the above analysis highlights the importance of context for interpreting the exact nature of a demonic being.

There are a number of accounts where demons inflict bodily harm upon an individual under the form of disease, sickness, or death (e.g., *Genesis Apocryphon*, 4Q560, *Prayer of Noah*). Other types of demonic assault are spiritual and are described as "leading astray" (e.g., *Prayer of Levi*, 4Q510, *Noah's Prayer*) or

[337] In other cases, the reason for a demon to attack an individual is not mentioned. The one explicit exception to this is in *Genesis Apocryphon*, where a demon is send by God to afflict Pharaoh.

"ruling over" (e.g., *Plea for Deliverance*, *Moses' Intercession*) a righteous person. The typical manifestation of spiritual influence is demonic temptation which can coerce an individual to abandon the law or worship idols, although it is unlikely that temptation itself is demonic. In *4QIncantation*, for example, the discussion surrounding "spirits of controversy" and a "spirit of wickedness" describes natural internal proclivities. The specific type and result of demonic affliction varies from passage to passage and the diversity of demonic influence is evident in the assessment of the primary literature.

This study's definition of "incantation" is suggested so as to include all relevant anti-demonic formulae while excluding other forms of prayer. The application of this definition to certain passages sufficiently characterizes the form of an expression, while further enhancing the categories "apotropaic" and "exorcistic." The usefulness of this definition is seen, for example, in the description of *Songs of the Sage* as "incantation."

When categorizing anti-demonic passages, the complexities of each passage contribute to the understanding of its overall function and, in this way, details such as the addressee of a prayer, the object of an adjuration, or the focus of a petition, are taken into consideration. The basic form of a prayer (e.g. a petition or a hymnic expression) is also an essential component for classification. These factors need to be accounted for when categorizing an anti-demonic passage as either "exorcistic" or "apotropaic."

The second part of this chapter (§2.2) analyzes types of "anti-demonic" prayers which either prevent impending demonic harm (apotropaic) or remedy current demonic affliction (exorcistic). This examination demonstrates that the categories "apotropaic" and "exorcistic" need to be nuanced in order to reflect the various forms that anti-demonic language may take. Since exorcistic elements are present within narratives and articulated in formulaic fashion, the classifying terms "exorcistic incantation" and "exorcistic narrative" are useful. Similarly, apotropaisms take a petitionary form or are expressed through a formula and, thus, there is a distinction between "apotropaic petitions" and "apotropaic incantations." In cases where an anti-demonic passage is not in the form of a narrative, incantation, or petition, it is appropriate to describe such passages as containing

apotropaic or exorcistic "elements" or "features." These classifying terms are flexible enough to bring all pertinent anti-demonic material into conversation without excluding significant works that do not adhere to strict criteria. However, the terms are specific enough to describe the overall nature and function of a given passage. The following table displays the application of these classifications to the early Jewish literature examined in this chapter:[338]

Figure 2.3

Apotropaic Petitions	**Apotropaic Incantations**	**Passages w/ Apotropaic Elements**	**Exorcistic Incantations**	**Exorcistic Narratives**
4Q213a (*Prayer of Levi*)	4Q510-511	4Q444[339]	4Q560	Tobit
11Q5 (*Plea for Deliverance*)			11Q11 i-v	*Genesis Apocryphon*
11Q11 vi (Ps. 91)				
Jub. 1:20 (*Moses' Intercession*)				
Jub. 10:1-6 (*Prayer of Noah*)				
Jub. 12:20 (*Abram's Prayer*)				
Jub. 19:28 (*Abraham's Blessing*)				

This chapter is concerned to address the nature of apotropaism and the response to demonic evil within early Jewish literature. In this regard, three points may be made:

First, there is more than one way to ascertain or ensure protection from future demonic harm in that there are different forms of apotropaic prayer.

---

[338] There are seven passage examined which are not assigned a classification. The Priestly Blessing (Num. 6:24-26), biblical Psalm 91, 8Q5, and Psalm 155 (11Q5) do not possess explicit references to demonic beings or demonic influence. Although 1QS, 1QH[a], and 6Q18 do mention demonic beings, they lack the necessary language to be described as "anti-demonic."

[339] As discussed above (§2.2.3.3), while 4Q444 possesses characteristics of an incantation its present condition does not allow a definite classification.

Protection may be sought directly from God in the form of a petition, or demons may be warded off by a formulaic use of powerful words. These different apotropaic expressions display the flexibility of early Jewish apotropaic traditions.

Second, the demonologies of apotropaic prayer are complex. Some passages unmistakably exhibit an aetiology of evil spirits from the Watcher tradition (e.g. *Noah's Prayer*) while others possess a mixture of demonological traditions, including Enochic terms and Mesopotamian influences (e.g. *Songs of the Sage*). Still others are generic (e.g. *Plea for Deliverance*). There is no one single "demonology" of early Jewish apotropaic tradition and it is inappropriate to suggest a uniform understanding of demonic evil in apotropaic prayer. Thus, while demons are depicted as posing physical and spiritual threats to humans, the way in which demonic beings interact with and function within humanity must be assessed on a case by case basis.

Third, apotropaic traditions may convey a particular eschatology and, indeed, there is something significant in the way apotropaisms defer the destruction or subjugation of demons to God. Some prayers possess eschatological phrases (i.e., "not for an everlasting destruction") that envisage an eventual future destruction of evil that is not to occur in the "present age." In a few cases, this is directly linked to Enochic/*Jubilees* demonology. However, the issue is much more complex and one of the eschatological phrases occurs in a passage containing mixed demonologies (cf. 4Q510 frag. 1). Ultimately, all that can be concluded with certainty is that some apotropaic prayers reserve the final judgment and destruction of demons for God. Beyond this, the eschatological specifics must be determined according to each individual passage.

In conclusion, the nature of apotropaic prayer is brought into sharper focus in this chapter. The above examination highlights the variety of forms for preventative prayers and provides more precise terminology for discussing apotropaic tradition. As this chapter demonstrates, an apotropaic response to demonic evil is expressed alongside early Jewish exorcistic tradition. As the previous chapter demonstrates, scholarly contributions to demonology in the synoptic gospels, in light of early Jewish anti-demonic tradition, focus mainly on exorcism. Therefore, bearing in mind the understanding of early Jewish

apotropaism suggested in this chapter, as well as the need to evaluate each passage in its own right, an assessment of the potential presence of apotropaic responses to demonic evil in the synoptic gospels can now take place.

Chapter 3: Non-Petitionary Apotropaisms in the Synoptic Gospels

The previous chapter demonstrates that in relation to early Jewish anti-demonic material scholars distinguish between preventative measures taken against future demonic influence and curative tactics used in reaction to existing demonic affliction. The examination of demonologically relevant passages sharpens certain terminology and focuses on the subtle, nuanced nature of early Jewish apotropaic and exorcistic passages. The previous chapter concludes that apotropaisms are, in their essence, meant to "ward off" demons before affliction occurs. Apotropaisms may take the form of, but are not limited to, petitions and incantations. It is also the case that apotropaisms, in some instances, presuppose a certain eschatological worldview in which the anti-demonic measure has a temporary effect (e.g. 4Q510 1 7-8).

With an analysis of early Jewish apotropaisms now in place focus shifts to the issue of human interaction with the demonic in early Christian tradition; specifically to questions about the extent, if any, that apotropaic responses to demons may be expressed in the synoptic gospels. Since apotropaisms take several forms, the aim in this chapter is to identify and evaluate any non-petitionary apotropaisms in the synoptic material.[1] This is done in two stages. First, characteristics of a given passage that are explicitly anti-demonic or otherwise relevant are examined in order to determine whether there are parallels between these features and early Jewish apotropaic tradition. Conclusions from the previous chapter help to detect and investigate similarities. The second stage measures potential apotropaic elements in a given passage against the larger demonologies in a particular gospel. The review of demonology in chapter one assists in contextualizing any synoptic gospel apotropaic features within broader

[1] This chapter focuses on the *depiction* of various figures (e.g. Jesus, Satan, demons, etc.) portrayed in each gospel. Care is taken to avoid making claims about a figure's "intentions" that go beyond the parameters of a given gospel and thus "import" or incorporate elements of Christology or demonology from elsewhere; cf. Brown, "The Devil in the Details," 209-210. Any claims or suggestions made regarding a figure's "intention" implies the "depicted intention" conveyed in the pericope or gospel being discussed.

demonological concerns. In this way, the discussion below determines the presence or absence of non-petitionary apotropaisms in the synoptic gospels and addresses how any apotropaisms impact the demonologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

The Matthean and Lucan Temptation narrative (Mt. 4:1-11; Lk. 4:1-13) is the most prominent passage that exhibits features that have been discussed as "apotropaic."[2] Therefore, this pericope shall serve as the point of departure here, followed by other pertinent passages from the synoptics.

3.1 Scriptural Apotropaism in the Temptation Narrative

The tempting of Jesus by the devil in a wilderness setting is found in all three synoptic gospels (Mt. 4:1-11; Mk. 1:12-13; Lk. 4:1-13). The account in Mark is comprised of only two verses, and contains few specific details.[3] The longer narrative in Matthew and Luke includes a dialogue between Jesus and Satan which is relevant to the discussion of human interaction with demonic evil. The Matthean and Lucan accounts are nearly identical, and although differences between them have little impact on the focus of this study, most variants are taken into account in this section. It is beyond the scope of this study to weigh in on the synoptic problem and the majority opinion that the double tradition is reliant upon Q.[4] Generally Matthew's sequence of the temptations is seen to be more original,

---

[2] E.g., M. Henze, "Psalm 91 in Premodern Interpretation and at Qumran," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005), 183-184; E. Koskenniemi, "The Traditional Roles Inverted: Jesus and the Devil's Attack," *BZ* 52 (2008): 261-268; D. Lincicum, "Scripture and Apotropaism in the Second Temple Period," *BN* 138 (2008): 63; and Wold "Apotropaic Prayer."

[3] The RSV translates Mk. 1:12-13: "*12* The Spirit immediately drove him out into the wilderness. *13* And he was in the wilderness forty days, tempted by Satan; and he was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered to him." As noted above (§1.2), Best argues that the Temptation in Mark portrays the ultimate defeat of Satan by Jesus. As Best and others explain, and as it will be made clear in our analysis of the pericope, the final conquest over Satan is not suggested in Matthew and Luke's version of the narrative.

[4] See the discussion on the Two-Document Hypothesis in §1.2 above.

although there are some arguments to the contrary.[5] The differences between the two temptation accounts are relatively unimportant for our purposes here. Attention is given to the content of the dialogue in order to adjudicate the possible presence of apotropaic traditions in the narrative. In the following discussion, an assessment of potential apotropaic traditions will follow the presentation of the pericope along with brief comments on the key motifs in, and meaning of, the narrative. The account in Matthew and Luke is found in this table:[6]

Figure 3.1

Matthew 4:1-11	Luke 4:1-13
1 Then Jesus was led up by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil. 2 And he fasted forty days and forty nights, and afterward he was hungry. 3 And the tempter came and said to him, "If you are the Son of God, command these stones to become loaves of bread." 4 But he answered, "It is written, 'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God.'" 5 Then the devil took him to the holy city, and set him on the pinnacle of the temple, 6 and said to him, "If you are the Son of God, throw yourself down;	1 And Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan, and was led by the Spirit 2 for forty days in the wilderness, tempted by the devil. And ate nothing in those days; and when they were ended, he was hungry. 3 The devil said to him, "If you are the Son of God, command this stone to become bread." 4 And Jesus answered him, "It is written, 'Man shall not live by bread alone.'" 5 And the devil took him up, and showed him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time, 6 and said to him, "To you I will give all this authority and their glory; for it has

[5] That Matthew's sequence is faithful to the original source, cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 364; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary* (trans. J. E. Crouch; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 148; François Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50* (trans. Christine M. Thomas; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 139; and Joseph A. Fitzmyer , *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* (AYB 28; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), 507. Terrence L. Donaldson discusses theories that favor either Matthean or Lucan fidelity to the original source in *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology*, JSNT Supplement Series 8 (ed. Bruce D. Chilton; JSOT Press, 1985), 88-90. Ultimately, Donaldson means to show that both positions have valid arguments and it is a mistake to base an entire thesis on one assumption.

[6] The English translations in *figure 3.1* are from Kurt Aland ed., *Synopsis of the Four Gospels* (14th ed.; German Bible Society, 2009), 19-20.

for it is written, 'He will give his angels charge of you,' and 'On their hands they will bear you up, lest you strike your foot against a stone.'" 7 Jesus said to him, "Again it is written, 'You shall not tempt the Lord our God.'" 8 Again, the devil took him to a very high mountain, and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them; 9 and he said to him "All these I will give you, if you will fall down and worship me." 10 Then Jesus said to him, "Begone, Satan! for it is written, 'You shall worship the Lord your God and him only shall you serve,'" 11 Then the devil left him, and behold, angels came and ministered to him.	been delivered to me, and I give it to whom I will. 7 If you, then, will worship me, it shall all be yours." 8 And Jesus answered him, "It is written, 'You shall worship the Lord your God, and him only shall you serve.'" 9 And he took him to Jerusalem, and set him on the pinnacle of the temple, and said to him, "If you are the Son of God, throw yourself down from here; 10 for it is written, 'He will give his angels charge of you to guard you,' 11 and 'On their hands they will bear you up, lest you strike your foot against a stone.'" 12 And Jesus answered him, "It is said, 'You shall not tempt the Lord your God.'" 13 And when the devil had ended every temptation, he departed from him until an opportune time.

3.1.1 Introductory Comments on the Temptation Narrative

In the double tradition Satan confronts Jesus with three separate temptations. This testing takes place in the wilderness (LXX = ἔρημος, MT = מדבר), a setting which carries several connotations in the Hebrew scriptures. It can be a place of refuge where one might have a spiritual encounter. For instance, Elijah, for fear of Jezebel, flees to the wilderness where he receives angelic assistance and meets God at Mount Horeb (1 Kgs. 19:1-18).[7] Other Jewish and ancient Near Eastern traditions hold that the desert is a dwelling place of demons.[8] Weighing the

[7] The wilderness is also portrayed as David's stronghold 1 Sam. 23:14.

[8] Some scholars argue that the association of the desert as an abode for demons is present in the Temptation pericope; cf. Craig A. Evans, *Matthew* (NCBC; ed. Ben Witherington III; Cambridge University Press, 2012), 81; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 514; and Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 290-291. Langton, *Demonology*, 20, notes that in Babylonian tradition demons were thought to reside in the desert. In the Hebrew scriptures, see Lev. 16:10 and Isa. 34:13-14. Fröhlich connects the desert demons in Isaiah to figures in Mesopotamian demonology; cf. "Theology and Demonology," 103.

positive and negative overtones which may be implied by ἔρημος, François Bovon concludes that the symbolism of the desert is neutral: neither good nor bad. It is a place where one can "experience the divine or the monstrous."[9] In the Temptation pericope, Jesus is brought to the wilderness by the Holy Spirit and, in Matthew's account, is attended to by angels (Mt. 4:11). Yet, Jesus is expressly led into the wilderness to undergo temptation by Satan. Thus, the setting of the narrative evokes both themes: elements of the divine and the demonic.

The wilderness location, with its positive and negative connotations, is the stage upon which an important exchange unfolds. The Temptation follows Jesus' baptism in Matthew (3:13-17) and his genealogy in Luke (3:23-38). In Matthew, the testing of Jesus comes immediately after he is identified explicitly as the beloved son of God (Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός) (3:17). Luke also emphasizes the identity of Jesus as God's son by presenting a genealogy that links Jesus with "[the son] of Adam, [the son] of God" (τοῦ Ἀδὰμ τοῦ θεοῦ) (3:38). Thus, both gospels establish that Jesus is the son of God when he is led into the wilderness.[10]

The description of Jesus as God's son is echoed by Satan. The devil opens two of his three temptations with the address: "If you are the Son of God…" (Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ) (Mt. 4:3, 6; Lk. 4:3, 9). An essential aspect of the narrative's meaning hinges on the interpretation of this challenge made by the devil. The English translation appears to convey the devil's doubt about the nature of Jesus. After all, the words "if you are the Son of God" evoke a challenge to Jesus to prove his divine sonship. Understanding the dialogue in this way suggests that the devil's tests are intended to coax Jesus into ostentatious acts in order to verify that

---

[9] Bovon, *Luke*, 140; cf. Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son*, 40.

[10] Evans, *Matthew*, 80, emphasizes this point when he states: "The identification of Jesus as the beloved 'Son' of God (Matt 3:17) sets the stage for the Satanic wilderness temptation." Likewise, although the ancestry of Jesus (Lk. 3:23-38) is placed in between Luke's account of Jesus' baptism (3:21-22) and the Temptation (4:1-13), Jesus' testing by Satan is viewed as connected to his baptism. Fitmyer, *Luke*, 506, argues that the Temptation helps to introduce Jesus' public ministry and is "closely linked to the baptism scene and the genealogy in that he is now tested precisely as Son of God." Cf. Bovon, *Luke*, 140, 143; and George B. Caird, *The Gospel of St Luke* (PGC; ed. D. E. Nineham; London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968), 79.

he is who people say he is. In doing so, Satan seeks either to prove Jesus is a fraud or manipulate the son of God into displaying his power thereby subordinating himself to Satan. Interpreting the address "if you are the Son of God" in this manner implies that the devil himself is unsure of Jesus' identity.

There is an alternative reading of the devil's address. The Greek word εἰ can also mean "since." Craig Evans explains that, of the four types of Greek "if-then" sentences, the use of εἰ in the Temptation is a "first-class conditional sentence" in which the protasis is assumed to be true.[11] A more accurate translation of the devil's phrase is "*Since* you are the Son of God." Interpreting the expression in this way suggests that Satan is aware of Jesus' identity.[12] Thus, the challenge is not whether Jesus is truly God's son, but rather the real intention of Satan is revealed in the contents of each test. Jesus is tempted to miraculously feed himself (Mt. 4:3; Lk. 4:3), place himself in danger to force God's salvation (Mt. 4:6; Lk. 4:9), and to obtain political power via idolatrous means (Mt. 4:9; Lk. 4:7). There are three main, albeit general, interpretations of these temptations summarized by Craig Keener: (1) "salvation-historical" in which "Jesus recalls the Israelites tempting in the desert", (2) "Christological" which "affirms a correct understanding of Jesus' messiahship as against contemporary political or militaristic interpretations", and (3) "a parenetic interpretation, in which Jesus

---

[11] Evans, *Matthew*, 83. Similarly, cf. Bovon, *Luke 1*, 143; Fitmyer, *Luke*, 515; Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 361; and Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009), 139.

[12] Bovon, *Luke 1*, 143, argues: "*Ei* ('if') should not be interpreted as hypothetical, but almost as casual. The devil is not in doubt; he believes that Jesus is the Son of God." Likewise, Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 361: "Jesus status as 'Son of God' is not questioned; rather it is the presupposition for the devil's temptation." See also Joel Kennedy, *The Recapitulation of Israel: Use of Israel's History in Matthew 1:1-4:11* (WUNT II. Reihe 257; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 192-193; and Brandon D. Crowe, *The Obedient Son: Deuteronomy and Christology in the Gospel of Matthew* (BZNW vol. 188; Walter de Gruyter, 2012), 160. Although Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 50-51, is hesitant to translate εἰ as "since," he offers two reasons why the protasis εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ is assumed to be true in the Temptation pericope: (1) "this is the normal grammatical usage of this condition" and (2) "in Mt. 8:29 it is obvious that the demons have intimate knowledge that Jesus is precisely the Son of God. It would stand to reason that Satan, the prince of demons, understands this better than the rest."

provides a model for tested believers."[13] Any of these three interpretations, despite the different theological emphases and purposes conveyed by Matthew and Luke, have a fundamental commonality: they relate to the nature of Jesus' sonship and mission. This essence of sonship and mission is the subject of satanic assault.[14] In other words, the type of "son" Jesus is (and how he carries out his mission as "son") is what Satan tries to disrupt.

The pericope ultimately conveys a righteous figure ("son of God") who is demonically tempted to forsake reliance on and fidelity to God in favor of self-serving or instantaneous results. In early Jewish tradition Satan is a provocateur of Job, and this narrative's similarity to the Temptation in the gospels is well known. Moreover, in *Jubilees* the *Aqedah* is revised to depict Satan (not God) as the inciting source of Abraham's trial (*Jub.* 17-18). In some passages from the Dead Sea Scrolls, the *Yahad* is a righteous community that is in continuous opposition to Belial and his tests (e.g. 1QS i 16-19).[15] In a more direct relation to the temptations of Jesus, some scholars suggest there is an "Adamic typology" present in the wilderness trial. Corresponding themes include demonic temptation, "forty days" (Adam was placed in Eden after forty days according to *Jub.* 3:9), and a portrayal

---

[13] Keener, *Matthew*, 137; cf. Kennedy, *The Recapitulation of Israel*, 186. As an example of these interpretations, consider the enticement of political power (Mt. 4:9; Lk. 4:6-7). A "salvation-historical" reading emphasizes Jesus' fidelity to God and refusal of idolatry as opposed to Israel's failure in this matter (e.g. Exodus 32). In the "christological" interpretation, Jesus rejects the incorporation of military or political means into his mission as messiah. Finally, a parenetic understanding serves as a model of worship and service to God alone in the face of worldly temptations.

[14] As Evans, *Matthew*, 80, states: "The temptations do not directly challenge the divine sonship of Jesus; rather they attempt to misdirect it and, if successful, render it powerless and ineffective."

[15] For an exploration of the theme of "testing" in early Jewish literature in connection with Jesus' testing in the wilderness, see Kelly, "The Devil in the Desert," 190-220; William R. Stegner, "Wilderness and Testing in the Scrolls and in Matthew 4:1-11," *BR* 12 (1967): 18-27; Garrett, *The Temptations of Jesus*, 19-49; idem, *Demise of the Devil*, 40-43; and Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 43-50.

of Jesus as a "second" or "new" Adam (e.g. Luke's link between Jesus and τοῦ Ἀδὰμ).[16]

While there are certainly points of similarity between the Temptation and Adamic tradition, the clearest and most commonly referred to model for the Temptation is Israel's experience in the wilderness after the Exodus from Egypt.[17] Jeffrey B. Gibson states: "the Q account of Jesus' Wilderness temptation is intent to present Jesus' experience specifically in parallelism with, indeed, as the *recapitulation of*, the temptation which Israel, God's firstborn and υἱός, was subjected to during *its* wilderness wanderings, as this was recounted in Deuteronomy 6-8."[18] There are three initial parallels that suggest a relationship between the two episodes: (1) the location where both Jesus and Israel are "led" in order to be "tested" (cf. Deut. 8:2-5) is in the wilderness;[19] (2) in each instance the

---

[16] Cf. Jeremias, "Ἀδάμ," *TDNT* 1:141-143; Andrei Orlov, "Veneration Motif in the Temptation Narrative of the Gospel of Matthew: Lessons from the Enochic Tradition" (paper presented at the Seventh Enochic Seminar "Enochic Influence on the Synoptic Gospels," Camaldoli, Italy, July 25, 2013), 3-5; and Dochhorn, "The Devil in the Gospel of Mark," 100-103. Jeremias especially points to the "new Adam" motif in Pauline theology. For a rejection of Adamic typology in the temptation account, cf. Bovon, *Luke 1*, 145; and Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 512. For weaknesses in Jeremias' supposition along with an overall discussion of the typology, see C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders, *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 36-45.

[17] Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 510-511; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 142; Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 352, 358-359; and Evans, *Matthew*, 81-83. Additionally, the parallel is the subject of a chapter in Kennedy's monograph *The Recapitulation of Israel*, 154-215.

[18] Gibson, *The Temptations of Jesus*, 86-87 (italics his). Similarly Kennedy, *The Recapitulation of Israel*, 185 states: "The testing narrative presents Jesus as Israel, recapitulating her history, embodying Israel in himself, fulfilling that call in the obedient way she had failed to do as recorded in her scriptural history."

[19] For Gibson, this is especially the case since "wilderness" appears with the definite article (Mt. 4:1; Lk. 4:2); cf. idem, *The Temptations of Jesus*, 85-87; Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son*, 36-38.

subject tested is God's "son" (cf. Deut. 1:31; 8:5);[20] and (3) the number forty is given as a time of duration (cf. Deut. 8:4; Num. 14:34).[21]

A final parallel that suggests the Temptation is a recapitulation of the Israelites in the wilderness is the correspondence of the types of tests faced; that is, Jesus prevails over the same challenges that Israel is subjected to and fails. When Jesus is hungry he does not grumble against God as Israel does (Exod. 16; Num. 11), but rather he relies on God for sustenance. Whereas Israel puts the Lord to the test (Exod. 17:7), Jesus refuses to do so. Jesus' repudiation of idolatry calls to mind Israel's weakness in this matter (Exod. 32).

The extent to which scholars associate Israel's wilderness wanderings and Jesus' Temptation vary in manner and degree. Birger Gerhardsson goes so far as to suggest that the Temptation is an example of early Christian midrash intimately tied to Israel's testing.[22] He suggests that Jesus' temptations, and his responses to those temptations, should be interpreted in light of the command in Deuteronomy 6:5: "and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your might." The command constitutes the essence of true sonship which is the subject of Satan's three attacks. First, the encouragement for Jesus to produce bread for himself is meant to take advantage of the craving to satisfy hunger. While hunger, in itself, is not evil, Gerhardsson notes that the desire to self-satisfy can be equivalent to loving God with a "divided heart."[23] Second, Satan's exhortation for Jesus to throw himself from the temple is an effort

---

[20] See especially Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son*, 19-24. Gerhardsson emphasizes the connection between Jesus' and Israel's sonship throughout his study.

[21] Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 359, argue: "we should understand the forty days from the life of Jesus to correspond to the forty years during which Israel was tested in the desert." Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son*, 42, states: "Jesus' forty days in the wilderness corresponds to Israel's forty years."

[22] "...the longer temptation narrative is to be placed in the category of *haggadic midrash*. The tempter bases his assertions on passages or themes from the Scriptures, and Jesus answers with scriptural quotations. The three decisive replies in the dialogue are all from Deut 6-8, the deuteronomic exposition of how God allowed his 'son' Israel to wander for forty years in the desert that he might discipline and test him." Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son*, 11.

[23] Gerhardsson concludes this by examining the meaning of לב in the Hebrew scriptures and the יצר in Qumran and rabbinic literature. Cf. Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son*, 48-51, 75.

to coerce Jesus into forcing God to preserve the life of his son. Gerhardsson observes that the Hebrew word "soul" (נפש) also means "life," and thus Jesus is to put his "soul" in danger to test God's promise of protection. Finally, Satan offers Jesus earthly kingdoms and their glory in exchange for worship. In Deuteronomy 6:5 the phrase "your might" (מאדך) is translated in later rabbinic writings with the Aramaic נכסין and the Hebrew ממון. According to Gerhardsson, "ממון and נכסין signify material assets, goods and riches" and thus "the pharisaic-rabbinic expositors understood the relatively rare formula in the actual Deuteronomic text מאדך to mean 'your property.'"[24] If Jesus were to accept Satan's proposal, he would be trading idolatry for material gain. Therefore, Jesus' rejection of all three enticements is a demonstration that he is indeed a worthy son who loves God with his whole heart, soul, and might. Although Gerhardsson's theory is not completely persuasive,[25] he convincingly demonstrates the resemblance and close relationship between the testing of Israel and Jesus.

The allusion in the Temptation to Israel's wilderness wanderings is, according to some, strengthened by Jesus' quotations from the law in response to Satan. Not only does Jesus renounce the very temptations that confronted Israel, but he also renounces them by using Deuteronomy. As Charles Kimball explains, the citations from Deuteronomy "implicitly contrast Jesus' victory with Israel's failure and thereby represent an antithetical Israel-Christ typology."[26] Given that Satan himself uses scripture in the Temptation account (Mt. 4:6; Lk. 4:10-11), another view is that the dialogue between the devil and Jesus resembles a rabbinic

---

[24] Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son*, 76.

[25] For instance, Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 553, state: "While [Gerhardsson's] interpretation is certainly brilliant, it is somewhat speculative, especially because one has doubts about the other places in Matthew where Gerhardsson finds allusion to the *Shema*'..." Cf. Crowe, *The Obedient Son*, 160.

[26] C. A. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*, JSNT Supplement Series 94 (ed. S. E. Porter; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 89. Kennedy, *The Recapitulation of Israel*, 184, suggests: "There are other aspects to help see recapitulation in this narrative, but the Deuteronomy quotations are undoubtedly the most explicit reason for doing so...".

dispute.[27] Whatever the nuances of one's particular conclusion, the quotations from Deuteronomy are convincingly interpreted by many as situated against the backdrop of the wilderness scenes in the Pentateuch. Whether Deuteronomy is cited to evoke the stories of the Israelites, or whether it is a model of rabbinic discussion, or perhaps both, Jesus' scriptural citations signify layers of meaning. Yet these may not be the only strata of possible connotations present in the use of Deuteronomy. Conversations about "scriptural apotropaism" and adherence to the torah warrant an assessment of the links between the Temptation and early Jewish anti-demonic tradition.

3.1.2 Deuteronomy and "Scriptural Apotropaism"

David Lincicum discusses the "apotropaic employment of Scripture in the Second Temple period."[28] Lincicum surveys the use of scripture in numerous examples of ancient apotropaic formulae and objects intended to "ward off" demonic evil. These range from early Jewish and Mesopotamian amulets to later Greek magical recipes and Aramaic incantation bowls.[29]

The two earliest amulets mentioned are from the Ketef Hinnom site near Jerusalem from between the seventh and sixth centuries B.C.[30] Two small silver scrolls are etched with Hebrew inscriptions requesting God's protection from "evil" (רע). The Priestly Blessing (Num. 6:24-26) is cited in Ketef Hinnom I (l. 14-18) and, perhaps, in Ketef Hinnom II (ll. 5-8). In Ketef Hinnom I and, possibly, Ketef Hinnom II the word הרע appears with the definite article which some interpret as a request for protection from "not just anything evil, but rather *all* Evil."[31] The

---

[27] Cf. Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. John Marsh; Oxford: Blackwell, 1972), 254-255; Gibson, *The Temptations of Jesus*, 115; Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 352; and Bovon, *Luke 1*, 145.

[28] Lincicum, "Scripture and Apotropaism," 81.

[29] Specifically, Lincicum, "Scripture and Apotropaism," 66, assesses "the employment of Scripture in three different media: amulets, incantation bowls, and magical papyri." Similarly, see Angel, "Early Jewish Magic," 785-798.

[30] Cf. Lincicum, "Scripture and Apotropaism," 69.

[31] Barkay et al., "The Amulets from Ketef Hinnom," 68.

expression הגער ברע ("the rebuker of Evil") is found in Ketef Hinnom II (ll. 4-5) suggesting possible exorcistic connotations.[32] Lincicum notes the possibility that Ketef Hinnom I (ll. 4-7) contains text based on Deuteronomy.[33] However, the amulet's text is fragmentary and the inscription does not appear to be a direct quotation. A number of Samaritan protection amulets quote passages from Deuteronomy, but these are dated much later.[34] In addition to these amulets Lincicum discusses relevant passages from the Dead Sea Scrolls, namely *Songs of the Sage*, 4Q560, and *11QApocryphal Psalms*.

The historical spectrum presented by Lincicum demonstrates that the apotropaic use of scripture was a common practice throughout antiquity.[35] Lincicum initiates his study of scriptural apotropaisms in Jewish practice by comparing them to quotations from Deuteronomy in the Temptation. Since Lincicum's article is concerned mainly with the use of scripture in Second Temple Judaism he does not comment beyond the initial comparison to the Temptation. Moreover, Deuteronomy is not linked explicitly to early anti-demonic praxis in a way that suggests a direct influence upon the Matthean and Lukan account. However, Best and Wold note, in passing, that a passage in the *Damascus Document* possibly offers a "connecting point" between early Jewish apotropaism and the use of Deuteronomy in the Temptation.[36]

Apotropaic Effect of Torah Observance

---

[32] Cf. Gabriel Barkay, et al., "The Challenges of Ketef Hinnom," 162-71; Barkay, et al., "Amulets from Ketef Hinnom," 41-71; and Lincicum, "Scripture and Apotropaism," 69-71.

[33] Cf. Lincicum, "Scripture and Apotropaism," 69-70.

[34] Lincicum, "Scripture and Apotropaism, 67 n. 19, notes that "none of these [Samaritan amulets] predate the 3rd century C.E." Quotations from Deuteronomy are popular in earlier inscriptions, but not in an apotropaic or incantation context. For instance, cf. William Horbury and David Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Cambridge University Press, 1992).

[35] Indeed, the apotropaic use of scripture is popular and well attested to throughout subsequent centuries in the form of amulets, bowls, papyri, etc.; cf. §4.1.3.

[36] Cf. Best, *The Temptation and the Passion*, 50; Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer," 109-110; and Lincicum, "Scripture and Apotropaism," 63.

CD-A xvi 4-5 is reconstructed and translated as follows:

4 וביום אשר יקום (יקים) האיש על נפשו לשוב
5 אל תורת משה יסור מלאך המשטמה מאחריו אם יקים את דבריו

4 ...And on the day on which one has imposed upon himself to return
5 to the law of Moses, the angel Mastema will turn aside from following him, should he keep his words.[37]

As noted in *Jubilees* 10:8 and 11:5 "Mastema" is the chief of evil/demonic beings. Thus, sustained adherence to the law of Moses ("torah") results in repelling the figure equivalent to "Satan" in the Temptation account.[38] Kister interprets the Qumran passage within the framework of community, and he observes that returning to the law entails joining the *Yahad*.[39] That is, true observance of the torah takes place within the elect community, and once an individual is within the community Mastema will be turned away. The concept that torah observance effectively fends off demonic evil is associated with the "genre of 'apotropaic prayers.'"[40] Furthermore, if every individual outside the community is possessed, as Kister's interpretation suggests, then the act of joining the *Yahad* is exorcistic.[41]

---

[37] García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 565. Joseph Baumgarten and Daniel Schwartz translate the lines as follows: "*4*...And on the day when a man takes upon himself (an oath) to return *5* to the Torah of Moses, the angel Mastema shall turn aside from after him, if he fulfills his words." J. H. Baumgarten and D. R. Schwartz, "Damascus Document (CD)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 2: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charles worth; PTSDSSP; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995), 39. See also 4Q271 4 ii 6-7.

[38] On the figure "Mastema" at Qumran see Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 341; VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 127; and §2.2.15. Based on the discussion of Satanology in §1.2 above, including the viewpoints of Dochhorn, Branden, and Garrett, the title Σατανᾶς is understood to refer to the chief evil being, ruler of demons, and principal adversary of Jesus in the synoptic gospels.

[39] Kister, "Demons, Theology and Abraham's Covenant (CD 16:4-6 and Related Texts)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* (eds. R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller; Scholars Press, 199), 167-184.

[40] Kister, "Demons, Theology and Abraham's Covenant," 170.

[41] In Kister's words from "Demons, Theology, and Abraham's Covenant," 172: "Those who do not belong to the sect are considered to be possessed by evil spirits, while the sect is immune from

Therefore, Kister understands membership in the Qumran community, characterized by fidelity to the torah, as having both apotropaic and exorcistic powers. Kister's persuasive interpretation of the passage from the *Damascus Document* opens up an avenue for approaching Deuteronomy within an early Jewish anti-demonic context. Indeed, Flusser and Eshel have long noted that "the law" is one of several common features in apotropaic prayers (cf. §2.1.2).[42]

In view of Kister's interpretation of torah observance, the context of at least one of the citations from Deuteronomy (Mt. 4:7; Lk. 4:12) is of particular significance. Deuteronomy 6:16 reads: "You shall not put the Lord your God to the test, as you tested him at Massah." This edict, as an isolated statement, is perfectly sufficient for Jesus to use as his refusal to test God. Yet the command in Deuteronomy continues (6:17-19): "You shall diligently keep the commandments of the Lord your God, and his decrees, and his statutes, which he has commanded you. And you shall do what is right and good in the sight of the Lord…that you may go in and take possession of the good land which the Lord swore to give to your fathers by *thrusting out all your enemies from before you*, as the Lord has promised" (italics mine). Following the exhortation to trust God is the appeal to obey God's commandments (the Decalogue, Deut. 5:6-21, may be specifically in view). Keeping the commandments, it is promised, results in the ability to "thrust out" Israel's enemies (i.e. the Canaanites) who occupy the Promised Land. The infinitive construct of הדף ("to push, thrust, expel, repulse") is used. The word also appears with a similar meaning and context in Deuteronomy 9:4, and the third person masculine singular imperfect with a plural suffix (יהדפם) appears in Joshua

---

them." And further, "This means that joining the sect is, in fact, an act of expulsion of evil spirits (not merely in a spiritual metaphorical sense), i.e., of exorcism." This argument is formed in large part by Kister's evaluation of "sectarian dualism" in texts such as *Damascus Document* and *1QWar Scroll*.

[42] Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 194-205; Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 69-88; and idem, "Genres," 395-415.

23:5. According to Moshe Weinfeld, הדף is used rather than the more common גרש ("to drive away, to expel, to divorce") which is intentionally avoided.[43]

For Weinfeld, trust in God is linked to obedience. He states: "Not keeping God's commandments means to test God; therefore one understands why the injunction to keep commandments in Deut 6:17 follows the warning not to test YHWH in 6:16."[44] Thus, there is a specific progression in Deuteronomy 6:16-19: one is called to trust God, trusting in God means keeping his commandments, obedience to God's commandments then enables one to thrust out one's enemies. A similar progression is depicted in the Temptation narrative where Jesus affirms his trust in God by adhering to the law in opposition to his enemy, Satan. There is an obvious difference between the military opponents of Israel and a demonic adversary. In addition, the manner of Satan's willing departure (Τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος in Mt. 4:11, and ὁ διάβολος ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ in Lk. 4:13) likely does not parallel the expulsion of the Canaanites from the Promised Land. Yet, this reading of the Deuteronomy passage goes hand-in-hand with the notion of "torah fidelity" as a repellant of evil. While one should be reticent to assert that the Deuteronomy passage itself expresses an apotropaic orientation, it possibly contains a kernel of what is later depicted as an apotropaic result of adhering to the torah.

Two distinct but complementary features are presented by Lincicum and Kister; on the one hand invoking scripture wards off demons, and on the other hand obedience to the torah wards them off. In the Temptation, Jesus affirms his obedience to the law when he invokes Deuteronomy to oppose the devil. Consequently, a case can be made that Lincicum's and Kister's observations about warding off the demonic are present in the Temptation. While Kister's observations on community do not relate to the Temptation account, the apotropaic effect of adhering to the torah described in the *Damascus Document* holds analogy with Jesus' quotations of Deuteronomy in the face of demonic confrontation.

---

[43] Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11* (AB vol. 5; New York: Doubleday, 1970), 347; cf. S. R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 96.

[44] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 355.

Likewise, Jesus' reliance on the law fits well within the pattern of apotropaic prayer outlined by Flusser and Eshel. Therefore, this "connecting point" between apotropaic function and the Temptation account relates to the characteristic of the law as incompatible with demonic evil. The link between torah fidelity and apotropaic intent has implications for why Deuteronomy is referenced by Jesus in the Temptation. In a plain reading of the narrative the passages from Hebrew scriptures are cited so as to correspond to each temptation; for instance, Jesus does not turn stones to loaves because "man shall not live by bread alone" (Mt. 4:4; Lk. 4:4). However, apotropaic connotations implied in the Deuteronomy quotations convey a particular meaning beyond what a plain interpretation might suggest. Put simply, Jesus' responses with Deuteronomy may be more than mere refusals of Satan's enticements.

Deuteronomy and "Formulaic Expression"

In addition to why Deuteronomy is used, how the quotations are expressed is also significant. The manner in which Deuteronomy is cited is a second "connecting point" between scripture in the Temptation and early Jewish apotropaism. Each quotation, except in Luke 4:12, is introduced with the perfect passive γέγραπται ("it is written").[45] According to Fitzmyer, γέγραπται is one of several introductory phrases attached to scriptural quotations found throughout the New Testament.[46] It also is roughly equivalent to Hebrew phrases found in some Qumran passages, including כיא כן כתוב ("for it is written," 1QS v 15) and כאשר כתוב ("as it was

[45] Lk 12:4 instead employs the introductory formula εἴρηται ("it is said") which is the perfect passive of λέγω.

[46] An article by Fitzmyer focuses specifically on scripture quotations in Qumran and New Testament literature. The quotations are arranged using three main types of introductory formulae: (1) "to write," (2) "to say," (3) and "other formulae." Introductory phrases which fit into the category "other formulae" include the so-called "fulfillment formulas" in the New Testament of which Jesus is the subject. "It is written" or "γέγραπται" belongs to the first group. Cf. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," *NTS* 7 (1960-61): 297-333; repr. in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (University of Montana: Scholar's Press, 1974), 3-58.

written," 1QS viii 14). All the quotations from the Hebrew Bible that are introduced with a formula in the New Testament fall generally into four "classes" suggest by Fitzmyer:

> (A) the Literal or Historical class, in which the Old Testament is actually quoted in the same sense in which it was intended by the original writers; (B) the class of Modernization, in which the Old Testament text, which originally had a reference to some event in the contemporary scene at the time it was written, nevertheless was vague enough to be applied to some new event... (C) the class of Accommodation, in which the Old Testament text was obviously wrested from its original context, modified or deliberately changed by the new writer in order to adapt it to a new situation or purpose; (D) the Eschatological class, in which the Old Testament quotation expressed a promise or threat about something to be accomplished in the *eschaton* and which the Qumran [or New Testament] writer cited as something still to be accomplished in the new *eschaton* of which he wrote.[47]

Fitzmyer includes the quotations from the Temptation account in the first (i.e., the Literal or Historical) of his four classes. In doing so, he emphasizes that the citations from Deuteronomy summon the actual, literal force of the original source; in this case the law. Thus, by introducing the quotations with γέγραπται, Jesus is portrayed as appealing to the true and authoritative meaning of Deuteronomy rather than merely adapting Hebrew scriptures to fit his current situation as would be the case with other categories of quotation formulae (classes B or C).

Two important points are raised by Fitzmyer which afford insight into Jesus' quotations in the Temptation. First, it is demonstrated that the various quotation formulae, including γέγραπται, present in the New Testament are

---

[47] Fitzmyer, *Semitic Background of the NT*, 16. Although Fitzmyer's "four classes" are initially offered for the arrangement of Hebrew scripture quotations in the Dead Sea Scrolls, they are sufficient for the organization of New Testament quotations. In *Semitic Background of the NT*, 53 n. 70, Fitzmyer acknowledges the limitations of these classes, noting: "I have re-examined the New Testament quotations in light of the four categories which emerged from my analysis of the Qumran passages. Many of them fall easily into the same categories, as I have tried to indicate above. However, I do not want to give the impression that these four categories exhaust the uses of the Old Testament in the New; there is always the danger in such a comparative study of creating a Procrustean bed."

strikingly parallel to formulae in Qumran passages. A comparison of early Christian literature with scrolls from Qumran reveals stronger similarities on this point than if the formulae are compared with later rabbinic writings.[48] Second, quotations introduced with a formula, such as Jesus' references to Deuteronomy, convey a "realistic potency"; that is, the quotations of Jesus are explicitly not an allusion to the law, they are an invocation of the literal, original source.[49] Even if it is accepted that the quotations allude to Israel's situation in the wilderness, they are not limited to this function, but rather serve an immediate and precise purpose for Jesus.

The introductory formula γέγραπται is not an anti-demonic device. It appears throughout the New Testament in various situations, most of which have nothing to do with demons.[50] Yet, within the Temptation narrative there is a context of demonic confrontation and, potentially, an anti-demonic function of torah observance. Therefore, the very nature of Jesus' quotations, which γέγραπται helps to characterize, could indicate that the invocations of Deuteronomy serve not

---

[48] While most introductory formulae in the Mishnah involve אמר, the root כתב (which would align with γέγραπται) is also used; cf. Fitzmyer, *Semitic Background of the NT*, 15; Bruce M. Metzger, "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah," *JBL* (Dec. 1, 1951): 297-307. For Fitzmyer in *Semitic Background of the NT*, 7-8, "the Hebrew equivalents of the New Testament formulae are far more numerous in the Qumran literature than in the Mishnah. Consequently, the comparative study of the Qumran and the New Testament introductory formulae would tend to indicate a closer connection of the New Testament writings with the contemporary Qumran material than with the later Mishnaic." However, Horbury explains that the significance of Qumran literature for New Testament interpretation should not cause one to overlook the value of rabbinic literature. In response to Fitzmyer, he mentions other New Testament formulae which have parallels in rabbinic material outside the Mishnah, or which appear in the Mishna but not at Qumran. Horbury concludes in "Rabbinic Literature in New Testament Interpretation," in *Herodian Judaism and NT Study*, 225: "It seems therefore in this case not to be clear that rabbinic literature is at some disadvantage, as compared with Qumran literature, in illustrating the New Testament formulae."

[49] Cf. Fitzmyer, *Semitic Background of the NT*, 7-8.

[50] Some examples of a quotation introduced with γέγραπται are: Mt. 2:5; Lk. 2:23; Acts 15:15; Rom. 1:17, 2:24; 1 Cor. 1:31; and 2 Cor. 9:9. For a more complete catalogue of New Testament uses of γέγραπται along with Hebrew equivalents in the Hebrew Bible and Dead Sea Scrolls, cf. Fitzmyer, *Semitic Background of the NT*, 8-10.

only as "proof texts" for Jesus' refusal of Satan's enticements, but in themselves may be a forceful and authoritative rebuttal of Satan's challenges.

To better understand Jesus' quotations as authoritative expressions it is useful to consider the nature of anti-demonic incantations. Nitzan's exploration of Qumran prayers and poetic texts focuses, at one point, on the formation and purpose of "magical poetry." Her analysis is mainly centered on songs or hymns which are recited for protection against harmful demonic forces. As discussed previously (§2.2.3.4), most of these songs contain some basic features including a "word of power." This "word of power" may be the name of a god or other authoritative phrases "which have the ability to banish or proscribe the activity of harmful spirits."[51] Examples of "words of power" along with adjurations include an early Canaanite incantation (seventh century B.C.) and an incantation from among the PGM.[52]

An interesting observation regarding the anti-demonic purpose and the material shape (i.e., too large to be worn as an amulet) of the Canaanite object is made by Frank Cross and Richard Saley. They suggest that the object was likely meant to be affixed upon the doorpost of a home to ensure the home's protection. Cross and Saley write:

> We believe it not farfetched to point out a parallel between the plaque, and its function, and the marks made with the blood of the Passover lamb on the doorsteps of Israelites in the Yahwistic tradition, designed to protect Israelite firstborn in the night of the last plague on Egypt

---

[51] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 229.

[52] The Canaanite incantation contains a prohibition against demons ("*5* ...The house I enter *6* you shall not enter *7* and the court I tread *8* you shall not tread") and words of authority ("*9-10* The Eternal One has made a covenant with us... *13* with oaths of Heaven and Ancient Earth, *14* with the oaths of Ba'al..."); the translation is from Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 230; cf. Frank M. Cross and Richard J. Saley, "Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of the Seventh Century B. C. from Arslan-Tash in Upper Syria," *BASOR* 197 (1970): 42-49. The incantation from the PGM contains explicit adjurations in the name of a god (e.g. ὁρκίζω κεφαλήν τε θεοῦ, ἐστὶν Ὄλυπος), while a later amulet from the Cairo Genizah (TS K 1.68) adjures a demon in the name of God ("*8*...I adjure you, *9* spirit and demon, in the name of the Tetragrammaton..."); reconstructions and translations are from Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 230-231; cf. PGM I. 305 ff. in Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 11; and TS K 1.68 in Schiffman and Swartz, *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts*, 123-127.

> (Exodus 12:22 f.). No less a parallel is the practice required by the Deuteronomist, also writing in the seventh century, instructing the children of Israel to inscribe their doorsteps with words from the law (Deut. 6:4-9). These practices in Israel evidently had a pagan background.[53]

The use of the blood of the Passover lamb is certainly a fascinating episode and it intersects with the issue of early Jewish apotropaisms. In Exodus 12:22-23 hyssop dipped in blood is touched to the lintel and doorposts, and when God sees the blood he will pass by and "not allow the destroyer to enter your houses to slay you." There is definitely an element to this blood ritual, intended to prevent harm from befalling the faithful, which resembles an apotropaic practice. If "the destroyer" (המשחית) were to be identified as a demonic being, the sign of blood which prohibits the destroyer's actions could be labeled as an anti-demonic apotropaism.[54] The procedure outlined in Deuteronomy 6:7-9 relating to the Shema strikes a familiar chord with the traditions and significance of the law noted above; specifically in Deuteronomy 6:16-19 and CD-A xvi 4-5. Yet, this passage refers in no way to any negative force offset by the law, demonic or otherwise. While neither Exodus 12:22-23 nor Deuteronomy 6:4-9 may be "apotropaic" to their earliest readers, they are interpreted as such in later generations.

Other examples of anti-demonic songs discussed by Nitzan are from the Dead Sea Scrolls. The שירי פגעים ("songs for the possessed") attributed to David in 11Q5 xxvii 9-10 are regarded as evidence for the existence of this tradition at Qumran.[55] Likewise, the incantations that comprise 11Q11 depict the use of

---

[53] Cross and Saley, "Phoenician Incantations," 48-49.

[54] This does not seem to be the case. It is generally understood that "the destroyer" is not a demon, but an agent of God. John Durham explains: "This משחית 'destroyer' has been variously held to be a death angel acting in Yahweh's service (cf. 2 Sam 24:15-17; 2 Kgs 19:32-37), a kind of extension of Yahweh himself, or a primitive demon either opposed or replaced by Yahweh… Once again, the information in the OT is too sketchy for any detailed conclusions, but the repeated assertion that the blow to come is to be leveled by Yahweh and the clear statement of this verse that Yahweh 'will not permit' the destroyer to enter the Israelite houses suggests that in the composite at hand the destroyer was considered Yahweh's emissary." John Durham, *Exodus* (WBC 3; Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1987), 163.

[55] In regard to David's "songs to perform over the possessed" (שירים לנגן על הפגועים) in 11Q5, Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 228, writes: "These remarks provide early evidence for a tradition of 'anti-

authoritative names, including the tetragram (e.g. col. v ll. 4, 8), and an anti-demonic version Psalm 91 in column vi.[56] The form and function of 4Q510-511 is a major focus in Nitzan's examination. Whereas "typical incantations" include an adjuration directed at demons, the *Songs of the Sage* does not.[57] Instead, the "word of power" is the declaration of God's praise made by the sage (e.g. 4Q510 1 4). This unique "word of power" is one of two components that characterize the text as an incantation; the other one being the "banishing of harmful spirits" (i.e., "to frighten and terrify all the spirits…").[58] In comparison with other incantations it appears that the declaration of praise for frightening demons is roughly equivalent to adjuring the demons with a powerful name. As Nitzan explains, in 4Q510-511 "the 'word of power' is the praise itself."[59] Thus, to sing or proclaim praise, which is typically innocuous, can in certain contexts function as authoritative opposition to demons. The result of this technique in *Songs of the Sage* is that the stated purpose of an expression (i.e., to frighten away demons) turns a proclamation of praise into a "word of power" for an apotropaic incantation.

The anti-demonic expression of the sage in 4Q510-511 is an informative lens through which to view the Jesus' quotations in the Temptation. Given that Jesus explicitly invokes the law to repudiate satanic imposition, it is conceivable that the appropriation of Deuteronomy and its formulaic expression, in this

---

demonic songs' (*šire pega'im*) intended to provide protection against demons, known to us from the Talmud. The Talmud suggests the use of Psalms 91 and 3 to this end, noting that, even though it is forbidden to use words of Torah for healing purposes, 'to protect is different' (*b. Šebu.* 15b; *j. 'Erub.* 10:11 [26c])." Elsewhere, in addition to the passage in 11Q5 Nitzan, cites 11Q11 and Eleazar's recitation of Solomon's exorcistic hymns (Josephus, *Ant.* 8.45-47; cf. §2.2.4.3, n. 292) as evidence of the use of "songs for the possessed" in early Judaism; cf. Nitzan, *Hymns*, 54. She also asserts that "[t]he Qumranic forms of '*Pegaim* Songs' are of the earliest known in Jewish tradition." Ibid.

[56] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 232-236.

[57] Recall the discussion on "incantations" above in §2.1.5; §2.2.3.4. Cf. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 244-252; and idem, *Hymns*, 54-58.

[58] These two components in *Songs of the Sage* are arranged and compared to analogous components in other incantations, including from the PGM and TS K 1.127 from the Cairo Genizah. Cf. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 245-252.

[59] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 250; cf. ibid, 248; and idem, *Hymns*, 58.

instance, function as a "word of power." The law and the formula γέγραπται are both referred to in numerous other circumstances for a multitude of purposes and, as such, are not demonologically oriented in themselves. Yet, just as a neutral hymn of praise is adapted for apotropaic intent in *Songs of the Sage*, the formulaic expression of Deuteronomy carries a confrontational tone in the Temptation. A key factor in both cases is context. The situation in *Songs of the Sage* is described in overt terms which make it clear that the hymn is for an anti-demonic purpose. A similar description for Jesus' quotations is not given; the dialogue simply unfolds before us. That is, Satan tempts and Jesus answers. Yet, the context seems to be less than a harmonious discussion between Jesus and Satan. The wilderness setting, the characterization of Satan as "the tempter" (ὁ πειράζων),[60] the refusal of Jesus to acquiesce to Satan's provocations, and manner of the devil's eventual departure[61] all contribute to the sense of the Temptation as a hostile conflict. This suggests that even though the expression of Deuteronomy is not openly described as a "word of power," the combative scenario provides an appropriate framework for its presence as such. Another feature which may line up with Nitzan's incantation components is the phrase ὕπαγε Σατανᾶ in Matthew 4:10. Jesus' command to "begone Satan" could be interpreted as a "banishing of harmful spirits." If this is the case, the Matthean account contains the two basic features of an "incantation" suggested by Nitzan.

"Status" and "Angels" in the Temptation and Songs of the Sage

The similarities between the Temptation account and the apotropaic songs in 4Q510-511 are not limited to the nature of an incantation. Another parallel relates to the "status" of both Jesus and the sage. According to Nitzan, the sage is able to

---

[60] Satan is referred to as ὁ πειράζων only in Mt. 4:3, however Jesus is said to be "tempted by the devil" in Mt. 4:1 and Lk. 4:2. Satan is also described as the source of Jesus' temptations in Lk. 4:13.

[61] In Matthew, the devil leaves (Τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος) (4:11) only after Jesus commands him to depart (ὕπαγε Σατανᾶ) (4:10). In Luke, it is clear that Satan's departure is only temporary, and he intends to resume his assault (Καὶ συντελέσας πάντα τειρασμὸν ὁ διάβολος ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἄχρι καιροῦ) (4:13).

employ seemingly harmless words of praise for a forceful and specific purpose because he has an elevated status. She explains that the sage has a "feeling of election, mission, and mystical closeness to God…[which] accompanies him during his struggle with demonic or destructive forces. He consequently has no need for any particular praxis, and recites regular sectarian poetry for magical purposes."[62] Noteworthy is that the sage's "feeling of attachment to God" contributes to his apotropaic ability. Nitzan comments that the requirement for an individual to have a special or elect status in order to effectively use certain formulae is also found in Babylonian and Greek traditions.[63]

Jesus' own superior lineage and status is detailed in the gospels. The Matthean and Lukan genealogies outline the illustrious station of one who counts Abraham, Jacob, David, Solomon and other important Israelite figures as ancestors. Both gospels present their genealogies before the Temptation account, thus ensuring that their audience is aware of Jesus' background when he enters the wilderness to be tested (cf. Mt. 1:1-17; Lk. 3:23-38). An even more unmistakable marker of Jesus' identity is pronounced by God himself; "this is my beloved Son" (Mt. 3:17; cf. Lk. 3:22). Indeed, it seems that the "feeling of attachment to God" which Nitzan writes of in relation to the Qumran sage also applies to Jesus. This is not to argue that Jesus is the New Testament "version" of the *maskil* from 4Q510-511 or any other document;[64] but rather, the sage of the *Yahad* and the Jesus of

---

[62] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 271. Angel provides a similar discussion regarding the sage's status and his ability to counteract demons; cf. idem, "Maskil, Community, and Religious Experience," 6-12.

[63] This is argued by Nitzan alongside ancient Babylonian, early Jewish, and Greek magical texts which depict a practitioner of magic as either being sent from God (or gods) or some other person of authority; cf. *Qumran Prayer*, 264-265. Thus, the special, elect status of the sage is not a unique requirement for the effective use of certain formulae. Furthermore, "sorcerers frequently engage in fasts, afflictions, or various forms of self-purification which detach them from any physical impurity connected with satanic powers." Ibid, 263.

[64] The relationship between Jesus and the Qumran Maskil or the Teacher of Righteousness is not a topic for the current conversation, but it has been taken up by others. E.g., see George J. Brooke, "The Pre-Sectarian Jesus," in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (*STDJ* 60; ed. F. García Martínez; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 33-48; Carol A. Newsom, "The Sage in the Literature of Qumran: The Functions of the *Maśkîl*," in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (eds. J. G. Gammie and L. G. Perdue; Eisenbrauns, 1990), 373-382; and Bernard Brandon Scott, "Jesus as

Matthew and Luke both enjoy a certain elevated status within their own respective literary frameworks. Both figures are considered models of righteousness, and their proximity to the divine is greater than the common man. Apparently this particular eminence endows the sage with the ability to utilize a hymn of praise against demons. It does not seem too large a leap to suggest that the status of Jesus, Israelite *par excellence* and son of God, awards him the capacity to express the law in an anti-demonic manner.

Another point of similarity between the *Songs of the Sage* and the Temptation narrative relates to angelic beings. Joseph Angel contends that angels are participants in the apotropaic ritual portrayed in 4Q510-511 (cf. §2.2.3.4). The "apotropaic energy" that ultimately wards off demons is created in part by the sage's, and his community's, liturgical worship of God in union with the angels. This ritual of joint liturgy with angelic beings is achieved by the transcendence of both the sage and his hymns of praise.[65] For Angel, it is not only the nature of the sage or the power of his hymns that keep away demons, but the elevated liturgy with the angels in which the coming eschatological age that is free from demonic harm is foreshadowed.[66] Angel's interpretation of angelic participants in *Songs of the Sage* echoes, to a degree, the views of Nitzan. In the hymns sung by the sage, "all the positive forces in the universe – the righteous, the creatures of heaven and earth, and the ministering angels – act against the destructive forces of the spirits of evil."[67] Nitzan explains that the anti-demonic effectiveness of prayer aided by

---

Sage: An Innovating Voice in Common Wisdom," in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, 399-415.

[65] A textual analysis of various terms, as well as a comparison of themes ("topoi") in *Songs of the Sage* to other "sectarian" works (e.g. 1QS), brings Angel, "Maskil, Community, and Religious Experience," 27, to conclude that in 4Q510-511 "the familiar Qumranite topoi of participation with the angels and embodiment of the archetypal temple" served an anti-demonic context. Some of the important themes throughout the text include the sage's position among the angels (cf. 4Q511 8 6-10) and the community's union and liturgical participation with the angels (cf. 4Q511 2 i 7-10; and 4Q511 35 3-5).

[66] Angel, "Maskil, Community, and Religious Experience," 21, writes: "By affording protection to the community now, the *Songs* offered a foretaste of the eschatological age."

[67] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 261-262. The specific hymns presented as describing these "positive forces" include 4Q511 1 1-8, 2 i 1-10, and 10 7-12.

angels is found elsewhere in early Judaism. Noting several passages in *1 Enoch* Nitzan comments: "it is stated here that when the prayer of the righteous ascends and unites with the prayer of the supernal holy beings, it has the power to obviate the trials of those who dwell on the earth from the harm caused by destructive demons."[68] For Nitzan, the union of human and angelic prayer which can rebuff demonic activity is present in the *Songs of the Sage*. Whether or not this tradition of *1 Enoch* lies in the background of 4Q510-511, it is clear that angels play a role, to some extent, in the apotropaic hymns of the sage.

Angelic beings are also present in the Temptation, albeit in a different capacity. After the satanic temptations in Matthew, angels offer assistance to Jesus. Matthew 4:11 states "and behold, angels came and ministered to him" (καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄγγελοι προςῆλθον καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ). The imperfect of διακονέω is used, and is usually translated as "serve" or "minister." Davies and Allison note that the sense of this term, in this context, could include "to give to eat."[69] Such a reading ensures a connection between the angelic assistance and the first temptation; since Jesus refused to perform the self-serving miracle of turning stones to loaves, he is now nourished with heavenly food. Being fed by angels is interpreted by some as an allusion to the Hebrew Bible where Elijah is sustained by an angel before traveling forty days and nights to Horeb (1 Kgs. 19:5-8).[70]

Alternatively, the presence of angels may be a response to the third temptation in Matthew. Satan's quotation of Psalm 91, meant to induce Jesus to throw himself from the temple, includes the promise that God "will give his angels charge of you" and "on their hands they will bear you up" (Mt. 4:6). Despite Jesus' rejection of Satan's maneuver, or because of it, Jesus ultimately is ministered to by angels.[71] Other scholars, such as Andrei Orlov, consider the

---

[68] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 262. *1 En.* 40:6-7, in Isaac, *1 Enoch*, 32, is translated: "And the third [angelic] voice I heard interceding and praying on behalf of those who dwell upon the earth and supplicating in the name of the Lord of the Spirits. And the fourth [angelic] voice I heard expelling the demons and forbidding them from coming to the Lord of the Spirits in order to accuse those who dwell upon the earth." See also *1 En.* 47:1-2.

[69] Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 374.

[70] Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 374; Evans, *Matthew*, 87; and Orlov, *Dark Mirrors*, 108.

[71] Cf. Keener, *Matthew*, 143.

ministering angels as one of several features of the Temptation that are found in pseudepigraphic writings. Orlov specifically highlights the correlation between themes in *2 Enoch* and the Matthean version of Jesus' trial in the desert. One theme is "instillation on high," where Enoch's heavenly journey is related to Jesus' otherworldly experience on a "very high mountain" where he can see at once "all the kingdoms of the world" (Mt. 4:8).[72] Another theme is referred to as the "veneration motif." The angelic veneration of a human protagonist described in *2 Enoch* and other pseudepigraphic works is compared and contrasted with the angels ministering to Jesus.[73] Thus, for Orlov, the angelic presence in the Temptation is indicative of apocalyptic traditions adopted by Matthew and, in its own unique way, speaks to the divine nature of Jesus.[74]

Although these different theories shed intriguing light on the presence and function of the ἄγγελοι in Matthew 4:11, they cannot be brought into direct relation to the presence or function of angels in *Songs of the Sage* or any other

---

[72] The *Primary Adam Books* also contain similar themes and are discussed in unison with *2 Enoch*; cf. Orlov, "Veneration Motif," 13-14. *2 Enoch* is considered to be contemporary with or earlier than Matthew's gospel; cf. F. I. Anderson, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch" in vol.1 of *OTP*, 94-97. However, the substantive versions of the *Primary Adam Books* are dated much later. On these, Orlov, "Veneration Motif," 5, states: "Although known macroforms of the *Primary Adam Books* survived only in their later medieval versions, these later Christian compilations undoubtedly contain early Jewish conceptual seeds that might also stand behind the veneration motif in the gospels' temptation story."

[73] Orlov, "Veneration Motif," 11, writes: "It is possible that the motif of angelic veneration of humanity reflected in the Gospel of Matthew has its true origins not in the Adamic tradition but in early Enochic lore, a portentous mediatorial trend in which the early Jewish angelology received its most profound symbolic expression." Similarly, Luigi Schiavo analyzes the temptation narrative alongside elements of "heavenly journeys" portrayed in various eschatological and/or apocalyptic texts including *1 En.* 17-19; 20-36; *2 Enoch*; Rev. 1:10; 4:2; 17:3 and others. From these different passages, Schiavo isolates nine "elements of the typology of the 'heavenly journey'"; cf. Luigi Schiavo, "The Temptation of Jesus: The Eschatological Battle and the New Ethic of the First Followers of Jesus in Q," *JSNT* 25.2 (2002): 146. The accompaniment of angels is one of these elements.

[74] Orlov, "Veneration Motif," 24, concludes: "in the temptation story the divinity of the human protagonist is affirmed in a new paradoxical way, not through the veneration motifs but through their deconstruction."

early Jewish anti-demonic context. We are left simply with Angel and Nitzan's observations about angelic participation with apotropaisms from Qumran, and a brief reference to the ministering angels in Matthew's temptation. Ultimately, it is difficult to link the presence of angels in the Temptation to early Jewish apotropaic tradition. Unlike passages in 4Q510-511 and *1 Enoch* where angels are described or depicted as cooperating in apotropaic exercises, whether in petitions or heavenly liturgies, there is no such direct portrayal of the angels in Matthew. Instead, the angels appear on the scene after Satan has left.[75] The verb διακονέω could have several meanings, but in itself suggests nothing related to anti-demonic activities. One must also account for the absence of the heavenly beings in Luke's version of the pericope. It is generally supposed that this tradition in Matthew is taken from Mark 1:13.[76] Although it is conceivable that Matthew may have included a detail related to apotropaism that Luke did not, it seems unlikely that the angels would have been omitted by Luke if they were thought to be instrumental in warding off the devil. Therefore, without an explicit link to the devil's departure, the ministering angels in Matthew do not, in themselves, carry an apotropaic tone.

The elevated status of both the sage and Jesus, as well as the presence of angels in 4Q510-511 and the Matthean Temptation, suggest common patterns between the Qumran and synoptic gospels writings. The shared features, though

---

[75] Mark is vague on this point. In Mk 1:13 the satanic temptations, the wild beasts, and the ministering (διακονέω) angels are referenced concurrently. The ambiguous language could almost suggest that the angels supported Jesus in his conflict with Satan, but such an assertion would be reading into the text.

[76] Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 254, offers the following explanation: "The use of the text of Q by Matthew and Luke has been influenced by Mark, whence [Mt. 4:11] derives the angels who are absent from Luke. If they were however originally in Q they would be there as rudiments of an earlier form related to Mark." For Eric Franklin, the absence of the angels in Luke reveals an important distinction in Luke's temptation versus that of Matthew and Mark. Franklin writes: "The three temptations [in Luke] are not the once-for-all overcoming of Satan's power, the once-for-all establishment of the reality of his sonship that they are in Mark and Matthew." That the angels are not present to witness Jesus' victory is evidence of this interpretation; cf. Eric Franklin, *Luke: Interpreter of Paul, Critic of Matthew* in JSNT Supplement Series 92 (ed. Stanley E. Porter; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 215-216.

relatively minor, begin to demonstrate that the anti-demonic orientations in *Songs of the Sage* and the Temptation narrative are not entirely dissimilar. The table below helps to exhibit these common themes:

Figure 3.2

	Songs of the Sage	**Temptation Narrative**
Type of Demonic Confrontation	Demonic "Leading Astray"	Demonic Temptation
Status of the Practitioner	The Sage of the Elect	The Beloved Son of God
"Word of Power"	Hymnic Praise of God	Formulaic Expression of the Law
"Banishing of Demons"	"To Frighten/Terrify"	"Begone, Satan!" (Mt. 4:10)
Angelic Assistance	Liturgical Worship with Angels	Presence of Ministering Angels (Mt. 4:11)

The feature most relevant for our larger discussion is the second "connecting point" between the Temptation and early Jewish apotropaic function; namely, the resemblance of Jesus' formulaic expressions to the "word of power" in 4Q510-511. This point raises the question of whether the biblical citations are quoted only as proof texts for Jesus' refusals of Satan, or if the quotations, in themselves, are intended to be a "weapon of opposition." Given the narrative's context of demonic confrontation, the authoritative and potential anti-demonic connotations of the law, and the use of Deuteronomy with γέγραπται, it is conceivable that the quotations of Deuteronomy are anti-demonic expressions. If they are indeed formulaic, and if they are intended to counteract or mitigate Satan to any extent, then the quotations of the law fit the definition of "incantation" suggested in §2.1.5.

3.1.3 The Implications of Apotropaisms in the Temptation

The analysis of the use of Deuteronomy in the Temptation in light of early Jewish anti-demonic apotropaism reveals two significant "connecting points" between both traditions. First, the apotropaic value of the law in early Judaism, seen especially in Kister's interpretation of torah observance in the *Damascus Document*, is insightful for understanding why Deuteronomy is quoted by Jesus. Second, the similarity of Jesus' expressions to early Jewish incantations highlights their authoritative and formulaic nature, and characterizes them as profound repudiations of the devil's enticements. However, there are two aspects that must be considered before suggesting the presence of apotropaic elements in the Temptation. The first is whether an apotropaic response by Jesus fits within the larger roles of Satan and demons in Matthew and Luke. The second issue is the viability of interpreting the Jesus of Matthew and Luke as a practitioner of apotropaisms.

3.1.3.1 Apotropaism and the Satanology/Demonology of the Gospels

Satan and demonic beings play a significant role in the life and ministry of Jesus depicted in the synoptic material, and it is most often the case that when Jesus encounters demonic evil it is in the form of possession. Exorcism is usually the response to this type of demonic influence and the exorcism of a demon or demons by Jesus has an immediate positive result in that the possessed person is relieved of affliction. Yet, in the Temptation, Satan does not physically assault Jesus and, accordingly, the themes of possession and exorcism are not an issue. Therefore, what is at stake here is not determining if Jesus' action against Satan is apotropaism versus exorcism. Rather, the question at hand is the extent to which a temporary warding off of Satan in the beginning of Jesus' ministry impacts the role of Satan throughout the rest of the gospels. In order to adjudicate the presence of apotropaism in the Temptation it is necessary to recall the features of Satanology/demonology conveyed in the relevant pericopae discussed above (cf. §1.1.4). This entails a brief discussion of the Temptation (Mt. 4:1-11; Lk. 4:1-13), Beelzebul Controversy (Mt. 12:22-32; Lk. 11:14-23), and the Lukan description of

Satan's fall (Lk. 10:17-20) while considering the possibility of an apotropaic action against Satan by Jesus.

Jesus' Victory and Satan's Defeat in the Temptation

The Temptation account depicts the only "face to face" conflict between Jesus and the devil in the synoptic material. It is necessary to understand whether Jesus is victorious in his confrontation with Satan and, if so, the nature of his success and Satan's defeat must be addressed. Let us first consider the issue in Matthew. The narrative does not appear to describe an explicit, unequivocal defeat of Satan; he simply fails to lead Jesus astray and the two figures are actively in opposition throughout the rest of Jesus' ministry.[77]

Jesus is successful in his contest with Satan because he does not acquiesce to any of the devil's suggestions. Since, as Branden shows, early Jewish literature informs the demonological worldview in Matthew, it is useful to reflect upon the concept of "testing" elsewhere in order to understand the essence of Jesus' victory over temptation. In early Judaism, the ability of an individual to withstand testing, often at the hands of a demonic adversary, functions as a mark of that individual's righteousness. In the *Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah* 5:1-16 Satan, also called "Beliar," works through two proxies (Manasseh and Belkira) in an attempt to force Isaiah, under threat of death, to recant his prophesies. Satan also tries to persuade Isaiah by promising to make him the object of worship. Isaiah refuses and, though he is put to death, the Holy Spirit speaks through him and he is given a vision of God. In *Jubilees* 17-18 Abraham proves his righteousness to God by demonstrating his willingness to sacrifice his son; a test which is instigated by "Prince Mastema" (*Jub.* 17:16; 18:9, 12). In both the Hebrew Bible and pseudepigraphic works the figure Job is highly regarded for remaining faithful to God despite satanic testing. The *Testament of Job* describes how Satan is like a weary wrestler who is ashamed of his failure to coerce Job and ultimately

[77] Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 55, notes: "the temptations function as *the beginning* of satanic challenge to Jesus' mission… This theme does not end when Satan leaves Jesus and angels minister to Him" (italics mine).

withdraws (cf. *T. Job* 27:2-5; §1.1.2.3 n. 109). This image, for Garrett, "illustrate[s] the notion that by withstanding the devil's tests the righteous person achieves victory over him."[78] Although these tests don't necessarily involve "temptation," Satan's defeat lies in his inability to turn Job away from God. Garrett compares Satan's failure in the *Testament of Job* with Satan's retreat from Jesus in Luke's Temptation,[79] and this comparison also fits the Matthean narrative. Therefore, Jesus' fidelity to God despite testing is an inherent victory over Satan.

A further detail important to this discussion relates to Jesus' demand ὕπαγε Σατανᾶ (Mt. 4:10). Matthew uses the imperative mood which characterizes ὑπάγω as a command, and Satan is addressed with the vocative case. Thus, the Greek construction of this expression, along with the confrontational tone of the narrative, depicts Jesus' words as a hostile rebuke. However, the significance lies not so much in Jesus' directive but in Satan's response; namely, he obeys Jesus' order to depart and withdraws. Satan's submission to Jesus indicates that he is, at least in this particular contest, the weaker figure.

A final feature in Matthew which may imply Jesus' victory over Satan is that "the devil" is replaced by "ministering angels." Whereas Jesus refuses angelic assistance at Satan's behest in the second temptation, the angels appear and serve Jesus once he has demonstrated his obedience to God. The absence of the devil and the presence of the angels may signify the positive outcome of Jesus' wilderness trial.[80]

---

[78] Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 42.

[79] Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 41-43.

[80] Davies and Allison contrast the angels ministering to Jesus to that which the first man, Adam, is deprived of. They state in *Matthew I-VII*, 374: "What Adam forfeited by his disobedience, namely, the ministration of angels, Jesus regained by his obedience…". Franklin, *Luke: Interpreter of Paul*, 215-216, argues that the Lukan Temptation is not the final defeat of Satan and, thus, "angels do not come to witness Jesus' victory…". If Luke purposefully omitted the angels from his narrative, this may indeed be one of the reasons why. However, while I agree with Franklin's assertion that Satan remains active beyond the Temptation, the presence of the angels in Matthew could indeed attest to Jesus' triumph over temptation without precluding the continuous activity of Satan in the rest of the gospel. Mark's less detailed account of Jesus' testing by Satan does not explicitly specify the outcome of the conflict, but concludes in 1:13: "[Jesus] was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered to him." For Garrett, "[t]he remark about angelic aid, which implies divine favor, is as

Luke's Temptation also portrays Jesus as remaining faithful to God and refusing to surrender to Satan. However, unlike Matthew's account, there is no mention of the ministering angels and Jesus does not command Satan to depart. Still, the immediate context of the narrative suggests that Jesus emerges from the wilderness testing in a victorious manner. Just as Jesus is "full of the Holy Spirit" and "led by the Spirit" (Lk. 4:1) before his encounter with Satan, after Satan's departure (4:13) "Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee" (4:14). Jesus' denial of Satan's temptations and his possession of the "power of the Spirit" indicate that, similar to Matthew's account, Jesus emerges as the stronger figure. In relation to Satan's departure Luke states: καὶ συντελέσας πάντα πειρασμὸν ὁ διάβολος ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἄχρι καιροῦ (4:13). Here, πάντα πειρασμὸν refers only to this particular event and ἄχρι καιροῦ qualifies the devil's departure as impermanent.[81] It seems that, as Franklin argues, Luke wants to specify that the Temptation is not a "once-for-all overcoming of Satan's power" and the devil is still an active adversary of Jesus.[82]

In the Matthean narrative there are three reasons to interpret Jesus as victorious against Satan: (1) Jesus does not submit to any temptations; (2) Satan obeys Jesus' command to "begone;" and (3) Jesus is ministered to by angels. Although each of these points demonstrate that Jesus is stronger than the devil, they neither suggest that the devil is totally vanquished nor do they indicate that Satan is deprived of all power. The restrained nature of Jesus' triumph and Satan's defeat portrayed by these three points is compatible with apotropaic tradition. To the first point, Jesus resists the temptations by adhering to the law which has apotropaic connotations in early Judaism. Furthermore, the image of Satan as a weary wrestler is consistent with one who is an addressee of an apotropaism; that is, Satan is not destroyed but simply overpowered and rebuffed. Second, Jesus'

---

close as the evangelist comes to telling us that Jesus endured Satan's tests"; idem, *Temptations of Jesus*, 59; cf. Heil, "Jesus with the Wild Animals," 63-78. If, as Garrett explains, the ministering angels represent "divine favor," then this may also be the case in Matthew.

[81] On this point I follow Garrett's interpretation in *Demise of the Devil*, 41-43. See also the discussion in §1.1.2.3.

[82] Franklin, *Luke: Interpreter of Paul*, 215.

command ὕπαγε Σατανᾶ functions as a rebuke which causes Satan to flee and, in this way, is comparable with a "warding off." Finally, although there is no explicit anti-demonic role of the angels in Matthew, angels are linked elsewhere to apotropaism (e.g. 4Q510-511). At the very least, the two features are not mutually exclusive.

In Luke's account, the reserved or temporary aspect of Satan's defeat is more emphatic, and Jesus' success over the devil, though implied, is more subdued than in Matthew. These features are consistent with apotropaism since, as Eshel and Nitzan explain, apotropaisms are limited and restrained anti-demonic actions that are not intended to bring about the demonic adversary's final destruction. [83] Therefore, interpreting Jesus' Deuteronomy quotations in the Matthean and Lukan Temptation as apotropaic is not in conflict with either Jesus' victory or the devil's failure within this specific narrative.

The Kingdoms and the Strong Man in the Beelzebul Controversy

Jesus does not defeat Satan once and for all in the wilderness confrontation and this is evident elsewhere in the gospels. A description of the conflict between the two figures is conveyed in the Beelzebul Controversy which contains kingdom imagery and the parable of the strong man that help to explain the nature of satanic and demonic opposition:

Figure 3.3 [84]

Matthew 12:25-29	Luke 11:17-22
25 Knowing their thoughts, [Jesus] said to them, "Every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste, and no city or house divided against itself will	17 But [Jesus], knowing their thoughts, said to them, "Every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste, and a divided household falls. 18 And if

[83] This is especially clear when Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 248, discusses the language in *Songs of the Sage*, stating: "the negative formation of the time of activity found in the incantation of the Maskil: 'not for eternal destruction'...is only intended to limit the time of activity of the malevolent spirit... The impression received is hence of a more moderate sort of magical activity." Similarly, Eshel, "Genres," 413, notes: "The [Qumran] apotropaic hymns and prayers thus are aimed only at limiting the time of the spirits' destruction, but not at putting a definite end to them."

[84] The English translation in *figure 3.3* is from Aland, *Synopsis*, 108-109.

stand; 26 and if Satan casts out Satan, he is divided against himself; how then will his kingdom stand? 27 And if I cast out demons by Beelzebul, by whom do your sons cast them out? Therefore they shall be your judges. 28 But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you. 29 Or how can one enter a strong man's house and plunder his goods, unless he first binds the strong man? Then indeed he may plunder his house.	Satan also is divided against himself, how will his kingdom stand? For you say that I cast out demons by Beelzebul. 19 And if I cast out demons by Beelzebul, by whom do your sons cast them out? Therefore they shall be your judges. 20 But if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you. 21 When a strong man, fully armed, guards his own palace, his good are in peace; 22 but when one stronger than he assails him and overcomes him, he takes away his armor in which he trusted, and divides his spoil.

The kingdom language places the roles of Satan and demons into a broader framework by linking Satan with demonic beings. Jesus' encounters with the demons throughout his ministry are not a series of isolated and unrelated events, but rather there is a structure of demonic opposition, described as a kingdom, in which Satan serves as a leader.[85] The manifestation of God's kingdom, which Jesus represents and proclaims, is present in Jesus' exorcistic activity. In other words, actions against demons are also actions against Satan and the whole demonic kingdom. It is in this way that exorcisms take spoils from, or "plunder," Satan's kingdom.

The parable of the strong man illustrates that Satan is weaker than Jesus. Satan is "bound" by Jesus in Matthew, whereas Jesus "overcomes" Satan and "strips him of his armor" in Luke. It is important to understand the way in which Satan is bound and overcome by Jesus. Some scholars hold that the parable refers to a specific past event, most likely the Temptation, in which Jesus bested Satan.[86]

---

[85] For Branden, the kingdom language applied to Satan "demonstrates the NT understanding of demonology in which Satan heads a kingdom which is well ordered and purposed against God." Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 78 n.138.

[86] In relation to Jesus' claim that his exorcisms herald the making present of God's kingdom, N. T. Wright states that this could only be the case if "a prior battle had already been won. Jesus was claiming that he had already met the prince of demons and defeated him. This extraordinary and cryptic statement can only be understood in the light of the temptation narrative"; N. T. Wright,

This is certainly a possibility, and the Temptation is the most obvious account which occasions the initial victory of Jesus over Satan. However, as Branden observes, "Matthew does not explicitly state when this binding occurred" and, thus, the purpose of referring to Satan as "bound" is to signify the superior strength of Jesus vis-à-vis Satan.[87] Similarly, Garrett and Twelftree interpret the parable in Luke as an allegory of how Jesus' exorcisms contribute to the ongoing defeat of Satan and his kingdom.[88] Therefore, the parable of the strong man portrays Jesus, the stronger man, launching a process of assault against Satan and the demonic kingdom. According to the "kingdom of God" claim (Mt. 12:28, Lk. 11:20) this assault, which is a "dismantling" of Satan's kingdom, is enacted through Jesus' exorcistic activity.[89]

Because exorcism is a way of "plundering" Satan's house and "dividing his spoil," it is the appropriate response by Jesus when he encounters demonic possession. Yet, in the initial confrontation with Satan in the wilderness the response is different. In the Temptation, Jesus meets the leader of the opposition but does not destroy him. Rather he proves himself to be the stronger individual and subsequently, as the kingdom language in the Beelzebul Controversy shows, degrades Satan's kingdom by exorcizing the demons he encounters. An apotropaic rebuke from Jesus in the Temptation is congruent with the kingdom imagery in the Beelzebul Controversy since a "warding off" of Satan in the Temptation impacts neither the effectiveness nor the significance of Jesus' exorcisms. Instead, it complements the "opposing kingdoms" analogy in that it demonstrates both Jesus' hostility and his superiority to the leader of the demons.

One difficulty in accepting this interpretation lies in the struggle to understand why Jesus simply rebuffs Satan in the wilderness instead of taking a more permanent action. Yet, this is an issue which any interpreter of the Temptation must confront whether or not apotropaisms are identified. In Jesus'

Jesus and the Victory of God (vol. 2 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God*; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 453.

[87] Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 64-65, 81 n. 162.

[88] Cf. Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 45; Twelftree, *In the Name of Jesus*, 135.

[89] Cf. Evans, ""Inaugurating the Kingdom of God," 49-75.

wilderness testing he successfully rejects the devil's assaults, yet the devil and his demons remain active throughout the rest of Jesus' ministry. Thus, while Jesus' restrained response to Satan in the wilderness may be somewhat puzzling, it does not conflict with the kingdom imagery in the Beelzebul Controversy. Moreover, the parable of the strong man demonstrates that Jesus is (1) stronger than Satan and (2) in the process of dismantling Satan's kingdom. Certainly the first point could be the result of an effective apotropaism. Likewise, since the dismantling of Satan's kingdom is depicted as an ongoing effort rather than an absolute and final defeat, this too is compatible with the restrained and impermanent nature of apotropaism.

The Vision of Satan's Fall from Heaven

Jesus' vision of Satan's fall is found only in Luke. The seventy disciples report to Jesus that in his name they have authority over demons. Jesus responds in 10:18 by describing his vision: "I saw Satan fall like lightening from heaven" (Ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σατανᾶν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα). This vision has repercussions for understanding the time and manner of Satan's defeat in Luke and, therefore, intersects with the assessment of apotropaism in the Temptation. Specifically, it must be addressed whether an apotropaism against Satan in the Temptation fits within the larger depiction of Satan's role in Luke.

Simon Gathercole discusses various interpretations of Luke 10:17-20 and arranges them into "three principal interpretive options" for locating the event of Satan's fall; Jesus' vision refers to a: (1) primeval past event; (2) recent past event; or (3) future event.[90] Gathercole assesses and critiques each option before arguing that the vision refers to a future, eschatological fall of Satan. To better grasp the issue of Satan's fall in the context of Luke's gospel, it is useful to briefly outline the strengths and weaknesses of each position.

Interpreting Jesus' vision as a reference to a primeval past event implies the pre-existence of Jesus. This theory is divided into two possible explanations. The first associates Satan's fall with the events in Genesis 1-2. This view holds

[90] Gathercole, "Jesus' Eschatological Vision," 144.

that Satan is cast from heaven sometime during the creation, possibly the second day (cf. *2 En.* [J] 29) or the sixth day (cf. *L.A.E.* 13-16).[91] Second, Satan's fall is seen by some to correspond to the descent of the Nephilim in Genesis 6. In either of these cases Gathercole acknowledges that "the religious-historical evidence clearly does not show that [a primeval] fall is unlikely in principle."[92] Still, based on the immediate context of the pericope and the wider context of Luke's gospel, Gathercole explains that a reference from Jesus to a primeval event in response the disciples' success is unlikely.

The second option is to interpret the fall of Satan as taking place simultaneously with Jesus' statement in Luke 10 or elsewhere within Jesus' ministry. One possibility is that Satan's fall is the result of the disciples' mission depicted in Luke 10 which includes exorcism. This is Twelftree's view based in large part on his interpretation that the imperfect tense of ἐθεώρουν (10:18) links Jesus' vision with the disciples' mission.[93] Gathercole is doubtful of this theory, stating: "[s]ignificant as the disciples' exorcistic activity is, it is very difficult to see how it could be invested with such powerful cosmic significance that it could be described as tantamount to the fall of Satan himself."[94] Furthermore, basing an interpretation on the tense of ἐθεώρουν is questionable since "the present and imperfect were the only tenses of θεωρέω in common use."[95]

If Jesus' vision does not describe the effect of the disciples' mission it may refer to an event which happened elsewhere in his ministry. The Temptation is the clearest direct confrontation between Jesus and Satan in which the outcome is favorable to Jesus. Otherwise, some scholars associate Satan's fall with Jesus' assurance that he has "bound the strong man" which, in turn, allows for the

---

[91] Gathercole notes that locating Satan's fall during or around the creation is the interpretation held by many of the Church Fathers including Tertullian, Origen, and Jerome; cf. idem, "Jesus' Eschatological Vision," 145-149.

[92] Gathercole, "Jesus' Eschatological Vision," 148.

[93] Twelftree, *In the Name of Jesus*, 140; cf. §1.1.2.3.

[94] Gathercole, "Jesus' Eschatological Vision," 151.

[95] Gathercole, "Jesus' Eschatological Vision," 151 n. 37.

success of Jesus' and the disciples' exorcisms.[96] Yet, Gathercole is hesitant to accept either of these views. He holds that the devil's failure in the Temptation "could hardly be described as Satan 'falling from heaven'; in fact, Luke's account suggests a very different picture: 'When the devil had finished all this tempting, he left him until an opportune time' (Lk 4, 13)."[97] Note especially Gathercole's translation of πάντα πειρασμὸν as "all this tempting" which emphasizes his understanding of the expression as referring only to the temptations in the wilderness. The problem with equating Satan's fall with the Temptation or associating it with Jesus' remarks in the Beelzebul Controversy is that "Satan later reappears, still with some considerable force."[98]

The third and most reasonable option, according to Gathercole, is to interpret Jesus' statement in Luke 10:18 as a description of a future event. Gathercole argues that, based on background traditions which depict Satan's fall, the vision in Luke 10 foretells Satan's descent from heaven to earth followed by a period of wrath against the faithful before Satan's final destruction. Particularly relevant are passages from surrounding Jewish and Christian traditions that tell of a final time of tribulation prior to Satan's demise. Among these are the *Testament of Solomon* 20:16-17 and Revelation 12:7-9.[99] These traditions contribute to early Christian eschatological themes: "first, that of the final fall of Satan to earth, and

---

[96] E.g., Wollenweider, "Ich sah den Satan," 201; Gathercole, "Jesus' Eschatological Vision," 151-153.

[97] Gathercole, "Jesus' Eschatological Vision," 152.

[98] Gathercole, "Jesus' Eschatological Vision," 153. Gathercole points to Lk. 22:3 and 22:31 to show that Satan is active beyond the Temptation, Beelzebul Controversy, and the vision of Satan's fall. He concludes: "In the light of the fact that Satan is still active in Luke 22, then, it makes better sense to see the fall of Satan as, from the point of view of Luke 10, an event which has not yet taken place. In support of this, it is important to note that ἐθεώρουν very commonly refers to sight of events to come." Ibid.

[99] Gathercole also refers to Dan 12:1 and Mk. 13:19-22, both of which describe the preservation of the elect from a period of violent destruction. Although these passages do not directly relate to the fall of Satan, Gathercole, "Jesus' Eschatological Vision," 156, suggest that "[a]gainst this background, we can see that Lk 10,17-20 combines, perhaps even for the first time, the traditions about the eschatological fall of Satan with those of the final outbreak of his persecutions of the elect."

secondly, the final time of trial, which the elect will survive, preceding Satan's destruction. Against this background, then, the motifs in Lk 10, 17-20 are not merely disparate elements…".[100]

This final option is very similar to Garrett's interpretation of Jesus' vision. She associates Satan's defeat with Jesus' resurrection (Luke 24), and even refers to the passage in Revelation 12 to help explain "the desperate burst of diabolical activity [preceding] Satan's ultimate demise at the judgment."[101] However, whereas Garrett connects this onslaught of demonic assault with certain events in Acts (e.g. 5:1-3, 13:6-12), Gathercole thinks this view is too narrow. The background traditions depicting the eschatological woes "seem to refer to events on a global scale, which affect both unbelievers and believers. These isolated incidents in the book of Acts, then, are probably not the best events to equate with Satan's outburst."[102] Instead, Gathercole links the coming tribulation and preservation of the elect with the eschatological language in Luke 21. This imagery includes "nation rising against nation, and kingdom against kingdom" (cf. vs.10), "great distress upon the earth and wrath upon God's people" (cf. vs. 23), "signs in sun and moon and stars, and upon the earth distress of nations" (vs. 25), and the coming of the "Son of man" (vs. 27). This language aligns with the tribulations described in Mark 13 and Daniel 12, as well as the destructive period after Satan's fall from heaven in Revelation 12.

By connecting Satan's fall with the eschatological language in Luke 21 instead of certain passages in Acts Gathercole offers an alternative to Garrett's theory. He explains that Luke 21 "envisages considerable turmoil taking place after the events recorded in the narrative of Luke-Acts, and these eschatological woes constitute a better context for the turmoil subsequent to the fall of Satan from heaven."[103] Thus, while both Garrett and Gathercole interpret Jesus' vision to refer

---

[100] Gathercole, "Jesus' Eschatological Vision," 157.

[101] Garett, *Demise of the Devil*, 56; cf. §1.1.2.3.

[102] Gathercole, "Jesus' Eschatological Vision," 158.

[103] Gathercole, "Jesus' Eschatological Vision," 161, continues: "Most scholars, in connection with Luke 10, 18, point to the way in which Jewish eschatological expectation about the fall of Satan is fulfilled in the ministry of Jesus. However, we can see that the cosmic events such as the falling of the angelic stars (as in 1En 90.23-24) are still envisioned by Luke as *future*, to accompany the final

to a future event, Gathercole suggests a wider, eschatological fulfilment of the vision.

Gathercole's theory, especially his connection between Satan's fall and the eschatology in Luke 21, presupposes that certain background traditions inform the Lucan passage. I think this is likely since, as chapter 1 demonstrates, the history of traditions influenced numerous aspects of synoptic gospel demonology and Satanology. Therefore, Gathercole's interpretation of Jesus' vision is convincing.[104]

The purpose of this discussion is to assess how an apotropaic response to Satan in the Temptation interacts with the fall of Satan portrayed in the vision in Luke 10. The second interpretive option laid out by Gathercole locates Satan's fall sometime during the ministry of Jesus. The only scenario in which this interpretation is inconsistent with an apotropaism in Luke 4 is if Satan's fall is equated with the Temptation. Since by nature an apotropaism is a restrained, temporary anti-demonic action it does not have the powerful significance of casting Satan from heaven. Otherwise, if the fall is associated with the binding of

---

return of the Son of Man." Still, although Gathercole prefers to locate Satan's fall in the eschaton, he acknowledges that Jesus' death and resurrection could bring about the event (i.e., Garrett's theory) if the time of tribulation extends beyond Acts; cf. ibid., 161 n. 74.

[104] Still, I am less persuaded that Gathercole adequately dismisses the notion that the vision refers to a primeval event. While I agree that "'Satan falling' is a strange way to describe the descent of the nephilim" (Gathercole, "Jesus' Eschatological Vision," 148), imagery in Luke 10 aligns with other traditions which may allude to or describe a primeval fall of Satan (i.e. Isa. 14:12, *2 En.* [J] 29, and *L.A.E.* 13-16). The basis for Gathercole's rejection of this view is that it does not fit into the context of the pericope: "Why respond to the success of the disciples with reference to the primeval fall of Satan? The only reason could be that Jesus was simply claiming that he had seen something more impressive than that which they had witnessed, but which was otherwise largely unrelated." Ibid., 149. Yet, such a claim is not unrelated. Jesus could be describing one reason for the successes of their exorcisms; Satan, the chief of demons, was already fallen and, therefore, in a more vulnerable position and susceptible to attack. Additionally, if reference to a primeval fall in Lk. 10:18 does not harmonize with other aspects of the larger work as a whole it could simply attest to various strata of traditions present in the final form of the gospel. Ultimately, I think the viability of this theory comes down to the way in which one thinks the background traditions inform the pericope, and to whether or not one is willing to attribute to Luke the belief in a pre-existent Jesus.

Satan by the stronger man, then an effective apotropaic technique in the Temptation demonstrates Jesus' superiority and ability to bind the devil. Furthermore, the Beelzebul Controversy shows that exorcizing demons is equivalent to "overcoming" Satan and removing his "armor" (Lk. 11:22). If Satan's fall is the result of a series of exorcistic attacks against his demons by Jesus and the disciples it does not make sense that Jesus' apotropaic rebuke of Satan in Luke 4 would diminish the significance of his exorcisms. Rather, since satanic temptation is the issue in Luke 4, whereas demonic possession is the issue elsewhere, Jesus' apotropaism and exorcisms are simply two different, non-conflicting responses to separate situations. Thus, unless the Temptation is interpreted as the occasion of Satan's fall, this theory of Jesus' vision in Luke 10 is compatible with an apotropaic response by Jesus in the Temptation.

The interpretation of Jesus' vision as a reference to a primeval event portrays Satan in a "defeated but not yet destroyed" state throughout Luke's gospel.[105] Although still an active opponent, the fallen Satan is successfully barraged by the exorcistic ministry of Jesus and the disciples. This view especially explains the effectiveness of an apotropaism; that is, Jesus easily "wards off" Satan who is already in a weakened position. The third and most likely interpretation of Jesus' vision is that it refers to a future eschatological fall of Satan. Here, Jesus and the disciples are engaged in a hostile battle against Satan and his demonic allies. It is fitting in these circumstances for Jesus to employ an apotropaic tactic to defend himself against, and exert authority over, Satan in the Temptation. Additionally, locating Satan's fall in the future may attach an element of eschatology to Jesus' apotropaism. Just as the apotropaism in in *Songs of the Sage* is "not for an everlasting destruction" (4Q510 1 7), so too a "warding off" of Satan in the Temptation reserves his defeat for the eschatological event described in Luke 10. A temporal action against Satan, who will fall in the future, parallels the description in Luke 4:13 that the devil withdraws "for a time." Therefore, unless Satan's fall is connected to the Temptation which is unconvincing, an

[105] As noted above (§1.1.3.1), a defeated but not destroyed Satan is similar to the binding of Azaz'el for future judgment in *1 Enoch* 10; cf. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 220-224.

apotropaic response by Jesus is compatible with any of the three principal interpretations of Jesus' vision in Luke 10.

3.1.3.2 Jesus as Practitioner of Apotropaisms

One type of apotropaic prayer takes the form of a petition to God. As demonstrated in the examples from early Judaism, an apotropaic petition is offered by a supplicant who is in a rather compromised state. For instance, the *Plea for Deliverance* emphasizes the sinful condition of the praying individual, and the petitioner in *Prayer of Levi* is one in need of a holy spirit and other beneficent gifts. In the various petitions from *Jubilees* a third party often serves as intercessor to aid those in spiritual and physical danger, and the recipient of an apotropaic petition is often lacking strength or a righteous state and is dependent upon an outside source for protection. In the case where an apotropaism takes the form of an incantation, it could be said that one is relying on a particular formula to ensure safety from evil.

If apotropaisms are viewed as tools for the powerless or as rituals in which one must utter particular formulae or adhere to halakhic statues in order to be rescued from evil, then this interpretation of Jesus using apotropaic formulations would not be consistent with portrayals of Jesus in each of the gospels. In response to this concern, I would emphasize (1) the nature of apotropaic prayer and (2) the manner of Jesus' quotations from Deuteronomy. Regarding the first point, it is clear that Jesus' expressions are more similar to an incantation than a petition. By this fact alone an apotropaism in the Temptation does not have the connotation of dependency that a petition often carries. Moreover, the comparison of Jesus to the sage in 4Q510-511 (§3.1.2) suggests that the ability to use certain words for an apotropaic purpose is due to a person's elevated status. Far from being a characteristic of helplessness, an apotropaic tactic can be indicative of the power of the one who uses it. Second, although the formulaic nature of Jesus' quotations resemble the style of an incantation, this does not detract from the authority of Jesus. Rather, the manner of his expressions are analogous, to a degree, to the descriptions of his exorcisms. While specific exorcism incantations existed in the

ancient world and the exorcists' success could depend upon the proper implementation of a given procedure, Jesus is portrayed as exorcizing the possessed without relying on common exorcism rituals.[106] In a similar way, Jesus responds to demonic evil with well-known apotropaic techniques (i.e., adhering to the law, quoting scripture), but the anti-demonic efficacy of Jesus' words are not tied to his use of a fixed ritual or a magical invocation.

Since *Songs of the Sage* provide precedent for interpreting apotropaic prayer as a tactic suitable for an authoritative figure, it is reasonable to conclude that Jesus' use of an apotropaism does not affect his power or status. Furthermore, given that an apotropaic response to Satan in the Temptation does not conflict with the larger demonologies and Satanologies in Matthew and Luke (§3.1.3.1), interpreting Jesus as "warding off" Satan does not fundamentally shift the dynamic between the two figures which is portrayed throughout the rest of the gospels. Instead, there are two implications of interpreting apotropaic features in the Temptation: (1) it enhances the meaning and force of Jesus' quotations from Deuteronomy, and (2) it depicts Jesus as responding to the demonic in line with responses to external evils in early Jewish tradition.

3.1.4 Psalm 91 and "Apotropaic Inversion" in the Temptation

In addition to Deuteronomy, the only other direct quotation in the Temptation is from Psalm 91 (Mt. 4:6; Lk. 4:10-11). This psalm has a unique relationship with demonological contexts and is explicitly used in later traditions to seek refuge from demonic harm.[107] The original Hebrew passage, presented above with an English translation (§2.2.1.2), is not overtly anti-demonic but contains terminology similar to ancient Mesopotamian demonological language. For example, the

---

[106] For instance, although Jesus sometimes demands the name of a demon (e.g. Lk. 8:30), other times he does not (e.g. Lk. 4:35). Also, Jesus does not invoke a power-authority, nor does he "adjure" (ὁρκίζω) the demons; he simply casts them out with mere words seemingly by his own power. Thus, it can be said that Jesus responds to the demonic in ways familiar to his time, but unique in ways that emphasize his own superior authority and ability. This is one of the points made by Twelftree in §18 of *Jesus the Exorcist*.

[107] See especially §2.2.1.2; §2.2.2.4.

Hebrew word לילה in verse 5 bears a similarity to the night demon "Lilith,"[108] and some argue that the syntax used in verses 5-6 allude to demonic evil.[109] The LXX translates in verse 6 δαιμονίου μεσημβοινοῦ ("evil spirit at noon-day").[110] The earliest explicit connection between Psalm 91 and anti-demonic praxis is the inclusion of the biblical passage with the exorcism hymns in *11QApocryphal Psalms* which places the psalm firmly within the framework of anti-demonic ritual.[111] In later traditions, excerpts from Psalm 91 appear in Aramaic incantation

---

[108] Another example is the connection between the "flying arrow" (חץ יעוף) in vs. 5 and the Canaanite god "Resheph" whose symbol was an arrow. Schmutzer, "Psalm 91," 96, comments: "While these demonic identities may be depersonalized in Israel's theology, the same identities were not dismantled in the antecedent pantheons and practices surrounding Israel." In addition, Fröhlich describes דבר ("pestilence") and קטב ("destruction") in vss. 3 and 6 as "demonic representatives of the plague." Idem, "Evil in Second Temple Texts," 45. For more on the relationship of the Hebrew terms to ancient Near Eastern thought, see Henze, "Psalm 91," 184.

[109] Jeremy Smoak observes the similar linguistic patterns between the apotropaic amulet Ketef Hinnom I and the petitionary nature of some psalms, including Psalm 91; cf. Jeremy D. Smoak, "May YHWH Bless You and Keep You from Evil: The Rhetorical Argument of Ketef Hinnom I and the Form of Prayers for Deliverance in the Psalms," *JANER* 12 (2012): 202-236. In his outline of the structure of the psalm, Erhard Gerstenberger describes vss. 3-8 as "apotropaic sayings." Gerstenberger likewise identifies various terms in vss. 5, 6 and 13 as referring to demonic beings; cf. E. S. Gerstenberger, *Psalms, Part 2, and Lamentations* (FOTL 15; Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2001), 163-168. For a general overview of the apotropaic use of the psalm, see: Thomas J. Kraus, ""Septuaginta-Psalm 90 in apotropäischer Verwendung: Vorüberlegungen für eine kritische Edition und (bisheriges) Datenmaterial," *BN* 125 (2005): 39-73.

[110] Charles Brenton translates these words "the evil spirit at noon-day," but the words could arguably be rendered "noon-day demon." Charles Lee Brenton, *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament* (London: Samuel Bagster and Son Limited, 1900), 754. Henze, "Psalm 91," 183-184, notes that the Greek term "does not necessarily designate an evil spirit, though this meaning is well established in the LXX." Cf. Koskenniemi, "Miracles of the Devil," 88. Rudolf Arbesmann surveys the interpretive trends for Ps 91:6's "δαιμονίον μεσημβοινόν" and "daemonium meridianum" in patristic exegesis in "The 'DAEMONIUM MERIDIANUM' and Greek and Latin Patristic Exegesis," *Traditio* 14 (1958): 17-31.

[111] On Psalm 91 in 11Q11 vi, see Fröhlich, "Evil in Second Temple Texts," 45-46; Henze, "Psalm 91," 186-182; Angel, "Early Jewish Magic," 790; and Hermann Lichtenberger, "Ps 91 und die Exorzismen in 11QPsAp^{a}," in *Die Dämonen*, 416-421. Although Mika Pajunen tempers the strong anti-demonic nature of the prayer argued by others (e.g. Henze), he acknowledges the clear anti-

bowls and amulets dating from Late Antiquity to the early Middle Ages.[112] The Aramaic version of the prayer in the Targum of Psalms contains more than a few direct references to demons. For instance, verses 5-6 are translated: "You will not be afraid of the terror of *the demons that go about in* the night, nor of the arrow *of the angel of death that he shoots* in the daytime, nor of the *death* that goes about in the darkness, nor of *the company of demons that destroy* at noon."[113] Additionally, the Latin Vulgate echoes the LXX by translating in verse 6 "daemonio meridiano."[114] These points demonstrate that Psalm 91 has a long association with the ability to "ward off" demons, and the evidence suggests that the tradition would have been recognized during the time when the synoptic gospels were composed.

In light of the connotations of Psalm 91, it is unusual that in the Temptation this particular psalm is attributed to Satan. In both Matthew and Luke, Satan uses the formula γέγραπται to introduce quotations from verses 11 and 12 of the psalm. These versus appear as part of the lure for Jesus to throw himself off the temple to spur divine preservation and, thus, Psalm 91 is apparently invoked to support the satanic temptation of reliance on God. This enigmatic use of the psalm

---

demonic role of the prayer in 11Q11. Pajunen states: "The actual casting out of the demon has already been accomplished by the previous psalm(s) [i.e., 11Q11 i-v]. In Psalm 91, the healed person confirms his faith in God (v. 2) and is granted the promise of divine protection against further demonic attacks… In this context, the Qumranic version of Psalm 91 makes a fitting ending for the ritual that includes (or consists solely of) healing by exorcism." Mika S. Pajunen, "Qumranic Psalm 91: A Structural Analysis," in *Scripture and Tradition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Rajja Sollamo* (eds. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta; JSJSup 126, ed. J. J. Collins; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 604-605. Pajunen's characterization of the function of Psalm 91 within 11Q11 is much like the "symbiotic" relationship of exorcistic and apotropaic method discussed in §2.2.2.4.

[112] Cf. Schiffman and Swartz, *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts*, 39; Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 71-74; and Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 359-365.

[113] The English translation is from David M. Stec, *The Targum of Psalms: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes*, vol. 16 of *The Aramaic Bible* (eds. Kevin Catcart, Michael Maher, and Martin McNamara; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 175 (italics his).

[114] Cf. Arbesmann, "The 'DAEMONIUM MERIDIANUM,'" 17-31; cf. Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi which reads "insanientis meridie."

has been explained by means of various theories, a brief overview of which is necessary for evaluating the proper role of the psalm within the temptation pericope.

Satan's Use of Psalm 91: Theories

Some scholars hold that Satan is portrayed using Psalm 91 merely as a proof text for his temptation and is unaware of its anti-demonic implications.[115] It is possible that a gospel writer intended to depict an ill-informed Satan quoting an anti-demonic passage while the author himself was mindful of the psalm's context. However, it seems strange that both Matthew and Luke would incorporate this tone of irony, evidently originating from a common source, into a dramatic confrontation between Jesus and the devil. Other scholars refrain from commenting on the implications of Satan's use of an apotropaic prayer and explain that the psalm simply is misused or "twisted" by the devil for his own purpose.[116] Yet, there are many other passages that could have been cited which relate to divine protection (e.g. Josh 1:9; Isa. 41:10; Pss. 23, 121:1-8). Ps. 34:7 promises angelic assistance to those who fear God; a theme nearly identical to that conveyed in Psalm 91:11-12. If the intention was for Satan to present a biblical case to coerce Jesus into a display of reliance on the safety of God, plenty of other passages which did not have the demonological nuances of Psalm 91 would have sufficed.

A theory set forth by J. Samuel Subramanian suggests that Matthew and Luke have a prophetic understanding of Psalm 91; namely, the psalm depicts a righteous figure who is saved by God, and the Temptation conveys the fulfillment of that prophecy in Jesus. Subramanian comments on Matthew's use of the psalm:

---

[115] Cf. Bovon, *Luke 1*, 145. Without getting into the demonological aspects of the Psalm 91, Joel Green suggests that Satan "overlooks" elements of the psalm when addressing Jesus; cf. Joel B. Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke* (Cambridge University Press, 1995), 27.

[116] Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 517, writes: "Vanquished by Scripture of the Word of God in the first two temptations, the devil now quotes it to his own purpose"; cf. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the OT*, 93.

> The devil is demanding a spectacular miracle which would prove Jesus' messiahship: 'If you are the Son of God, throw yourself down' (Mt. 4.6). The devil then quotes Ps. 90(91).11-12 as a messianic prophecy about divine protection available to Jesus as the *Son of God*. As we have seen earlier, Psalm 91, in its original context, speaks of divine protection given to the pious one. But the application of Ps. 90(91).11-12 in the context of the temptation narrative in Mt. 4.6 to Jesus as 'Son of God' indicates that the devil does not see Jesus merely as a pious individual, but as the Son of God (the Messiah in an implicit way) about whom the psalmist is presumed to be speaking prophetically.[117]

As Subramanian acknowledges, there is no direct or explicit messianic element in the quotation, and any such feature must be implied from context. Yet even if the devil's quotation is meant in this way, why would the authors choose an apotropaic psalm when other Davidic psalms which promise God's assistance to a righteous figure (e.g. Psalms 23 and 25) could be used? Therefore, the issue with Subramanian's theory is not with the quotation of a psalm, but with the use of Psalm 91 in particular.

A common observation about the dialogue between Jesus and Satan is that it resembles a rabbinic dispute. Davies and Allison state: "It requires little labour to find debates in which two rabbis throw biblical passages back and forth – and that is more or less what we have here: Jesus and the devil confront each other by quoting various Scriptures…".[118] This parallel of the dialogue in the Temptation to patterns of rabbinic discussion is noted by Bultmann and others.[119] One example from the Babylonian Talmud (*b. Sanh.* 89b) describes a conversation in which Satan and Abraham quote scripture in a polemical fashion.[120] Kimball points to a midrashic text (*Pes. R.* 36) which is "sometimes used in connection with Ps.

---

[117] J. Samuel Subramanian, *The Synoptic Gospels and the Psalms as Prophecy* (LNTS 351; ed. Mark Goodacre; T&T Clark, 2007), 95. On Luke's use of Psalm 91, cf. ibid, 72-75.

[118] Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 352.

[119] Cf. Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 254-255; Gibson, *The Temptations of Jesus*, 115; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 145; and Keener, *Matthew*, 143.

[120] Cf. *Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud: Sanhedrin*, H. Freedman, trans. (ed. I. Epstein; London: The Soncino Press, 1969). Another oft-cited example is from *Sifre* Deut. 307 where questions are proposed and answered using scripture references. Cf. Jacob Neusner, *Sifre to Deuteronomy: An Analytical Translation, vol. 2* (BJS 101; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1987), 317-321.

91.11" that reads: "When the King the Messiah, reveals himself, he will come and stand on the roof of the temple."[121] Although this passage intersects with the Temptation in its association with Psalm 91 and its reference to the roof ("πτερύγιον" in Mt. 4:5; Lk 4:9) of the temple, the late date of the *Pesikta Rabbati* precludes any direct bearing of the passage on the gospel narrative.[122]

Although it is certainly the case that the dialogue between Jesus and the devil is similar to some patterns of rabbinic discussion, this parallel only addresses Satan's use of scripture without specifically engaging Satan's quotation of an apotropaic psalm. Several theories engage directly the anti-demonic nature of Psalm 91. Among these is an argument offered by Errki Koskenniemi who studies the Temptation alongside aspects of *11QApocryphal Psalms* and the first century Jewish *LAB*. In passages from both 11Q11 and *LAB* a holy individual is assaulted by a demon and elements of God's cosmological order are used to counteract the demonic attacks. This is manifest in 11Q11 vi to the extent that Davidic hymns, where Psalm 91 is included, are used to frighten away demons by reminding them of the cosmological order established by God.[123] The traditional roles held by exorcist and demon are reversed in the Temptation, and it is Satan who invokes the

---

[121] Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the OT*, 94. Twelftree states: "In asking Jesus to throw himself down from the Temple, the devil may be tempting Jesus to display his messiah-ship, for a rabbinical saying in the *Pesiqta Rabbati* says that 'when the King, the Messiah, reveals himself, he will come and stand on the roof of the temple.' However, we cannot be certain that this saying reflects expectations of Jesus' time." Twelftree, "Temptation of Jesus," *DJG*: 823.

[122] Dates of composition from the 4th to the 9th century A.D. have been suggested. According to William Braude, the most probable date of *Pesikta Rabbati* is the 7th century; cf. *Pesikta Rabbati: Discourses for Feasts, Fasts, and Special Sabbaths*, William G. Braude trans. (2 vols.; YJ 18; ed. Leon Nemoy; Yale University Press, 1968), 20-26. For an English translation of *Pes. R.* 36, see ibid, 682.

[123] The *LAB* shares in the tradition that David and Solomon are exorcists. In this text, according to Koskenniemi, "Traditional Roles Inverted," 165-166, "[t]he method used to block the demon is the cosmological knowledge of the exorcist." Koskeniemi derives this interpretation from *LAB* 60, 1-3; cf. ibid. For the first century dating of *LAB*, see Frederick J. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible* (Oxford University Press, 1993), 6.

psalm in a challenge to Jesus.[124] This occurs due to Satan's doubt about Jesus' alleged status as God's son. Thus, whereas an exorcist typically quotes Psalm 91 to remind demons of their "proper place" in creation, the devil invokes Psalm 91 to remind Jesus of the same cosmological order by calling into question his claim of divine sonship.

While Koskenniemi is persuasive in his assessment of the devil's use of Psalm 91 in light of 11Q11, his overall theory hinges on the interpretation that Satan is uncertain of Jesus' identity as "son." This is arguably not the case since εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ (Mt. 4:3, 6; Lk. 4:3, 9) can be translated "Since you are the Son of God" (cf. §3.1.1). If Satan is testing the way in which Jesus carries out his mission as "son," it seems unnecessary to remind him of God's cosmological order.

Matthias Henze suggests a different viewpoint, one that makes good sense of the psalm's use in the double tradition. In his discussion of Luke's version of the narrative he explains that:

> By quoting Psalm 91, the demon par excellence inverts the intention of the dictum, originally spoken to console those haunted by evil spirits, and now turns it into a tool for temptation. The point here is not so much that the devil quotes Scripture out of context, as is often remarked. To the contrary: the audacity of the satanic trial can be appreciated to its fullest only when the larger, antidemonic context of the quote is realized... When taken out of context, the devil's quote loses its edge, seems arbitrary and could be replaced by any number of passages from the Hebrew Bible. The force of the temptation lies precisely in the implied context of the quote, i.e., its antidemonic connotations which undoubtedly would have been known to Luke and his original audience.[125]

---

[124] Similarly, Orlov comments on veneration motifs in early Jewish apocalyptic texts, and argues that the traditional roles in those motifs are reversed in the Matthean Temptation. He states: "It has been already demonstrated that in the temptation story Satan fulfills several functions traditionally ascribed to angelic figures, such as offices of the psychopomp and the *angelus interpres*. Yet, the elusive adversary is able to mimic not only the duties of angelic figures but also the deity himself. It is therefore possible that in the Matthean account Satan is portrayed as an idolatrous negative replica of the divine *Kavod*." Orlov, "Veneration Motif," 19; cf. idem, *Dark Mirrors*, 107-112.

[125] Henze, "Psalm 91," 185-186. Evans offers a similar view of Psalm 91 in the temptation, but does not elaborate on the issue; cf. Craig A. Evans, "Jesus and Psalm 91 in Light of the Exorcism Scrolls," in *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Contribution* (eds. P. W. Flint, J. Duhaime, and K. S. Baek; Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 541-555.

This assessment, like Koskenniemi's, takes into account the apotropaic background of Psalm 91. Yet for Henze, it is the function of the psalm that is inverted from one of apotropaic efficacy to one of demonic aggression. According to this theory, while the psalm may indeed serve as a proof text for a particular temptation, Satan is not unaware of its apotropaic connotations. The devil "misuses" or "misapplies" the psalm in the sense that its invocation is a ploy to intimidate Jesus. Thus, while the dialogue between Jesus and Satan may resemble rabbinic disputation, Koskenniemi and Henze are correct to see an element of "inversion" at work in the exchange. Henze's article does not discuss analogous occurrences of this "inversion" tactic, but other examples are available. To accurately evaluate this function of Psalm 91 in the Temptation, and thereby place its inversion within a larger demonological construct, it is useful to consider these similar techniques.

3.1.4.1 Inversion Techniques

The "Inversion" in 11QApocryphal Psalms

An important parallel to the inversion of Psalm 91 in the Temptation is present in 11Q11 v 4-7:

4 לדויד ע[ל ל]חש בשם יהו[ה קרא בכו]ל עת
5 אל השמ[ים כי]יבוא אליך בלי[לה וא]מרתה אליו
6 מי אתה [הילוד מ]אדם ומזרע הקד[ושי]ם פניך פני
7 [שו]א וקרניך קרני חל[ו]ם חושך אתה ולוא אור

4 Of David. A[gainst An incanta]tion in the name of YHW[H. Invoke at an]y time
5 the heav[ens. When]he comes to you in the nig[ht,] you will [s]ay to him:
6 'Who are you, [oh offspring of] man and of the seed of the ho[ly one]s? Your face is a face of
7 [delu]sion and your horns are horns of ill[us]ion, you are darkness and not light[126]

[126] The Hebrew reconstruction and English translation is from García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 198-200; cf. §2.2.4.3.

These lines are instructions to an exorcist on how to use the incantation (§2.2.4.3), and line 5 preserves a directive for the exorcist to engage the demon verbally (אליו ואמרתה). The question "who are you?" (מי אתה) in line 6 signals the aggressive tone of the exorcist's words since gaining the identity of a demon is an authoritative practice.[127] Line 6 then identifies the demon as "offspring of man" and "seed of the holy ones"; a description that suggests an Enochic aetiology of evil spirits which is present elsewhere in the Qumran literature.[128] Consequently, the "horns" (קרני) and "face" (פני) are symbolic of the demon's power and presence. In lines 6-7 these features are proclaimed to be "empty" (שוו, √שוא) and an "illusion" (חלום). The mocking of these demonic attributes is, as Alexander describes, a "strategy of psychological counter-attack" which is a component of the anti-demonic measure conveyed in the incantation.[129]

The "psychological counter-attack" against a demon in 11Q11 v 6-7 can be compared to the "inversion" tool of Satan. In the Qumran passage an effective technique is for the exorcist to mock the powerful qualities of the demon, presumably to render the being impotent. In the Temptation this technique is used against the righteous individual; the result is an authoritative anti-demonic text invoked by Satan. Here, the psalm is expressed not to "ward off" Jesus, but rather to display the power of Satan and to neutralize any attempt to ward *him* off. Whereas the exorcist in *11QApocryphal Psalms* subverts the demon's weapons of intimidation, Satan adopts this method by challenging the effectiveness of apotropaic prayer. In both instances, the tools of influence are mocked. This

---

[127] Cf. Fröhlich, "Magical Healing at Qumran," 43; and idem, "Evil in Second Temple Texts," 46. Bonner considers this aspect of exorcism to be quite evident: "The belief that knowledge of a name gives a hold upon its owner is so well known to students of folklore and of the history of religion that it is unnecessary to offer evidence for it. From the tale of Rumpelstilzkin in Grimm's Märchen to the magical papyri, in which the adept vaunts his knowledge of secret names that control both demons and gods, proofs beyond number show how widely this idea prevailed. It seems to appear in Mark's vivid narrative about the Gerasene demoniac (5. 1-20)." Bonner, "The Technique of Exorcism," 44; cf. n. 320 in chapter 2.

[128] Cf. Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 337-341.

[129] Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 346. Cf. García Martínez et al., *DJD XXIII*, 201.

interpretation not only serves to demonstrate the "force of the temptation," as Henze observes, but also amplifies the hostility of the confrontation. A stronger argument for the presence of psychological warfare in the pericope is made if Satan's tactic is seen as a response to Jesus' apotropaic quotations of Deuteronomy.

The use of Psalm 91 by Satan is not the only instance of reverse anti-demonic tactics found in the gospels. The accounts of the Gerasene Demoniac (Mt. 8:28-34; Mk. 5:1-20; Lk. 8:26-39) and the Demoniac in the Synagogue (Mk 1:23-28; Lk 4:33-37) also contain dialogue between Jesus and demonic beings which is relevant to the topic of "inversion techniques."

Inversion Language in the Gerasene Demonic

Figure 3.3

Matthew 8:28-32	Mark 5:1-15	Luke 8:26-35
28 And when he came to the other side, to the country of the Gadarenes, two demoniacs met him, coming out of the tombs, so fierce that no one could pass that way. 29 And behold, they cried out, "What have you to do with us, O Son of God? Have you come here to torment us before the time?" 30 Now a herd of many swine was feeding at some distance from them. 31 And the demons begged him, "If you cast us out, send us away into the herd of swine." 32 And he said to them, "Go." So they came out and went into	1 They came to the other side of the sea, to the country of the Gerasenes. 2 And when he had come out of the boat, there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit, 3 who lived among the tombs; and no one could bind him any more, even with a chain; 4 for he had often been bound with fetters and chains, but the chains he wrenched apart, and the fetters he broke in pieces; and no one had the strength to subdue him. 5 Night and day among the tombs and on the mountains he was always crying out, and bruising himself	26 Then they arrived at the country of the Gerasenes, which is opposite Galilee. 27 And as he stepped out on land, there met him a man from the city who had demons; for a long time he had worn no clothes, and he lived not in a house but among the tombs. 28 When he saw Jesus, he cried out and fell down before him, and said with a loud voice, "What have you to do with me, Jesus, Son of the Most High God? I beseech you, do not torment me." 29 For he had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man. (For

the swine; and behold, the whole herd rushed down the steep bank into the sea, and perished in the waters.	with stones. 6 And when he saw Jesus from afar, he ran and worshiped him; 7 and crying out with a loud voice, he said, "What have you to do with me, Jesus Son of the Most High God? I adjure you by God, do not torment me." 8 For he had said to him, "Come out of the man, you unclean spirit!" 9 And Jesus asked him, "What is your name?" He replied, "My name is Legion; for we are many." 10 And he begged him eagerly not to send them out of the country. 11 Now a great herd of swine was feeding there on the hillside; 12 and they begged him, "Send us to the swine, let us enter them." 13 So he gave them leave. And the unclean spirits came out, and entered the swine; and the herd, numbering about two thousand, rushed down the steep bank into the sea, and were drowned in the sea. 14 The herdsmen fled, and told it in the city and in the country. And people came to see what it was that had happened. 15 And they came to Jesus, and saw	many a time it had seized him; he was kept under guard, and bound with chains and fetters, but he broke the bonds and was driven by the demon into the desert.) 30 Jesus then asked him, "What is your name?" And he said, "Legion"; for many demons had entered him. 31 And they begged him not to command them to depart into the abyss. 32 Now a large herd of swine was feeding there on the hillside; and they begged him to let them enter these. So he gave them leave. 33 Then the demons came out of the man and entered the swine, and the herd rushed down the steep bank into the lake and were drowned. 34 When the herdsmen saw what had happened, they fled, and told it in the city and in the country. 35 Then people went out to see what happened, and they came to Jesus, and found the man from whom the demons had gone, sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed and in his right mind; and they were afraid.

	the demoniac sitting there, clothed and in his right mind, the man who had had the legion; and they were afraid.	

Although there are variants in the different versions of the narrative,[130] the pertinent point for our discussion is the vocal response of the demons to the presence of Jesus which is very similar in all three passages. In this narrative the presence of Jesus prompts the demons to cry out "what have you to do with me/us." The expression τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί[131] (τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί in Mt. 8:29), literally "what to me/us and to you," is a cryptic phrase and its meaning can only be interpreted within the context of how it is used. Twelftree notes that the Greek expression "probably corresponds to Hebrew-Aramaic idiom (מה־לי ולך) and means: "Why are you bothering us?"[132] The parallel Hebrew expression, or a slight variant, occurs at least six times in the Hebrew Bible. These occurrences, the contexts in which they occur, and their LXX and NRSV translations are:

Figure 3.4

	MT	LXX	NRSV	Context
Josh. 22:24	מַה־לָּכֶם וְלַיהוָה	τί ὑμῖν καὶ Κυρίῳ	"What have you to do with the Lord?"	Rebuke

[130] For example, Matthew uses δαιμόνιον (8:31), Mark uses πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτος (5:2, 8, 13), and Luke uses both δαιμόνιον (8:27, 30, 33) and πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτος (8:29). While the different terms may be used by each gospel writer to characterize certain aspects of demonology, theology, or cultural points, they are generally equivalent terms for demonic beings. For a more thorough discussion on the demonological terminology, see Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 94-99; 121-123; and 152-154.

[131] The emphatic form ἐμοὶ is used rather than μοι. According to Mounce, *Biblical Greek*, 92, "[t]he emphatic form is used when the author wants to be especially emphatic, usually in contrasting one person with another."

[132] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 63.

Judg. 11:12	מַה־לִּי וָלָךְ	τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί	"What have you against me?"	Neutral
2 Sam. 16:10	מַה־לִּי וְלָכֶם	τί ἐμοὶ καὶ ὑμῖν	"What have I to do with you?"	Rebuke
1 Kgs. 17:18	מַה־לִּי וָלָךְ	τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί	"What have you against me?"	Rebuke
2 Kgs. 3:13	מַה־לִּי וָלָךְ	τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί	"What have I to do with you?"	Rebuke
2 Chr. 35:21	מַה־לִּי וָלָךְ	τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί	"What have we to do with each other?"	Neutral

Although an extensive analysis of each passage is unnecessary here, brief comments on the context of the idiom in a few cases are needed. Twelftree highlights the nature of the expression in two of the passage: 2 Samuel 16:10 and 1 Kings 17:18. In 2 Samuel 16:5-8 King David, approaching the village of Bahurim, is met by Shimei who curses and casts stones at David and his men. One of David's soldiers, Abishai, is incensed by the insult and asks David's permission to kill Shimei (16:9). David does not allow this, prefaces his response with מַה־לִּי וְלָכֶם, and concludes: "Let him alone, and let him curse; for the Lord has bidden him…" (16:11). In this instance the idiom functions as a negative response, a type of reprimand at the suggestion of action against Shimei. Twelftree notes Josephus' commentary on this passage (*Ant.* 7.265): "Josephus shows that, in the New Testament era, the phrase in question was understood as a rebuttal or counter-attack."[133] Characterizing the phrase in 2 Samuel 16:10 as a "counter-attack" may be a bit strong, but the words certainly are used as a type of rebuke.

[133] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 63. In *Ant.* 7.265, David's response to Abishai is: "Will you not be quiet, sons of Saruia?"

1 Kings 17 tells of Elijah's stay with a widow and her son in Zarephath. In verses 17-18 the woman's son becomes gravely ill, and she blames this on Elijah, saying: "What have you against me, O man of God? You have come to me to bring my sin to remembrance, and to cause the death of my son!" Here, the widow initiates her accusation against Elijah with מַה־לִּי וָלָךְ, and it is clear in this case that the idiom is not expressed as a benign question but rather an antagonistic protest. According to Twelftree, "[w]hat the woman attempts to do in these words is to defend her household by a kind of warding off of Elijah from the situation."[134]

The context of the idiom in the other four passages differs in each case. The phrase is used both as an antagonistic expression (cf. Josh. 22:24; 2 Kgs. 3:13) and as a legitimate inquiry (Judg. 11:12; 2 Chr. 35:21). A common feature is that in all four of these passages the phrase is used where one person or party opposes another. Twelftree's overall conclusion is that the Greek expression and its equivalents in the Hebrew Bible are negative, confrontational words used to rebuke or repel someone. While this is an accurate characterization of the phrase for certain instances, its context influences and, perhaps, determines its meaning. In the narrative of the wedding feast at Cana in John's gospel, Jesus responds to a request made by this mother with τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί (2:4). The passage in no way depicts Mary and Jesus in opposition to one another. On the contrary, Mary appears to take Jesus' words as an affirmation; 2:5 states "His mother said to the servants, 'Do whatever he tells you.'"[135] Therefore, the circumstances in which the idiom is used indicate, to a large extent, whether it is hostile in nature or a neutral,

---

[134] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 63-64. Twelftree comments on Philo's reflection of the passage in 1 Kings 17 in *Quod Deus sit immutabilis*. Philo (*Deus*. 138) writes: "Every mind that is on the way to be widowed and empty of evil says to the prophet, 'O man of God, thou hast come in to remind me of my iniquity and my sin.'" For Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 64, this passage demonstrates "that the phrase (τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί) was used to ward off evil." Similarly, T. A. Burkill states: "Philo expressly refers to these words [מַה־לִּי וָלָךְ /τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί] in an interesting passage, and the way in which he utilizes them suggests that the widow's utterance may have served as the model for a current apotropaic formula." T. A. Burkill, *Mysterious Revelation: An Examination of the Philosophy of St. Mark's Gospel* (Cornell University Press, 1963), 76.

[135] For instance, see Arthur H. Maynard, "TI EMOI KAI ΣOI," *NTS* 31 (1985): 582-586.

albeit distinct, turn of phrase. All of these points must be kept in mind when considering the use of the expression by demons in the gospels.

In the Gerasene Demoniac pericope the way in which the demons verbally engage Jesus hints at the purpose of τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί and the ensuing dialogue. In each account a form of the verb κράζω is used.[136] Use of this word suggests a sense of anxiety or alarm on the part of the demons at the approach of Jesus which is reflected in the subsequent request that Jesus "not torment me" (Mk 5:7; Lk 8:28; cf. Mt 8:29).[137] The demons view Jesus as a threat to their well-being and thereby "cry out" in distress at the sight of him, and their fears are ultimately proved legitimate since Jesus does exert control over them and casts them out of the man. Given this situation, it is likely that τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί is not meant as a neutral question but as an antagonistic expression – one which Thomas A. Burkill describes as an "apotropaic formula."[138] The cause for interpreting the idiom in

---

[136] Matthew uses the aorist ἔκραξαν (8:29) and Mark and Luke use the aorist perfect κράξας (5:7) and ἀνακράξας (8:28), respectively. Whereas the demoniac(s) simply "cried out" the expression Matthew and Mark, he "cried out" (ἀνακράξας), "fell down before" Jesus, and "said with a loud voice" (φωνῇ μεγάλῃ εἶπεν) in Lk. 8:28. These successive actions, though more complex, do not significantly alter the nature of dialogue.

[137] Mark conveys the unique detail that the demoniac, upon seeing Jesus, "ran and worshipped him" (5:6). The Greek ἔδραμεν καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ is also translated "he ran and threw himself down before him" (Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St Mark* (BNTC; Continuum, 1991), 140) and "he ran and showed him reverence" (Collins, *Mark*, 263). Collins, *Mark*, 267, states: "Since vv. 3-5 depict the man as lacking control over himself, the reverential gesture is probably an act initiated by the unclean spirit… The act of bowing down before Jesus expresses the demon's recognition of Jesus' power and status." Twelftree thinks this detail can be attributed to early Church redaction. He comments in *Jesus the Exorcist*, 81: "demoniacs were most probably disturbed when they met Jesus, so προσεκύνησεν is probably a later interpretation of the falling down of the demoniac in front of Jesus." While Twelftree's theory is entirely possible, it is important to note that the act of reverence by the demoniac does not necessarily negate the hostility of the demons toward Jesus. As Collins notes, προσεκύνησεν could simply be a recognition of Jesus' authority; a feature which is evident in the narrative from Jesus' exorcism of the demons. In any case, this detail does not undermine the antithetical and contentious nature of the demons' response to Jesus' presence.

[138] Burkill, *Mysterious Revelation*, 78. Though Burkill uses this language to describe the idiom in Mk. 1:24 in particular, this understanding corresponds as well to the idiom's function in the

this way is reinforced by its negative uses in the Hebrew scriptures. Therefore, this phrase is probably intended to be a defense mechanism to keep Jesus at bay.

The demons invoke Jesus' identity in the form of a title which addresses, not simply the name of Jesus, but his nature.[139] The tactical advantage of ascertaining the enemy's identity is demonstrated when Jesus himself requests the demons' name (Mk. 5:9; Lk. 8:30). Following the invocation of Jesus' identity is the request: "do not torment me" (μή με βασανίσῃς). The attempt to dictate or influence the actions of Jesus is a component of the defense mechanism of the demons. Twelftree suggests that the demons' fear of "torment" had eschatological connotations for the early church.[140] Matthew 8:29 depicts the expression of the demons as a question rather than a phrase: "Have you come here to torment us before the time?" (ἦλθες ὧδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς). If Matthew's detail "before the time" indicates that there is a future period allotted for the torment of demons, this could be an eschatological feature similar to the aetiology of demons in the Watcher tradition. The demon's wish to avoid torment is manifest in Mark

---

demonic addresses in Mt. 8:29; Mk. 5:7; and Lk. 8:28, 4:34. Regarding Mk. 5:7 Collins, *Mark*, 268, states: "This question is analogous to that of the unclean spirit in 1:24. In both cases, the demon attempts to control Jesus, or at least to ward him off or resist him, by pronouncing his name and demonstrating that he knows Jesus' identity."

[139] This is conveyed in Mt. 8:29 as "Son of God" (υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ), Mk. 5:7 as "Jesus, Son of the Most High God" (Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου), and Lk. 8:28 as "Jesus, Son of the Most High God" (Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου). In his analysis of the Gerasene Demoniac pericope Twelftree emphasizes the usefulness of "the name" as a feature of exorcism incantations; cf. idem, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 81-86. Several passages in the PGM show the significance of the name in various formulae. For example, according to Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 7, 96, PGM I 160-161 is translated "But you say to him: 'What is your divine name? Reveal it to me ungrudgingly, so that I may call upon [it].'" In PGM IV 3039-3046 it is clear that the nature of the demon is sought: "I conjure you, every daimonic spirit, to tell whatever sort you may be, because I conjure you by the seal / which Solomon placed on the tongue of Jeremiah, and he told. You also tell whatever sort you may be, heavenly or aerial, whether terrestrial or subterranean…because I conjure you by god…" In the case of the Gerasene Demoniac and the Demoniac in the Synagogue (Mk. 1:23-28; Lk. 4:33-37), Burkill, *Mysterious Revelation*, 73, states: "The demon seeks to gain access to apotropaic power by using its opponent's name." See also n. 320 in the previous chapter.

[140] Although the demon's request μή με βασανίσῃς "had clear eschatological significance for the early Church" Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 83, argues that "this phrase is probably original."

with explicit exorcistic language: τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; ὁρκίζω σε τὸν θεόν, μή με βασανίσῃς (Mk. 5:7). Here, the demons call upon the name and nature of Jesus followed by an adjuration in the name of God. The term ὁρκίζω can be compared to equivalent phrases in 4Q560 1 ii 6 (אומיתך) and 11Q11 i 7 (משביע).[141] Noting that the adjuration is said in the name of God, Twelftree states: "Mark probably understood the demon to be using God as his source of power-authority to fetter Jesus."[142] The difference between Mark 5:7 and the Qumran and other formulae is that the situation is reversed; in Mark the demons use exorcistic language against the exorcist.

All three versions of the Gerasene Demonic episode depict tactics in which demons invert anti-demonic language to repel Jesus. Whether these tactics are described as "apotropaic" or "exorcistic" depends on the details provided in each narrative. In Matthew, the demons' expression preempts the exorcistic activity of Jesus; the mere presence of Jesus provokes the demons to speak. Since here the demons seek to prevent a perceived impending harm that they are not yet subject to, their expression is "apotropaic." In Mark and Luke the demons' expressions are proclaimed after Jesus begins the exorcism (cf. Mk. 5:8; Lk. 8:29). In this case, the inverted anti-demonic language is a response to an assault which the demons currently experience at the hands of the exorcist. Since the demons do not seek to prevent future harm but attempt to offset present affliction, their efforts are "exorcistic." What is ultimately portrayed in Mark and Luke is two parties trying to control each other using exorcistic methods.

The phrase τί ἐμοὶ/ἡμῖν καὶ σοί is not in itself an anti-demonic or protective expression. However, in the case of the Gerasene Demoniac, from the context of the passage and the content of the demons' speech, the idiom is not a neutral question. Its connection with an invocation of an enemy's identity along with a

---

[141] See also the reconstruction in 8Q5 1 1. On "adjurations" as components of exorcistic/incantation formulae, cf. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 87-88; idem, "Genres," 412-413; Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 244; and §2.1.2. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 82, notes the similarity between the demon's expression in Mk. 5:7 and PGM IV 3019-3020 which he translates: "I adjure (ὁρκίζω) you by the God of the Hebrews..." Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 96, translates these lines: "I conjure you by the god of the Hebrews, / Jesus..."

[142] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 83.

spoken desire not to be harmed by the enemy constitutes a type of formulaic use of the idiom; that is, it prefaces or is part of a defense mechanism. In Matthew 8:29 the demons' attempt to ward off Jesus with a formulaic expression is a type of "apotropaic incantation," while in Luke 8:28 the demons' use of a formulaic expression intended to mitigate or counteract Jesus' exorcistic efforts is an "exorcistic incantation." In Mark especially, the invocation of an enemy's identity and adjuration of that enemy with a powerful name to offset or neutralize harmful action is an "exorcistic incantation." These efforts by demons are unusual, and describing their actions as "exorcistic" or "apotropaic" is really meant to indicate that they resemble those anti-demonic methods since they cannot properly be anti-demonic. Instead, the demons invert what are normally exorcistic or apotropaic methods used against them and attempt to "turn the tables" on the exorcist.

Inversion Language in the Demoniac in the Synagogue

A similar example of this inversion tactic is portrayed in the account of the Demoniac in the Synagogue:[143]

Figure 3.5

Mark 1:23-26	Luke 4:33-35
23 And immediately there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; 24 and he cried out, "What have you to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are, the Holy One of God." 25 But Jesus rebuked him saying, "Be silent, and come out of him!" 26 And the unclean spirit, convulsing him, and crying with a loud voice, came out of him.	33 And in the synagogue there was a man who had the spirit of an unclean demon; and he cried out with a loud voice, 34 "Ah! What have you to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are, the Holy One of God." 35 But Jesus rebuked him saying, "Be silent, and come out of him!" And when the demon had thrown him down in the midst, he came out of him, having dome him no harm.

[143] The translation presented in *figure 3.5* is from Aland, *Synopsis*, 35.

Here again the demoniacs "cry out" (ἀνέκραξεν in Mk. 1:23; Lk. 4:33) at the approach of Jesus. Twelftree points out that "Ανακράζειν is not a synonym for καλεῖν ("to call out")...It is a cry of extreme consternation."[144] This feature is analogous to κράζω in the Gerasene Demoniac pericope and characterizes the demons as anxious at the presence of Jesus. The cry of the demons opens with τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί and, given the similar confrontational context of the passage and contents of the demons' speech, the idiom has the same antagonistic connotation here that it has in the Gerasene Demoniac narrative.[145] Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί is expressed alongside a title for Jesus (Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ) which mentions his background as a Nazarene.[146] Twelftree compares this detail to an incantation from the PGM which expresses knowledge of the deity's city of origin.[147] The demons in the synagogue fear "destruction" (ἀπόλλυμι) rather than the "torment" (βασανίζω) which is the case for the Gerasene Demoniac. According to Twelftree, this is a description of Jesus' activity which goes hand-in-hand with naming his origin.[148]

---

[144] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 60. According to Burkill, *Mysterious Revelation*, 88, "the demon's address of [Mk. 5:7] plays the same kind of role in the story as that played by the address...in the story of the exorcism in the synagogue at Capernaum; the demon senses the identity of its dangerous opponent and raises its voice to defend itself against him." On the terminology for "demon" and "unclean spirit" in Mark and Luke, see Wahlen, *Impurity of Spirits*, 89-92, 151-152.

[145] Although the phrase is viewed by some to convey the submissiveness of the demons, Collins, *Mark*, 169, explains: "the spirit's following declaration, 'I know who you are, the Holy One of God'...does not express submission. Although he does not flaunt the authority of Jesus as blatantly as Asmodeus challenged that of Solomon, the unclean spirit is presented as attempting to fain control over Jesus."

[146] As Burkill, *Mysterious Revelation*, 73, explains, "the device of naming the name could be employed in attack (by the exorcist) and in self-defence (by the demon)." Similarly, Collins, *Mark*, 169, states: "The spirit expects that the knowledge he has about Jesus will allow him to control Jesus and to resist being driven out of the man."

[147] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 66, states: "Even though PGM VIII.13...comes from the fourth or fifth century, we see from it that the origin of the one being named was probably of importance in Mark 1.24." Cf. Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 145.

[148] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 67, argues: "So far, apart from the initial words of general defence [τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί], the demon has made known Jesus' origin (Nazareth) and his activity (the demon's destruction) in a continuing effort to over-power Jesus." For Twelftree, ibid., 66, the word

The demons' address in Mark 1:24 and Luke 4:34 concludes with the assertion "I know who you are, the Holy One of God" (οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ). Both Burkill and Twelftree note the similarity between the "I know" formula and PGM VIII 13: "I know you Hermes, who you are and where you come from and what your city is...,"[149] and Twelftree describes the demons' use of this formula as the "climax" of their defense.[150] Moreover, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ is roughly equivalent to υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου in Mark 5:7 and Luke 8:28.[151]

Therefore, the formulaic address by the demons to Jesus in the Demoniac in the Synagogue passage functions as a means of defense against the approaching exorcist. As in the case of the Gerasene Demoniac pericope, an idiom is used within a confrontational setting (τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί) and the name, identity, and activity of "the opponent" are invoked. The language attributed to the demons in both pericopae, which would typically be used by the exorcist, is inverted in an attempt to deter the exorcist. Bultmann highlights "the unusual situation that the demon appears in the role of the threatened man, who utters his 'protective' words, while Jesus takes on the role of the demon!"[152] It is clear in the Demoniac in the

---

ἀπόλλυμι had significance for the early Church in which "the destruction of evil was expected in the Messianic age," however, he further stipulates: "neither in Mark nor in the rest of the New Testament is ἀπόλλυμι used in relation to the ministry of Jesus. Also, ἀπόλλυμι is by no means a word of particular interest to Mark. Nor did any section of the early Church – as represented in the Gospels – think that Jesus' exorcisms were the final or complete destruction of evil." Burkill, *Mysterious Revelation*, 89, comments that the verb used for "destroy" in the Demoniac in the Synagogue corresponds to the verb "torment" in the Gerasene Demoniac.

[149] Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 145; cf. Burkill, *Mysterious Revelation*, 78; and Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 67.

[150] Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 67. Likewise, Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 209 n. 1, holds that the words οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ are best understood "in the traditional demonological sense, viz., as 'protective words' which anyone threatened by a demon says to him; his 'recognition' of the demon gives power over him."

[151] Cf. Burkill, *Mysterious Revelation*, 88. The designation "Holy One of God," or a slight variant, is applied to Jesus several times in the New Testament (e.g. Lk. 1:35; Jn. 6:69) and is used to describe certain righteous figures in the Hebrew Bible (e.g. Aaron in Ps. 106:16 and Elisha in 2 Kgs. 4:9); cf. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 67-68.

[152] Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 209 n. 1.

Synagogue passage that Jesus "rebukes" (ἐπιτιμάω) and commands the demons (Mk. 1: 25: φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ; Lk. 4:35: φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ) after their address to him. Thus the demons' formulaic expression resembles an "apotropaic incantation" directed at Jesus to ward him off. Burkhill rightly characterizes the demonic address as an "instrument of apotropaic power" and a "defensive weapon."[153] It is a tactic in which demons seize upon what is normally "anti-demonic" language and use it for their own protection.

3.1.4.2 Implications of the Satanic Inversion of Psalm 91

There are two main implications attached to Satan's inversion of Psalm 91 in his dialogue with Jesus. First, it places elements of the pericope more firmly within the background of early Jewish anti-demonic tradition. The apotropaic connotation of Psalm 91 implied in this interpretation is part of a larger process of development in which the prayer ensures protection from demonic evil; a purpose that is explicit in *11QApocryphal Psalms* and in later rabbinic literature. The technique of inverting an adversary's tool of power is also found in *11QApocryphal Psalms* where an exorcist mocks a demon's aggressive traits. Indeed, the similarity between the anti-demonic methods in the Temptation and 11Q11 v, vi demonstrates a strong connection between the two works.

The second implication is that Satan's inversion tactic accentuates the hostile tone of the narrative. While it is certainly the case that the quoting of scripture by both Jesus and the devil is similar to patterns of rabbinic discussion, the confrontation portrayed in the Temptation should not be mistaken as a convivial discourse. Rather, while Jesus and Satan are depicted in opposition to one another throughout the gospels (e.g. Mt. 12:22-23; Lk. 11:17-23), Satan's use of Psalm 91 in the Temptation characterizes this pericope as an especially antagonistic personal encounter between the two. This is even more so the case if Jesus' quotations are interpreted as an apotropaic technique.

These implications, to a large degree, are applicable to the anti-demonic language attributed to the demoniacs in other synoptic pericopae. Although the

[153] Burkill, *Mysterious Revelation*, 74, 76.

inversion language has long been commented on it has not been associated with the technique in 11Q11, and doing so connects these instances with a broader early Jewish tradition which helps to contextualize the interaction between Jesus and demonic evil portrayed in the gospels.

3.2 Mark 9:25: An Anti-Demonic "Symbiosis?"

Outside of the Temptation pericope a potential non-petitionary apotropaism occurs in one of Mark's exorcism stories. In Mark 9:14-29 Jesus exorcizes a particularly stubborn demon from a boy who has been stricken from childhood. Among the topics in this narrative is the need for faith (9:19; 23) and a useful technique for the disciples' exorcistic activity (9:29). However, the relevance of this particular pericope for this discussion relates to the unique anti-demonic expression attributed to Jesus; namely, Jesus' exorcistic command that the demon leave the boy is paired with the mandate that the demon "never enter him again." This subtle but significant feature touches upon the belief that a person who has been freed from demonic influence is susceptible to a repeat attack. The concept of demon re-entry is not widely found in the gospels, and the directive for a demon to never return once it has been cast out is exclusive to Mark 9:

17 And one of the crowd answered him, "Teacher, I brought my son to you, for he has a mute spirit; 18 and whenever it seizes him, it dashes him down; and he foams and grinds his teeth and becomes ridged; and I asked your disciples to cast it out, and they were not able."... 20 And they brought the boy to him; and when the spirit saw him, immediately it convulsed the boy, and he fell on the ground and rolled about, foaming at the mouth... 25 And when Jesus saw that a crowd came running together, he rebuked the unclean spirit, saying to it, "You mute and deaf spirit, I command you, come out of him, and never enter him again."

Although the shared material from Mark 9:14-29 is found in Matthew 17:14-21 and Luke 9:37-43, it is important to emphasize that the notion of demon re-entry is also present, albeit in a different context, in Matthew and Luke:

Figure 3.6[154]

[154] The English translation in *figure 3.6* is from Aland, *Synopsis*, 112.

Matthew 12:43-45	Luke 11:24-26
43 "When the unclean spirit has gone out of a man, he passes through waterless places seeking rest, but finds none. 44 Then he says, 'I will return from which I came.' And when he comes he finds it empty, swept, and put in order. 45 Then he goes and brings with him seven other spirits more evil than himself, and they enter and dwell there; and the last state of that man becomes worse than the first. So shall it be also with this evil generation."	24 "When the unclean spirit has gone out of a man, he passes through waterless places seeking rest; and finding none he says, 'I will return to my house from which I came.' 25 And when he comes he finds it swept and put in order. 26 Then he goes and brings seven other spirits more evil than himself, and they enter and dwell there; and the last state of that man becomes worse than the first."

The key questions for this study are whether (1) the command to "never enter him again" is equivalent to an apotropaism and, if so, (2) does the expression in Mark 9:25 resemble the "co-functioning relationship" between exorcism and apotropaism in *11QApocryphal Psalms*. In order to address these questions we must briefly note similar features from surrounding traditions before assessing the formula in Mark 9.

3.2.1 Surrounding Traditions

A prohibition against a demon's return to its victim is part of exorcistic formulae found in several other places which are often compared with the exorcism in Mark 9:25. A passage in Philostratus's *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* tells of Apollonius's exorcism of a youth possessed by a demon. Part of the encounter reads: "When Apollonius looked at the spirit, it uttered sounds of fear and fury, such as people being burned alive or tortured do, and *it swore to keep away from the youth* and not enter any human" (*Vita Apol.* 4.20) (italics mine). Not only does the demon leave the youth, but it promises to "keep away," signaling the belief in demon re-possession.[155] Similarly, Josephus mentions incantations composed by Solomon "with which those possessed by demons drive them out, *never to return*" (*Ant.*

[155] Paul Achtemeier compares this Philostratus passage to the exorcism in Mark 9; cf. Paul J. Achtemeier, "Miracles and the Historical Jesus: A Study of Mark 9:14-29," *CBQ* 37 (1975): 480.

8.45-46) (italics mine), and further describes Eleazar's exorcism of a possessed man: "and when the man at once fell down, [Eleazar] adjured the demon *never to come back to him*, speaking Solomon's name and reciting the incantations which he had composed" (*Ant.* 8.47-48) (italics mine).[156] An exorcism rite from the PGM also prohibits future demon re-entry and even instructs the exorcist to furnish the victim with a phylactery to guard against such an occurrence.[157] The translation of this rite, which is said in the name of the God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and "Jesus Chrestos," reads: "I conjure you, daimon, whoever you are, by this god… Come out, daimon, whoever you are, *and stay away from him*… After driving out the daimon, hang around him, NN, a phylactery, which the patient puts on after the expulsion of the daimon…" (PGM IV 1230-1255) (italics mine).[158] In each of these three different cases a prohibition against the future return of the demon to its victims is a distinct aspect of an exorcism ritual.

In an earlier less direct example from Tobit (cf. §2.2.1.3), Raphael explains that burning the fish heart and liver will ward off demons and "they will never stay with the person any longer." (6:8)[159] Raphael's assurance of the permanent effect of the ritual is repeated in 6:17: "The demon will smell it and flee, and never will it be seen near her again."[160] From Qumran, there is a possible similarity between the exorcism in Mark 9 and the petition in the Syriac Psalm. In 11Q5 xxiv 12 the petitioner requests that God purify him from the evil scourge and "let it not turn

---

[156] Craig Evans explains that Jesus' command that the demons not re-enter its victim "parallels Josephus's claims about the success of certain exorcists of his day." C. A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20* (WBC 34b; Nelson Reference & Electronic, 2001), 53; cf. Collins, *Mark*, 439; Steven L. Davies, *Jesus the Healer: Possession, Trance, and the Origins of Christianity* (SCM Press, 1995), 91-92; Achtemeier, "Miracles and the Historical Jesus," 480.

[157] As Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist*, 39, explains, in the magical papyri "the exorcist sought to protect the sufferer from the demon's return by sending the demons away or by the use of amulets."

[158] Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 62. For a similar anti-demonic rite said in the name of Jesus "god of the Hebrews," see PGM IV 3010-3086.

[159] This is Fitzmyer's translation of the "Long" recension in *Tobit*, 200.

[160] This is Fitzmyer's translation of the "Long Recension" of Tob. 6:18 in *Tobit*, 202.

again upon me" (אל יוסף לשוב אלי).[161] In §2.2.2.3 above we determined that if נגע רע ("evil scourge") is interpreted as a demonic being, the requests for purification and safety from its future return is tantamount to both an exorcistic and apotropaic plea. Still, although נגע רע is likely not a demon but a metaphor for sin, the plea in line 12 expresses a concern for the re-entry of something evil and requests protection from its return. Likewise, although *11QApocryphal Psalms* does not explicitly state that the apotropaic psalm is to ensure that the demon is to keep away and never return, this function is probably implied.

Each of these examples attest to the belief in demon re-possession and to the technique of prohibiting such an assault, both of which appear in Mark 9. This is not to suggest that the earlier works directly influenced Mark 9 or that the pericope influenced the later works, they simply demonstrate that the concept found in the Markan passage was widely known and practiced.

3.2.2 The Command in Mark 9:25 and its Implications for the Gospel

In Mark 9:25 Jesus begins his address to the demon with a familiar exorcistic formula. Mark uses the word ἐπιτιμάω ("rebuke") and the nature of the demon is invoked, both of which demonstrate Jesus' authority.[162] The subsequent command to "never enter him again" (καὶ μηκέτι εἰσέλθῃς εἰς αὐτόν) is concerned with

---

[161] Sanders, *DJD IV*, 71. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1177, translate "may it stop coming back to me." Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism*, 65, compares this passage in Syriac Psalm to the return of the demon in Matthew 12 and Luke 11.

[162] According to Kee, "Terminology," 232, "ἐπιτιμᾶν in the synoptic exorcism accounts is the equivalent of the Semitic root, גער." He further explains in ibid., 235, that the term implies more than a simple reprimand, it describes "a way of subjugating the evil spirits in order that God's dominion may become a reality." Thus, use of the word in Mk. 9:25 emphasizes Jesus' authoritative command and has broader eschatological implications. Similarly, Joel Marcus states: "Jesus' word of command, however, is not just a piece of magic, but a weapon in God's cosmic battle. This eschatological framework is suggested by the narrator's use of *epetimēsen* ('rebuke') to characterize the adjuration…this term is redolent of creation myths and dreams of eschatological victory." Joel Marcus, *Mark 8-16* (AYB 27a; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 664.

protecting the boy from a prospective return of the demon.[163] The Greek grammar makes it especially clear that the words address a future situation as the negative μηκέτι ("no longer") is paired with the aorist subjunctive of ἔρχομαι; a construction which denotes the prohibition of a future action.[164] Given that any measure taken to prevent future demonic influence is apotropaic, the exorcistic formula in Mark 9:25 can be described as containing an apotropaism.[165] Jesus' address to the demon takes the form of an incantation, though, unlike formulae from surrounding traditions and like Jesus' other exorcisms, no source of power/authority is invoked. Here, then, is an anti-demonic incantation attributed to Jesus which contains both exorcistic and apotropaic commands. As seen from other examples including the dual purpose of *11QApocryphal Psalms*, the address in Mark 9 illustrates the co-functionality of exorcistic and apotropaic techniques.

The passages in Matthew 12 and Luke 11 indicate that the concept of demon re-entry is also known to both of these synoptic writers, however the Matthean and Lukan pericopae are parables, and there is no practical concern for the issue except in Mark 9.[166] Moreover, according to Joel Marcus, "the command

---

[163] In addition to the prohibition against demon re-entry, the violence of the demon's exit in Mk. 9:26 also parallels the accounts from Josephus, Philostratus and elsewhere; cf. Bonner, "The Technique of Exorcism," 47-49; Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 655. According to Bonner, "The Technique of Exorcism," 49, "there can be little doubt that in the thought of the time the final convulsion was interpreted as the last spiteful act of the demon, whose violence was a sign that he was gone to return no more."

[164] This is comparable to the pairing of the negation οὐ μή with the aorist subjunctive which, according to Mounce, *Biblical Greek*, 296, "is a strong negation of a future situation."

[165] Achtemeier, "Miracles," 480, likewise calls the prohibition against re-entry an "apotropaic formula."

[166] Collins, *Mark*, 439 n. 110, explains that Matthew 12 and Luke 11 attest to the general awareness of demon re-possession. According to Davies and Allison, Mt. 12:43-45 is, in part, a parable about Jesus' relationship to Israel. They state in *Matthew VIII-XVIII*, 360: "From those to whom much has been given much will be required. Israel has had the opportunity to see and hear one greater than Jonah and one greater than Solomon. All to no avail. Therefore her judgment will be harsher…" that is, the "last things are worse than the first." Christopher Evans notes that the original purpose of the Q passage is unclear. He states: "Matthew, who has it after the condemnation of this generation for its failure to appreciate what is present in Jesus' ministry, interprets it of the future condition of the Jews. In Luke it seems to teach that exorcism is in itself

to the demon to never return gains an added eschatological resonance" and stresses the permanence of the exorcism.[167] Yet, based on the significance attached to exorcism throughout the gospels, especially in the Beelzebul Controversy, it seems unlikely that Jesus' other exorcisms are impermanent and it is certainly not the case that they lack eschatological significance.[168] Therefore, this begs the question of why Mark 9 contains the only prohibition against demonic re-possession. To put it another way, what is it about this particular exorcism that warrants the addition of an apotropaic command? Since this is a singular event the key to understanding the presence of this apotropaic feature most probably lies in the immediate context of the pericope.

The need for faith is at the center of Mark 9:14-29.[169] The story opens with the disciples' inability to exorcize the demon (v. 18), and this possibly places them among the "faithless generation" in v. 19.[170] Even the boy's father appears less than wholeheartedly optimistic when he requests Jesus' help, saying "if you can do anything" (v. 22) and exclaiming "help my unbelief" (v. 24). It seems likely that Jesus responds to such tepid trust, uncertainty, and the failure of the disciples with

---

negative, and is not conclusively proof against evil. Positive possession of, and by, the good is necessary, and a state of neutrality between good and evil is impossible." Evans, *Saint Luke*, 494. For Fitzmyer, the Lukan version stresses the inadequacy of exorcism *alone* as a remedy. The parable, he states, warns the disciples "about too great assurance over manifestations of the defeat of physical or psychic evil" and that "it is not sufficient that a demon be driven out; the person represented by the house swept clean and set in order must be on Jesus' side (see v. 23) and also listen to the word of God and observe it"; cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV* (AYB 28a New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 924-925.

[167] Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 664.

[168] This is reflected elsewhere when the demons' reveal their fear of Jesus' "destruction" (Mk. 1:25; Lk. 4:34) and "torment" (Mt. 8:29; Mk. 5:7; Lk. 8:28), indicating the eschatological implications of exorcism and implying its permanent effect. The meaning of exorcism, including its eschatological connotations, in each gospel is discussed throughout chapter 1.

[169] As Collins, *Mark*, 437, states, "'faith' or 'trust' is the key theme in the Markan story."

[170] Collins, *Mark*, 437, notes that the description "faithless generation" could refer to the disciples "on the assumption that their inability to cast out the spirit was due to their lack of faith or to the insufficiency of their faith." For Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 653, the disciples "are the primary referent, since it is their failure that has just been described," though he notes that the term "generation" is "all-embracing" and probably refers also to the scribes, the crowd, and the boy's father.

a dramatic demonstration of his power. Jesus asks the boy's father how long he has been affected (vs. 21), a question which Marcus says "stresses the duration of his son's condition, thus increasing the magnitude of the eventual healing."[171] Even the detail that the boy appears dead until Jesus "lifted him up, and he arose" (v. 27) suggests that Jesus' exorcism resembles the great miracle of resurrection.[172] Accordingly, an apotropaic command for the demon to never return, which emphasizes the efficacy of Jesus' exorcism, fits within the drama of the Markan pericope. Therefore, in the context of the narrative the prohibition against re-possession could simply be meant to contrast Jesus ability with the disciples' failure and/or the father's struggling of faith.[173]

The inclusion of an apotropaic command in Jesus' exorcistic formula in Mark 9:25 does not significantly impact the larger demonological issues in Mark. The Beelzebul Controversy (Mk. 3:22-27), like the Matthean and Lukan versions, indicates that Satan is the chief of demons and, thus, Jesus' conflicts with the demonic are ultimately part of the greater battle with Satan's kingdom.[174] If Best's theory is accepted and Satan's defeat occurs in the Temptation narrative (Mk. 1:12-13), then Jesus' superiority over demons is a forgone conclusion and his exorcisms "are certain to be successful."[175] The exorcism in Mark 9 reinforces this view since the apotropaic command underscores Jesus' victory over the afflicting demon. However, according to Twelftree, Garrett, and others, the gospel depicts an ongoing battle between Jesus and Satan in which exorcisms are signs of the

---

[171] Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 660.

[172] Collins, *Mark*, 439, explains: "Although the story does not imply that the boy was actually dead, the dual expression in v. 27 attracts the attention of the audience and may call to mind the raising of the daughter of Jairus who had died…In both stories, the extraordinary power of Jesus is gloriously manifested."

[173] This is, to a degree, suggested by Achtemeier, "Miracles," 479, who identifies in the Markan pericope the combination of two separate stories: "Included in the first story would be the contrast between the disciples' inability to heal, and Jesus' power to do it (vs. 18b); included in the second the contrast between Jesus' confidence and the father's wavering faith (vss. 23-24)."

[174] E.g. Dochhorn, "The Devil in the Gospel of Mark," 103-106.

[175] Best, *The Temptation and the Passion*, 15.

successive but not complete vanquishing of the devil.[176] The apotropaism in Mark 9 is also congruent with this interpretation since it is an example of Jesus' "plundering" Satan's "goods" (3:27) yet does not conflict with the continuing adversarial role of Satan portrayed in Mark. Indeed, the forceful, dramatic exorcism and prohibition against demonic re-possession contributes to the dismantling of the satanic kingdom and compliments the broader eschatological context of Jesus' conflict with Satan. Therefore, the apotropaic command in Mark 9:25 is in harmony with the more general interpretations of exorcism and the role of Satan in Mark's gospel.

3.3 Passages Alluding to Apotropaic Efficacy

The passages discussed so far in this chapter contain features and phrases in which Satan and/or demons are directly engaged, and they have clear and explicit parallels to apotropaisms in surrounding traditions. However, there are also elements in the synoptics that are not straightforwardly apotropaic responses to demonic evil, but rather they suggest or support the notion of a preventative measure against future harm. These features may subtly allude to the efficacy of apotropaism in a way that is difficult to unequivocally demonstrate, yet their potential presence contributes to the adjudication of apotropaic tradition in the gospels. Two passages of this type are examined, one from Luke and one from Mark, but this is not to suggest that other examples do not exist.

3.3.1 Anti-Demonic Authority in Luke 10:19

As discussed above (§1.1.2.3; §3.1.3.1), Luke 10:17-20 is important for understanding both the manner of Satan's defeat and the nature of Jesus' and the disciples' anti-demonic ministry. But there is another feature in this pericope – namely, authority over demonic evil – which is relevant for the discussion of apotropaic tradition. Within this passage is the demonstration of the disciples'

[176] Cf. Twelftree, *In the Name of Jesus*, 113; Garrett, *The Temptations of Jesus*, 29 n. 2, 116; and Dochhorn, "The Devil in the Gospel of Mark," 105. See also the discussion in §1.1.2.1.

ability to exorcize in Jesus' name in verse 17 and assurance that the disciples are invested with authority over evil in verse 19.[177] These verses must be interpreted together since the disciples' anti-demonic ability in verse 17 is explained by the authority given to them by Jesus in verse 19.[178] The gift of authority in verse 19, while clearly reflected in the success described in verse 17, has still wider implications for the abilities of Jesus' followers. For instance, Fitzmyer connects the authority in verse 17 with the mission of the twelve in Luke 9:1, and Garrett sees signs of this authority several places in Acts, including Paul's protection from a viper in Acts 28:3-6.[179] Given the breadth and significance of verse 19 vis-à-vis the disciples' anti-demonic authority in Luke's writings, a potential association of the verse to apotropaism should be considered.

There are two ways in which Luke 10:19 may allude to apotropaic tradition, and the first relates to the actual expression in verse 19. Jesus promises his disciples: "I have given you authority to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall hurt you." As many scholars note, Luke's imagery of treading upon (πατεῖν ἐπάνω) serpents and scorpions (ὄφεων καὶ σκορπίων) evokes the language in Psalm 91:13: "You will tread on the lion and the adder, the young lion and the serpent you will trample under foot." The similarity can be noted here:

Figure 3.7

Luke 10:19	Psalm 91:13 MT	Psalm 91:13 LXX

[177] Observing that the disciples' exorcisms are accomplished in Jesus' name, Evans, *Saint Luke*, 454, states: "This is the only explicit statement in the gospels of the use by the disciples of the name of Jesus in exorcism during his lifetime. It provides a firm basis for the use of the name of the exalted Lord in similar circumstances in the church."

[178] Crump, "Jesus, the Victorious Scribal-Intercessor," 57, explains "verse 19 makes clear that the disciples' authority over the demons has been given to them by Jesus. This serves to explain how it is that the demons submit to them 'in Jesus' name' (10.17)." Cf. Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34*, 564.

[179] Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 863. Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 50, explains: "Jesus' gift of authority and promise of protection in 10:19 [has] an ongoing, even future effect." Similarly, Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34*, 564, states: "In the Lukan sequence, the verse [19] explains the basis for the disciples' success as reported in v 17, and generalizes to make it clear that the authority there experienced is not restricted to that particular mission…"

δέδωκα ὑμῖν τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πατεῖν ἐπάνω ὄφεων καὶ σκορπίων, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, καὶ οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσῃ	עַל־שַׁחַל וָפֶתֶן תִּדְרֹךְ תִּרְמֹס כְּפִיר וְתַנִּין	ἐπ᾽ ἀσπίδα καὶ βασιλίσκον ἐπιβήσῃ καὶ καταπατήσεις λέοντα καὶ δράκοντα

Clearly the Lukan verse does not directly quote the psalm, but, as Garrett states, "[a]lthough the vocabulary in Luke 10:19 is not identical to that of the psalm, the promise of ability to trample demonic powers with immunity is very similar."[180] Moreover, some argue that an allusion to Psalm 91 in this verse is not accidental. According to Henze:

> In the Gospel of Luke, Jesus confers the assurance of Psalm 91:13 upon the seventy. What is interesting here is the explicit connection between the quote of Psalm 91:13 and the earlier statements of the disciples that they were able to overcome demons. The reference to Psalm 91 is hardly fortuitous. It assumes that the reader is aware not only of the larger literary context of verse 13 but also of the interpretive history of the psalm according to which those who receive its assurances derive from it the power to ward off demons.[181]

Thus, not only does the language in Luke 10:19 resemble Psalm 91, but, in Henze's view, Luke intentionally appeals to the apotropaic nature of the psalm for his description of the disciple's authority over evil.

While the degree to which verse 19 evokes Psalm 91 is debatable, the anti-demonic psalm certainly fits within the context of Luke 10:17-20 which promises

---

[180] Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 55-56. Likewise, Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34*, 656, contends: "the 'treading upon' metaphor depends on Ps 91:13, where the venomous snake (פתן, *ptn*) is among the dangerous creatures trodden upon." On the contrary, Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 863, holds that an allusion to Psalm 91 in the Lukan verse is "farfetched." In addition to Psalm 91, Lk. 10:19 may also evoke imagery from early Jewish literature including the *Testament of Levi* 18; cf. Evans and Sanders, *Luke and Scripture*, 43-44; Evans, *Saint Luke*, 455; and Crump, "Jesus, the Victorious Scribal-Intercessor," 56. And while both the Lukan passage and Ps. 91:13 refer to serpentine embodiments of evil, the pairing of "serpents and scorpions" in Luke may be a reference to Deut. 8:15; e.g., Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34*, 564-566; and Vollenweider, "Ich sah den Satan," 197.

[181] Henze, "Psalm 91,"185.

and demonstrates the subordination of demons to the followers of Jesus. Garrett even suggests that the allusion contains a note of irony based on the devil's quotation of the psalm in the Temptation; that is, the prayer with which the devil tests Jesus is then used to ensure the subjugation of evil.[182] Since the Temptation material is a double tradition whereas Luke 10:17-20 is unique to the third gospel it is imprudent to use one passage to interpret the other. However, the explicit quotation of the psalm in the Temptation and the allusion to it in verse 19 suggests an awareness of apotropaic tradition, and a possible incorporation of this tradition into the author's depiction of Jesus' gift of anti-demonic authority to the disciples.

The second way in which Luke 10:19 may be associated with apotropaism is if the authority to "trample" includes the ability to thwart or ward off demonic harm before affliction takes place. The words πατεῖν ἐπάνω ("to trample upon") imply victory for the subject but does not necessarily mean the object's complete destruction.[183] In the context of the passage the objects of the "trampling" are demonic powers, and the disciples' victory over them is achieved through exorcism (vs. 17). Yet the general phrase "all the power of the enemy" (πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἐχθροῦ), along with the final clause "and nothing shall hurt you" (καὶ οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσῃ), suggests that this anti-demonic authority extends beyond the immediate pericope. As already noted, some scholars connect this authority with various other passages, including Garrett's association of the verse with non-exorcistic activities in Acts.[184] Despite these possibilities, the anti-demonic authority in verse 19 is not specific other than the likely reference to exorcism in verse 17. Furthermore, there is no direct correlation between the authority promised in verse 19 and anti-demonic apotropaisms anywhere else in

---

[182] Explaining the relationship between Psalm 91 and Luke 10, Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 56, states: "Luke surely recognized the allusion, because he was familiar with this Psalm: Satan had quoted the preceding two verses of it (vv. 11-12) to Jesus at the testing in the wilderness. It would thus be an ironically appropriate passage to echo when making a gift of authority over all the power of 'the Enemy.' This is especially so if, as evidence from Qumran suggests, the Psalm were already being used as a promise of protection from demonic powers (as was clearly the case in Rabbinic times)."

[183] E.g., Evans, *Saint Luke*, 455.

[184] Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 50.

Luke's writings. Yet, if the authority promised in Luke 10:19 does indeed imply a broader and more general range, it could conceivably relate to the ability to ward off demons.

3.3.2 Taking Up Serpents and Protection from Poison in the Longer Ending of Mark

Another passage which is relevant to the discussion of protection from future harm is from the last chapter of Mark:

> 15 And [Jesus] said to them, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation. 16 He who believes and is baptized will be saved; but he who does not believe will be condemned. 17 And these signs will accompany those who believe: in my name they will cast out demons; they will speak in new tongues; 18 they will pick up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it will not hurt them; they will lay their hands on the sick, and they will recover." (16:15-18)[185]

This passage belongs to one of several possible endings of Mark's gospel and is referred to as the Longer Ending.[186] Although the Longer Ending is found in the majority of early manuscripts,[187] it is generally accepted by most scholars that

---

[185] The English translation is from Aland, *Synopsis*, 334.

[186] James Kelhoffer sums up the possibilities in this way: "New Testament manuscripts support four possibilities for the original ending of the Gospel of Mark: ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ in 16:8, the 'Shorter Ending' of Codex Bobbiensis (it^{k}), the 'Longer Ending' (Mark 16:9-20) and the interpolated 'Longer Ending' of Codex Freerianius (W, 032). In addition, a number of MSS like Y include *both* the Shorter and Longer Endings after Mark 16:8." James A. Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and Their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark* (WUNT 2. Reihe 185; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2000), 1-2.

[187] Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 1088-1089, explains: "These verses [i.e., 16-20] are found in the overwhelming majority of manuscripts and in all major manuscript families and are attested already by Irenaeus (*Against Heresies* 3.10.5) in 185 C. E. and, perhaps, even earlier, by Justin (*1 Apology* 45, around 155 C. E.). But they were almost certainly not penned by Mark, nor were they the original ending of the Gospel." Furthermore, the verses "do not exist in our earliest and best Greek manuscripts, Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, both of which terminate at 16:8..." Also, in some MSS which do contain the Longer Ending, the verses are noted with scribal marks such as asterisks

verses 9-20 are non-Markan.[188] Moreover, there is debate as to whether or not 16:8 is the intended ending of the gospel.[189] There is a long history of scholarly

---

or annotations which, according to Collins, *Mark*, 804, "are used to indicate doubt about the authenticity of vv. 9-20, that is, about whether those verse originally belonged to the text of Mark."

[188] Most scholars hold that the Longer Ending was added to the end of Mark's gospel during the second century A.D. Suzanne Watts Henderson states: "internal and external evidence together strongly indicates that these twelve verses were added sometime later, probably prior to the mid-second century CE. In the first place, the transition from Mark 16:8 to 16:9 is grammatically abrupt, since the implied subject shifts without explanation from fearful women to Jesus. Moreover, the [Longer Ending] not only features numerous words that do not reflect Mark's language or thought-world but also includes oblique references to material found in the other three canonical gospels. Such a synthesis of other traditions indicates that the [Longer Ending], then, must post-date their composition." Idem, "Discipleship After the Resurrection: Scribal Hermeneutics in the Longer Ending of Mark," *JTS* 63.1 (2012): 108-109; cf. Collins, *Mark*, 804-807; Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 1088-1096; and the first four chapters in Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*. Indeed, according to Travis Williams, "[f]rom a text-critical perspective, style has been one of the major reasons why scholars have rejected the authenticity of the longer ending." Travis B. Williams, "Bringing Method to Madness: Examining the Style of the Longer Ending of Mark," *BBR* 20.3 (2010): 398. After Williams' own analysis of the style of the Longer Ending, he concludes in ibid., 417: "the results were clearly against an authentically Markan style." Others, while acknowledging textual and stylistic incongruities, highlight the points of commonality between the Longer Ending and the rest of Mark. For instance, Henderson, "Discipleship After Resurrection," 107, describes the purpose of her article thusly: "Without denying lexical and historical differences between the two, this study argues for a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between Mark and the [Longer Ending] by detecting important thematic elements—especially concerning discipleship—that the later passage shares with its host gospel." Still some argue for the authenticity of the Longer Ending; cf. William R. Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (SNTSMS 25; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974); see also the history of scholarship detailed in Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, 5-46.

[189] Mark 16:8 terminates with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ ("for they were afraid"), and there is question as to whether this is a suitable way for Mark to end his gospel. One the one hand, as Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 1091, states, "[m]any exegetes, convinced that the Gospel could not have terminated with the women running away and remaining silent, have hypothesized either that Mark was prevented from finishing his narrative by illness, arrest, or some other mishap, or that an original ending describing the resurrection appearance prophesied in 14:28 and 16:7 has been lost." In addition, from a grammatical standpoint Alan Cadwallader notes the "jarring" Greek ending: "The sentence ends with γάρ – a harsh sounding, unrefined, unsophisticated and non-literary ending." Alan H.

discussion relating to these and other points vis-à-vis the ending of Mark, and it is beyond the scope of this thesis to delve into these issues. Rather, as a matter of convenience, the majority opinion is assumed here that 16:9-20 is a second century addition. Yet, as Suzanne Henderson explains, "[s]ince the [Longer Ending] constitutes both a secondary and a persistent addition to Mark's gospel, it offers an important window into the handling of gospel traditions in the second century and beyond."[190] Therefore, although any conclusion drawn from discussing 16:15-18 may attest more to the reception of Mark's gospel than to the synoptic work itself, the passage is still valuable for our conversation about protection from future harm.

The Longer Ending indicates that in at least some second century Christian communities there is still a concern for demonic evil since exorcism is the first among five "signs" (σημεῖα) that accompany those who believe. According to James Kelhoffer, the sign of casting out demons in 16:17 is "a conscious imitation

---

Cadwallader, "The Hermeneutical Potential of the Multiple Endings of Mark's Gospel," *Colloquium* 43.2 (2011): 135. However, the unfinished, lost, or mutilated ending theories are unlikely (cf. Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 1091-1092), and ending an ancient work with γάρ, although rare, does occur (cf. Cadwallader, "Multiple Endings of Mark's Gospel," 135). Conversely, there are efforts to show that ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ is an appropriate ending to the Gospel. For instance, Aída Spencer suggests: "Closing the Gospel with the ambivalence of the women is a synecdoche of the whole Gospel. The women model the dual inclinations of amazement and fear. The reader, too, is asked, by implication: will you be another hardened heart, incapacitated by fear, or will you repent, be forgiven, and proclaim Jesus, the crucified Messiah, God's Son, resurrected from the dead?" Aída Besançon Spencer "The Denial of the Good News and the Ending of Mark," *BBR* 17.2 (2007): 280-281; for an appendix of other scholarly works arguing the appropriateness of 16:8 as the ending of Mark, cf. ibid., 281-283.

[190] Henderson, "Discipleship After the Resurrection," 110. Henderson also states in ibid., 111: "Ultimately, the scribal hermeneutics at work here both reaffirm dimensions of Markan discipleship and rework it in the light of contemporary [second century] concerns." Similarly, regarding the various endings of Mark Cadwallader, "Multiple Endings," 145, explains that the "respect due to these endings is poorly served by confinement to arguments for and against authenticity. They are all "authentic" in that they testify to the efforts of various communities of faith to live in canonical connection with the Gospel of Mark."

of Mark 6:6b-13, which relates the commissioning of the Twelve."[191] Thus, the exorcistic mission of the disciples which began during Jesus' ministry is portrayed as continuing after the resurrection. Included in 16:17 is an all-important feature of exorcism; namely, the faithful are to cast out demons in the name of Jesus (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δαιμόνια ἐκβαλοῦσιν). Presumably this sentence implies the invocation of Jesus' name. The anti-demonic value of Jesus' name is attested in surrounding literature, including references from Origen and Justin Martyr.[192] A reasonable question is whether Jesus' name is also meant to accompany the other signs, particularly the handling of snakes and the drinking of poison. Although the snakes and the poison probably do not signify elements of the demonic, the promise that an authoritative name affords protection from future harm is similar in concept to apotropaism. Yet, while it is realistic to interpret that believers heal illness (16:18) using Jesus' name, it is unlikely that they invoke the name in order to speak in new languages (γλώσσαις λαλήσουσιν καιναῖς) (16:17). Thus, the phrase ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί probably does not apply to each of the five signs, though the Greek syntax of the passage does not demand one reading over the other. Regardless, the promise of immunity from serpentine and poisonous harm warrants a brief note.

"They will pick up serpents" (ὄφεις ἀροῦσιν)[193] (16:18a)

The reference to ὄφις ("serpent," "snake") is unique and the only potential parallel in the synoptic tradition is Luke 10:19.[194] However, Kelhoffer points out: "the

---

[191] Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, 104. Similarly, Henderson notes that exorcism is a theme of discipleship in Mark's gospel and the Longer Ending; cf. idem, "Discipleship After the Resurrection," 112-113.

[192] Cf. Origen, *CC* 1.6, 3.24, 7.8-10; Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 30.3. Note also the passages in PGM IV 1230-1255, 3010-3086.

[193] Some versions of 16:18 read: καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ὄφεις ἀροῦσιν.

[194] According to both Collins and Kelhoffer, Lk. 10:19 is the closest analogy in the synoptics to the Markan ὄφεις ἀροῦσιν; cf. Collins, *Mark*, 814; Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, 106-107, 343. Henderson notes that the reference in Mark may be a development of the Lukan passage; cf. idem, "Discipleship After the Resurrection," 116 n. 28.

words of Jesus to the returning missionaries in Luke cannot explain why believers are *picking up* snakes in Mark 16:18a."[195] Another possible association is Acts 28:3-6 which tells how Paul was bitten by a viper (ἔχιδνα) but suffers no ill effect. There are clear differences between the two passages; for instance, the terminology is not the same (ὄφις and ἔχιδνα), and Mark 16:18 describes the intentional handling of snakes whereas Paul is accidently bitten. Still, Paul's immunity from harm evokes the promise of protection for believers expressed in the Markan passage. Furthermore, the favorable reaction from those who witnessed Paul's snakebite ("they changed their minds and said he was a god," Acts 23:6) may point toward the intention behind the snake handling in Mark.[196]

Unlike the signs of exorcism (e.g., Acts 19:13), speaking in new tongues (e.g., Acts 2:4-11), and healing the sick (e.g., Acts 28:8), which are all attested to in early Christian works, there is no evidence that the early Christians took up snakes in response to Mark 16:18.[197] Therefore, the exact way in which this passages is received in early tradition is unclear, yet it nevertheless promises protection from a specific future harm to a certain group of people; namely, believers who are baptized.

---

[195] Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, 402 (italics his). He continues: "Moreover…an interpretation of the verb ἀροῦσιν in light of Luke 10:19 to mandate the vanquishing or killing of snakes is unwarranted because it does not fit the context of the [Longer Ending] as it would in Luke 10:17-19." Ibid.

[196] Collins, *Mark*, 814, states: "the incident involving Paul is illuminating for understanding the assumption of the author of the longer ending that outsiders would be impressed by an ability to pick up snakes without being harmed." Similarly, Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, 388, explains that Greco-Roman material concerning snakes "suggest that the [Longer Ending's] third sign offers neither a unique nor an uncommon image for promoting the power associated with a certain deity, or even with a god's adherents." For a discussion on snakes in early Jewish, Christian, and Greco-Roman literature, see pp. 346-416 in *Miracle and Mission*.

[197] According to Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, 410-411, "there is no exact parallel to the [Longer Ending's] third sign in the NT. The same may be said for the various occurrences of snakes in the extracanonical Christian writings discussed above. Although later Christian authors remembered the boy Jesus, the apostle Philip and even Saint Patrick for their power over snakes, none writes of picking up snakes in a manner analogous to Mark 16:18a."

"And if they drink any deadly thing, it will not hurt them" (κἂν θανάσιμόν τι πίωσιν οὐ μὴ αὐτοὺς βλάψῃ) (16:18b)

Another sign in 16:18 promises safety for those who drink "anything deadly" (θανάσιμόν τι). It is possible that θανάσιμόν τι could refer to something spiritually harmful, but the context of the passage suggests otherwise.[198] Kelhoffer observes that use of the general θανάσιμος and τι instead of more specific terms for poison signifies that "the text provides assurance of immunity to any number of potentially harmful or deadly beverages…".[199] It may be that the assurance of protection applies to poison that is drunk intentionally, accidently, or both, though it is not specified. The quotation of Mark 16:18b is attributed to Porphyry who attacks Christianity by suggesting a "poison test" be administered to those selected to the clergy, and stipulates that those who don't take poison either confess that they do not believe in Jesus' words or admit themselves a coward.[200]

Philip of Side records the following tradition from Papias concerning Justus Barsabbas:

> Papias…related, as having received [it] from the daughters of Philip, that Barsabbas, who [is] also [called] Justus, when he was tested by the

---

[198] Collins, *Mark*, 814, explains that, while the phrase could denote a metaphorical harm like heresy, "[s]ince the other 'signs' refer to extraordinary abilities, this one probably does also. Immunity from heresy, even if perceived as rampant and beguiling, does not fit the context of the longer ending."

[199] Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, 419.

[200] The attribution of the quotation from Mk. 16:18 to Porphyry is found in Macarius Magnes' *Apocriticus*. Identifying the critic of Christianity in *Apocriticus* with Porphyry is implied, and T. W. Crafer states: "the objections [in *Apocriticus*] represent an attack on the Scriptures in detail, and undoubtedly reflect the philosophy of Porphyry, the famous Neoplatonist of the third century…"; T. W. Crafer, *The Apocriticus of Macarius Magnes* (Translations of Christian Literature, Series I, Greek Texts; London: SPCK; New York: Macmillan Company, 1919), ix. Porphyry's quotation of the Markan passage and his suggestion of the "poison test" is translated and discussed in Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, 68-67; cf. Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, 417-418; Crafer, *The Apocriticus*, 85-86.

> unbelievers and *drank viper's venom*, was by the name of Christ protected from harm.[201]

This passage is especially significant as it tells how Justus is protected "by the name of Christ" (ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ). It is unclear if this story of Justus is a direct response to Mark 16:18 and, as we have seen, a connection in the Markan passage between Jesus' name and drinking poison is doubtful. Yet the Papias tradition gives evidence to the value of Jesus' name in a situation where, as mentioned in Mark, a believer drinks poison. The notion that Jesus' name prevents harm is, in broad terms, apotropaic. However, since the venom is not associated with a demon, the immunity afforded by Jesus' name is an example of a different type of apotropaism in which protection from future non-demonic harm is sought.[202]

Another, less direct, parallel is the pseudepigraphic narrative in which Joseph is warned by an angel that his food is "mixed with enchantments" to entice him to Potiphar's wife (*T. Jos.* 6:1) and, to demonstrate God's power, the food is eventually eaten with no adverse effect (6:7-8).[203] The passage specifies that before Joseph eats the tainted food, he prays: "May the God of my fathers and the angel of Abraham be with me."[204] A prayer that calls upon the assistance of God and the authoritative figure Abraham to prevent harm is essentially an apotropaic plea. However, the potential threat in this instance is not from a demon and, thus, the prayer belongs to a more general kind of apotropaic plea in a manner similar to

---

[201] Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, 438 (italics mine). The English translation is provided along with the Greek text of Pilippus Sidetes frag. 6 in ibid., 437-438; cf. Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (3d ed.; Baker Academic, 2007), 742-743. A slightly different version of the Papius tradition is also preserved by Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 3.39.9), though, despite the later date of the fifth century Philip of Side, Kelhoffer concludes that the latter's account of the Papius tradition is more reliable; cf. Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, 433-442; Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 736-737.

[202] This is a more general understanding of "apotropaic" which can be used to characterize efforts, as Flusser describes, " to avert personal dangers" that are not necessarily demonic; cf. idem, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 201.

[203] Cf. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," 820-821; Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, 425-429.

[204] *T. Jos.* 6:8; cf. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," 821.

the use of the name for protection from a non-demonic threat in the Papius tradition.[205]

Notwithstanding these examples from surrounding traditions, Kelhoffer explains that "all of the evidence before the sixth century concerning the intentional drinking of poison with impunity is literary rather than historical. Moreover, Mark 16:18b cannot be reduced to a single literary source and cannot on its own establish some practice of drinking poison in the early church."[206] Like the promise to handle snakes with impunity, the reception of Mark 16:18b in early Christian communities is unknown. As is the case with both of the signs in verse 18 there is simply the promise of immunity from future harm given to those who adhere to the gospel through belief and baptism.

Implications for the Topic of Apotropaism

Although the promises of immunity from snakes and poison are found alongside the promise that believers will cast out demons in Jesus' name, there is no explicit relationship between the value of Jesus' name and the prevention of future harm. Moreover, the ὄφις and θανάσιμος τι are not associated with anything demonic. Therefore, the signs in Mark 16:18 do not have a direct connection with anti-demonic apotropaism. Still verse 18 depicts a belief in which those associated with Jesus, those who believe, are afforded protection from future harm. Although not straightforwardly apotropaic, or even anti-demonic, this concept is well suited to the broader understanding of "apotropaism." There are even vague parallels between the Markan passage and forms of apotropaism discussed elsewhere. For instance, the immunity from future harm promised to those who align themselves with the gospel is, in general terms, similar to the anti-demonic effect for those

---

[205] Still, one should not be too quick to deny any demonic element in this episode. Potiphar's wife's spell over Joseph's food is associated with idolatry (*T. Jos.* 6:5) and a connection between demons and idols/idolatry in early Jewish and Christian tradition (e.g., *Jub.* 11:4; 1 Cor. 10:19-20) is well known. Yet, regardless of any implied demonology that might exist in the passage, since Joseph's prayer is not overtly anti-demonic it is an example of a broader understanding of "apotropaic."

[206] Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, 420.

who adhere to the torah. Similarly, those adherents of the gospel who are baptized lay claim to a special status which prevents them from the adverse effects of snakes and poison much like the qualities of the sage in 4Q510-511, including his special status, allow for protection from demons. While there is no direct link between Mark 16:17-18 and anti-demonic apotropaism, the relevance of this passage for our discussion is that it attests to the concept of apotropaism and gives examples of how the notion of "apotropaism" may be interpreted in wider, non-demonic terms.

3.4 Conclusions

The focus of this chapter is the identification and examination of non-petitionary apotropaisms in the synoptic gospels. I have endeavored to demonstrate that, although they may not be as prominent or numerous as depictions of exorcisms, apotropaic features are present in all three synoptic gospels. Each apotropaism is compared with parallel traditions from surrounding literature, mainly from the Dead Sea Scrolls, and assessed within the larger demonological/Satanological themes in each gospel. Apotropaisms in the gospels are in many ways analogous to other apotropaic responses to demonic evil in surrounding traditions, and are in harmony with the demonologies/Satanologies of the gospels themselves.

Lincicum shows how the quotation of scripture is used for apotropaic purposes in early Judaism, while Kister's reading of CD-A illustrates that torah observance can ward off demons. These two observations justify an interpretation of the Matthean and Lukan Temptation narrative in which Jesus' use of scripture and adherence to Deuteronomy in the face of the devil's tests are essentially an apotropaic response to personified evil. Moreover, examining Jesus' quotations against surrounding anti-demonic traditions highlights their similarity to forms of incantations such as those found in *Songs of the Sage*. Further parallels with *Songs of the Sage* include the elevated status of both Jesus and the sage, as well as the presence of angels in Matthew and the Qumran document. An investigation of these features together with other demonologically significant pericopae indicates that interpreting the Deuteronomy quotations as apotropaic does not conflict with

either the larger roles of Satan or demons in Matthew or Luke, or with the gospels' depictions of Jesus as an authoritative figure.

The use of Psalm 91 in the Temptation is best understood within the anti-demonic context of the prayer. While the dialogue between Jesus and the devil resembles a rabbinic dispute, a comparison with the inversion tactic in 11Q11 v places the purpose of the psalm in new light: Satan's quotation is an aggressive power-play meant to intimidate Jesus. The devil's tactic of "psychological warfare" intensifies the antagonism in the narrative by appealing to the interpretive history of the psalm within anti-demonic tradition. The Temptation pericope is not the only place in the synoptics where anti-demonic language is reversed and used against Jesus (e.g., Mt. 8:28-32; Mk. 5:1-15; Lk. 8:26-35).

In Mark 9:25 an apotropaic prohibition against demon re-possession is attached to an exorcism formula, thereby highlighting Jesus' authority and emphasizing his anti-demonic effectiveness. This passage also demonstrates the complimentary relationship between exorcistic and apotropaic techniques. In addition to explicit apotropaisms, allusions to apotropaic efficacy are also present in some cases. Luke 10:17-20 may allude to the apotropaic Psalm 91 if: (1) the authority to "trample," though certainly applicable to exorcism, also includes the power to ward off or avoid demonic affliction; and/or (2) a direct allusion to the apotropaic Psalm 91 is intended which would then demonstrate Luke's awareness and incorporation of apotropaic tradition into his depiction of Jesus' gift of anti-demonic authority to the disciples. In the Longer Ending of Mark, immunity from future non-demonic harm (i.e., snakes and poison) promised to Jesus' followers are examples of a broader type of apotropaisms – a concept that is analogous to anti-demonic apotropaism. Both the Longer Ending in Mark and Luke 10:19 (which may be applied to stories in Acts) suggest that protective measures against harm are also a concern for the early Christian community.

In conclusion, there are four points demonstrated in this chapter: (1) the gospels do indeed contain non-petitionary apotropaic responses to demonic evil; (2) these apotropaisms resemble those in early Jewish tradition and yet are unique to the particular context of specific gospel pericopae; (3) interpreting elements in the gospels as "apotropaic" does not lessen the authoritative or powerful portrayal

of Jesus in the gospels; and (4) the apotropaisms are compatible with the portrayals of Satan and demons in the rest of the synoptic writings. Perhaps one reason apotropaic features are not as numerous as exorcisms is because exorcisms display the inauguration of the kingdom of God which is of greater interest to the synoptic writers. Still, the evangelists are aware of apotropaic tradition, and when an apotropaism is appropriate (e.g., Mk. 9:25) it is incorporated into a narrative. Among the main implications for identifying apotropaisms in the synoptic gospels is that human interaction with demons reflects the multi-faceted anti-demonic tradition of the period. Thus, in the same way that early Jewish literature has multiple ways of countering demons, so too the synoptic gospels.

Chapter 4: Apotropaic Petitions in the Gospels

Whereas the previous chapter identified and examined non-petitionary apotropaisms in the synoptic gospels, this chapter addresses the question of whether the gospel writings contain pleas for deliverance from demonic harm. This task is accomplished by (1) comparing relevant passages to early Jewish anti-demonic pleas analyzed in chapter two; and (2) discussing any potential apotropaic petitions within the larger demonological issues of a given gospel.

Many scholars, beginning with Flusser and more recently Wold, have noted the similarity between the Matthean Lord's Prayer and Qumran apotropaic pleas. Therefore, the possible apotropaic connotation of the Lord's Prayer is discussed first, followed by a passage from Luke's gospel. Also, since Stuckenbruck has made an intriguing case for interpreting apotropaic qualities in a petition in John's gospel, which has implications for this study of the synoptics, his theory is engaged in the final section of this chapter.

4.1 The Matthean Lord's Prayer

The Lord's Prayer is preserved in the double tradition (Mt. 6:9-13; Lk. 11:2-4).[1] There are a number of views concerning the source of the prayer as well as the

[1] The secondary literature on the Lord's Prayer is extensive and, thus, our discussion is necessarily selective. Works which are informative for this conversation include: M. W. Martin, "The Poetry of the Lord's Prayer: A Study in Poetic Device," *JBL* 134.2 (2015): 347-372; J. Kwon, "Cyprian, Origen and the Lord's Prayer: Theological Diversities Between Latin West and Greek East in the Third Century," *AJT* 26.1 (2012): 56-87; D. E. Aune, "Apocalyptic and the Lord's Prayer," in *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul in the Context of Jewish and Greco-Roman Antiquity* (WUNT 303; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 75-93; repr. from *Meaning and Method: Essays on New Testament Interpretation in Honor of Harold W. Attridge* (eds. A. B. McGowan and K. H. Richards; SBL SBS 67; Atlanta: SBL, 2011); D. Wenham, "The Sevenfold Form of the Lord's Prayer in Matthew's Gospel," *ExpT* 121.8 (2010): 377-382; Luz, *Matthew 1-7* (2007), 307-327; idem, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary* (trans. W. C. Linss; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989), 367-389; B. Pitre, *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of the Atonement* (WUNT 2.Reihe; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); H. B. Green, *Matthew, Poet of the Beatitudes* (JSNT Supplement Series 203; Sheffield Academic Press, 2001); R. W. Byargeon,

originality of the two versions in Matthew and Luke. To account for the different versions Jeremias, based on the principle that "no author would have dared to make such alteration in the Prayer on his own," concludes that "the wording for

---

"Echoes of Wisdom in the Lord's Prayer (Matt 6:9-13)," *JETS* 41.3 (September, 1998): 353-365; A. I. Wilson, "The Disciples' Prayer: A Fresh Look at a Familiar Text," *RTR* 57 (1998): 136-150; H. D. Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain* (Hermeneia; Fortress Press, 1995); W. Carter, "Recalling the Lord's Prayer: The Authorial Audience of Matthew's Prayer as Familiar Liturgical Experience," *CBQ* 57 (1995): 514-530; E. A. Milton, "'Deliver Us from the Evil Imagination': Matt 6:13B in Light of the Jewish Doctrine of the YÊṢER HÂRÂ^{c}," *RST* 13-14 (1995): 52-67; D. A. Hagner, *Matthew 1-13* (WBC 33a; Word Books, 1993), 141-152; J. C. O'Neill, "The Lord's Prayer," *JSNT* 51 (1993): 3-25; D. E. Garland, "The Lord's Prayer in the Gospel of Matthew," *RE* 89 (1992): 215-228; D. E. Lanier, "The Lord's Prayer: Matt 6:9-13 – A Thematic and Semantic Structural Analysis," *CTR* 6.1 (1992): 57-72; M. Black, "The Doxology to the *Pater Noster* with a Note on Matthew 6.13b" in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (JSOTSup 100; eds. P. R. Davies and R. T. White; Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 327-338; S. E. Porter, "Mt 6:13 and Lk 11:4 'Lead Us Not Into Temptation'," *ExpT* 101.12 S (1990): 359-362; Betz, *Essays on the Sermon on the Mount* (trans. L. L. Welborn; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 55-69; R. T. France, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (TNTC; Inter-Varsity Press, 1985); R. H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (W. B. Eerdmanns Publishing Company, 1982), 104-111; J. Van Bruggen, "The Lord's Prayer and Textual Criticism," *CTJ* 17 (1982): 78-87; A. J. Bandstra, "The Original Form of the Lord's Prayer," *CTJ* 16 (1981): 15-37; J. Heinemann, "The Background of Jesus' Prayer in the Jewish Liturgical Tradition" in *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy* (eds. J. J. Petuchowski and M. Brocke; London: Burns and Oates, 1978), 81-89; S. J. Kistemaker, "The Lord's Prayer in the First Century," *JETS* 21.4 (December, 1978): 323-328; A. Vögtle, "The Lord's Prayer: A Prayer for Jews and Christians?" in *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy*, 93-117; S. Van Tilborg, "A Form-Criticism of the Lord's Prayer," *NovT* 14 (1972): 94-105; J. Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus* (SBT 6; SCM Press, 1967), 82-107; E. Lohmeyer, *"Our Father": An Introduction to the Lord's Prayer* (Harper and Row, 1966); G. J. Bahr, "The Use of the Lord's Prayer in the Primitive Church," *JBL* 84 (1965): 153-159; repr. in *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy*, 149-155; M. D. Goulder, "The Composition of the Lord's Prayer," *JTS* 14 (1963): 32-45; R. E. Brown, "The Pater Noster as an Eschatological Prayer," *Theological Studies* 22 (1961): 175-208; repr. in *New Testament Essays* (Geoffrey Chapman, 1965), 217-253; Jeremias, "The Lord's Prayer in Modern Research," *ExpT* 71 (1960): 141-146; and T. W. Manson, "The Lord's Prayer," *BJRL* 38 (1955-56): 99-113, 436-448. See also Mark Harding's bibliography in J. H. Charlesworth, M. Harding, and M. Kiely, eds., *The Lord's Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era* (Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1994), 186-201.

the Prayer [is] from two churches, that is, different liturgical wording of the Lord's Prayer. Each of the evangelists transmits to us the wording of the Lord's Prayer as it was prayed in his church at that time."[2] He further specifies, along with Raymond Brown, that "whereas Luke has preserved the original in respect of the length, Matthew has preserved the original form in respect of the common wording."[3] However, whereas Jeremias' and Brown's views assume that the prayer stems from the historical Jesus, Michael Goulder offers an alternative theory, later built upon by S. Van Tilborg, which suggests that Markan themes are used by Matthew to compose the prayer which is then amended by Luke.[4] While there certainly are similarities between features in Mark's Gethsemane pericope and the petitions in the Matthean Lord's Prayer,[5] Goulder's theory has been persuasively rejected based, in part, on the unlikelihood that Luke abbreviated the Matthean prayer.[6] Instead, many scholars accept the positions of Jeremias that: (1)

---

[2] Jeremias, *Prayers of Jesus*, 89; cf. idem, "The Lord's Prayer in Modern Research," 143. He further clarifies in *Prayers of Jesus*, 91: "The possibility remains that Jesus himself spoke the 'Our Father' on different occasions in a slightly differing form, a shorter one and a longer one."

[3] Jeremias, "The Lord's Prayer in Modern Research," 143; cf. idem, *Prayers of Jesus*, 93; and Brown, "Pater Noster," 177-178.

[4] According to Goulder, "The Composition of the Lord's Prayer," 35, "Jesus gave certain teaching on prayer by precept and example, which was recorded for the most part by St. Mark. This was written up into a formal Prayer by St. Matthew, including certain explanations and additions in Matthaean language and manner. St. Matthew's Prayer was then abbreviated and amended by St. Luke." Van Tilborg, "A Form-Criticism," 104, further qualifies that "Mark's gospel does not contain the Lord's Prayer, but nevertheless discloses three texts reminiscent of the text of the Our Father" and further that "in the congregation of Mark the Lord's Prayer was not known but that it originated in an liturgical reflection upon the Gethsemane story [Mk. 14:32-42]."

[5] The Markan expressions "Abba, Father" (14:36), "not what I will, but what you will" (14:36), and "pray that you may not enter into temptation" (14:38) are comparable to the petitions in Mt. 6:9, 10, and13 respectively. Cf. Van Tilborg, "A Form-Criticism," 96.

[6] For instance, Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 592, note: "the version of the Lord's Prayer in [*Didache*] 8.2, which follows Matthew very closely…shows us what we should expect if Mt 6.9-13 had been the text before Luke" and further, "it is much easier to think of additions accruing to the sacred text over time or being added by Matthew than of lines being dropped for no evident reason. (In the Lukan textual tradition, the tendency was certainly towards expansion in conformity to Matthew, as a glance at a textual apparatus will show.) The short text thus commends itself as the

Luke's version is more original regarding length and form while Matthew's is more original regarding content;[7] and (2) the prayer has its origin in the historical Jesus.[8]

There is still disagreement about the finer details of these theories; for example, it is debated whether the evangelists received the prayer from Q or an oral source.[9] Source critical debates are beyond the scope of this study. Because concern here is with the petition for deliverance from evil (τοῦ πονηροῦ), which is not found in Luke, focus is on the final form of the prayer in Matthew. Therefore, I accept as a working hypothesis the majority scholarly opinions that: (1) the Matthean Lord's Prayer is from an Aramaic original;[10] (2) the Matthean Lord's Prayer contains the *ipsissima vox* (voice/message) of the historical Jesus; and (3) whether or not the final clause (ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ) can be attributed to the evangelist's hand, it harmonizes with Matthean terminology and

---

more original… Lk 11.2-4 is independent of Mt 6.9-13, so the Lord's Prayer must have been a traditional piece." Citations from the *Didache* in this study are from Bart D. Ehrman, ed., *The Apostolic Fathers Vol. 1* (LCL 24; Harvard University Press, 2003).

[7] E.g., Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 143; John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus, vol. 2: Mentor, Message, and Miracles* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday & Company, 1994), 291-292; and Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 591-592. Conversely, Pitre is dissatisfied with this theory and raises important questions about its solidity, but he does not offer an alternative since his study is concerned with the *ipsissima vox* (voice/message) of Jesus conveyed by the prayer rather than the *ipsissima verba* (precise words) of Jesus; cf. *End of the Exile*, 135-136.

[8] Pitre, *End of the Exile*, 154, notes that "the vast majority of interpreters, including some of the most skeptical," trace the prayer to the historical Jesus. Cf. Aune, "Apocalyptic," 83; Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 146; Luz, *Matthew 1-7* (2007), 311; Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 592-593; Meier, *A Marginal Jew*, 294; and O'Neill, "The Lord's Prayer," 5.

[9] Pitre, *End of the Exile*, 134, explains: "the multiple word-for-word correspondences coupled with the preservation of a difficult *hapax legomenon* (τὸν ἐπιούσιον) make it extremely likely that we are dealing here with a Q tradition." Yet Aune, "Apocalyptic," 83, suggests: "These three versions [Matthew, Luke, and *Didache*] probably represent variations of the LP that existed in oral tradition before they were fixed in written form…which continued to be subject to changes in oral tradition." For a list of opponents and proponents of the inclusion of the Lord's Prayer in Q, see John S. Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels; Synopsis, Critical Notes and Concordance* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1988), 84.

[10] An Aramaic original is more likely than a Hebrew original; cf. Aune, "Apocalyptic," 84; Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 593; Luz, *Matthew 1-7* (2007), 311.

themes.[11] Should this discussion run counter to any of these points, or should they be significantly impacted by its conclusions, these assumptions will be returned to in due course.

4.1.1 Introductory Comments on Matthew 6:9-13

The feature most relevant to the topic of apotropaism is the petition for deliverance from evil in verse 13b. However, in order to properly contextualize and interpret the meaning of this plea, the prayer as a whole must be considered. The Matthean version reads:

9...Our Father who art in heaven, Hallowed by thy name. 10 Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, On earth as it is in heaven. 11 Give us this day our daily bread; 12 And forgive us our debts, As we also have forgiven our debtors; 13 And lead us not into temptation, But deliver us from evil.	Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου· ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου· γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς· τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον· καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν· καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.[12]

The form of prayer is divided between the first three "thou" petitions which glorify God, and the remaining "we" petitions which address personal or

---

[11] While some see strong indications that the final clause is the result of Matthean redaction (e.g., Green, *Poet of the Beatitudes*, 78; Van Tilborg, "A Form-Criticism," 105), others are more cautious. Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 614, state: "Because 'the evil one'...is a favourite expression of Matthew, he may either have added the entire line, thus giving a new couplet increasing the parallelism of the Lord's Prayer, or he may have changed the last word – although all this is far from certain, since the appellation was common." They also describe vs. 13b as a likely secondary expansion "of either Matthew or the tradition before him" (ibid., 612), and count the clause as among those in the prayer which have "the highest claim to being Matthean" (ibid., 592). To whatever extent the Matthean redactor influenced the wording of the final clause, its harmonization with other terminology and the larger context in Matthew is discussed and demonstrated throughout this section (§4.1).

[12] The English translation and Greek text is from Aland, *Synopsis*, 57.

individual concerns. Scholars disagree about whether the last verse constitutes one or two petitions.[13] Michael Martin analyzes the poetic characteristics of the prayer and concludes that, while the structure of the prayer should be viewed as having six petitions, the content is seven since the final couplet contains two separate requests.[14] Thus, the final two clauses will be treated as two distinct petitions although they are closely related to each other.

Martin raises another important point about the prayer; namely, it closely resembles ancient Jewish poetry.[15] This observation echoes the many comparisons between the prayer and early Jewish writings, among which is part of the Kaddish:

> Exalted and hallowed be His great Name
> in the world which He created
> according to His will.
> May He establish His kingdom…
> in your lifetime and in your days,
> and in the lifetime of the whole household of Israel,
> speedily and at a near time.[16]

---

[13] According to Wenham, "The Sevenfold Form," 377-382, the prayer contains seven petitions. Others treat the final verse as one petition; cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 592, 612-615.

[14] Martin, "Poetry," 370, notes: "interpreters have debated whether the final petition, 'and lead us not into trial, but deliver us from evil,' should be viewed structurally as a single petition (the sixth) or as two distinct petitions (the sixth and seventh). At stake in this question is the larger and centuries-old debate concerning whether the prayer should be viewed as having six or seven parts in its structure. Clearly, the figure-determined stichometry detailed above in the second half of the prayer…commends the six-part thesis." He further clarifies that both of these views "protect different truths. Whereas the prayer is certainly six-part in its poetic form or structure (insofar as it consists of two tricola stanzas), it is seven-part in its poetic content (insofar as the final couplet consists climactically of two petitions, bringing the total number of petitions to the symbolically important sum of seven)." Ibid., n. 68.

[15] He argues, "Poetry," 348, "the Lord's Prayer employs in every line a number of coordinated poetic devices characteristic of poetry in both the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint… Given the thematic and liturgical ties that the prayer obviously shares with ancient Jewish poetry, this form suggests that the prayer is a poem belonging to the Jewish religious literary tradition."

[16] Jakob J. Petuchowski, "Jewish Prayer Texts of the Rabbinic Period" in *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Literature*, 37; cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 595. For more on the Kaddish, see Baruch Graubard, "The Kaddish Prayer," in *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy*, 59-72.

Davies and Allison note that "two petitions of the Lord's Prayer, the two 'Thou' petitions, were, one strongly suspects, formulated under the influences of the Kaddish prayer – if, indeed, that prayer was already well known in the first-century A.D. (an uncertain point)."[17] Likewise, there are resemblances to passages from the Eighteen Benedictions, including the prayer: "Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned against You. Blot out and remove our transgressions from before Your sight, for Your mercies are manifold."[18] These similarities have led some scholars to suggest that these Jewish prayers influenced the composition of the Lord's Prayer.[19] The parallels may also indicate something along the lines of functionality; for instance, in contrast to prayers with a liturgical purpose, Joseph Heinemann states: "There can be no doubt that the prayer of Jesus in Matt. 6:9 displays all of the characteristics of Jewish private prayer…".[20] Other scholars remain cautious when describing the exact relationship between the Lord's Prayer and Jewish prayers, though basic similarities are generally acknowledged.[21] While

---

[17] Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 595. Similarly, Gundry, *Matthew*, 104, states: "The Kaddish, an Aramaic prayer used in the liturgy of the synagogue, probably provided Jesus a seed-plot for the Lord's Prayer."

[18] Petuchowski, "Jewish Prayer Texts," 28. The translation cited is part of the sixth benediction from the ancient Palestinian version.

[19] Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 595-597; Gundry, *Matthew*, 104. According to Heinemann, "Background," 86, "Jesus' prayer appears to have been modelled upon the pattern employed in the set synagogue prayers, especially the Eighteen Benedictions (though the actual wording of the preamble may have been inspired by the *Kaddish*)."

[20] Heinemann, "Background," 88. Alternately, some describe the prayer as a liturgical expansion (e.g. France, *Matthew*, 133), or at least emphasize that the prayer was used liturgically in the early Church (e.g. Brown, "Pater Noster," 178-179; Willy Rordorf, "The Lord's Prayer in the Light of its Liturgical Use in the Early Church," *SL* 14.1 (1980/81): 1-19). For the reception of the Lord's Prayer in the early Church, cf. Bahr, "The Use of the Lord's Prayer in the Primitive Church," 153-159; Kenneth W. Stevenson, *The Lord's Prayer: A Text in Tradition* (SCM Press, 2004); and Roy Hammerling, *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church: The Pearl of Great Price* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

[21] According to Green, *Poet of the Beatitudes*, 84 n. 36, the closest parallel between the Lord's Prayer and early Jewish prayer is the Kaddish, but other comparisons are "much less clear." Byargeon, "Echoes of Wisdom," 355, states that "[a]t best one can only conclude that the Lord's Prayer and the *Qaddish* share a similar theological perspective." And further: "the content is so

it is unclear to what extent, if any, the Kaddish and the Eighteen Benedictions directly influenced the Lord's Prayer, there is little doubt that it participates in the same tradition as other early Jewish prayers.

Eschatology and the Lord's Prayer

There is a divergence of opinion about whether the prayer should be interpreted as eschatological, temporal, or both. According to Brown, "by 'eschatological' we refer to the period of the last days, involving the return of Christ, the destruction of the forces of evil, and the definite establishment of God's rule."[22] Brown and Jeremias both argue for an eschatological interpretation of the entire prayer, one in which each of the seven petitions relates in some way to the events of the eschaton.[23] Even the seemingly temporal sense of the fourth and fifth petitions requesting "daily bread" and the forgiveness of debts are viewed from an eschatological perspective. The "daily bread" is taken as a reference to the nourishment of the eschatological banquet and there is compelling imagery from the Hebrew scriptures, notably the heavenly manna (cf. Exodus 16), to support this as one of the likely interpretations of the fourth petition.[24] Similarly, forgiveness of

---

general between the Lord's Prayer and the Eighteen Benedictions that to argue for dependence seems to push the general similarities between the two beyond the evidence." Ibid., 357.

[22] Brown, "Pater Noster," 175. In this particular context Brown's definition of "eschatology" is useful and will be applied our discussion of the petitions in the Lord's Prayer.

[23] Brown, "Pater Noster," 175-208; Jeremias, *Prayers of Jesus*, 82-107; and idem, "Modern Research," 141-146. This interpretation is followed by others, including Paul Trudinger who states: "the 'Our Father' in Matthew is a manifesto of apocalyptic eschatology. Each petition urges the one praying to look forward to that 'day of the Lord' which, in Matthew's view, is in effect 'just around the corner.'" Idem, "The 'Our Father' in Matthew as Apocalyptic Eschatology," *DR* 107.366 (1989): 52. For a summary of understandings of the terms "apocalyptic" and "eschatology," especially in relation to the Lord's Prayer, see Aune, "Apocalyptic," 75-93.

[24] One's interpretation of this petition largely depends on the meaning of the word ἐπιούσιος which modifies ἄρτος ("bread") in Mt. 6:11. For Brown, "Pater Noster," 196, the term comes from the verb "to go, come" and, thus, the petition requests "bread for the coming day, for the future." Cf. Jeremias, "Modern Research," 145; Rordorf, "Lord's Prayer," 6-9; Trudinger, "Our Father," 52-53; and Aune, "Apocalyptic," 88. This is a reference to the heavenly bread which the manna in the

debts, that is "debt" meaning "sin,"[25] is sought in anticipation of, and preparation for, the eschatological Last Judgment.[26]

---

desert (cf. Exod. 16:4) prefigures and is connected to the Eucharist (cf. Jn. 6:35), both of which have eschatological connotations; cf. Brown, "Pater Noster," 197-199; Rordorf, "Lord's Prayer," 8-9. Similarly, Jeremias, *Prayer of Jesus*, 101, concludes that the "eschatological thrust of all the other petitions in the Lord's Prayer speaks for the fact that the petition for bread has an eschatological sense too, i.e., that it entreats God for the bread of life." Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 609, accept ἐπιούσιος to mean "'for the following day' in the sense of 'today' (as in a morning prayer)." This view includes an eschatological sense of the petition, especially in light of the allusion to Exodus 16 which Davis and Allison believe is present in the request. They explain: "Bread was equated with manna (Exod. 16.4, 8, 12, 15, 22, 32; Ps 77.25 LXX; 105.40; LAB 10.7; Jn 6.25-34), and in Jewish texts the final redemption will see the manna return: 2 Bar. 29.8; Sib. Or. Frag. 3, 49; 7.149; *Mek.* on Exod. 16.25; (cf. Sib. Or. 3.746 (with Exod. 16.31); LAB 19.10; Rev 2.17)." Ibid; cf. Aune, "Apocalyptic," 89. Furthermore, Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 609: "one could easily think, especially in view of the eschatological orientation of the three preceding petitions and the circumstance that in Jesus' ministry table fellowship was an anticipation of the eschatological banquet (note Mt 8.11; Lk 22.28-30), that the material bread which God gives today transparently symbolizes and foreshadows and causes one to desire the spiritual, eschatological bread, which will bring lasting satisfaction." (For the literal and symbolic importance of ἄρτος in the Lord's Prayer, cf. Michael J. Brown, "'Panem Nostrum': The Problem of Petition and the Lord's Prayer," *JR* 80.4 (2000): 595-614.) Aune, "Apocalyptic," 90, also draws upon the notion of table fellowship, and observes that the Jewish concept of eschatological banquet "is analogous to Jesus' own inclusive practice of table fellowship, in which he ate and drank with 'tax collectors and sinners'... The fourth petition, 'give us today the bread of tomorrow,' then, very likely reflects Jesus' understanding of table fellowship with tax collectors and sinners (i.e., breaking bread with them) as an anticipation of the eschatological banquet...".

[25] Keener, *Matthew*, 223, explains that "debts" represented "sin" since most of the hearers of the prayer were borrowers rather than lenders, and Jesus probably had more than economic terms in view; cf. Green, *Poet of the Beatitudes*, 87; Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 611; and France, *Matthew*, 136. See especially Aune, "The Forgiveness Petition in the Lord's Prayer: First Century Literary, Liturgical and Cultural Contexts," in *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul*, 63-65.

[26] According to Jeremias, "Modern Research," 145, the fifth petition "looks upon the great reckoning which the world must expect, the disclosure of God's majesty in the final judgment." For Brown, "Pater Noster," 203-204, those who recite the fifth petition "stand by anticipation before the throne of God; and they request the supreme and final act of fatherly forgiveness, even as they extend the complete and final act of brotherly forgiveness... The fifth petition is the acting out of the Last Judgment as described by Mt 25:34"; cf. ibid., 199-204. Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 612 state: "Given the aorist tenses and eschatological orientation of the rest of the Pater Noster,

The way in which the sixth petition is understood is a major point of focus when considering the eschatology of the prayer, and it has implications for assessing the nature of "evil" in the seventh request (cf. §4.1.2). The meaning of 6:13a, καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, depends greatly upon the interpretation of πειρασμός, translated "temptation" or "testing." For some, πειρασμός indicates ethical and/or earthly struggles such as the human temptation to sin.[27] Parallels include instances where the term describes concerns like persecution (Acts 20:19) and illness (Gal. 4:14). This interpretation of πειρασμός in the Lord's Prayer views the petition as a request to be spared from daily temporal trials and temptations. Others suggest that πειρασμός refers to the eschatological tribulation which Brant Pitre describes as "the final time of 'testing' for the righteous that will precede the coming of the kingdom."[28] Passages outside of Matthew in which πειρασμός is used in connection with eschatological testing are 1 Peter 4:12; Revelation 3:10; and Daniel 12:10 (LXX). Thus, the term is used to denote trials in both temporal and eschatological contexts. A common objection to the eschatological interpretation is that in Mathew 6:13, as David Garland states, the "word 'temptation' does not have a definite article in the Greek, and that makes it unlikely that the petition refers to 'the test.' It is more likely to refer to a

---

6.12 probably has the future – the last judgment – in view." Pitre, *End of the Exile*, 146, who sees new exodus imagery in the background of the entire prayer, explains that "the connotation of both images [i.e., 'sin' and 'debt'] in light of these biblical echoes suggests that the disciples are to call upon God to bring about the final act of deliverance, the great Jubilee that will release the captive children of Israel from sin and debt and allow them to return to the promised land (cf. Isaiah 61)." Alternately, Aune , "Apocalyptic," 91, holds that there is "nothing particularly eschatological about this petition, though it has been argued that it should be so interpreted given the aorist senses and the eschatological orientation of the rest of the LP, yet the fact that Jesus proclaimed God's forgiveness in the present (Mark 2:5; Luke 7:48) mitigates against that view." Cf. idem, "The Forgiveness Petition," 57-74. Although Aune's temporal reading of the petition in light of the immediate presence of God's forgiveness in Jesus' teaching is convincing, I don't think this excludes eschatological implications of the petition, especially since they seem to be present throughout the rest of the prayer.

[27] Cf. Jeffrey Gibson, "Matthew 6:9-13//Luke 11:2-4: An Eschatological Prayer?," *BTB* 31 (2001): 96-105.

[28] Pitre, *End of the Exile*, 147-148; cf. Aune, "Apocalyptic," 91-92; Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 612-614; Jeremias, *Prayers of Jesus*, 105; and Brown, "Pater Noster," 207.

test that can occur at any time."[29] However, Davies and Allison provide a persuasive counter-argument:

> ...many Greek words are, as is well known, definite from the nature of the case and do not require the definite article even when it would be fitting (as 'heaven' and 'earth' in 6.10c). Beyond this, a general implication of the sixth petition to all affliction would necessarily include the final affliction. And more to the point: Jesus and the church after him – including Matthew – interpreted their present in terms of the 'messianic woes'... For them, therefore, every individual test or trial would inevitably be conceived as belonging to the eschatological drama (cf. perhaps 2 Pet 2.9).[30]

Thus, the lack of the definite article does not demand a specific reading of πειρασμός, and the eschatological overtones associated with the concept of "testing" seem to be implied in the text.

Some scholars reject outright any eschatological interpretation of the prayer.[31] Others see an eschatological context as the most probable way to read the "thou" petitions while the "we" petitions refer, at least partly, to daily matters.[32] Moreover, whereas the six aorist imperatives in the petitions are sometimes offered to support the eschatological reading,[33] David Aune, who views the prayer within an eschatological context, explains that the grammar of the petitions is not

---

[29] Garland, "The Lord's Prayer," 225.

[30] Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 613-614; cf. Aune, "Apocalyptic," 91-92; and Pitre, *End of the Exile*, 150.

[31] E.g., Van Tilborg, "Form-Criticism," 94-95. See the discussion in Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 593-595.

[32] Keener, *Matthew*, 216 n. 163, interprets the "thou" petitions as eschatological and the "we" petitions "as primarily directed toward present needs..." According to France, *Matthew*, 133, although each clause could be interpreted eschatologically, "the fact that Christians have used the prayer throughout the centuries without a specifically eschatological intention suggests that it also has an application to the disciples' daily concerns...". That petitions contain eschatological *and* ethical implications, cf. Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 148-152; and Luz, *Matthew 1-7* (2007), 313-314. This is not to say that those who advocate that the prayer is entirely eschatological (e.g., Jeremias, Brown, Davies and Allison, etc.) do not see any ethical concerns addressed in the prayer, rather they tend to emphasize the prayer as primarily eschatologically oriented while not denying certain daily ethical implications.

[33] E.g., Brown, "Pater Noster," 175-208; and Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 141-152.

necessarily limited to this particular interpretation.[34] Despite the ambiguity of the aorist imperatives, the interpretations which connect each petition with events of the eschaton – especially the destruction of evil and the establishment of God's kingdom – as argued by Jeremias, Brown, and more recently Aune, are most convincing. Therefore, this study agrees with Davies and Allison: "there is no room for certainty. We are, however, inclined to agree with those who see the Lord's Prayer as thoroughly eschatological. For the eschatological interpretation gives the text a pleasing thematic unity, and the objections raised against that interpretation are far from decisive."[35]

The Lord's Prayer and the New Exodus

There is another interpretive perspective which complements the eschatological reading of the Lord's Prayer and delineates the meaning of the petitions in relation to early Jewish themes. N. T. Wright suggests: "(1) that Jesus saw his kingdom work in terms of the much-hoped-for 'New Exodus,' and (2) that the Lord's Prayer encapsulates this vision."[36] Accordingly, Wright examines each petition in light of Exodus-related language and imagery such as the "fatherhood" of God toward Israel (Exod. 4:22-23) and the revelation of God's holy name to Moses (Exod. 3:13-16).[37] Pitre builds upon Wright's proposal and develops the connections between features in the Lord's Prayer and passages from the Hebrew scriptures; for instance, there is language describing the hallowing of God's name and the coming of his kingdom in Ezekiel 36:22-28 which parallels the first and second petitions in the Lord's Prayer, and the request for forgiveness from debt/sin is

---

[34] He notes: "[One] argument is that the aorist tense, with, with its punctiliar, once-and-for-all aspect, provides support for the eschatological interpretation. However, this use of the aorist does not necessarily support an eschatological interpretation, since the aorist is frequently used in ancient Greek prayer, where it is used to convey a sense of urgency." Aune, "Apocalyptic," 84-85.

[35] Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 594.

[36] N. T. Wright, "The Lord's Prayer as a Paradigm of Christian Prayer" in *Into God's Presence: Prayer in the New Testament* (ed. Richard N. Longenecker; Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2001), 138.

[37] See especially Wright, "The Lord's Prayer," 140-147.

related to the release from debt which accompanies the return from exile (cf. Lev. 25:25-28, 39-40; 1 Kgs. 8:33-36).[38]

Pitre also postulates that πειρασμός in the sixth petition, which signifies the final tribulation, can be associated with the New Exodus.[39] He notes that πειρασμός is used to describe the "great trials" (τοὺς πειρασμοὺς τοὺς μεγάλους, LXX) of the Exodus plagues in Deuteronomy 7:19, 29:3, but more significant is Deuteronomy 4:27-34 which compares the Exodus from Egypt to a future time of tribulation followed by a future return from exile.[40] According to Pitre, the latter passage especially "makes it quite clear that the biblical notion of *peirasmos* as a time of 'trial' could not only be easily connected with the Exodus and Passover but also serve as a prototype for a future time of 'tribulation' that would take place 'in the latter days.'"[41] Pitre's analysis demonstrates that πειρασμός, at the very least, echoes the early Jewish themes of exile and Exodus in a way that strengthens the eschatological reading of the petition in the Lord's Prayer. Due to these connotations of πειρασμός, the interpretation of verse 13a as a request that the petitioner be spared the final eschatological tribulations is convincing.[42]

4.1.2 The Lord's Prayer as a Deliverance Plea

The final petition of the Lord's Prayer may have apotropaic connotations, and scholars have long noted its similarity to early Jewish deliverance pleas. For Flusser, the Lord's Prayer does not belong to the category "apotropaic," but rather

---

[38] Pitre, *End of the Exile*, 137-153, analyzes the "New Exodus" background of five features of the Lord's Prayer: (1) "Father"; (2) "Your name be hallowed, Your kingdom come"; (3) "Give us our daily bread"; (4) "Forgive us our debts/sins as we forgive our debtors"; and (5) "Do not lead us into *peirasmos*."

[39] Pitre, *End of the Exile*, 146-153; cf. Aune, "Apocalyptic," 91-92; and Wright, "The Lord's Prayer," 144-147.

[40] In Deut. 4:29 the word used is θλῖψις, but πειρασμός is used in 4:34.

[41] Pitre, *End of the Exile*, 152.

[42] Wright, "The Lord's Prayer," 146, explains that in the sixth petition "Jesus' followers are instructed to pray that they may be spared the great *peirasmos* that is coming on Jesus himself *and* the cognate tribulation that is coming on Jerusalem and the whole world." Cf. Aune, "Apocalyptic," 91-92; and Pitre, *End of the Exile*, 153.

resembles Qumran and rabbinic prayers which request God's protection, especially from the evil inclination. The "evil inclination," which is not explicitly identified by Flusser as a reified being, is the source of temptation which leads to evil.[43] In this sense, the last sentence of the Lord's Prayer – "lead us not into *temptation*, but deliver us from *evil*" – follows the early Jewish pattern of petitioning for safety from temptation which originates from the rule of the evil inclination. Since this pattern in many of the Jewish prayers is concerned with temporal moral/ethical trials (e.g. the struggle against sin), he concludes "we have to reject any attempt to read into the last phrase of the Lord's Prayer any eschatological meaning."[44] Although Flusser demonstrates that there is a basic petitionary framework shared by Qumran texts, rabbinic prayers, and the Lord's Prayer, his comparison does not consider the different possible meanings of "evil inclination" in early Judaism, nor does he take into account the anti-demonic aspects of certain apotropaic pleas in relation to the Matthean passage. Therefore, Flusser's reading of the Lord's Prayer is not persuasive.

The *Plea for Deliverance* and *Prayer of Levi* are among the Qumran passages that are most often discussed alongside the Lord's Prayer due to their similar content and thematic arrangement. According to Anton Vögtle, while 11Q5 xix 13-16 do not specifically mention "temptation," the request for a good spirit and preservation against an evil spirit is close to the "thought sequence" of the last two Matthean petitions.[45] Much like in the Lord's Prayer, in *Plea for Deliverance* a "pious man pleads for forgiveness of his sins and for preservation from the dominion of Satan over him: 'Let not Satan rule over me, nor an unclean spirit.'"[46]

---

[43] Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 199-200, does state: "According to a passage in the Talmud, Satan, evil inclination and the Angel of Death are identical; in any case, both Satan and the evil inclination bring man to fall." However, he does not appear to interpret "evil inclination" as demonic in the early Jewish prayers or in relation to the Lord's Prayer. On the יצר רע in early Jewish and rabbinic literature, cf. §2.2.2.2.

[44] Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 203.

[45] Vögtle, "The Lord's Prayer,"102; cf. Jean Carmignac, *Recherches sur le "Notre Père"* (Letouzey & Ané, 1969), 315. Kistemaker, "The Lord's Prayer," 325, also notes the similarity between the last sentence of the Lord's Prayer, *Plea for Deliverance*, and *Prayer of Levi*.

[46] Vögtle, "The Lord's Prayer," 102.

This comparison is particularly striking if τοῦ πονηροῦ in Matthew 6:13b refers to "the evil one" (i.e., the devil), but Vögtle only discusses this as one possible interpretation of the phrase. In Stuckenbruck's analysis of John 17:15 and Qumran deliverance pleas (cf. §4.3) he also brings into conversation parallels with the Matthean Lord's Prayer, but the strength of these comparisons depends, to a large degree, on the nature of τοῦ πονηροῦ.[47]

Wold begins a substantive discussion of the relationship between apotropaism and the Lord's Prayer by drawing upon Flusser's comparison of the passage to *Plea for Deliverance* and *Prayer of Levi*.[48] He interprets in both Qumran prayers a request to God for protection from demonic beings and, thus, he considers each prayer to contain an apotropaic petition. Evaluating the Qumran texts alongside the Lord's Prayer yields three observations: (1) each passage is a longer non-apotropaic prayer which contains apotropaic features;[49] (2) each passage, in some fashion, asks to be distanced from sin/transgression;[50] and (3) both *Plea for Deliverance* and the Lord's Prayer request forgiveness of sins.[51] Regarding the Lord's Prayer itself, it is essential for the prayer's classification as "apotropaic" or "non-apotropaic" to determine whether or not the ambiguous ending τοῦ πονηροῦ refers to demonic evil. Assessing the meaning of τοῦ πονηροῦ raises questions about the eschatological orientation of the entire prayer as well as

---

[47] Cf. Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 139-160.

[48] Wold explains that, for adjudicating the Lord's Prayer, one difficulty with Flusser's article is that it is not specified whether certain terms refer to the demonic. Wold states in "Apotropaic Prayer," 102: "Flusser understands that the evil that leads humanity into temptation is the *evil inclination* and that the Lord's Prayer is a request for God to deliver us from its rule, which is the cause of all temptation. However, what is meant by 'evil inclination' is not delineated by Flusser which, in turn, makes it difficult to agree or disagree with his conclusion that Matthew's prayer does not belong to the apotropaic type."

[49] Cf. Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer," 108. This is noted by Flusser in "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 202.

[50] Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer," 108, states: "both [Qumran] prayers have parallels with the Lord's Prayer's request 'lead me not into temptation' (Mt 6:13a; par. Lk 11:4). The *Prayer of Levi* has 'to make me stray from your path' and the *Plea for Deliverance* has 'let me not stumble in transgression.'"

[51] As Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer," 109, notes, "the *Prayer of Levi* is generally requesting to be distanced from unrighteousness."

how the passage is understood within the larger demonological framework of Matthew's gospel. Although Wold does not fully resolve these issues he begins a process of delineating potential apotropaic features of the Matthean Lord's Prayer within Matthew's broader demonology.

It is clear from these scholarly discussions that when adjudicating the Lord's Prayer as apotropaic two issues must be taken into account: (1) a comparison with Qumran apotropaic pleas; and (2) an assessment of τοῦ πονηροῦ. These points both help to establish the meaning of the final request in the Lord's Prayer and place it within the broader context of first century apotropaic tradition. Additionally, the way in which apotropaism effects the eschatological interpretation of the prayer as a whole and Matthean demonology in general must be addressed.

Qumran Deliverance Pleas: A Comparison with the Lord's Prayer

The *Prayer of Levi* and *Plea for Deliverance* (cf. §2.2.2.1; §2.2.2.2) contain features which are also present in the Lord's Prayer. In order to identify these commonalities it is helpful to set these passages alongside one another:

Figure 4.1

Prayer of Levi (4Q213a 1 i 10-18)	*Plea for Deliverance (11Q5 xix 13-16)*	Matthew 6:9-13
10 I said, 'O Lord, you 11 you alone understand 12 paths of truth. Make far 13 evil and fornication turn away 14 wisdom and knowledge and strength 15 to find favour before you. 16 that which is pleasant and good before you. 17 let not any satan have power over me 18 upon me, my Lord, bring me forward, to be your…[52]	13…Forgive my sin, O Lord, 14 and purify me from my iniquity. Vouchsafe me a spirit of faith and knowledge, and let me not be dishonoured 15 in ruin. Let not Satan rule over me, nor an unclean spirit; neither let pain nor evil inclination 16 take possession of my bones. For thou, O Lord, art my praise, and in thee I do hope.[53]	9…Our Father who art in heaven, Hallowed by thy name. 10 Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, On earth as it is in heaven. 11 Give us this day our daily bread; 12 And forgive us our debts, As we also have forgiven our debtors; 13 And lead us not into temptation, But deliver us from evil.[54]

[52] The translation is from Stone and Greenfield, *DJD XXII*, 28-29.

[53] The translation is from Sanders, *DJD IV*, 77-78.

Among the themes shared by these three passages are requests for forgiveness of sins (Mt. 6:12; *Plea for Deliverance* l. 13), and the petitioner in *Prayer of Levi* (l. 12 ff.) requests to be kept far from unrighteousness.[55] Matthew 6:13 expresses the desire to be led away from temptation which is seen as analogous to language in the Greek translation of *Prayer of Levi* and the request in *Plea for Deliverance* (ll. 14-15) to "not be dishonoured in ruin."[56] These comparisons demonstrate that all three prayers contain what Vögtle calls "the juxtaposition of the petition for forgiveness of sins with the petition for prevention from situations of temptation."[57] Similarities to the Lord's Prayer are not exclusive to *Prayer of Levi* and *Plea for Deliverance*; for instance, apotropaic petitions in *Jubilees* (cf. §2.2.2.5) contain themes such as a request for mercy (cf. *Jub.* 1:20) and the petition to not be led astray (cf. *Jub.* 12:20). Other parallels include the beginning of Abram's prayer (*Jub.* 12:19), which glorifies God and his kingdom, and the opening of Matthew's prayer.

Noteworthy is that many of the apotropaic passages petition for positive attributes: a spirit of wisdom, knowledge, and strength (*Prayer of Levi* l. 14); a spirit of faith and knowledge (*Plea for Deliverance* l. 14); and grace and blessing (*Jub.* 10:3-4). These divine gifts are not directly linked to the warding off of

---

[54] The translation is from Aland, *Synopsis*, 57.

[55] Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer," 109, discusses this feature of *Prayer of Levi* alongside the petitions for forgiveness in the Lord's Prayer and *Plea for Deliverance*, giving the impression that he considers them to be, to a certain extent, analogous. I tend to agree, and the desire for righteousness rather than evil in *Prayer of Levi* is made especially clear in the later Greek translation: "Make far from me, O Lord, the unrighteous spirit, and evil thought and fornication, and turn pride away from me. Let there be shown to me, O Lord, the holy spirit, and counsel, and wisdom and knowledge and grant me strength, in order to do that which is pleasing to you…"; Stone and Greenfield, "The Prayer of Levi," 259.

[56] Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer," 108, uses the translation "let me not stumble in transgression" which, I think, better reflects the similarity to the expression "lead us not into temptation." Wold, ibid., also contends that the Matthean request is parallel to the Greek passage in *Prayer of Levi* "to make me stray from your path." As previously noted, Vögtle, "The Lord's Prayer," 102, compares "lead us not into temptation" with lines 14-16 of *Plea for Deliverance*; cf. Carmignac, *Recherches*, 315.

[57] Vögtle, "The Lord's Prayer," 97.

demons, but they may signify a righteous status of the petitioner which is beneficial for the effective use of apotropaism (cf. §3.1.2). For instance, in one apotropaic incantation (*4QIncantation*) a spirit of understanding, truth, knowledge, and justice, along with adherence to God's law, is associated with the struggle against "spirits of wickedness."[58] Although the Lord's Prayer does not contain analogous requests for positive attributes, Matthew presents the prayer within the larger context of the Sermon on the Mount (5-7) which consists of the virtues extoled in the Beatitudes (5:1-12) and the teaching on the importance of adhering to the law (5:17-20). If any part of the Lord's Prayer is interpreted as "apotropaic," its placement among these moral teachings may reflect the concept found in the Qumran apotropaic passages that a petitioner's righteous orientation is a component of their apotropaic ability.

In all three passages in *figure 4.1* there is a request for protection from some form of evil. For Wold, the meaning of the nearly identical petitions in *Prayer of Levi* line 17 and *Plea for Deliverance* lines 15-16 is the most essential characteristic for classifying the prayers as "apotropaic." Although there is general agreement that in *Plea for Deliverance* the terms "satan" and "unclean spirit" refer to demonic beings, Wold notes Lange's interpretation that the petition asks for a different orientation, a type of positive attitude, which counteracts the harmful demonic influence.[59] This view, which parallels Lange's understanding of the *Prayer of Levi*, is similar to Flusser's interpretation that the deliverance pleas seek to overcome an evil inclination. According to Wold: "If apotropaic prayer is understood as an address to God to protect one from demonic beings, or ward them off, then the interpretations of Flusser and Lange call into question whether

---

[58] The exact interpretation of 4Q444 frag. 1 is unclear. The beneficent spirit in l. 3 may be a counterbalance to the "spirits of controversy" in l. 2, and, while the "spirits of wickedness" (רשעה רוחי) in l. 4 may refer to demons, the possibility remains that the expression רוחי רשעה denotes non-demonic personal inclinations; cf. §2.2.3.3. Still, Chazon, *DJD XXIX*, 376, interprets רוחי רשעה as demonic, and the preceding positive attributes, including the laws of God in l. 4, aid in the battle against these spirits.

[59] Cf. Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer," 104-109; Lange, "Spirit of Impurity," 262; and §2.2.2.1; §2.2.2.2.

the *Plea for Deliverance* should even be referred to as apotropaic."[60] Wold's response underscores that the presence of demonic evil and the request for deliverance from that evil are together central to the classification "apotropaic." This study's assessment of the *Prayer of Levi* and *Plea for Deliverance* determined that the petitions are indeed apotropaic, and this is the most important comparative point to consider when adjudicating the Lord's Prayer.

Although Stuckenbruck's primary focus is a comparison of Qumran deliverance pleas to John 17:15, he raises three points which are relevant to the discussion of the Lord's Prayer. First, he refers to passages such as the *Prayer of Levi* and *Jubilees* which depict holy patriarchs as petitioners, and describes how the early Jewish prayers were "adapted" in a way which transcended their immediate context and function so as to allow the subsequent faithful to participate in the piety of revered Israelite figures. In other words, "patriarchs would not only be presented as practitioners of the piety familiar to those who read about them, but also would be made to formulate petitions that sought God's protection for their descendants. In such cases, readers would have been able to find themselves addressed in the unfolding story line."[61] This notion is similar to the presentation of the Lord's Prayer in Matthew. While Jesus is not, strictly speaking, the "petitioner," he is depicted as a figure of piety who offers his followers a template of perfect prayer. Participation in the Lord's Prayer by the faithful does indeed transcend the immediate context depicted in Matthew, as is attested by the use of the Matthean version in the early church community (e.g., *Didache* 8). Even though this point does not directly relate to the meaning of the last verse in Matthew, it helps to illustrate how the nature and function of the prayer are similar to early Jewish apotropaic pleas.

The second point is that the early Jewish petitions "were based on a twinfold assumption that (1) the present age is under the dominion of evil (ruled by Belial/r, Mastema, or evil spirits), and (2) the powers which hold sway are essentially defeated and await certain eschatological destruction."[62] These two

---

[60] Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer," 106.

[61] Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 159.

[62] Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One." 159.

concepts are especially compatible with the eschatological interpretation of the last two clauses in the Lord's Prayer. If the present age is under the rule of evil forces which will be destroyed in the eschaton, then an appeal for deliverance from the πειρασμός in Matthew 6:13a which will precede the destruction of evil is a reasonable request which fits well within the eschatological framework of the Matthean prayer. Moreover, a shared eschatology between the early Jewish apotropaic pleas and the Lord's Prayer supports the identification of τοῦ πονηροῦ in 13b as a personal being rather than evil in general.

The third point is that the early Jewish petitions are formed within a community which considers itself "elect"; not unlike, according to Stuckenbruck, the Matthean community.[63] This connection is supported by the views which interpret the Lord's Prayer as a liturgical expansion of its source, as well as the evidence of the communal use of the prayer in the early church.[64] The early worshipers' communal/liturgical use of the prayer may be indicated by its placement in the *Didache* between the instructions for baptism (*Did.* 7) and the celebration of the Eucharist (*Did.* 9).[65]

The significance of comparing the Lord's Prayer with *Prayer of Levi*, *Plea for Deliverance*, and other apotropaic passages is not to suggest a direct dependence of the former upon latter, but instead to illustrate the nature of early Jewish apotropaism in a way that informs the assessment of the Matthean prayer. For instance, the early Jewish passages highlight that an apotropaic petition is typically present within a larger prayer containing other themes and petitions. This observation is helpful when considering the apotropaic connotation of only one

---

[63] Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 160.

[64] For the liturgical aspects of the Matthean Lord's Prayer, cf. Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 145; Carter, "Recalling the Lord's Prayer," 514-530; Black, "The Doxology," 328; France, *Matthew*, 133; Van Tilborg, "Form-Criticism," 104; and Brown, "Pater Noster," 178-179. For the use of the Matthean Lord's Prayer in early church tradition, cf. Hammerling, *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*; Stevenson, *The Lord's Prayer*, 17-102; Kistemaker, "The Lord's Prayer," 323-328; and Bahr, "The Use of the Lord's Prayer in the Primitive Church," 153-159.

[65] Additionally, the *Didache's* instruction to the faithful to pray the Lord's Prayer three times daily (*Did.* 8:3) also invokes early Jewish prayers, but it is unclear if this was intended to be done as a community; cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 595-598.

verse of the Lord's Prayer. Thus, while the Lord's Prayer is clearly comparable with many early Jewish prayers, some of which are unconcerned with demonic threats (e.g. the Kaddish, Eighteen Benedictions), its resemblance to apotropaic pleas emphasize that an apotropaic interpretation of the prayer fits within first century anti-demonic tradition as well as first century prayer tradition.

The Meaning of τοῦ πονηροῦ

Scholars have long been divided as to whether τοῦ πονηροῦ in the final petition of the Lord's Prayer should be translated as a neuter substantive for "evil" in general or a masculine substantive "the evil one." The genitive case hides the meaning in this particular instance and either translation is possible. The interpretation of the phrase is central to the discussion of apotropaism for, as Wold explains, "if τοῦ πονηροῦ in Matthew 6:13b is interpreted as πονηρόν ('evil') then it is not an apotropaic element. If τοῦ πονηροῦ is read as πονηρός ('Evil One') then it is apotropaic."[66] Since the issue cannot be resolved grammatically, it is necessary to consider the interpretations of τοῦ πονηροῦ in light of the context of the prayer and the meaning of parallel phrases elsewhere.

There are two main reasons to interpret the phrase as a reference to a personified evil ("the evil one"). The first is due to the eschatological interpretation of the entire prayer. If petitions such as the request for daily bread and the forgiveness of debts have non-temporal significance, then understanding τοῦ πονηροῦ as "the evil one" rather than a general variety of everyday evils is better suited to the eschatological framework of the prayer. Moreover, if πειρασμός in verse 13a refers to the final tribulation, then it is likely that τοῦ πονηροῦ indicates the satanic power behind that eschatological turmoil.[67] The second reason is that the expression is used elsewhere in Matthew to mean "the evil one." Based on context, τοῦ πονηροῦ in 5:37 and 13:38 are meant to indicate a

[66] Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer," 110.

[67] This is Aune's view, and he explains in "Apocalyptic," 93, that the masculine substantive "evil one" "fits *peirasmos* understood as 'eschatological trial,' brought on by the power and influence of Satan." Similarly, Brown, "Pater Noster," 207, states: "once we realize that *peirasmos* means the final trial brought on by Satan's attack, a personal interpretation of *poneros* is most fitting."

singular masculine personal being, and ὁ πονηρὸς in 13:19 refers to the devil.[68] Although the phrase is not always used to denote a non-human "evil one" (cf. 5:39), the point is that there is precedent in Matthew for τοῦ πονηροῦ to signify "the evil one" Satan. Some also suggest that if the expression is intended to describe evil in general there should be a qualifying παντός,[69] and while an absent adjective does not in itself justify a specific interpretation, it contributes to the overall argument that τοῦ πονηροῦ should be identified as a singular personified being.

Some scholars interpret the phrase as a reference to all evil, which would include sin, disease, etc., and this view is consistent with the temporal reading of the entire prayer. Indeed, if the whole prayer (or at least the "we" petitions) is intended to address everyday concerns, it may seem out of place for the last petition to focus on a single otherworldly adversary. Aside from its incongruity with a non-eschatological context of the prayer, the main objection to the interpretation of τοῦ πονηροῦ as a personified evil is that ὁ πονηρός, which corresponds to הרע in Hebrew and בישא in Aramaic,[70] does not appear in Jewish literature as a designation for the figure "Satan." This leads Ulrich Luz to conclude that "[o]n the basis of the Jewish texts it is suggestive to think of everyday experiences: illness, affliction, evil people, the evil impulse."[71] However, as Matthew Black notes, there is a close comparison from Qumran where the

---

[68] Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them From the Evil One," 143, comments: "In the Matthean context, the personified meaning of the expression is strengthened by a less ambiguous reference to 'the evil one' in 5:37." Noting these and other parallels outside of Matthew (e.g., Jn. 17:15; 1 Jn. 5:18; 2 Thess. 3:3), Brown, "Pater Noster," 207 n. 31, states: "While one or the other of our examples might be challenged (since in some of them it is not impossible that *poneros* is abstract), their overall effect is conclusive." The parallel of these passages to Mt. 6:13b are also noted by others including Aune, "Apocalyptic," 93; Green, *Matthew, Poet of the Beatitudes*, 88-89; and Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 614-615. See the interpretations in Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 538; idem, *Matthew VIII-XVIII*, 399-400, 428-429.

[69] E.g., Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, 615; Brown, "Pater Noster," 207.

[70] Cf. Black, "The Doxology," 333.

[71] Luz, *Matthew 1-7* (1989), 385; cf. Idem, *Matthew 1-7* (2007), 323.

reconstruction הרשע ("Evil/Wicked One") refers to Belial.[72] Black also brings into conversation the term Melchireša' (מלכי רשע) which is translated "Prince of Evil" and used to describe Belial or Satan in two Qumran passages.[73] Alexander and others discuss the characterization of Belial as the "Angel of Enmity" (מלאך משטמה) in 1QM vii 11.[74] Even if early Jewish writings do not contain a precise parallel to the ὁ πονηρός/Satan equivalent, these examples illustrate that referring to the chief demonic figure with a description instead of a name is definitely a known practice. Therefore, since the objection based on early Jewish precedent that τοῦ πονηροῦ cannot mean "the evil one" is not definitive, and because an eschatological context of the prayer is most likely (cf. §4.1.1), the arguments for interpreting τοῦ πονηροῦ as a neuter substantive signifying generalized evil are not convincing.

Edward Milton offers an intriguing alternative to the three traditional interpretations of τοῦ πονηροῦ. Instead of translating the clause as (1) generalized evil, (2) an evil person, or (3) the devil, he proposes that it could refer to (4) the "*yêṣer hârâ*^{c}" which he translates "evil imagination."[75] Milton surveys the developing concepts of the יצר from its biblical association with the propensity to sin to its rabbinic description as an evil impulse, sometimes described as an outside force, pitted against a good impulse. The יצר from several Qumran

---

[72] Cf. Black, "The Doxology," 335-336; 4Q286 7 ii 5. If Black, ibid., 334, is correct and הרשע in 4Q286 is "used as a proper name to describe Satan or Belial," then this almost exactly reflects the use of ὁ πονηρός as a name for Satan. Black's reading of the passage is strengthened by Nitzan's reconstruction of the relevant part of line 5: "And cursed is the Wick[ed One during all periods] of his dominions…"; cf. Esther Eshel et al., *DJD XI*: *Qumran Cave 4. VI (Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 28. Nitzan, in ibid., 29, explains: "[הרש[ע (the Wicked One) is another title for Belial, the angelic leader of wickedness (cf. רשע ושר גוה in 1Q29 13 3, and שר ממשלת רשעה in 1QM XVII 5-6)."

[73] According to Black, "The Doxology," 335, מלכי רשע in the Aramaic 4Q80 frag.1 l. 2 is a parallel to the cursing of Belial's lot in the Hebrew 1QS ii 5 and, thus, "it is abundantly clear that Melchireša' is simply another designation for Belial or Satan." In 4Q544 frag. 2 l. 3, Black deduces that, based on the description of a "serpent" (frag. 1 ll. 13-14) who "rules over all darkness" (frag. 1 l. 5), Melchireša' here too is a reference to Belial or Satan; cf. ibid., 334.

[74] Cf. Alexander, "Demonology of the DSS," 334; cf. n. 297 in chapter 2.

[75] Cf. Milton, "Evil Imagination," 52.

passages (e.g., 1QS v 4-5) are noted as close comparisons to the final verse of the Matthean prayer, and Milton concludes: "According to the Dead Sea Scrolls, then, the evil imagination is what prompts human beings and angels to sin. The parallel to the words of the Lord's Prayer ('Lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil') could hardly be closer."[76] Given the relationship between the Lord's Prayer and Jewish literature, including the Qumran writings, Milton suggests that the plea in 13b requests deliverance from the "evil imagination."

Milton's theory draws heavily on the Jewish background of the Lord's Prayer, and he persuasively demonstrates the similarities between these two traditions. However, his treatment of the יצר in Qumran literature is dated and unconvincing.[77] He not only assesses the use of יצר and יצר רע in a couple of passages and applies them to the Lord's Prayer without taking into account the meaning of the terms in other works, but he also does not discuss *Plea for Deliverance* which refers to יצר רע (cf. §2.2.2.2) and has a bearing on the form and content of the Lord's Prayer.[78] Moreover, he rejects the more probable eschatological interpretation of the prayer, and interprets πειρασμός in 13a as an "inner" testing which accords with his understanding of τοῦ πονηροῦ as the non-reified "evil imagination."[79] Thus, Milton does not credibly link τοῦ πονηροῦ to יצר הרע, and his theory that the Greek phrase refers to a developing Jewish concept of the proclivity to sin has merits but is not worked out in a convincing way.

In light of the eschatological context of the Lord's Prayer, especially πειρασμός in 13a, and the use of τοῦ πονηροῦ as a description of a singular personified evil elsewhere in Matthew, the phrase is most likely a masculine substantive meaning "the evil one". Since "the devil" or "Satan" is the only reasonable subject of the title "evil one,"[80] the prayer's final petition requests

---

[76] Milton, "Evil Imagination," 56.

[77] More recently, see Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 44-64.

[78] See Milton's treatment of the Qumran material in "Evil Imagination," 56.

[79] For Milton's interpretation of the Lord's Prayer, cf. "Evil Imagination," 60-63.

[80] It is not tenable that "the evil one" describes a human adversary (i.e., "an evil man/one"). Even though Matthew uses πονηρός to refer to a human elsewhere (e.g., cf. 5:39), in the Lord's Prayer it make more sense that, as Wilson, "The Disciples' Prayer," 147, explains, since "Jesus' ministry is portrayed so clearly as the challenge and overthrow of the powers of darkness, the personal

God's deliverance from future demonic harm and is, thusly, an apotropaic plea. This, then, demonstrates yet another similarity between the prayer and Qumran deliverance pleas and emphasizes that the early Jewish pattern of apotropaic petitions is reflected in the Matthean passage. Some scholars point out that there is little difference between the interpretation of τοῦ πονηροῦ as "evil in general" or "the evil one" since a generalized reference to evil would include demonic opposition.[81] Stuckenbruck shows how this notion of an all-encompassing petition against "every" evil is present in the Qumran literature,[82] and in *Prayer of Levi* and *Plea for Deliverance* there are requests against temporal/moral evils which accompany the explicit references to the demonic. These Qumran passages illustrate that petitions for deliverance are often concerned with many forms of evil which, in turn, suggests that a request against generic or unspecified evil could, in broad and implicit terms, be apotropaic. In this study a prayer is only classified as "apotropaic" if it seeks protection from demonic harm, but if τοῦ πονηροῦ is interpreted as neuter, the final petition would fit the broad type of apotropaic plea suggested by Flusser which asks God "to avert personal danger."[83] These less specific deliverance prayers are analogous to the wider concept of apotropaism that, for example, lies behind the belief that association with Jesus through baptism affords a disciple protection from serpents or immunity from poison (cf. Mk. 16:18; §3.3.2).

Implications for Matthew's Gospel

---

reference to the devil is most likely." Furthermore, a reference to the satanic adversary is in keeping with the eschatological tone of the prayer, and it connects better with the understanding of πειρασμός as the final tribulation.

[81] Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 151 states: "The difference between Satan and evil is small in the present petition: to pray to be free from one is to pray to be free from the other." See also France, *Matthew*, 136.

[82] For instance, 1QS i 23-24 specifies that the community is under the "dominion of Belial and, thus, the "extended benediction that God 'keep you from every evil' [1QS ii 2-3], therefore, ultimately has protection from demonic powers…"; Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 146.

[83] Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 201.

In Matthew 6:13 Jesus is not petitioning God for his own protection, but rather he is leaving a format of prayer for his spiritual descendants. Therefore, the petition does not affect the status or authority of Jesus in Matthew. Furthermore, because the Lord's Prayer is already understood by many scholars as eschatologically oriented, and since, as Pitre and others demonstrate (§4.1.1), πειρασμός in 13a refers to the final tribulation, interpreting the last petition as a plea for safety from "the evil one" does not greatly shift the overall meaning of the prayer. Nevertheless, understanding the final request as an apotropaic plea has three implications for the prayer's immediate context. First, a "cosmological dimension" is emphasized which complements the eschatological tone elsewhere in the prayer. Wold comments on the significance of this aspect for the assessment of the prayer as a whole.[84] Even for those who are less convinced that the entire prayer is eschatological, the inclusion of an otherworldly feature in the final petition provides a distinct perspective of the prayer's multilayered nature. Second, it demonstrates that, in a passage which is intended to be a template of prayer for addressing the essential desires and needs of Jesus' followers, a concern for the demonic is a real and continuous threat. Just as Jesus invests his disciples with authority to combat demonic evil (e.g., Mt. 10:1; cf. Lk. 9:1), he urges all his followers to seek God's protection from "the evil one." Third, the presence of an apotropaic plea adds another dimension to the already close relationship between the Lord's Prayer and early Jewish prayer tradition. A comparison between the Matthean passage and early Jewish apotropaic pleas highlights several similarities, but most importantly they all request God's protection from future demonic influence. Additionally, just as early Jewish apotropaisms often imply a worldview in which the eschatological destruction of evil is attributed to God, asking for protection from Satan in the Lord's Prayer does not conflict with the restrained nature of apotropaism since the request seeks God's deliverance from evil rather than attempting to destroy or subjugate that evil.

---

[84] Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer," 111, states: "At present the boundaries between 'this worldly' and 'otherworldly' worldviews are being redrawn and the focus here on Matthew 6:13b invite us to engage the prayer in light of these developments… When adjudicating whether Matthew 6:13b is a type of apotropaic petition or not the interpretation of the entire prayer may be at stake."

An apotropaic plea in the Lord's Prayer must also be considered within the larger framework of Matthew's gospel. Given that Satan and the demons are depicted as opposing Jesus and his followers, and especially since Satan is not entirely vanquished in the gospel, an apotropaic plea in the Lord's Prayer is compatible with the general Satanology/demonology in Matthew,[85] and in fact the presence of such a plea is strengthened by the likely identification of apotropaisms in the Temptation pericope. Both of these passages attest to the two basic forms of apotropaism: (1) an apotropaic incantation in the Temptation by which Jesus formulates the law to temporarily ward off satanic influence; and (2) an apotropaic petition in the Lord's Prayer in which Jesus teaches his followers to request God's protection from satanic harm. Both passages presume the beliefs that satanic and demonic opposition are real threats and that these threats can be temporarily countered by right behavior and action (i.e., adherence to the law, reliance on God). Furthermore, the final petition of the Lord's Prayer has an intimate tie to πειρασμός, which evokes Exodus imagery and corresponds to the importance of Deuteronomy for Jesus' apotropaic technique as seen in the Temptation.[86] Although the allusion is implicit in the Lord's Prayer, it appears that God's promises to ancient Israel, whether it be the giving of the law or the promise of a New Exodus, are powerful tools in the battles against evil forces.

4.1.3 The Reception of the Lord's Prayer in Apotropaic Tradition

Although the reception of the Lord's Prayer does not necessarily reveal its original meaning, there is interpretive value in noting the way that meaning has been found

---

[85] On the roles of Satan and demons in Matthew, cf. §1.1.2.2. The implications of apotropaism within Matthean Satanology/demonology are discussed in §3.1.3; §3.1.4.2.

[86] While the petition in 13b is a separate request, it is a counterpart or extension of the petition in 13a to be led away from the *peirasmos*; e.g. Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 151. Therefore, it is not farfetched to view the request for deliverance in 13b as a petition to be spared the satanic/demonic forces behind the final tribulations. If this is the case then 13b also has connotations of the New Exodus.

by early readers and communities.[87] A short assessment of the Lord's Prayer in the writings of the early Church Fathers and amulets from Late Antiquity demonstrates that others found apotropaic motifs in the prayer.

The early Church Fathers' attention to the Lord's Prayer indicates its great significance for early Christians as well as the different interpretations and debates it sparked.[88] The Fathers engage with the prayer in a variety of ways; for instance, Tertullian stresses the practical usefulness of the prayer for instruction, Cyprian views it within a primarily baptismal context, and Origen highlights its platonic and eschatological essence. More specifically, the meaning of the last petition is understood differently in the eastern and western traditions. In the Latin West, the final phrase is typically interpreted as "deliver us from *evil*." There are exceptions, such as Tertullian and Cyprian who associate "evil" with the devil, but the less personified view of "evil" by Augustine has the most influence in this tradition.[89] For the Greek East, including Origen, the petition is usually taken to mean "deliver us from *the evil one*."[90] Thus, the early patristic writings reinforce the ambiguous nature of the phrase τοῦ πονηροῦ and they illustrate that multiple meanings are found, including a reference to the devil.

---

[87] John Collins, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia: Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 58-59, in reference to the influence of the Book of Daniel comments that: "Some scholars have argued that Daniel should be interpreted in light of its predecessors rather than that of its 'second-rate imitators.' Modern literary criticism, however, attaches great importance to the reception of a text and recognizes that our reading is often quite validly shaped by the later literary tradition." Although care must be taken not to interpolate meaning into a passages from a later source, Collins' quotation illustrates that considering the reception of a text is a valid feature of the overall analysis of that text.

[88] For an overview of the reception of the Lord's Prayer in patristic writings, cf. Kwon, "Cyprian, Origen and the Lord's Prayer," 56-87; Hammerling, *The Lord's Prayer*; and chapters 2-4 in Stevenson, *The Lord's Prayer*;

[89] Stevenson, *The Lord's Prayer*, 79-80, explains: "Augustine breaks with Tertullian, Cyprian and Ambrose in translating *a malo* not as the devil, but as the force of evil, present in temptation, but in much more. In this, as in other things, he is set to influence the West in a significant way, at variance with much of the East, with its personal view of 'the evil one'."

[90] According to Stevenson, *The Lord's Prayer*, 37, "Origen links temptation and deliverance together, and interprets evil personally as the devil – both features that we shall come across repeatedly in the East."

Amulets in Late Antiquity attest to the apotropaic use of the Lord's Prayer and, significantly, some even cite the prayer alongside Psalm 91.[91] Theodore de Bruyn describes the Lord's Prayer, usually the Matthean version, and Psalm 91 as "two favorite biblical texts" for amulets and notes that they are "frequently cited for their protective or beneficial effects."[92] The purpose of a given amulet is not always clear due to several factors such as the fragmentary or damaged condition of the material, or because the amulet itself is not specific. Therefore, de Bruyn's definition of "amulet" is useful for this study:

> [A]n item that is believed to convey in and of itself, as well as in association with incantation and other actions, supernatural power for protective, beneficial, or antagonistic effect, and that is worn on one's body or fixed, displayed, or deposited at some place.[93]

This definition encompasses material that is intended to provide protection or deliverance from one or more of an array of threats including sickness, poisonous

---

[91] Informative studies include: Brent Nongbri, "The Lord's Prayer and XMΓ: Two Christian Papyrus Amulets," *HTR* 104.1 (January, 2011): 59-68; Theodore de Bruyn and Jitse Dijkstra, "Greek Amulets and Formularies from Egypt Containing Christian Elements: A Checklist of Papyri, Parchments, Ostraka, and Tablets" *BASP* 48 (2011): 163-216; de Bruyn, "Papyri, Parchments, Ostraca, and Tablets Written with Biblical Texts in Greek and Used as Amulets: A Preliminary List," in *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approach* (ed. T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas; vol. 5 of *Texts and Editions for New Testament Study*, ed. S. E. Porter and W. J. Porter; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 145-189; Thomas J. Kraus, "Manuscripts with the *Lord's Prayer* – They Are More Than Simply Witnesses To That Text Itself," in *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World* (ed. T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas; vol. 2 of *Texts and Editions for New Testament Study*, 2006), 227-266; Csaba A. La'da and Amphilochios Papathomas, "A Greek Papyrus Amulet from the Duke Collection with Biblical Excerpts," *BASP* 41 (2004): 93-113; Eldon J. Epp, "The Oxyrhynchus New Testament Papyri: 'Not Without Honor Except In Their Hometown,'" *JBL* 123.1 (2004): 5-55; G. H. R. Horsley, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity, 3: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1978* (Macquarie University, 1983).

[92] De Bruyn, "A Preliminary List," 149; de Bruyn and Dijhstra, "Greek Amulets," 172. On the widespread use of the Lord's Prayer and Psalm 91 in amulets, see also La'da and Papathomas, "A Greek Papyrus Amulet," 107-113; and Kraus, "Manuscripts with the *Lord's Prayer*," 227-266.

[93] De Bruyn, "A Preliminary List," 147; cf. de Bruyn and Dijkstra, "Greek Amulets," 164, 168.

animals, and demonic harm.[94] For instance, P.Princ. II 107 is an anti-fever amulet which invokes the Archangel Michael with ὁρκίζω followed by lines from Psalm 91 and the Lord's Prayer.[95] P.Iand. I 6 is an amulet of protection from "every evil spirit," various demons, and "every disease."[96] It purports to be (or refers to) an "exorcism of Solomon," and it cites most of the Lord's Prayer including verse 13 and Psalm 91:13.[97]

P.Princ II 107, P.Iand. I 6, and other amulets offer insights for assessing the reception of biblical passages in Late Antiquity, and the below table (*figure 4.2*) helps to illustrate the variety, nature, and content of a small selection of items. De Bruyn presents a system of criteria for classifying materials as amulets which includes taking into account the written text (e.g., *voces magicae* or characters) and material form (e.g., document/object size or folds in the papyri). He places them into one of four grades of certainty; materials that are: (1) certainly amulets; (2) probably amulets; (3) possibly amulets; and (4) unlikely amulets.[98] Unless otherwise noted, the information in *figure 4.2* follows these guidelines: (1) the designation listed in the "classification" column adheres to de Bruyn's categories and classifications; (2) the numbers in the "*LDAB*" column refer to each item's identification number in the *Leuven Database of Ancient Books*;[99] (3) the "date" column corresponds to the date of each item listed in the *LDAB*; and (4) the

---

[94] According to de Bruyn and Dijkstra, "Greek Amulets," 177-178: "In addition to charms that offer protection or deliverance (the distinction can blur) from harm and from evil spirits that were believed to work all manner of harm, there are charms that seek protection against sickness, scorpions, and poisonous animals, or that request deliverance from specific evil powers."

[95] An excellent discussion of P.Princ. II 107 is found in Kraus, "Manuscripts with the *Lord's Prayer*," 254-266.

[96] For the English translation, cf. Marvin Meyer and Richard Smith, eds., *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power* (Harper Collins, 1994), 45-46.

[97] According to de Bruyn, "A Preliminary List," 151, this amulet is "a garbled text miscopied from an exemplar that concluded with an exorcism." See also the discussion in Kraus, "Manuscripts with the *Lord's Prayer*," 241-242.

[98] See the criteria and classification in de Bruyn, "A Preliminary List," 149-189; cf. de Bruyn and Dijkstra, "Greek Amulets," 167-173.

[99] This database contains critical information about each item, including provenance and bibliographical references. The database can be accessed online: http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/.

information in the "content" column is concerned only with the Lord's Prayer and Psalm 91, but in many cases the item cites other biblical passages as well.[100] Moreover, the references to Psalm 91 citations use the LXX numbering (Ps. 90) in order to match the items' description in most catalogues.

Figure 4.2

Item	*LDAB*	Content	Classification	Date, A.D.[101]
P.Ant. II 54	5425	Mt. 6:10-12	Possibly Amulet[102]	275-325
P.Schøyen I 16	2994	Mt. 6:9-13 Ps. 90:1-13	Certainly Amulet	Late 4th century[103]
O.Athens inv. 12227 (=PGM II 04)	5594	Mt. 6:11-13	Probably Amulet[104]	300-399
P.Oxy. LX 4010	5717	Mt. 6:9-13	Possibly Amulet[105]	300-399
P.Princ. II 107 (=Suppl.Mag. I 29)	5835	Mt. 6:9-11 Ps. 90:1-2	Certainly Amulet	350-550
P.Köln IV 171	5971	Mt. 6:12-13	Certainly	400-499

[100] For a full list of an item's content, see the *LDAB* or de Bruyn, "A Preliminary List," 166-189.

[101] Unless otherwise noted, this column corresponds to the dates listed in the *LDAB*.

[102] Kraus, "Manuscripts with the *Lord's Prayer*," 253 comments: "even if it cannot be ruled out that this item was used as an amulet, it appears to be unlikely that it was produced for that purpose. Paleography supports the notion that this papyrus was once a miniature notebook or a small codex." De Bruyn, "A Preliminary List," 160, states that the papyrus is "a good candidate for an amulet," but notes that there are scholars who disagree.

[103] Although the date listed in the *LDAB* is 450-599 A.D., Kraus and others date the papyrus to the late fourth century A.D.; cf. idem, "Manuscripts with the *Lord's Prayer*," 236; de Bruyn and Dijkstra, "Greek Amulets," 190; de Bruyn, "A Preliminary List," 168; La'da and Papathomas, "A Greek Papyrus Amulet," 111; and Horsley, *New Documents*, 104.

[104] Kraus, "Manuscripts with the *Lord's Prayer*," 238, describes this fragment of a clay tablet and "(apotropaic) house benediction." Cf. Cf. de Bruyn, "A Preliminary List," 170; Epp, "Oxyrhynchus New Testament Papyri," 28 n. 113.

[105] With its duplication of Mt. 6:13 at the end, P.Oxy. LX 4010 has been considered to be an amulet. However, this classification has more recently come under scrutiny. Kraus, "Manuscripts with the *Lord's Prayer*," is hesitant to classify the item as an amulet due to its physical size and lack of folding; cf. de Bruyn, "A Preliminary List," 182. Based on these scholarly observations and on an image of the piece (http://www.csad.ox.ac.uk/POxy/papyri/vol60/150dpi/4010.jpg), P.Oxy. LX 4010 is likely not an amulet.

			Amulet	
P.Iand. I 6 (= P.Giss.Lit. V 4 = PGM II P 17)	6107	Mt. 6:9-13 Ps. 90:13	Certainly Amulet	400-599
PSI VI 719 (PGM II P 19)	2767	Mt. 6:9 Ps. 90:1	Certainly Amulet	500-599

In addition to the items listed in *figure 4.2* archeologists have discovered many other amulets which cite the Lord's Prayer, Psalm 91, or both, and a large number of them have been catalogued.[106] Later amulets include the sixth century exorcism papyrus BGU III 954 which cites Matthew 6:9-13 and requests: "drive out of me, your servant, the demon of witchcraft and the one of wickedness and the one of enmity, and take from me every disease and every infirmity."[107] In addition to *voces magicae* (e.g., ὁρκίζω in P.Princ. II 107), some amulets contain *nomina sacra* (e.g., Ἰη(σο)ῦ and Χρ(ιστο)ῦ in P.Köln IV 171) or *staurograms* (e.g., P.Duk.inv. 778; BGU III 954). Also noteworthy is that, according to de Bruyn and Jitse Dijkstra, biblical passages "may be quoted in an abbreviated form as a cipher for an entire work as in the incipits of the gospels or the opening words of verses in a psalm."[108] Consequently, it is possible that simply citing the opening verse of the Lord's Prayer or Psalm 91 (cf. PSI VI 719) evokes the apotropaic power of the entire prayer.

The differences between patristic exegesis in the East and West suggest that, early on, the precise meaning of certain petitions was fluid. I am not aware of any amulets that cite the Lord's Prayer and are older than the late third century A.D., and indeed there are challenges to accurately classifying some of their functions. Furthermore, there is a danger in reading too much into the contents of

---

[106] The advanced search tool on the *LSAB* website allows one to navigate the catalogued material based on content, provenance, material (e.g., papyrus, pottery, etc.), date, and numerous other search criteria. Additionally, for material containing references to Psalm 91 and/or the Lord's Prayer, see the inventories provided by de Bruyn, "A Preliminary List," 149; de Bruyn and Dijkstra, "Greek Amulets," 172; La'da and Papathomas, "A Greek Papyrus Amulet," 107-113; and Kraus, "Manuscripts with the *Lord's Prayer*," 227-266.

[107] The translation is from Meyer and Smith, *Ancient Christian Magic*, 42; cf. de Bruyn, "A Preliminary List," 152, 166; and Kraus, "Manuscripts with the *Lord's Prayer*," 246-247.

[108] De bruyn and Dijkstra, "Greek Amulets," 172.

these amulets for, as Thomas Kraus warns, "by isolating a specific feature or text from its larger context the interpreter runs the risk of misinterpretation."[109] This is especially problematic with fragmentary/damaged amulets since the larger context has often not survived. However, examining the reception of the Lord's Prayer in these later traditions results in two important observations: (1) the writings of most Greek and some Latin fathers show that understanding τοῦ πονηροῦ as a personified evil is a reasonable and prevalent interpretation in early church communities; and (2) the sheer popularity of the Lord's Prayer among biblical texts cited in protective amulets, even if they are not strictly anti-demonic, conveys that at some point the prayer became associated with the prevention and/or healing of personal harm. This is supported by the multiple pairings of the Lord's Prayer with Psalm 91 which is more clearly associated with apotropaism in earlier traditions. Therefore, although some church fathers have a generalized understanding of evil, and while the association of the Lord's Prayer with apotropaism in the amulets are later developments, these points indicate that, at the very least, the original Matthean passage is well suited to the concept of protection from demonic harm.

4.2 Jesus' Prayer for Peter in Luke 22:31-32

In the triple tradition depicting Jesus' foretelling of Peter's denial (Mt. 26:33-35; Mk. 14:29-31; Lk. 22:31-34; cf. Jn. 13:37-38), Luke includes a unique statement with which Jesus addresses Peter:

31 Simon, Simon, behold, Satan demanded to have you, that he might sift you like wheat, 32 but I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail; and when you have turned again, strengthen your brethren.	Σίμων Σίμων, ἰδοὺ ὁ σατανᾶς ἐξῃτήσατος ὑμᾶς τοῦ σινιάσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον· ἐγὼ δὲ ἐδεήθην περὶ σοῦ ἵνα μὴ ἐκλίπῃ ἡ πίστις σου· καὶ σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήρισον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου.[110]

[109] Kraus, "Manuscripts with the *Lord's Prayer*," 254-255.

[110] The English translation and Greek text is from Aland, *Synopsis*, 288.

This passage describes the prevention or, perhaps, the mitigation of future satanic harm through prayer and, consequently, is relevant to the study of apotropaic petitions.[111] Scholars generally accept that the particular period of trial or testing in view here is Jesus' passion beginning with his agony at the Mount of Olives (Lk. 22:39) through his crucifixion, death, and burial (Lk. 23:50-56).[112] It is during this time of open attack on Jesus followed by his absence (his arrest, death, and burial) that the disciples are particularly susceptible to faltering faith and weakness. In this sense, the satanic trial does not relate to physical danger, but rather it threatens their faithfulness to God which the language of "sifting like wheat" suggests. Separating the chaff from the wheat is imagery that is likely taken from Amos 9:9 in which the expression "as one shakes with a sieve" designates God's judgment on the house of Israel.[113] Thus, the threat described in verse 31 is that, as Nolland explains, "Satan hopes to bring [the disciples] to destruction by showing their lack of integrity in their devotion to God."[114]

Clearly Peter is the addressee of the passage (opening Σίμων Σίμων), and the phrase in verse 32 "when you have turned again" probably refers to the period after Peter's denial of Jesus; that is, Peter turns away from Jesus by renouncing him thrice, then he turns again and remembers his master. The content, then, of Jesus' statement is both a prayer that Peter's faith will not permanently fail and a command to strengthen the other disciples. However, despite this being an address to Peter concerning his faith (singular σοῦ in vs. 32), the grammar indicates that all

---

[111] In English it appears that Satan's demand and Jesus' prayer took place in the past, but in the Greek all the verbs in the passage are in the aorist tense and, thus, indefinite. Moreover, Jesus tells of the future failure and return of Peter's faith which is to assist in the confrontation with satanic influence. Therefore, the content of Lk. 22:31-32 is concerned with satanic conflict which has not yet occurred.

[112] For instance, Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1424 states: "The satanic plot that will bring about the passion of Jesus will test the fidelity of the apostles; it will be their hour of trial too." Cf. Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1071-1072; Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 54, 137 n. 63; and Darrell L. Bock, *Luke* (IVPNTC: InterVarsity Press, 1994): 352-353.

[113] Bock, *Luke*, 353, explains: "'Sift like wheat' is an idiom that in our culture would parallel 'take someone apart' (Amos 9:9 has the image)." Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1422, 1424; and Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1072.

[114] Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1073.

the disciples (plural ὑμᾶς in vs. 31) are vulnerable to satanic trial. Therefore, in the face of satanic influence which threatens to lead the disciples astray, Jesus' response is to pray for the endurance of Peter's faith who, in turn, will strengthen the others.[115]

There are two points in which this passage is similar to traditions in early Jewish literature. The first is the detail that "Satan demanded to have you" which suggests Satan does not have the freedom to act entirely according to his own volition. Garrett notes the parallel between this notion in verse 31 and analogous depictions of Satan in the Hebrew scriptures which include, for example, the Book of Job where Satan requests and receives permission from God to test Job.[116] Indeed, the concept that Satan's activities operate under divine sanction is noted elsewhere in this study, particularly in *Jubilees* 10:8 which depicts Mastema asking God for authority over a number of evil spirits that they may "corrupt and lead astray" the sons of men.[117] The underlying theme in all these examples, including the Lukan passage, is that although Satan is an adversary he is not equal to or greater than God and, in fact, is bound by God's sovereignty. The second similarity, which is more directly related to the issue of apotropaism, is the passage's resemblance to petitions in *Jubilees*. Unlike the *Prayer of Levi* or *Plea for Deliverance* in which an individual petitions God for his own safety, several

---

[115] According to Bock, *Luke*, 353, "Jesus' prayer has dealt with the threat through a request not that the failure be prevented but that any permanent damage be averted. His request is that Peter's *faith may not fail*." See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1422; and Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1072.

[116] Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, 39, 129 n. 13, compares Satan's demand in Lk. 22:31 to similar themes in various early Jewish writings, including Job 1:11-12, 2:5-6; Zech. 3:1; *Apoc. of Abraham* 13:9-13, 23:11-13; and *Jub.* 10:7-9. Regarding the biblical passages, Garrett, ibid., 39, concludes: "The notion that Satan has obtained divine permission to carry out these tasks continues to appear regularly. Even though Satan often seems to be God's opponent more than a divine functionary, the devil was still supposedly exercising authority that had been divinely delegated at some previous point in time." Garrett's observation that satanic activity is under divine authority in the biblical passages is also applicable to Lk. 22:31. Similarly, Evans, *Saint Luke*, 802, comments: "The verb here [ἐξῃτήσατο, aorist of αιτέομαι] means 'to obtain by asking'... The situation is that in Job 1:12, where Satan, as the heavenly accuser of men, obtains from God power over Job, and permission to test him."

[117] Cf. Wintermute, "Jubilees," 76; §2.2.2.5.

places in *Jubilees* (cf. §2.2.2.5) contain third party "intercessory" apotropaic petitions. The same format of intercession is present in Luke 22:31-32, for just as Moses petitions God to defend the Israelites against Beliar's spirit (*Jub.* 1:20), and like Noah requests his progeny's protection from evil spirits (*Jub.* 10:3), Jesus prays for Peter's faith and, through this, the disciples' strength during the coming confrontation with satanic evil. The comparison between these depictions of intercession highlights in this particular Lukan passage Jesus' role as an advocate; that is, as Nolland states, "[o]ver against Satan's malevolent purpose is set the intervention of Jesus."[118]

A key difference between Luke 22:31-32 and the apotropaic petitions in *Jubilees* is that the prayers in the latter work explicitly include requests for the prohibition of demonic influence while the Lukan passage treats satanic trials as inevitable.[119] If Jesus' prayer is read as apotropaic, it presumes the future adversarial activity of Satan for an undetermined time and this notion fits the ongoing conflict with Satan portrayed throughout Luke's gospel and Acts (§1.1.2.3). Jesus' prayer also does not address the judgment or destruction of Satan and, in this way, is compatible with the restrained and temporary nature of apotropaisms elsewhere. Moreover, Jesus is not praying for his personal needs, but rather on behalf of others which in no way calls into question his own authority or status. However, although the concept of an intercessory apotropaism by Jesus is suitable to aspects of Satanology/demonology and the depiction of Jesus in Luke, Jesus' prayer is for the strength of Peter's and, through him, the disciples' faith and not for the warding off of satanic influence and, thusly, is not apotropaic.

---

[118] Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1072. Similarly, Evans, *Saint Luke*, 802 comments: "Over against Satan as the accuser and tester of the apostles as a whole is Jesus as paraclete (cf. John 2:1) and prevailing intercessor for them..."; cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1425; Bock, *Luke*, 353; and Michael D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm, 2* (JSNTSup 20: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 735.

[119] Instead of requesting the prohibition against satanic influence Jesus' prayer is for a positive attribute to help combat evil. This analogous to Lange's interpretation of *Plea for Deliverance* in which he sees the petitioner request, not the prohibition of evil, but "a different orientation" to counter evil. Cf. Lange, "Spirit of Impurity," 262; Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer," 105-107; and §2.2.2.1.

Nevertheless, it is worth noting that while Jesus' prayer is not apotropaic, an effect of the disciple's strong faith is that they may withstand satanic trial and, to this extent, Jesus' prayer has a degree of "anti-demonic usefulness."

4.3 A Plea for Deliverance in John 17:15

Any discussion relating to personified evil in the gospels needs to take into account one of the puzzling features of early Christian demonology: the absence of exorcisms in the Gospel of John. Whereas exorcizing the demon possessed is a significant element of the ministry of Jesus in each of the synoptics, the few demonological references in John are used in relation to human opposition to Jesus.[120] The lack of exorcisms has been explained by means of an array of theories. Some of these, such as the proposal that the evangelist is unaware of Jesus' role as an exorcist or that he is embarrassed by it, are not very persuasive.[121]

---

[120] The anarthrous διάβολός ("a devil") is used by Jesus in 6:70 to describe his betrayer Judas Iscariot, and in several places (7:20; 8:48-52; 10:20) Jesus is accused by opponents of "having a demon" (δαιμόνιον). Ronald A. Piper describes the charge of possession as "an instrument of rivalry" and the demonization of one's opponents; cf. idem, "Satan, Demons, and the Absence of Exorcisms in the Fourth Gospel" in *Christology, Controversy, and Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole* (Supplements of *Novum Testamentum* XCIX; eds. D. G. Horrell and C. M Tuckett; Brill, 2000), 253-278.

[121] Based on Jesus' widespread reputation as an effective exorcist it is unlikely that the author of John did not know of this aspect of his ministry. Moreover, John's awareness of some of the synoptic passages, such as the references to Mary Magdalene (Jn. 19:25; 20:1, 18) who had seven demons in Luke 8:2 and the similarity between the Beelzebul accusations (Mk. 3; Mt. 12; Lk. 11) and charges of demon possession (Jn. 7:20; 8:48-52; 10:20), suggests a familiarity with exorcistic traditions in the synoptics. Eric Plumer, "The Absence of Exorcisms in the Fourth Gospel," *Bib* 78 (1997): 350-368, argues that John omits exorcisms, at least partly, because he is hesitant to associate them with Jesus. This is also doubtful since John does not shy away from the charges that Jesus is demonically possessed, nor does he fail to include depictions of healings which may associate Jesus with magical techniques (e.g., 9:6-7). Twelftree presents and refutes these and other "inadequate solutions" for the absence of exorcisms in John; cf. idem, *In the Name of Jesus*, 183-187; idem, "Exorcism in the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics" in *Jesus in the Johannine Tradition* (eds., R. T. Fortna and T. Thatcher; Westminster John Know Press, 2001), 135-143; and idem,

Others incorporate larger themes of the Johannine material, such as the identity of Jesus, in order to explain the omission of exorcism. For Twelftree, at least part of the reason for this omission is John's characterization of Jesus, attested by the miracles he performs, as spectacularly divine.[122] John's effort to depict Jesus' tremendous status and unmistakable divinity is better served by detailed descriptions of great miracles instead of exorcisms which are somewhat common.[123] Moreover, there is a certain ambiguity to exorcism in that the source of power-authority, especially in cases like Jesus' when set formulae are not used, can be unclear. This is evident in the accusation of the Pharisees that Jesus exorcizes by the power of Beelzebul. John sets aside these ambiguous exorcisms, not because he is unaware or embarrassed by controversy, but because the vague circumstances that can surround exorcisms do not attest to Jesus' divinity as well as miracles do. Alternatively, Ronald Piper suggests that the significance of this matter in John lies not so much in the absence of exorcisms but in the presence of accusations of demon possession against Jesus.[124] The charges from opponents that Jesus is possessed by a demon are important for the depiction of Jesus since they reflect issues related to, for example, purity, social status, and dualism. Thus, Piper concludes: "The language of demon possession is not in the fourth gospel related to matters of magical healing; but to rivalry. It is reserved for demonising one's opponents."[125] Both Twelftree and Piper make convincing points,[126] but

---

Jesus the Exorcist, 141-142, 222-223. Similarly, see the critique of Plumer in Piper, "The Absence of Exorcisms," 261-263.

[122] Twelftree, *In the Name of Jesus*, 189, explains: "the Johannine miracles are intended to be understood as unambiguously divine both in origin and as a revelation of the divine." These include the miracles of turning water into wine (Jn. 2:1-11) in an act superior to Dionysus, and healing an official's son (Jn. 4:46-54) at a distance of over seventeen miles.

[123] Twelftree, *In the Name of Jesus*, 191, notes that "the miracles in the Fourth Gospel are portrayed, foremost, as *consistently* of an order of magnitude that contrasts with the relatively commonplace nature of the exorcism stories in the Synoptics."

[124] According to Piper, Twelftree's explanations do not fully account for the omission of exorcisms in John. See the critique of Twelftree in Piper, "The Absence of Exorcisms," 265-268.

[125] Piper, "The Absence of Exorcisms," 264-265.

[126] I am unconvinced by Piper's suggestion that John would have avoided exorcism altogether simply to highlight possession as an instrument of rivalry. Although the demonization of one's

ultimately it is difficult to be certain about the absence of any particular theme in an ancient literary work. The key idea for this study is that the lack of exorcisms does not necessarily indicate that demons were not part of the author's or audiences' worldview. What is known is that this particular cosmology does not shape the discourse of John's gospel in the same way it does in the synoptics.

Despite the muted emphasis on demons and possession in John compared to the synoptics, the figure Satan has a prominent role in the fourth gospel. The title ὁ Σατανᾶς only appears once (13:27), but other designations including ὁ διάβολος ("the devil," 8:44; 13:2) and ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ("the ruler of this world," 12:31; 16:11; cf. 14:30) denote a supernatural evil being who is an active adversary of Jesus.[127] Many scholars consider the conflict between Jesus

---

opponents is clearly present in the gospel, and while it does help to illustrate certain issues which Piper highlights, there is no reason to think that, for John, both possession as instrument of rivalry and exorcism as a healing could not have been included.

[127] Some scholars contest this view of Satan in John. For instance, Elaine Pagels, "The Social History of Satan, Part II," *JAAR* 62.1 (1994): 40, suggests "Satan does not appear as a supernatural character acting independently of human beings, as he does in the synoptic temptation scenes." She states elsewhere: "John dismisses the device of the devil as an independent supernatural character (if, indeed, he knew of it, as I suspect he did). Instead, as John tells the story, Satan, like God himself, appears incarnate, first in Judas Iscariot, then in the Jewish authorities as they mount opposition to Jesus..."; idem, *The Origin of Satan* (Penguin Books, 1995), 111. Contrary to this view, Judith L. Kovacs, "'Now Shall the Ruler of This World Be Driven Out': Jesus' Death as Cosmic Battle in John 12:20-36," *JBL* 114.2 (1995): 234, argues that the description of the devil in 8:44 and Satan's influence on Judas in 13:27 demonstrate that "for the Fourth Evangelist, 'the devil' is not a mere figure of speech, or a 'faded mythological conception.' Satan is an effective power who is active on the stage of human history." Similarly, Aune counters a notion advanced by James Charlesworth, stating: "Since the various aliases 'ruler of this world,' 'Satan,' and 'Devil' are designations for a personal being, there is no compelling reason to follow Charlesworth's conclusion that 'the devil in John is not fundamentally a hypostatic creature,' or that he has been demythologized." D. E. Aune, "Dualism in the Fourth Gospel and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reassessment of the Problem," in *Neotestamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honor of Peder Borgen* (Suppliments to *Novum Testamentum* vol. 106; eds. D. E. Aune, T. Seland, and J. H. Ulrichsey; Brill, 2003) 287; cf. J. H. Charlesworth, "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS 3:13-426 and the 'Dualism' Contained in the Gospel of John," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Crossroad, 1990), 93. See also Wendy E. Sproston, "Satan in the Fourth

and Satan to be at the heart of the gospel, and the overthrow of Satan is explicitly tied to Jesus' death on the cross in 12:31.[128] Twelftree even describes the crucifixion as a "grand cosmic exorcism" and implies that one of the reasons for the absence of other exorcisms is that John "would want nothing to detract from the centrality of the cross event as the locus of the defeat of Satan."[129] This is certainly an intriguing thought, but the important item to note is that, like in the synoptics, satanic opposition is a significant component of the gospel. This conflict between Jesus and Satan is reflected in a number of passages, one of which is 17:15. As mentioned previously (§4.1.2), Stuckenbruck discusses Jesus' petition for his disciples in verse 15 alongside Qumran deliverance pleas, and it is therefore related to the topic of this chapter.

John 17:15 and Apotropaism: Stuckenbruck's Observations

Chapters 14-17 comprise the Farewell Discourse which includes Jesus' dialogue with his disciples before his arrest in chapter 18. Teaching, instruction, and words of encouragement make up most of the discourse, but chapter 17 is a prayer

---

Gospel," in *Studia Biblica 1978: II. Papers on the Gospels* (JSNTSup 2; ed. E. A. Livingstone; Sheffield, 1980), 307.

[128] In relation to 12:31, George R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (WBC 36; Word Publishing, 1987), 213, comments "the declaration of v 31 must be taken at face value: the 'lifting up' of the Son of Man (cf. vv 23, 34) signifies…that *the judgment of this world, both negatively and positively, takes place in the crucifixion-exaltation of the Son of Man – Jesus*," (italics his) and further in ibid., 213-214: "For the Evangelist, the utterance of Jesus employs a well-understood picture to show the change of situation for the world when Jesus was 'lifted up' to heaven via the cross: Satan was *dethroned* and the Son of Man *enthroned* over the world for which he died" (italics his). See also Kovacs, "Jesus' Death as Cosmic Battle," 228, 233; and Sproston, "Satan in the Fourth Gospel," 307. On the important role of the conflict between Jesus and Satan in John's gospel, see Sigve Tonstad, "'The Father of Lies,' 'the Mother of Lies,' and the Death of Jesus (John 12:20-20-33)" in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology* (eds. R. Bauckham and C. Mosser; Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2008), 193-208; Twelftree, *In the Name of Jesus*, 196, 205; Piper, "The Absence of Exorcisms," 271; and Kovacs, "Jesus' Death as Cosmic Battle," 227-247.

[129] Twelftree, *In the Name of Jesus*, 196-197.

addressed to God.[130] Among the petitions in this prayer is the relevant request in verse 15:

I do not pray that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil one.	οὐκ ἐρωτῶ ἵνα ἄρῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, ἀλλ' ἵνα τηρήσῃς αὐτούς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ.[131]

According to Stuckenbruck, verse 15 is a petition from Jesus to God that the disciples be protected from Satan. The expression τοῦ πονηροῦ – the same terminology found in Matthew 6:13 – does not refer to an abstract evil in this verse but a "personified power who is in open conflict with God."[132] He justifies this interpretation in two ways. First, phrases or titles elsewhere in John, such as "devil" (cf. 8:44; 13:2) and "Satan" (13:27), provide the precedent for referring to personified evil. Second, and most suggestive, is the immediate context of the petition within the larger theme of "this world" (ὁ κόσμος οὗτος). There is a dichotomy in John which distinguishes between those who are "not of this world" and the hostile opposition of those belonging to "this world."[133] Given that this

---

[130] Stuckenbruck is careful to emphasize the nature of chapter 17 as "prayer." He explains in "Protect Them from the Evil One," 141, that " at least some of Jesus' words in John 17 can be understood as a real prayer rather than, for instance, a formal prayer which in fact is only meant to instruct." Chapters 14-17 are described as "testamentary" or, at least, there is a resemblance between the discourse and early Jewish testamentary instruction; cf. ibid., 139 n. 1. This has led Ernst Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17* (trans. Gerhard Krodel; London: SCM Press, 1968), 5 to comment: "the prayer moves over into being an address, admonition, consolation and prophecy. Its content shows that this chapter, just like the rest of the farewell discourse, is part of the instruction of the disciples." In response, Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 140, states: "The distinction between a prayer and instruction should not, however, be pressed too far. Some of Moses' instruction to the people just before his death is, after all, formally couched in the form of a prayer called a 'song' (Deut 32:1-43)."

[131] The English translation and the Greek are from Aland, *Synopsis*, 296.

[132] Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 143.

[133] Aune, "Dualism in the Fourth Gospel and the DSS," 285-286, concisely explains this dichotomy: "The basic structure of Johannine dualism involves the existence of two worlds, or two planes of being, which are designated in simple spatial terms in John 8:23 as 'above' (τὰ ἄνω) and 'below' (τὰ κάτω), correlated with the explanatory phrases 'not of this world' and 'of this world'".

theme is invoked throughout Jesus' prayer (e.g., 17:6, 9, 11, 14, 16), including in verse 15, the implication is that since the disciples are not to be taken out of the world, Jesus prays for them to be protected from τοῦ πονηροῦ which refers to the "ruler of this world" (12:31; 14:30; 16:11): the devil.[134] Therefore, parallel to the final petition in the Matthean Lord's Prayer, and based on similar reasons (i.e., terminology and context), Stuckenbruck interprets John 17:15 as a prayer for God's protection from the future influence of Satan.

Stuckenbruck's comments regarding the manner of protection that is sought in verse 15 are noteworthy. The verb τηρέω ("keep") appears multiple times in the prayer (e.g., 17:11, 12, 15) and, based on verses 11-12, is synonymous with φυλάσσω ("guard") which carries a connotation of protection.[135] Although τηρέω initially denotes the desire for protection from disunity (vss. 11-12), it is then used to request protection for those who are not of the world (vs. 14) but left in the world (vs. 15) and susceptible to the evil one. For Stuckenbruck, the association of "keep" with "protection" in the context of verse 15 may allude to the first line of the Priestly Blessing in Numbers 6:24: "The Lord bless you and keep you" (יברכך יהוה וישמרך, MT; εὐλογήσαι σε κύριος καὶ φυλάξαι σε, LXX; cf. §2.2.1.1). Yet, as Stuckenbruck himself points out, while some adaptations of the Priestly Blessing include a reference to "evil,"[136] "the Aaronic blessing simply concludes with the object of the verb ('you') without specifying what it is that Israel is to be kept or protected from."[137] Even though there is no direct correlation

---

[134] According to Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 143: "Jesus asks for protection from the evil one precisely because of the existing hostility between the disciples and the world." In a similar interpretation, Aune, "Dualism in the Fourth Gospel and the DSS," 287, states: "John 17:15 refers to Satan as ὁ πονηρός, 'the Evil One,' and according to 1 John 5:19, 'the whole world lies in the power of the Evil One'".

[135] Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 142, explains: "The notion of 'keeping' is reformulated in terms of protection by Jesus, who has 'guarded' (ἐφύλαξα) his disciples so that none of them are lost (v. 12)." It is not only in John 17 that τηρέω can mean either "keep" or "guard"; R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 301 n. 5, notes that in the LXX both τηρέω and φυλάσσω can be used to translate נצר and שמר.

[136] Cf. 1 Chr. 4:10; Ps. 121:7; 2 Macc. 1:25; and Wis. 16:8. See also §2.2.1.1 n. 81.

[137] Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 144.

between the petition in verse 15 and the Priestly Blessing, Stuckenbruck's observation reinforces the role of the blessing within the development of apotropaism as reflected in, for example, the Ketef Hinnom amulets which contain the Numbers passage (§2.2.1.1; cf. §2.1.2).

Another aspect of τηρέω is that in addition to meaning "protect" it is also used to describe "keeping" the words or commandments of God (e.g., 14:15, 21, 23-24; 15:10, 20; and 17:6). Stuckenbruck compares this dual function of τηρέω to the Hebrew equivalent of the verb in a rabbinic passage (*j.Peah* 16b), which is explicitly concerned with protection from demons: "if you keep the words of the Torah, I will protect you from the demons."[138] The cause and effect relationship depicted in the rabbinic passage (i.e., torah observance = protection from demons) is essentially identical to the value of torah observance conveyed in CD-A xvi 4-5 and, as argued above (§3.1.2), by Jesus in the Temptation narrative. In John 17 is an emphasis that the disciples have kept God's word (τὸν λόγον σου τετήρηκαν, 17:6; cf. vss. 8, 14) and, while there may only be an implicit connection between obedience and God's protection in Jesus' prayer, this resembles the link between the two themes elsewhere.

To understand the background of, and to provide insight to, the request in 17:15 Stuckenbruck examines Qumran passages such as the *Prayer of Levi*, *Plea for Deliverance*, and petitions from *Jubilees*, which provide "our closest link between the Aaronic blessing and its adaptations, on the one hand, and the narrative world of John 17, on the other."[139] There are three parallels between the passage in John and the early Jewish material. First, the Johannine "dualism" in which "the world" and its ruler are opposed to Jesus and his disciples is similar to eschatological/apocalyptic concepts present in some of the Qumran passages.[140]

---

[138] From: אם שמרתם דברי תורה אני משמר אתכם מן המזיקין; cf. Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 144 n. 10. For other passages reflecting the dual function of τηρέω, see Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 144 n. 10; and Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 301-302 n. 5.

[139] Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 144.

[140] Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 160, states: "While the hostility between the present age of wickedness and a future age of restoration has long been known through Second Temple-period literature produced by apocalyptic circles, some of the Dead Sea materials express this tension in language that comes closer to what meets us in John's Gospel." This tension

Second, the judgment of "the world" and its ruler which is attributed to Jesus' death reflects the confidence in the eventual defeat of evil expressed in the early Jewish prayers. Third, there is an aspect of community and election to both Jesus' prayer and the passages from Qumran. Stuckenbruck explains that the Qumran petitions "are formulated in recognition that in the meantime a community which considers itself especially elect needs divine help in order to ward off the unabating influences of evil power" in a way analogous to the relevance of 17:15 for the Johannine community.[141] Thus not only are the contents and purpose of the Qumran apotropaisms similar to the Johannine passage, but also the intended recipients as (i.e., a group of faithful followers). The point of these three parallels is that Jesus' petition and its larger context in John resembles the worldview of the early Jewish passages that produced similar apotropaic petitions; thus, they share in a common tradition.

Justification for Classification

Stuckenbruck's argument that τοῦ πονηροῦ in John 17:15 refers to a personified evil is convincing, especially given the tension between "this world" and "not of this world" in Jesus' prayer and the portrayal of the "ruler of this world" throughout the gospel. His demonstration that the word τηρέω can mean "protect," and that such an interpretation in verse 15 is likely, is also persuasive. Therefore, Jesus' prayer in verse 15 asks God to protect the disciples from future satanic influence and, in this way, is an apotropaic petition. Since Jesus is depicted as a third party mediator, the nature of his request can be described as an intercessory apotropaic plea. This is comparable to intercessory apotropaisms from *Jubilees* (cf. §2.2.2.5) and, like the non-apotropaic prayer in Luke 22:31-32 (cf. §4.2), it

---

between the present age in the future age is expressed in, for instance, 1QS, 1QM and 4Q510-511; cf. ibid., 145-147.

[141] Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 160. Stuckenbruck further explains in ibid.,: "just as the patriarch's petitions against demonic evil are formulated as prayers for their descendants and spiritual heirs, so also is Jesus' petition concerned with his 'descendants,' that is, the disciples and 'those who believe in me through their word' – members of the Johannine community who find themselves covered by its force."

emphasizes Jesus' role as an advocate; in this case Jesus advocates for his disciples in their battle with Satan.

The apotropaic interpretation of the final clause in the Lord's Prayer (§4.1.2) illustrates a petitionary pattern shared by the Matthean passage and Qumran apotropaic petitions including the *Prayer of Levi*, *Plea for Deliverance*, and passages from *Jubilees*. The similarity of John 17:15 to both early Jewish apotropaisms and Matthew 6:13 strengthens this element of continuity between early Jewish and early Christian anti-demonic tradition. Indeed, there are at least five commonalities displayed among these various apotropaic petitions:

First, apotropaic requests are often present within a longer non-apotropaic prayer, and this is precisely the case in John 17 where a plea for protection is one feature in a more generalized context.[142]

Second, in addition to the request for safety there are often other positive components of the prayer, such as a concern for righteousness[143] (e.g., *Jub.* 10:3-4) or the glorification of God (e.g., *Jub.* 12:19). This pattern also applies to John 17 which opens with the glorification of God (cf. vss. 1-3) and extols fidelity to God's word (e.g., vss.6, 8).

Third, the recipients of divine protection are sometimes depicted as having a distinct or elevated status. This is especially apparent in the Qumran passages which formulate apotropaisms in terms of protection for members of the elect community.[144] The idea that the disciples have elect status is present in John 17: they are given to Jesus from God (v. 6), they have received and kept the word (vss. 6, 8, 14), and they are in the world but not of it (vss. 11, 14).

---

[142] This characteristic of apotropaic petitions is noted by Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer," 108; cf. Flusser, "'Apotropaic' Prayers," 202.

[143] More specifically, the Qumran apotropaic petitions have an interest in, for example, the forgiveness of sins (e.g., *Plea for Deliverance* l. 13) and positive attributes such as wisdom, knowledge, and strength (e.g., *Prayer of Levi* l. 14). This can be compared to the placement of the Lord's Prayer within the larger context of the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew. See the discussion in §4.1.2.

[144] This is particularly the case in 1QS, 1QM, and 4Q510-511; cf. Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 145-147.

Fourth, divine protection extends to the "spiritual" or literal descendants of the petitioner in addition to the prayer's direct recipients. Just as petitions in *Jubilees* refer to a patriarch's posterity (e.g., *Jub.* 10:3-6; 12:19-20) and the Matthean Lord's Prayer has a wide audience, it is clear in John that not only the disciples but all followers are intended to avail of God's benefits in Jesus' prayer (e.g., v. 20-24).[145]

Fifth, the view in both the early Jewish passages and John that this world is under the rule of evil which will eventually be destroyed corresponds with the perspective in the Matthean passage (§4.1.1) and, thus, the Qumran petitions and the prayers from the gospels share basic eschatological beliefs.

Therefore, these five similarities demonstrate that the request in John 17:15 is consistent with the nature and expression of apotropaic petitions from surrounding traditions.

Implications of Apotropaism for John's Satanology

As Stuckenbruck has shown, the interpretation of τοῦ πονηροῦ as a personified evil is in harmony with the rest of John 17 in which the dichotomy between "this world" and "not of this world" is an important theme. Furthermore, the entire prayer is comprised of several requests by Jesus on behalf of the disciples, such as the plea to be guarded from disunity (v. 11) and for sanctification (v. 17), and the request to be kept from the evil one is in line with these other petitions. Also, because the Johannine petition, like the Lord's Prayer, is given on behalf of the disciples, the prayer's apotropaic nature does not impact the status or authority of Jesus in John. Consequently, there is nothing in the immediate context of John 17 that would prohibit the reading of verse 15 as an intercessory apotropaic petition.

---

[145] According to Stuckenbruck, all of the Farewell Discourse is addressed to the disciples *and* all the subsequent faithful. He states in "Protect Them from the Evil One," 139: "the disciples, though formally addressed, are told about times and circumstances that anticipate realities to be faced at a later time, so Jesus' instructions to the disciples function also as instructions for the later readers (e.g., 14:12, 16-20, 26; 15:20-21; 16:1-4a). Equally, Jesus' prayer in chapter 17 concerns itself not only with his immediate devotees but also with those who will come after them (17:20-24)."

Since τοῦ πονηροῦ is a designation for "the devil," 17:15 does not have any impact on the role of demons or the absence of demonic exorcisms in John. Yet, the oft-noted view that John portrays a conflict between Jesus (and the faithful) and the ruler of this world is further supported by the presence of an apotropaic attempt to protect the disciples from satanic influence. The petition in 17:15 indicates that satanic conflict extends beyond Jesus' death, and this must be resolved in light of 12:31 in which the crucifixion is equated with the "casting out" of the devil. Twelftree explains that in the synoptics, based on early Jewish traditions, there is a two-staged defeat of Satan, which is also the case in John.[146] However, unlike in the synoptics where the first stage of defeat corresponds to Jesus' exorcistic ministry, John depicts Jesus' death as the clear, albeit initial, victory over Satan. For Piper, the "casting out" of Satan achieved by Jesus' death is really the "casting down" of Satan from heaven who is, in turn, relegated to the earthly realm.[147] In this scenario, according to the dualistic worldview in John, Satan is still a threat to individuals, but he holds less sway over those "not of the world."[148] Since a two-staged defeat of the satanic figure is depicted or implied in early Jewish apocalypticism and synoptic Satanologies, and because this concept is plausible within a Johannine context, I am inclined to accept Twelftree's theory. Nevertheless, Judith Kovacs makes a relevant point:

> The question precisely how the Fourth Gospel envisions the defeat of the archon to be effected through the cross is one that our evidence may be insufficient to answer. In any case the answer would be difficult to formulate apart from a consideration of the whole early Christian apocalyptic tradition. What is clear is that the Fourth Evangelist is in agreement with such early Christian theologians as Paul and John of Patmos that the death of Christ is a decisive salvific event.[149]

---

[146] Twelftree, *In the Name of Jesus*, 196, states: "In concert with the thinking of the time, Jesus, as well as the early Christians reflected in the Synoptic traditions, expected Satan's defeat to take place in two stages (e.g., Isa. 24:22; *1En.* 10:4-6)."

[147] For instance, Piper, "The Absence of Exorcisms," 274, interprets "the victory over Satan simply as the isolation of Satan *to* this world, not his expulsion *from* it. In this case, there is no second stage to Satan's downfall necessarily envisaged. Satan is now defeated because he has no influence in the heavenly sphere…" (italics his).

[148] See Piper's argument in "The Absence of Exorcisms, "272-276.

[149] Kovacs, "Jesus' Death as Cosmic Battle," 246.

That is, to whatever degree and in whatever timeframe the crucifixion accomplishes victory over Satan, 17:15 insists that the influence and opposition of the devil is a continuing threat to the disciples. As a result, an apotropaic petition does not conflict with the "casting out" of Satan tied to Jesus' death.

John and the synoptics understand evil as in some way associated with Satan, and yet despite the presence of apotropaisms in both, how "salvation" occurs and the relationship of Jesus to it differs. John 3:14-15 compares the exultation of Jesus with the bronze serpent raised by Moses in the wilderness. In Numbers 21 serpents are sent by God to punish the Israelites. When the people repent, God instructs Moses in verse 8: "Make a fiery serpent, and set it up as a sign; that everyone who is bitten, when he sees it, shall live." This passage does not describe an apotropaic ritual. The scourge of the serpents do not represent demonic affliction, and the beneficial effect of the bronze serpent is not preventative, but rather for individuals who are already bitten. However, the raised serpent is a means of healing, and, according to Wisdom 16:6, it is a "symbol" (σύμβολο, LXX) of "salvation" (σωτηρία, LXX).[150]

In John 3:14-15, Jesus explains to Nicodemus:

14 And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of man be lifted up, 15 that whoever believes in him may have eternal life.	Καὶ καθὼς Μωϋσῆς ὕψωσεν τὸν ὄφιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οὕτως ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐν αὐτῷ ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.[151]

The reference to the exultation (ὑψοῦν) of the Son of man refers to Jesus' crucifixion.[152] As this Johannine passage makes clear, the cross, similar to the sign

[150] On the relationship between Jn. 3:14, Num. 21:8-9, and Wis. 16:6, cf. J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John, vol. 1* (ICC; T&T Clark, 1999), 133. See also Stan Harstine, *Moses as a Character in the Fourth Gospel: A Study of Ancient Reading Techniques* (JSNTSup 229; ed. S. E. Porter; Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 55-56; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 50; and Ernst Haenchen, *A Commentary on the Gospel of John Chapters 1-6* (trans. Robert W. Funk; Hermeneia; Fortress Press, 1984), 204-207.

[151] The English translation and Greek text are from Aland, *Synopsis*, 26.

[152] For the meaning of the word ὑψοῦν, see Bernard, *St. John*, 112; and Beasley-Murray, *John*, 50. Furthermore, scholars consider that the exultation Jn. 3:14 refers to the cross and not the ascension;

of the serpent, is a means of salvation for believers. Since elsewhere in John (cf. 12:31) the cross is associated with the casting out of Satan, there is a connection between salvation and the overthrow of evil. John 3:14 is not anti-demonic, however the passage helps to illustrate the link between soteriology and the defeat of Satan. Although apotropaisms are temporary and do not bring about the destruction of an adversary, an apotropaic petition on behalf of Jesus' followers in 17:15 corresponds to the authority of God over evil that is expressed throughout John's gospel, and especially in the crucifixion of Jesus.

4.4 Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter is to determine whether the gospels contain any apotropaisms in the form of petitions. The passages relevant to this discussion are examined alongside early Jewish apotropaic petitions and analyzed vis-à-vis the more general demonological and Satanological themes of the gospel in which they appear. I have argued that in at least two places, the Matthean Lord's Prayer and Jesus' prayer in John 17:15, there are requests to God for the protection from future satanic influence. In the case of the Lord's Prayer, in light of the prayer's eschatological nature, and given the references to personified evil elsewhere in Matthew, the phrase τοῦ πονηροῦ in 6:13b most likely refers to a personified being and, thus, the request for God's deliverance from "the evil one" is an apotropaic petition. Similarly, the context of John 17 as well as other designations for a "Satan" figure in John indicate that τοῦ πονηροῦ in 17:15 is a personified evil rather than an abstract neuter substantive. Consequently, Jesus' prayer that the disciples be kept from "the evil one" is an apotropaic petition. Although the roles of Satan and the activities of demons are depicted and emphasized differently in Matthew and John, in neither case does the presence of an apotropaic petition conflict with either gospel's portrayal of evil or the response of individuals to that evil. Jesus' prayer in Luke 22:31-32 also describes potential harm from Satan and, while it is not apotropaic since the purpose of the prayer is to strengthen Peter's

---

cf. John Ashton, "The Johannine Son of Man: A New Proposal," *NTS* 57.4 (2011): 514, 524-525; Bernard, *St. John*, 113; and Beasley-Murray, *John*, 50-51.

faith and not to obviate satanic influence, it illustrates the anti-demonic benefit of faith.

Four similarities emerge when the Lord's Prayer and Jesus' prayer in John are compared to early Jewish apotropaic petitions. First, just as the early Jewish petitions address God as the source of protection, so too do the prayers in the gospels. Second, while the Johannine petition is directed to God, it is placed upon the lips of Jesus on behalf of his followers and, therefore, is an intercessory apotropaic petition. This resembles passages from *Jubilees* in which a revered righteous patriarch requests God's safety for his descendants. This pattern is adapted in a slightly different manner in relation to the Lord's Prayer which, although it is not strictly an intercession, presents Jesus as a pious figure bestowing upon his spiritual descendants a template of prayer. Third, the apotropaic petitions in the gospels are situated within longer non-apotropaic prayers which include requests for various positive attributes. This reflects the pattern of early Jewish apotropaisms such as the *Prayer of Levi* and *Plea for Deliverance*. Fourth, in some of the more descriptive petitions the destruction of opposing evil is reserved for God and eschatological judgment of the enemy is assured.[153] These four similarities demonstrate the continuity of apotropaic petitionary patterns across early Jewish and early Christian traditions. For the

---

[153] This is implied in the eschatological reading of the Matthean Lord's Prayer in which the final testing (πειρασμός) in in 6:13a precedes the destruction of evil (cf. §4.1.2). Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 160, relates this concept to John, stating: "the confidence expressed in the [early Jewish] petitionary prayers considered here, based on definitive acts of God in the past and the certain eschatological defeat of demonic power in the future, is reframed in John's Gospel around Jesus' death, through which the world is already judged. Though the inimical world order holds sway, its days are numbered, and it already stands condemned." These features are similar to the eschatological framework of some apotropaisms, including the passage in *Jub.* 10:3-9 of which Stuckenbruck, ibid., 155, explains: "God's response to [Noah's] petition ensures that, from now on, the evil that is manifest on earth represents an essentially defeated power whose activity has already been subjected to a preliminary judgment." This restrained nature of apotropaism, which is ultimately a deference to God's authority over evil, is found also in *Songs of the Sage* (cf. §2.2.3.4), implied in Jesus' use of Deuteronomy against Satan (cf. §3.1.3.1), and included as one of Eshel's characteristics (point four) of apotropaic prayer (cf. §2.1.2).

Lord's Prayer, which is already recognized as having its roots in early Judaism, the nature of this relationship is further nuanced.

There are also commonalities shared by the petitions in Matthew, John, and other apotropaisms in the gospels. The two petitions are both expressed by Jesus on behalf of his followers and they each contain the identical phrase τοῦ πονηροῦ as a designation for Satan. This may suggest an awareness by one or both evangelists of a specific tradition of Jesus as an anti-demonic intercessor.[154] Another similarity is that if in John 17 there is an implied connection, suggested here by the use of τηρέω, between adherence to God's word and protection, then the Johannine passage conveys the same concept that is found in the Matthean and Lukan Temptation in which fidelity to the torah has an anti-demonic effect. Furthermore, if indeed the use of "keep" in John 17:15 echoes the Priestly Blessing, then this marks a development, like that of Psalm 91, wherein an ancient biblical passage is used in a later apotropaic context.

In conclusion, four points are demonstrated in this chapter: (1) the gospels of Matthew and John contain apotropaic petitions as a response to the threat of future satanic harm; (2) these petitions resemble early Jewish petitions and are especially analogous to passages from *Jubilees* in that they portray a revered figure interceding on behalf of his descendants; (3) the interpretation of certain prayers as "apotropaic petitions" does not diminish the portrayal of Jesus in either Matthew or John; and (4) reading the prayers as "apotropaic" does not conflict with the demonologies of either gospel, but rather strengthens the depiction of Satan as a continuous adversarial figure. Therefore, as is the case in early Jewish prayer tradition, the gospels of Matthew and John are mindful of and implement apotropaic petitions as a useful response to personified evil. Like non-petitionary apotropaisms in the synoptics, apotropaic petitions are not as numerous as depictions of possession and exorcism. Since both Mark and Luke demonstrate an awareness of apotropaic tradition (e.g., the Lukan Temptation, Mk. 9:25, etc.),

---

[154] According to Stuckenbruck, "Protect Them from the Evil One," 143, the use of τοῦ πονηροῦ in John to denote Satan "seems uncharacteristic of the writer's language" and, thusly, suggests "that Jesus' petition in 17:15 has been shaped by tradition," as does the similarity of the petition to Mt. 6:13.

nothing definitive can be concluded about the lack of apotropaic petitions in their works. Possibly, the inclusion of this specific type of apotropaism simply did not fit into their narratives. The matter is a little different regarding John's gospel. Given the absence of exorcisms and the relatively few encounters with the demonic in John, it is not surprising that there are also no apotropaisms directed at demons. Alternatively, John is clearly interested to show that Satan is an adversary and, thus, the presence of an apotropaic petition is well suited to the Johannine Satanological structure.

Chapter 5: Summary and Conclusion

This study is concerned with the depiction of human responses to personified evil especially in the synoptic gospels. One type of response, exorcism, is a prevalent theme in each of the synoptics and has received substantial scholarly attention. Studies of synoptic gospel demonology and Satanology illustrate that demonological beliefs in early Judaism influenced New Testament literature, and there are numerous points of continuity between early Jewish and synoptic portrayals of exorcism. However, exorcism is not the only anti-demonic technique found in the period. Apotropaic responses to demonic evil, which are well attested in early Jewish literature, have only been given minor consideration in scholarly discussions of the synoptic tradition. This study offers a timely and in-depth examination of apotropaic tradition in order to fill a void and advance critical assessments of the depiction of human interaction with personified evil in the gospels. This task is achieved by answering three guiding questions about: (1) an apotropaic response to demonic evil in early Judaism; (2) the presence of such responses in the synoptic gospels; and (3) how the presence of apotropaism affects the demonology and/or Satanology of each gospel. Addressing these questions provides insights into apotropaic responses to evil in early Judaism and how some of the earliest Christian writings express participation in, or continuity with, this tradition. This chapter summarizes the major points from the previous chapters (§5.1 – §5.3) and contextualizes these contributions (§5.4).

5.1 Locating this Study Among Previous Assessments of Demonology in the Synoptics

In chapter one themes related to demons and the devil in the synoptic gospels were reviewed, and individual interests of the evangelists into demonology and Satanology were discussed. Wahlen shows that, although certain terms (e.g., "demon," "unclean spirit") are used differently by each evangelist to highlight issues such as purity, the designations all denote hostile spiritual beings that are evil in nature and oppose Jesus and his followers. Wright discusses parallels

between depictions of demons in the synoptics and demonology in Enochic writings. Both Wahlen and Wright demonstrate that the cosmology in the gospels, in which evil and harmful spiritual beings are a reality, draws much from the beliefs expressed in early Jewish literature.

Examining the role of Satan and demons within the evangelists' theologies provides further insights, and four fundamental points are made. First, Satan and demonic beings are constant adversaries throughout Jesus' ministry and their opposition continues beyond his earthly presence. Second, Jesus' successful exorcisms and several other events (e.g., the Temptation) demonstrate that he is stronger than Satan and has authority over demons. Third, interaction with Satan and the demonic reveals the identity and messianic mission of Jesus.[1] Fourth, based on the content of the Beelzebul Controversy, the success of Jesus' exorcistic ministry helps to bring about the gradual defeat of Satan who is the ruler of demons. These points, which are not the only observations made about Satan and demons, help to establish the demonological and Satanological framework of the synoptic gospels which is necessary for assessing responses to personified evil.

One form of demonic influence is possession, to which exorcism is the appropriate response. Twelftree attributes the majority of Jesus' exorcisms to the historical Jesus, and connects these exorcisms to similar features from traditions in surrounding early Jewish and Hellenistic literature. The influence of early Judaism is reinforced by Sorensen who illustrates continuity between early Jewish and early Christian exorcistic traditions in contrast to Greco-Roman demonological beliefs. Thus, Twelftree and Sorensen each show how Jesus' exorcisms are a way of responding to the demonic in keeping with contemporary Jewish anti-demonic tradition. In chapter one, seven features of synoptic gospel demonology and Satanology are outlined (cf. §1.1.4) in order to illustrate shared conclusions and scholarly consensus.

Satanic/demonic opposition to Jesus and his followers is clearly important for each of the synoptic writers, and exorcism is a particularly effective way of emphasizing this conflict. Also evident is that demonological and exorcistic beliefs

[1] For instance, in the Beelzebul Controversy Jesus' exorcistic ministry is discussed in terms of the inauguration of the eschatological kingdom of God (Mt. 12:24-29; Lk. 11:15-22; cf. Mk. 3:20-30).

from early Judaism had a degree of influence on the gospels' depiction of human interaction with personified evil. One contribution from previous studies is to find positive agreement, or continuity, with earlier tradition; that is, when depictions of demons and exorcism occur in these two traditions are they operating within the same framework? Due to the significant presence of apotropaisms in early Jewish literature, one may question whether there is disagreement and discontinuity on account of the absence of apotropaisms in the gospels. If apotropaisms are indeed missing from the gospels, and yet frequent in surrounding Jewish tradition, this also needs tending to before any conclusions are reached about how the synoptics relate to this tradition. However, the conclusion that apotropaisms are not present in the synoptics had not, previously, been established. Therefore, this chapter demonstrates the need for a taxonomy from early Jewish passages where apotropaisms occur in order to adjudicate the possibility of similar instances in the synoptics.

5.2 Anti-Demonic Traditions in Early Judaism

Chapter two is comprised of two main sections, the first of which discusses scholarly assessments of early Jewish anti-demonic traditions. Of particular interest is the organization and categorization of relevant passages, mostly from the Dead Sea Scrolls, as well as the terminology and definitions used to describe anti-demonic material. Eshel, building on the work of Flusser, lists four points of contrast between apotropaic and exorcistic works, thereby highlighting certain features that are characteristic of each anti-demonic technique. Stuckenbruck's nuanced approach to demonological material does not focus so much on criteria but emphasizes the complexities of a given passage. Together these scholarly approaches underscore six points (cf. §2.1.4 – §2.1.5) to be considered when examining and classifying anti-demonic passages:

(1) Demonic beings or threat of demonic influence should be referred to within the passage.
(2) Noting the addressee of an expression or formula is helpful for determining the prayer's function.

(3) Anti-demonic passages in early Judaism represent a developing tradition compared with the Hebrew scriptures, yet anti-demonic passages are often adaptations of earlier biblical patterns and passages.
(4) The precise nature of demons, and the different ways in which demonic beings can influence individuals, should be taken into account.
(5) There is need for a descriptive definition and consistent use of the term "incantation."
(6) There is need for a clear and consistent method of classification.

Many of these points can only be assessed within a given work on a case by case basis. Regarding the fifth point, the most useful definition of "incantation" for this study is: a formula, powerful word, or repetitive expression (incl. a chant, song, or adjuration) directed toward a deity or demon with the purpose of counteracting or preventing demonic influence. Concerning the sixth point, the method of classification used in this study categorizes relevant material as either preventative ("apotropaic") or remedial ("exorcistic"), in keeping with the characteristics presented in Eshel's four points of contrast.

The second section of chapter two is an analysis of primary literature. Passages that seek to prevent harmful demonic influence take the form of apotropaic petitions and incantations. Apotropaic petitions can either appeal to God for one's own protection as in the *Prayer of Levi* and *Plea for Deliverance*, or intercede to God on behalf of an individual's descendants as in some prayers from *Jubilees*. Apotropaic incantations, like the passages in 4Q510-511, do not depict the practitioner as a powerless individual, but rather reflect his authoritative status. The other anti-demonic technique is the non-preventative, curative exorcistic incantations and the exorcistic narrative in the *Genesis Apocryphon*.

The classification of literature in section 2.2 illustrates the usefulness of the six points from section 2.1: (1) each apotropaic and exorcistic passage mentions one or more demonic beings and/or the threat of harmful influence from such beings; (2) apotropaic petitions typically address God directly while exorcistic incantations and the apotropaic incantations in 4Q510-511 are addressed to the demonic adversaries; (3) the later anti-demonic adaptation of passages from the Hebrew scriptures is evident by the apotropaic use of the Priestly Blessing and Psalm 91 as well as the similarity between apotropaic petitions and the structure

and expressions in some biblical psalms; (4) demonic beings in the primary literature generally have a background in Enochic or ancient Near Eastern traditions and are depicted as evil non-corporal entities with the ability to afflict individuals physically (e.g., sickness) or spiritually (e.g., temptation); (5) the definition of "incantation" used here consistently includes all relevant material while describing a specific form of anti-demonic expression; and (6) the complexities of each passage are considered in order to classify the appropriate prayers or expressions by their fundamental purpose as either apotropaic or exorcistic.

Analysis of the primary literature highlights three additional features relating to the nature of early Jewish apotropaism. First, protection from future demonic harm can take the form of a direct plea to God or a formulaic expression directed at the demonic threat. There are also cases in which a passage contains an "apotropaic feature" that is not in the form of a prayer, incantation, or narrative. Second, given the influence of both ancient Near Eastern and Enochic demonologies upon apotropaic passages, early Jewish apotropaic tradition is not indicative of one particular demonology. Finally, some apotropaic passages contain an eschatological element (e.g., "not for an everlasting destruction") which specifies that the anti-demonic action is temporary. If this aspect of apotropaism is not explicit, it is typically implied that the intent is simply to "ward off" demonic harm. The restrained nature of apotropaism conveys a deference to God's authority over evil and, in some cases, anticipates the final destruction of evil in the eschaton. However, while eschatological elements can hint at the meaning of an anti-demonic action, they cannot be used as rigid criteria for a specific classification.[2]

5.3 Apotropaic Tradition in the Synoptics with Reference to John's Gospel

[2] For instance, Eshel, in "Apotropaic Prayers," 87-88 and "Genres," 412-413, says that qualification "henceforth and forever" is an exorcistic element, but it occurs in the apotropaic *Jub.* 10:6. Similarly, the permanent prohibition against demon re-entry ("never enter him again") is apotropaic.

The concept of early Jewish apotropaism, delineated in chapter two, is used to contextualize relevant pericopae in the gospels. In chapter three there are two points of connection between early Jewish apotropaism and the Matthean and Lukan Temptation. The first is concerned with the use of scripture. There is a precedent in early Judaism for the practice of invoking scripture for apotropaic benefit. Moreover, adherence to the torah, especially demonstrated in a passage from CD-A, has the ability to ward off demonic opposition. This is analogous to the depiction of Jesus in the Temptation narrative where he adheres to the law while quoting the law in a confrontation with Satan. The second point is that Jesus' scriptural citations are introduced with a formula (γέγραπται) which invokes the literal, original sense of the words; in this case the torah. In this way Jesus' quotations resemble the nature of authoritative expressions in early Jewish incantations. In addition to these two connecting points there are less direct parallels (cf. *figure 3.2*) between the Temptation and early Jewish tradition, such as the elevated "status" of Jesus and the sage in 4Q510-511, and the role of angelic beings in the Qumran document and in Matthew 4:11. Interpreting Jesus's quotations as apotropaic expressions does not alter the portrayal of Satan or demons elsewhere in Matthew or Luke, nor does it diminish the figure of Jesus in these gospels. Rather, Jesus' victory over Satan is emphasized without negating the continuous opposition from Satan, and Jesus' authoritative status is reinforced.

The meaning of Satan's use of Psalm 91 in the Temptation is fully understood when the apotropaic context of the psalm is taken into account. According to this view, Satan "inverts" the anti-demonic power of the psalm in what is an aggressive, hostile tactic meant to intimidate Jesus. A precedent for this tactic is found in a passage from *11QApocryphal Psalms* in which an exorcist mocks the powerful attributes of his demonic opponent. In each case, the inversion technique is intended to demean the opposition and assert the practitioner's dominance. Inversion language is also found in the triple tradition of the Gerasene Demoniac and the double tradition of the Demoniac in the Synagogue. In these passages, the demons are made to utter what is typically anti-demonic language in response to Jesus' approach. Unlike Satan's inversion tactic, which is an offensive

tactic used when Satan confronts Jesus, the inversion language of the demoniacs is a defense mechanism used when Jesus confronts the demons. The implication of these interpretations is that the hostility of the struggles portrayed in each pericope – the conflict between Jesus and satanic/demonic opposition – is emphasized. Furthermore, the Temptation narrative in particular is more firmly associated with early Jewish anti-demonic tradition given the use of Psalm 91 and the parallel to 11Q11. Therefore, having applied my taxonomy, the Temptation passage may be adjudicated as an instance where multiple, and sometimes quite subtle, apotropaisms occur.

In Mark 9:25 Jesus' exorcistic incantation addressed to a demon includes a prohibition against demon re-entry which is comparable with formulae from surrounding early Jewish and Hellenistic traditions. The directive against demonic re-possession is concerned with counteracting future demonic activity and, thusly, is an apotropaism. The pairing of an apotropaism with exorcism echoes the "symbiotic" relationship between the two anti-demonic techniques evident from the inclusion of Psalm 91 with the incantations in *11QApocryphal Psalms*. The addition of an apotropaic command to this exorcism in Mark accentuates the permanency and power of Jesus' authority over demons in a pericope which is indented to be a dramatic edification of faith. Moreover, as is the case with the Matthean and Lukan apotropaisms, interpreting an apotropaic feature in Mark does not conflict with the gospel's Satanology or demonology. Instead, it reinforces the theme depicted elsewhere in Mark that Jesus has authority over evil.

In the case of two passages examined it was concluded that they do not contain explicit apotropaic features, but rather point to the notion of preventing harm. The authority over demonic evil given by Jesus to his disciples in Luke 10:19 is expressed with imagery evoking Psalm 91 in a context which alludes to the psalm's apotropaic power. Another suggestion is that the disciples' authority over "all the power of the enemy" in verse 19 includes the ability to ward off future demonic threats and, in this way, is preventative. Mark's Longer Ending (16:17-18) illustrates the power of Jesus' name for confrontations with the demonic, and promises immunity from specific non-demonic threats to the baptized faithful. Although these elements do not directly relate to anti-demonic

apotropaism, they fit within a broader notion of prevention (i.e., Jesus' followers are guarded from future harm) that is more loosely associated with the concept of "apotropaism."

The focus of chapter four is to assess whether apotropaisms, specifically in the form of petitions, are present in the gospels or not. One of the passages under consideration is Jesus' prayer in Luke 22:31-32 where the threat of satanic harm to the disciples resembles the intercessory apotropaic petitions from *Jubilees* in which a patriarch prays for the wellbeing of his descendants. In the Lukan passage, Jesus prays for the strength of Peter's faith rather than the prevention of satanic influence, and it is therefore not an apotropaic petition. However, the passage is significant in that it displays the advantage of faith in opposition to personified evil.

Sustained attention was given to the Matthean Lord's Prayer to determine if τοῦ πονηροῦ in verse 13b refers to "the evil one," and in this regard Jesus' prayer in the Fourth Gospel became relevant. The understanding of τοῦ πονηροῦ in Matthew as "the evil one" is probable for two reasons: (1) an eschatological interpretation of the prayer is most convincing, especially in light of certain terminology (e.g., πειρασμός) and the presence of "New Exodus" themes; and (2) there is precedent elsewhere in Matthew for interpreting the phrase as "the evil one." When the Lord's Prayer is compared with early Jewish apotropaic petitions, several characteristics of the latter shed light upon the nature and form of the Matthean passage. For instance, apotropaic pleas often occur in a larger prayer with other non-apotropaic requests, and this is consistent with the entire Lord's Prayer. Some of the non-apotropaic features include the glorification of God (cf. the opening of the Lord's Prayer) and requests for positive attributes. An apotropaic interpretation of the Lord's Prayer also envisages the reality of personified evil as well as its ultimate destruction which matches the general cosmology and eschatological worldviews of the early Jewish prayers.

An apotropaic reading of the final petition in the Lord's Prayer does not lessen the authoritative status of Jesus since he is offering the prayer as a guide for his followers. This reading is also consistent with the continuous adversarial depiction of Satan throughout the gospel. However, there are three implications of

the apotropaic interpretation: (1) the eschatological tone of the entire prayer is accentuated; (2) it illustrates that conflict with personified evil is a significant and a constant concern; and (3) it shows yet another way in which the Lord's Prayer has a close relationship to early Jewish prayer tradition. The reception history, or alternatively the history of consequences (*Wirkungsgeschichte*), of the Lord's Prayer is notable: it is included in anti-demonic amulets from the third and fourth centuries A.D. onwards. This observation would seem to strengthen an interpretation of the prayer as apotropaic, since early readers also found that the meaning of this prayer was for protection from demonic harm.

Part of Jesus' prayer in the Johannine Farewell Discourse includes the request that God keep the disciples ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. The phrase in John, like in the Matthean Lord's Prayer, is best interpreted as "from the evil one," and there are two reasons for this: (1) there is precedent elsewhere in John for descriptions of and references to personified evil; and (2) the dualistic tensions of the passage and the gospel as a whole (i.e., the notions of "this world" and "the ruler of this world") suggest this interpretation. Accordingly, the request, which Jesus prays on behalf of the disciples, is an intercessory apotropaic petition. This interpretation does not conflict with the larger themes in John's gospel which, in contrast to its absence of exorcism material, depict Satan as a frequent and active adversary. There is also a connection in the prayer, with the use of the word τηρέω, between the disciples being "kept" from evil and their "keeping" the words of God. This reflects the notion that fidelity to God's words or commandments can be associated with protection. When the Johannine petition, alongside the Lord's Prayer, is considered in light of early Jewish apotropaic petitions, there are numerous parallels which illustrate a strong continuity among these traditions.

5.4 Conclusions

The endeavor to determine whether apotropaisms occur in the gospels has yielded positive results. As part of the process of adjudicating the possible presence of an apotropaism, interwoven with each assessment were observations about how each apotropaism is expressed. These results are summarized in the following figure:

Figure 5.1

Apotropaic Incantations	Apotropaic Petitions	Apotropaic Features	Allusions to the Concept of "Apotropaism"
Jesus' use of Deuteronomy in the Temptation (Mt. 4:1-11//Lk. 4:1-13)	The final petition in the Lord's Prayer (Mt. 6:13)	Satan's inversion of Psalm 91 in the Temptation (Mt. 4:1-11//Lk. 4:1-13)[3]	Jesus' allusion to Psalm 91; the disciples' anti-demonic authority (Lk. 10:19)
Jesus' prohibition against demon re-entry (Mk. 9:25)	"Protect them from the evil one" (Jn. 17:15)		Immunity from future non-demonic harm (Mk. 16:18)
Demoniacs' inversion language to "ward off" Jesus (Mt. 8:28-34; Mk. 1:23-28, 5:1-20; Lk. 4:33-37, 8:26-39)[4]			The value of strong faith to withstand satanic influence (Lk. 22:31-32)

Despite the presence of apotropaisms, an imbalance, in terms of frequency, between exorcisms and apotropaisms in the gospels and early Jewish literature may be observed. Therefore, questions arise as to what such an imbalance signifies. That exorcisms dominate may relate to the presentation of Jesus as boldly and forcefully confronting the demonic. The gospels depict Jesus as an elevated figure – the son of God – and as such, exorcisms serve Christological themes that demonstrate Jesus' status and authority. Given that a successful exorcism results in the unequivocal subjugation of the demonic opponent, it is easy to see why Jesus' exorcistic abilities are depicted as a sign inaugurating the kingdom, a central motif in the synoptics. Apotropaisms typically do not connote

[3] Although an expression of Psalm 91, in certain contexts, could be described as "incantation," in the Temptation Satan is attempting to intimidate Jesus, not ward him off. Satan's use of Psalm 91 is classified as an "apotropaic feature" because it is not in the form of a petition or incantation, but it presumes the apotropaic context and power of the psalm.

[4] Clearly the demoniacs' inversion language is not an anti-demonic incantation, but it is classified here as "incantation" since the demoniacs' utter formulaic expressions in order to ward off a perceived threat (i.e., Jesus).

such power, they are defensive rather than offensive, and this may be one reason for their less frequent occurrences. The only two apotropaic petitions found in this study are not for Jesus' own protection, but rather his followers. In the Temptation, apotropaism serves to highlight Jesus' authority, but this pericope describes the only confrontation between Jesus and Satan, whereas exorcisms of demons are a more common, public, and explicit illustration of Jesus' power over evil.

Nevertheless, sustained attention to apotropaic elements provides important insight into several passages and themes in the gospels. Indeed they help to contextualize the relationship of Jesus to Satan; the presence of apotropaisms in the Temptation raises questions about the outcome of that confrontation. Jesus' apotropaic "warding off" of Satan introduces tension into the conflict between Jesus and personified evil. In Matthew and Luke, Jesus' victory over his opponent is not concluded and the activity of Satan continues throughout the rest of Jesus' ministry. The reader does not doubt that Jesus is stronger than Satan and he will be overcome, but this is not concluded in the wilderness scene. Apotropaism are rare in the gospels, and as such when they subtly occur in the Temptation they are a tool in the hands of the evangelist for heightening tensions when setting up this unresolved conflict.

Apotropaisms also have implications for eschatology, and this is evident in the way the coming of God's kingdom relates to personified evil. Given that exorcisms reflect the ushering in of the kingdom, the temporary nature of apotropaism accentuates the "not yet" aspect of the kingdom's complete inauguration. That is, God's reign is being enacted, but the eschatological judgment and destruction of evil has yet to be fulfilled. This is seen especially in the Matthean Lord's Prayer where believers are told to request future deliverance from πειρασμός and τοῦ πονηροῦ.

Apotropaisms have relevance for understanding how the evangelists view soteriology, whether in the synoptics or the Fourth Gospel. For John, the cross is a symbol of deliverance which also signifies Satan's defeat. Since there is an anti-demonic quality to the cross, salvation is closely tied to Jesus' authority over evil. The apotropaic plea for Jesus' followers allows believers to participate in God's victory over Satan by obtaining protection from evil which is available because of

the salvific merits of the cross. Whereas anti-demonic significance is associated with the cross in John, in the synoptics, power over demons and the devil is a mark of the divine kingdom. This connection is made plain when Jesus associates exorcism with the coming kingdom in the Beelzebul Controversy. Although the ministry of exorcism is conferred upon the disciples, apotropaisms encourage all believers to partake in God's authority over evil. This means that relief from demonic possession is not the only way to avail of the anti-demonic effects of Jesus. Personified evil is not always for the righteous individual to meet with and conquer, but in some cases it should simply be rebuffed. In Matthew's Lord's Prayer Jesus teaches his followers an apotropaic petition, and in Mark Jesus prohibits demons from re-entering a man who suffered possession. These examples show that God's power over evil, manifest in the activities of Jesus, is available to believers in a form other than exorcism.

As already observed, early Jewish anti-demonic tradition reflects nearly equal interest in both apotropaisms and exorcisms. Therefore, in order to situate reactions to demonic beings in the gospels within this context, it is necessary to assess the relationship of apotropaism and exorcism to one another here too. Indeed, if exorcisms were the only anti-demonic features in the gospels there would be less emphasis on the concern for personified evil beyond Jesus' earthly presence. Jesus' exorcistic ministry would look more like Best's description of a "mopping up" operation, one that may be continued by the disciples but is merely eliminating the remnants of an opposition that no longer bears substantial threat. Instead, the apotropaic pleas in Matthew and John underscore that the followers of Jesus should have recourse to God's protection from present and future satanic affliction. Even the apotropaism in Mark 9:25 and the allusions to apotropaism in Luke 10:19 support the notion that future demonic influence is to be prevented in a way that exorcism simply does not address. Thus, the eschatological and demonological implications of apotropaisms as taught to Jesus' followers in perpetuity indicate that evil is not totally destroyed – an impression which Jesus' exorcistic activity may convey. Alternately, if Jesus were drawing upon apotropaisms frequently in the gospels this would seriously interrupt a portrait of his efficacy and power to usher in the kingdom. However, although apotropaisms

do not occur as often as exorcisms, the presence of both anti-demonic techniques provides a view of synoptic demonology in which Jesus' superiority is asserted, his followers can participate in his authority, and yet final destruction of evil is reserved for the eschaton which has not yet arrived.

The layers to which these responses to personified evil belong, whether to the historical Jesus, the evangelists, or both, has not yet been addressed. If the historical Jesus taught apotropaic petitions to his followers, this then indicates that he did not envisage his earthly ministry bringing about the destruction of evil. If this were the case, when Jesus confronts demons he is a successful exorcist, and yet his few apotropaisms would demonstrate an awareness of the limited extent of his earthly battle against evil. The overwhelming interest into exorcisms as opposed to apotropaisms in the gospels, set against the traditions of the time, reflect an imbalance. Within the presentation of Jesus' authoritative anti-demonic mission, apotropaisms stand out as being unusual and may be explained along the lines of evangelists either setting up narrative tension or the early church dealing with the ongoing presence of evil in their daily lives. The only apotropaism where Jesus is countering evil directed at him is in the Temptation, and the continued presence of apotropaisms in the early church confirms that this confrontation is not concluded with Jesus' death and resurrection. Therefore, in the gospels the arrangement of apotropaisms seems to reflect the concerns of the evangelists. However, although apotropaisms in the wilderness scene serve the evangelists' larger eschatological arc of an inaugurated but unfulfilled kingdom, it is not impossible that the historical Jesus may have drawn upon apotropaisms in subtle ways too. If Jesus was an exorcist, which is likely, this study on apotropaisms raises questions about whether Jesus was only an exorcist.

In conclusion, the relevance of the presence of apotropaic tradition when assessing demonologies of the synoptic gospels has been demonstrated. As our awareness of early Jewish and early Christian conceptions of evil continues to receive scholarly attention, new avenues of inquiry still arise. In relation to apotropaic tradition, an examination of preventative measures in Christian literature outside of the gospels is one avenue for further study. Within the pages of the New Testament, for example, possible apotropaic imagery occurs in

Ephesians 6:10-17 in which positive attributes – including the word of God – are described as battle armor in the fight against wickedness, and this should be explored. Furthermore, a wide ranging study on apotropaism in the Fourth Gospel may offer fresh observations. This study is an initial contribution to a subject matter with broad parameters and yet it hopefully lays a foundation for future studies that will enhance our understanding of human interaction with the demonic in early Christian tradition.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Achtemeier, Paul J. "Miracles and the Historical Jesus: A Study of Mark 9:14-29." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 37 (1975): 471-491.

Aland, Kurt, ed. *Synopsis of the Four Gospels*. 14th ed. German Bible Society, 2009.

Alexander, Philip S. "Contextualizing the Demonology of the Testament of Solomon." Pages 613-635 in *Die Dämonen: die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt*. Edited by Hermann Lichtenberger, Armin Lange, and K. F. Diethard Römheld. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2003.

___. "The Demonology of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 331-353 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Comprehensive Assessment vol. 2*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999.

___. "'Wrestling against Wickedness in High Places': Magic in the Worldview of the Qumran Community." Pages 318-337 in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evens. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Anderson, F. I. "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch." Pages 92-221 in vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Doubleday, 1983.

Angel, Joseph, L. "Maskil, Community, and Religious Experience in the *Songs of the Sage* (4Q510-511)." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 19 (2012): 1-27.

___. "The Use of the Hebrew Bible in Early Jewish Magic." *Religion Compass* 3.5 (2009): 785-798.

Arbesmann, Rudolf. "The 'DAEMONIUM MERIDIANUM' and Greek and Latin Patristic Exegesis." *Traditio* 14 (1958): 17-31.

Arnold, Russell C.D. *The Social Role of Liturgy in the Religion of the Qumran Community. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 60. Edited by Florentino García Martínez. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Ashton, John. "The Johannine Son of Man: A New Proposal." *New Testament Studies* 57.4 (2011): 508-529.

Aune, David E. "The Forgiveness Petition in the Lord's Prayer: First Century Literary, Liturgical and Cultural Contexts." Pages 57-74 in *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul in the Context of Jewish and Greco-Roman Antiquity*.

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 303. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

___. "Apocalyptic and the Lord's Prayer." Pages 75-93 in *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul in the Context of Jewish and Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 303. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013. Repr. from pages 237-258 in *Meaning and Method: Essays on New Testament Interpretation in Honor of Harold W. Attridge*. Edited by A. B. McGowan and K. H. Richards; Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study 67. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

___. "Dualism in the Fourth Gospel and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reassessment of the Problem." Pages 281-303 in *Neotestamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honor of Peder Borgen*. Suppliments to *Novum Testamentum*106. Edited by D. E. Aune, T. Seland, and J. H. Ulrichsey. Brill, 2003.

Bahr, Gordon J. "The Use of the Lord's Prayer in the Primitive Church." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 84 (1965): 153-159. Repr. pages 149-155 in *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy*. Edited by J. J. Petuchowski and M. Brocke. London: Burns and Oates, 1978.

Baillet, Maurice. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VII: Qumran Grotte 4. III (4Q482-4Q520)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

___, J. T. Milik, and R. De Vaux, O.P. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan III: Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumran. (2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

Bandstra, Andrew J. "The Original Form of the Lord's Prayer." *Calvin Theological Journal* 16 (1981): 15-37.

Barkay, Gabriel, Marilyn J. Lundberg, Andrew G. Vaughn, and Bruce Zuckerman. "The Amulets from Ketef Hinnom: A new Edition and Evaluation." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 334 (May, 2004): 41-71.

____, Marilyn J. Lundberg, Andrew G. Vaughn, Bruce Zuckerman, and Kenneth Zuckerman. "The Challenges of Ketef Hinnom." *Near Eastern Archaeology* 66:4 (2003): 162-171.

Batluck, Mark D. Review of Clinton Wahlen, *Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels*. *Review of Biblical Literature* (2009).

Baumgarten, Joseph M. "On the Nature of the Seductress in *4Q184*. *Revue de Qumrân* 15 (1991): 133-143.

Beasley-Murray, George R. and Daniel R. Schwartz. "Damascus Document (CD)." Pages 4-57 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 2: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995.

___. *John*. Word Biblical Commentary 36. Word Publishing, 1987.

Bernard, J. H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John, vol. 1*. The International Critical Commentary. T&T Clark, 1999.

Best, Ernest. *Ephesians*. International Critical Commentary. T&T Clark, 2006.

___. *The Temptation and the Passion*. Society for New Testament Studies 2. 2d ed. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Bets, Hans Dieter. *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain*. Hermeneia. Fortress Press, 1995.

___, ed. *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, Including the Demotic Spells*. 2d ed. University of Chicago Press, 1992.

___. *Essays on the Sermon on the Mount*. Translated by L. L. Welborn. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

Black, Matthew. "The Doxology to the *Pater Noster* with a Note on Matthew 6.13b." Pages 327-338 in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 100. Edited by P. R. Davies and R. T. White; Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.

Böcher, Otto. *Christus Exorcista: Dämonismus und Taufe im Neuen Testament*. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 16. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1972.

Bock, Darrell L. *Luke*. IVP New Testament Commentary Series. InterVarsity Press, 1994.

Bohak, Gideon. *Ancient Jewish Magic*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Bonner, Campbell. "The Technique of Exorcism." *Harvard Theological Review* 36 (1948): 39-49.

Bovon, François. *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50.* Translated by Christine M. Thomas. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

Brakke, David. Review of Eric Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity. The Journal of Religion* 84.3 (July, 2004): 450-451.

Brand, Miryam T. *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature.* Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 9. Edited by A. Lange, B. M. Levinson, and V. Noam. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 2013.

Branden, Robert C. *Satanic Conflict and the Plot of Matthew. Society of Biblical Literature* 89. New York: Peter Lang, 2006.

Brenton, Charles L. *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament.* London: Samuel Bagster and Son Limited, 1900.

Briggs, Charles A. and Emilie G. *The Book of Psalms.* A Critical and Exegetical Commentary, Volume 2. T & T Clark, 1907.

Brooke, George, John Collins, Torleif Elgvin, Peter Flint, Jonas Greenfield, Erik Larson, Carol Newsom, Émile Puech, Lawrence H. Schiffman, Michael Stone, and Julio Trebolle Barrera. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXII: Qumran Cave 4. XVII (Parabiblical Texts, Part 3).* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Brooke, George J. "The Pre-Sectarian Jesus." Pages 33-48 in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament.* Vol. 60 of *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah.* Edited by Florentino García Martínez. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Brown, Derek R. "The Devil in the Details: A Survey of Research on Satan in Biblical Studies." *Currents in Biblical Research* 9.2 (2011): 200-227.

Brown, Michael J. "'Panem Nostrum': The Problem of Petition and the Lord's Prayer." *Journal of Religion* 80.4 (2000): 595-614.

Brown, Raymond E. "The Pater Noster as an Eschatological Prayer." *Theological Studies* 22 (1961): 175-208. Repr. pages 217-253 in *New Testament Essays.* Geoffrey Chapman, 1965.

Bruyn, Theodore de, and Jitse H. F. Dijkstra. "Greek Amulets and Formularies from Egypt Containing Christian Elements: A Checklist of Papyri, Parchments, Ostraka, and Tablets." *Bulletin of the American Society of Papryologists* 48 (2011): 163-216.

___. "Papyri, Parchments, Ostraca, and Tablets Written with Biblical Texts in Greek and Used as Amulets: A Preliminary List" Pages 145-189 in *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approach*. Edited by T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas. Vol. 5 of *Texts and Editions for New Testament Study*. Edited by S. E. Porter and W. J. Porter. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. Oxford: Blackwell, 1972.

___. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.

Burkill, T. A. *Mysterious Revelation: An Examination of the Philosophy of St. Mark's Gospel*. Cornell University Press, 1963.

Burrows, Millar, ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Volume II*. New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951.

Byargeon, Rick W. "Echoes of Wisdom in the Lord's Prayer (Matt 6:9-13)." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 41.3 (September, 1998): 353-365.

Cadwallader, Alan H. "The Hermeneutical Potential of the Multiple Endings of Mark's Gospel." *Colloquium* 43.2 (2011): 129-146.

Caird, George B. *The Gospel of St Luke*. Pelican Gospel Commentaries. Edited by D. E. Nineham. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968.

Carmignac, Jean. *Recherches sur le "Notre Père."* Letouzey & Ané, 1969.

Carter, Warren. "Recalling the Lord's Prayer: The Authorial Audience of Matthew's Prayer as Familiar Liturgical Experience" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 57 (1995): 514-530.

Carr, Wesley. *Angels and Principalities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Charlesworth, James H., M. Harding, and M. Kiely, eds. *The Lord's Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era*. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1994.

___. "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS 3:13-426 and the 'Dualism' Contained in the Gospel of John." Pages 76-106 in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Crossroad, 1990.

Chazon, Esther G. "The Function of the Qumran Prayer Texts: An Analysis of the Daily Prayers (4Q503)." Pages 217-225 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery*. Edited by L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam. Israel Exploration Society: Jerusalem, 2000.

___, Torleif Elgvin, Esther Eshel, Daniel Falk, Bilhah Nitzan, Elisha Qimron, Eileen Schuller, David Seely, Eibert Tigchelaar, and Moshe Weinfeld. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXIX: Qumran Cave 4. XX (Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

___. "Hymns and Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls" in Pages 244-270 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment vol. 1*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1998).

Clarke, Ernest G. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Numbers. The Aramaic Bible* vol. 4. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. *Mark*. Hermeneia: a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2007.

Collins, John J. *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

___, ed. *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*. Semeia 14. Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1979.

Conybeare, F. C. "The Testament of Solomon." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 11:1 (October, 1898): 1-45.

Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. London: Faber and Faber, 1960.

Crafer, T. W. *The Apocriticus of Macarius Magnes*. Translations of Christian Literature, Series I, Greek Texts. London: SPCK; New York: Macmillan Company, 1919.

Cross, Frank M. and Richard J. Saley. "Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of the Seventh Century B. C. from Arslan-Tash in Upper Syria." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 197 (1970): 42-49.

Crowe, Brandon D. *The Obedient Son: Deuteronomy and Christology in the Gospel of Matthew*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vol. 188. Walter de Gruyter, 2012.

Crump, David. "Jesus, the Victorious Scribal-Intercessor in Luke's Gospel," *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992): 51-65.

Cserháti, Márta. "Binding the Strong Man: Demon-Possession and Liberation in the Gospel of Luke." Pages 108-115 in *Evil and the Devil*. Edited by Ida Fröhlich and Erkki Koskenniemi. Volume 481 of *Library of New Testament Studies*. Edited by Mark Goodacre. T&T Clark, 2013.

Curtis, John E. and Julian E. Reade, eds. *Art and Empire: Treasures from Assyria in the British Museum*. British Museum Press, 1995.

Dahood, Mitchell. *Psalms II 51-100*. The Anchor Bible. Doubleday and Company, 1968.

Davenport, Gene L. *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*. Studia Post-Biblica 20. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Davies, Eryl W. *Numbers*. The New Century Bible Commentary. London: Marshall-Pickering; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Davies, Steven L. *Jesus the Healer: Possession, Trance, and the Origins of Christianity*. SCM Press, 1995.

Davies, W. D. and Dale C. Allison. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. The International Critical Commentary. 3 vols. Vol. 2: *Matthew VIII-XVIII*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.

___. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. The International Critical Commentary. 3 vols. Vol. 1: *Matthew I-VII*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.

Day, Peggy L. *An Adversary in Heaven: śāṭān in the Hebrew Bible*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 43. Edited by F. M. Cross. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.

Di Lella, Alexander A. "Tobit." Pages 456-477 in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. Oxford University Press, 2007.

Dochhorn, Jan. "The Devil in the Gospel of Mark." Pages 98-107 in *Evil and the Devil*. Edited by Ida Fröhlich and Erkki Koskenniemi. Volume 481 of *Library of New Testament Studies*. Edited by Mark Goodacre. T&T Clark, 2013.

Donaldson, Terrence L. *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 8. Edited by Bruce D. Chilton. JSOT Press, 1985.

Driver, S. R. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.

Duling, Dennis, C. "Testament of Solomon (First to Third Century A.D.)." Pages 935-987 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 1*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Doubleday, 1983.

___. "Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of God." *Harvard Theological Review* 68 3/4 (October, 1975): 235-252.

Durham, John. *Exodus*. Word Biblical Commentary 3.Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1987.

Ehrman, Bart D., ed. *The Apostolic Fathers*. 2 Vols. Loeb Classical Library. Harvard University Press, 2003.

Eisenman, Robert H., and Michael Wise. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*. Dorset: Element, 1992.

Epp, Eldon J. "The Oxyrhynchus New Testament Papyri: 'Not Without Honor Except In Their Hometown.'" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 123.1 (2004): 5-55.

Epstein, I., ed. *Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud: Sanhedrin*. Translated by H. Freedman. London: The Soncino Press, 1969.

Eshel, Esther. "Genres of Magical Texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 395-415 in *Die Dämonen: die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt*. Edited by Hermann Lichtenberger, Armin Lange, and K. F. Diethard Römheld. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2003.

___. "Apotropaic Prayers in the Second Temple Period." Pages 69-88 in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by. Esther G. Chazon. Vol. 48 of *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*. Edited by F. García Martínez. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

___. "Demonology in Palestine in the Second Temple Period." PhD diss., Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1999 [Hebrew].

___, Hanan Eshel, Carol Newsom, Bilhah Nitzan, Eileen Schuller, and Ada Yardeni. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XI: Qumran Cave 4. VI (Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History*. 1926-1932. Translated by Kirsopp Lake et al. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Evans, Christopher F. *Saint Luke*. Trinity Press International New Testament Commentaries. London: SCM Press, 1990.

Evans, Craig A. *Matthew*. New Cambridge Bible Commentary. Edited by Ben Witherington III. Cambridge University Press, 2012.

___. "Jesus and Psalm 91 in Light of the Exorcism Scrolls." Pages 541-555 in *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Contribution*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, J. Duhaime, and K. S. Baek. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

___. "Jesus and Evil Spirits in the Light of Psalm 91." *The Bible Translator* 1 (2009): 43-58.

___. "Inaugurating the Kingdom of God and Defeating the Kingdom of Satan." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 15.1 (2005): 49-75.

___. *Mark 8:27-16:20*. Word Biblical Commentary 34b. Nelson Reference & Electronic, 2001.

___, and James A. Sanders. *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Farmer, William R. *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 25. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

___. *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964.

Farrer, Austin M. "On Dispensing with Q." Pages 55-86 in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967.

Fitzgerald, John T. "The Temptation of Jesus: The Testing of the Messiah in Matthew." *Restoration Quarterly* 15 (1972): 152-160.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Tobit*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.

___. "Tobit." Pages 13-21 in *The Oxford Bible Commentary: The Apocrypha*. Edited by Martin Goodman. Oxford University Press, 2001.

___. *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*. Anchor Yale Bible Commentary 28a. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

___. "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 7 (1960-61): 297-333. Pages 3-58 in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. University of Montana: Scholar's Press, 1974.

___, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: A Commentary*. 2ed. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971.

___, *The Gospel According to Luke I-X*. Anchor Yale Bible Commentary 28. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.

Flusser, David. "Qumran and Jewish 'Apotropaic' Prayer." *Israel Exploration Journal* 16 (1966): 194-205. Repr. pages 214-225 in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*. The Hebrew University, Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988.

___. "Healing Through the Laying-On of Hands in a Dead Sea Scroll." *Israel Exploration Journal* 7 (1957): 107-108. Repr. pages 21-22 in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*. The Hebrew University, Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988.

France, R. T. *The Gospel According to Matthew*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Inter-Varsity Press, 1985.

Franklin, Eric. *Luke: Interpreter of Paul, Critic of Matthew*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 92. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.

Freedman, H. *Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud: Sanhedrin*. Edited by I. Epstein. London: Soncino Press, 1969.

Fröhlich, Ida. "Magical Healing at Qumran (11Q11) and the Question of the Calendar." Pages 39-49 in *Studies on Magic and Divination in the Biblical World*. Edited by Helen R. Jacobus, Anne Katrine de Hemmer Gudme, and Philippe Guillaume. *Biblical Intersection* 11. Gorgias Press, 2013.

___. "Evil in Second Temple Texts." Pages 23-50 in *Evil and the Devil*. Edited by Ida Fröhlich and Erkki Koskenniemi. Volume 481 of *Library of New Testament Studies*. Edited by Mark Goodacre. T&T Clark, 2013.

___. "Theology and Demonology in Qumran Texts." *Henoch* 32 (2010): 101-129.

___. "Invoke at Any Time: Apotropaic Texts and Belief in Demons in the Literature of the Qumran Community." *Biblische Notizen* 137 (2008): 41-74.

García Martínez, Florentino. "Magic in the Dead Sea Scrolls" Pages 13-33 in *The Metamorphosis of Magic from Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period*. Edited by J. N. Bremmer and J. R. Veenstra; Peeters Publishers, 2002.

___, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. Van Der Woude. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXIII: Qumran Cave 11. II (11Q2-18, 11Q20-31)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

___, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997-1998.

___. "Texts from Qumran Cave 11." Pages 18-26 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport. Vol.10 of *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*. Edited by F. García Martínez and A.S. Van Der Woude. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992.

Garland, David E. "The Lord's Prayer in the Gospel of Matthew." *Review and Expositor* 89 (1992): 215-228.

Garrett, Susan R. *The Temptations of Jesus in Mark's Gospel*. Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998.

___. *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

Gathercole, Simon. "Jesus' Eschatological Vision of the Fall of Satan: Luke 10.18 Reconsidered." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 94.2 (2003): 143-163.

Gerhardsson, Birger. *The Testing of God's Son*. Translated by John Toy. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1966.

Gerstenberger, Erhard S. *Psalms, Part 2, and Lamentations*. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 15. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2001.

Gibson, Jeffrey B. "Matthew 6:9-13//Luke 11:2-4: An Eschatological Prayer?" *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 31 (2001): 96-105.

___. *The Temptations of Jesus in Early Christianity. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 112. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Goulder, M. D. *Luke: A New Paradigm, 2*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 20. Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.

___. "The Composition of the Lord's Prayer." *Journal of Theological Studies* 14 (1963): 32-45.

Graubard, Baruch. "The Kaddish Prayer." Pages 59-72 in *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy*. Edited by J. J. Petuchowski and M. Brocke. London: Burns and Oates, 1978.

Green, H. Benedict. *Matthew, Poet of the Beatitudes*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 203. Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Green, Joel B. *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.

___, and S. McKnight, eds. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Downers Grove, 1992.

Greenfield, Jonas C. "Two Notes on the Apocryphal Psalms." Pages 309-314 in *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*. Edited by Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

Gundry, Robert H. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. W. B. Eerdmanns Publishing Company, 1982.

Haenchen, Ernst. *A Commentary on the Gospel of John Chapters 1-6*. Translated by Robert W. Funk. Hermeneia. Fortress Press, 1984.

Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew 1-13*. Word Biblical Commentary 33a. Word Books, 1993.

Hammerling, Roy. *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church: The Pearl of Great Price*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Hanneken, Todd R. "The Watchers in Rewritten Scripture: The Use of the *Book of the Watchers* in *Jubilees*." Pages 25-68 in *The Fallen Angels Traditions: Second Temple Developments and Reception History*. Edited by Angela Kim Harkins, Kelley Coblentz Bautch, and John C. Endres. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 53. The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2014.

Harding, Mark. Review of Graham H. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus*. *Journal of Religious History* 21.2 (1997): 110-112.

Harstine, Stan. *Moses as a Character in the Fourth Gospel: A Study of Ancient Reading Techniques*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 229. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Heil, John P. "Jesus with the Wild Animals in Mark 1:13." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 68 (2006): 63-78.

Heinemann, Joseph. "The Background of Jesus' Prayer in the Jewish Liturgical Tradition." Pages 81-89 in *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy*. Edited by J. J. Petuchowski and M. Brocke. London: Burns and Oates, 1978.

Henderson, Suzanne Watts. "Discipleship After the Resurrection: Scribal Hermeneutics in the Longer Ending of Mark." *Journal of Theological Studies* 63.1 (2012): 106-124.

Henze, Matthais. "Psalm 91 in Premodern Interpretation and at Qumran." Pages 168-193 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by M. Henze. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005.

Holmes, Michael W. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. 3d ed. Baker Academic, 2007.

Hooker, Morna D. *The Gospel According to St Mark*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. Continuum, 1991.

Horbury, William. "Rabbinic Literature in New Testament Interpretation." Pages 221-235 in *Herodian Judaism and New Testament Study*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 193. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

___. "Moses and the Covenant in the Assumption of Moses and the Pentateuch." Pages 34-46 in *Herodian Judaism and New Testament Study*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 193. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006. Repr. from pages 191-208 in *Covenant as Context*. Edited by A. D. H. Mayes and R. B. Salter. Oxford, 2003.

___, and David Noy. *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Horsley, G. H. R. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity, 3: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1978*. Macquarie University, 1983.

Isaac, E. "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch (Second Century B.C. – First Century A.D.)." Pages 4-89 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 1*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Doubleday, 1983.

Jaquette, James L. Review of Graham H. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus*. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 57.1 (Jan., 1995): 194-195.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Prayers of Jesus*. Studies in Biblical Theology 6. SCM Press, 1967.

___, "The Lord's Prayer in Modern Research." *Expository Times* 71 (1960): 141-146.

Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities*. 1926-1965. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Käsemann, Ernst. *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17*. Translated by Gerhard Krodel. London: SCM Press, 1968.

Kee, Howard C. "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Second Century B.C.)." Pages 775-828 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 1*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Doubleday, 1983.

___. "The Terminology of Mark's Exorcism Stories." *New Testament Studies* 14 (1968): 232-246.

Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009.

Kelhoffer, James A. *Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and Their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II. Reihe 185. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2000.

Kell, Balmer H. "An Exposition of Matthew 4:1-11." *Interpretation* 29 (1975): 57-62.

Kelly, Henry A. "The Devil in the Desert." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 26 (1964): 190-220.

Kennedy, Joel. *The Recapitulation of Israel: Use of Israel's History in Matthew 1:1-4:11*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II. Reihe 257 Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Kimball, Charles A. *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 94. Edited by S. E. Porter. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.

Kistemaker, Simon J. "The Lord's Prayer in the First Century." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 21/4 (December, 1978): 323-328.

Kister, Menahem. "The Yetzer of Man's Heart, the Body and Purification from Evil: Between Prayer Terminologies and World Views." Pages 241-282 in *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls Volume VIII*. Edited by M. Bar-Asher and D. Dimant. Haifa University Press, 2010 [Hebrew].

___, "Demons, Theology and Abraham's Covenant (CD 16:4-6 and Related Texts)." Pages 167-184 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings*. Edited by R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller. Scholars Press, 1999.

Kittel, Gerhard, ed. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by George W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976.

Kloppenborg, John S. *Q Parallels; Synopsis, Critical Notes and Concordance*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1988.

Klutz, Todd. Review of Clinton Wahlen, *Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels*. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 27.5 (2005): 44-46.

___. "The Grammar of Exorcism in the Ancient Mediterranean World" Pages 156-165 in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrew's Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. Edited by Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis. Vol. 63 of *Supplements to Journal for the Study of Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins. Brill, 1999.

Knox, Wilfred Lawrence. "Jewish Liturgical Exorcism." *Harvard Theological Review* 31.3 (July, 1938): 191-203.

Koskenniemi, Erkki. "Miracles of the Devil and His Assistants in Early Judaism and their Influence on the Gospel of Matthew." Pages 84-97 in *Evil and the Devil*. Edited by Ida Fröhlich and Erkki Koskenniemi. Volume 481 of *Library of New Testament Studies*. Edited by Mark Goodacre. T&T Clark, 2013.

___, "The Traditional Roles Inverted: Jesus and the Devil's Attack." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 52 (2008): 261-268.

Kovacs, Judith L. "'Now Shall the Ruler of This World Be Driven Out': Jesus' Death as Cosmic Battle in John 12:20-36." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 114.2 (1995): 227-247.

Kraus, Thomas J. "Manuscripts with the *Lord's Prayer* – They Are More Than Simply Witnesses To That Text Itself." Pages 227-266 in *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World*. Edited by T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas. Vol. 2 of *Texts and Editions for New Testament Study*. Edited by S. E. Porter and W. J. Porter. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

___. ""Septuaginta-Psalm 90 in apotropäischer Verwendung: Vorüberlegungen für eine kritische Edition und (bisheriges) Datenmaterial." *Biblische Notizen* 125 (2005): 39-73.

Kwon, Junghoo. "Cyprian, Origen and the Lord's Prayer: Theological Diversities Between Latin West and Greek East in the Third Century." *Asia Journal of Theology* 26.1 (2012): 56-87.

Laato, Antti. "The Devil in the Old Testament." Pages 1-22 in *Evil and the Devil*. Edited by Ida Fröhlich and Erkki Koskenniemi. Volume 481 of *Library of New Testament Studies*. Edited by Mark Goodacre. T&T Clark, 2013.

La'da, Csaba A. and Amphilochios Papathomas. "A Greek Papyrus Amulet from the Duke Collection with Biblical Excerpts." *Bulletin of the American Society of Papryologists* 41 (2004): 93-113.

Lange, Armin. "Considerations Concerning the 'Spirit of Impurity' in Zech 13:2." Pages 254- 268 in *Die Dämonen: die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt*. Edited by Hermann Lichtenberger, Armin Lange, and K. F. Diethard Römheld. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2003.

___. "The Essene Position on Magic and Divination." Pages 377-435 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*. Edited by Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen. Vol. 23 of *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*. Edited by F. García Martínez and A. S. Van Der Woude. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Langton, Edward. *Essentials of Demonology*. London: The Epworth Press, 1949.

___ *Satan, A Portrait*. London: Skeffington & Sons, LTD, 1946.

Lanier, David E. "The Lord's Prayer: Matt 6:9-13 – A Thematic and Semantic Structural Analysis." *Criswell Theological Review* 6.1 (1992): 57-72.

Lanpher, James E. Review of Graham H. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus*. *The Journal of Religion* 76.1 (Jan., 1996): 103-105.

Levine, Amy-Jill. "Tobit." Pages 10-30 in *The New Oxford Annotated Apocrypha: New Revised Standard Version*. Edited by Michael D. Coogan. Oxford University Press, 2010.

Lichtenberger, Hermann. "Ps 91 und die Exorzismen in 11QPsAp^{a}." Pages 416-421 in in *Die Dämonen: die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt*. Edited by Hermann Lichtenberger, Armin Lange, and K. F. Diethard Römheld. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2003.

Lincicum, David "Scripture and Apotropaism in the Second Temple Period." *Biblische Notizen* 138 (2008): 63-87.

Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians*. Word Biblical Commentary 42. Nelson Reference and Electronic, 1990.

Lohmeyer, Ernst. *"Our Father": An Introduction to the Lord's Prayer*. Harper and Row, 1966.

Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*. Translated by J. E. Crouch. Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

___ *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*. Translated by Wilhelm C. Linss. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989.

Machiela, Daniel A. *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*. Volume 79 of *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Macintosh, A. A. "A Consideration of Hebrew גער." *Vetus Testamentum* 19 (Oct., 1969): 471-479.

Manson, Thomas W. "The Lord's Prayer." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 38 (1955-56): 99-113, 436-448.

Marcus, Joel. *Mark 8-16*. Anchor Yale Bible Commentary 27a. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Martin, Michael W. "The Poetry of the Lord's Prayer: A Study in Poetic Device." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 134.2 (2015): 347-372.

Mastin, B. A. "The Inscriptions Written on Plaster at Kuntillet 'Ajrud." *Vetus Testamentum* 59 (2009): 99-115.

Mathewson, David. "The Apocalyptic Vision of Jesus According to the Gospel of Matthew: Reading Matthew 3:16-4:11 Intertextually." *Tyndale Bulletin* 62.1 (2011): 89-108.

Maynard, Arthur H. "TI EMOI KAI ΣOI." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 582-586.

Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol. 2: *Mentor, Message, and Miracles*. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1994.

Metzger, Bruce M. "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah." *Journal of Biblical Literature* (Dec. 1, 1951): 297-307.

Meyer, Marvin and Richard Smith, eds. *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power*. Harper Collins, 1994.

Milton, Edward A. "'Deliver Us from the Evil Imagination': Matt 6:13B in Light of the Jewish Doctrine of the YÊṢER HÂRÂ'." *Religious Studies and Theology* 13-14 (1995): 52-67.

Montgomery, James A. "Some Early Amulets from Palestine." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 31:3 (1911) 272-281.

Mounce, William D. *Basics of Biblical Greek*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2003.

Murphy, Frederick J. *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*. Oxford University Press, 1993.

Naveh, Joseph. "Fragments of an Aramaic Magic Book from Qumran." *Israel Exploration Journal* 48 (1998): 252-261.

Nemoy, Leon, ed. *Pesikta Rabbati: Discourses for Feasts, Fasts, and Special Sabbaths*. Translated by William G. Braude. 2 vols., Yale Judaica 18. Yale University Press, 1968.

Neusner, Jacob. *Sifre to Deuteronomy: An Analytical Translation, vol. 2*. Brown Judaic Studies 101. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholar's Press, 1987.

Newsom, Carol A. "The Sage in the Literature of Qumran: The Function of the *MAŚKÎL*." Pages 373-382 in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue. Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Nielsen, Helge Kjar. Review of Graham H. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus*. *Journal of Theological Studies* 45 (1994): 646-647.

Nitzan, Bilhah. *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 12. Edited by F. García Martínez and A.S. Van Der Woude. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

___. "Hymns from Qumran – 4Q510-4Q511." Pages 53-63 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport. Vol. 10 of *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*. Edited by F. García Martínez and A.S. Van Der Woude. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992.

Nolland, John. *Luke 9:21-18:34*. Word Biblical Commentary 35b. Nelson Reference & Electronic, 1993.

Nongbri, Brent. "The Lord's Prayer and XMΓ: Two Christian Papyrus Amulets." *Harvard Theological Review* 104.1 (January, 2011): 59-68.

O'Neill, J. C. "The Lord's Prayer." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 51 (1993): 3-25.

Orchard, Bernard. *Matthew, Luke and Mark: The Griesbach Solution to the Synoptic Question, vol. 1*. Manchester: Koinonia Press, 1977.

Orlov, Andrei A. "Veneration Motif in the Temptation Narrative of the Gospel of Matthew: Lessons from the Enochic Tradition." Paper presented at the Seventh Enochic Seminar "Enochic Influence on the Synoptic Gospels." Camaldoli, Italy, July 25, 2013.

___. *Dark Mirrors: Azazel and Satanael in Early Jewish Demonology*. State University of New York Press, 2011.

Oshima, Takayoshi. "A Neo-Assyrian Cylinder Seal with a Healing Scene in a Reed Hut." *Bible Lands E-Review* S/1 (2013): 1-8.

Pagels, Elaine. *The Origin of Satan*. Penguin Books, 1995.

___. "The Social History of Satan, Part II" *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 62.1 (1994):17-58.

Pajunen, Mika S. "Qumranic Psalm 91: A Structural Analysis." Pages 591-605 in *Scripture and Tradition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Rajja Sollamo*. Edited by Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 126. Edited by J. J. Collins; Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Penny, Douglas L. and Michael O. Wise. "By the Power of Beelzebub: An Aramaic Incantation Formula from Qumran (4Q560)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113.4 (1994): 627-650.

Petuchowski, Jakob J. "Jewish Prayer Texts of the Rabbinic Period." Pages 21-44 in *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy*. Edited by J. J. Petuchowski and M. Brocke. London: Burns and Oates, 1978.

Philostratus. *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. 2005. Translated by Christopher P. Jones. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Pilch, John J. Review of Eric Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity*. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 66 (2004): 331-332.

Piper, Ronald A. "Satan, Demons, and the Absence of Exorcisms in the Fourth Gospel." Pages 253-278 in *Christology, Controversy, and Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole*. Supplements of *Novum Testamentum* XCIX. Edited by D. G. Horrell and C. M Tuckett. Brill, 2000.

___. Review of Graham H. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus*. *Theological Book Review* 6.3 (1994): 42.

Pitre, Brant. *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of the Atonement*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II. Reihe 204. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Plato. *Republic*. 2013. Translated by Chris Emlyn-Jones et al. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Plumer, Eric. "The Absence of Exorcisms in the Fourth Gospel." *Biblica* 78 (1997): 350-368.

Porter, Stanley E. "Mt 6:13 and Lk 11:4 'Lead Us Not Into Temptation'" *Expository Times* 101.12 S (1990): 359-362.

Puech, Émile. *Discoveries in the Judean Desert XXXVII:Qumran Grotte 4. XXVII (4Q550- 4Q575a, 4Q580-4Q587, et Appendices)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009.

___ "Les deux derniers Psaumes davidiques du ritual d'exorcisme: 11Q11PsAp^{a} IV 4-V14." Pages 64-89 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport. Vol. 10 of *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*. Edited by F. García Martínez and A.S. Van Der Woude. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992.

___. "11QPsAp^{a}: Un ritual d'exorcismes. Essai de reconstruction." *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1990): 377-408.

Reed, Annette Yoshiko. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Reynolds, Bennie III. "Understanding the Demonologies of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Accomplishments and Directions for the Future" *Religion Compass* 7.4 (2013): 103-114.

Rordorf, Willy. "The Lord's Prayer in the Light of its Liturgical Use in the Early Church." *Studia Liturgica* 14.1 (1980/81): 1-19.

Rosen-Zvi, Ishay. *Demonic Desires: "Yetzer Hara" and the Problem of Evil in Late Antiquity*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

Rothschild, Clare K. "Historical Criticism." Pages 9-41 in *Methods for Luke*. Edited by Joel B. Green. Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Rudman, Dominic. "Authority and Right of Disposal in Luke 4.6" *New Testament Studies* 50.1 (January, 2004): 77-86.

Rusam, Dietrich. "Sah Jesus wirklich den Satan vom Himmel fallen (Lk 10.18)? Auf der Suche nach einem neuen Differenzkriterium." *New Testament Studies* 50.1 (January, 2004): 87-105.

Sanders, James A. "A Liturgy for Healing the Stricken (11QPsAp^{a} = 11Q11)." Pages 216-233 in *Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 4A. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1997.

___. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan IV: The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11. (11Qps^{a})*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

Schiavo, Luigi. "The Temptation of Jesus: The Eschatological Battle and the New Ethic of the First Followers of Jesus in Q." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 25.2 (2002): 141-164.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. and Michael D. Swartz. *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts from the Cairo Genizah: Selected Texts from Taylor-Schechter Box K1*. Semetic Texts and Studies 1. Scheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

Schmutzer, Andrew J. "Palm 91: Refuge, Protection and its Use in the New Testament." Pages 85-108 in *The Psalms: Language for All Seasons of the Soul*. Edited by Andrew J. Schmutzer and David M. Howard Jr. Moody Publishers, 2013.

Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. Revised and Edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Martin Goodman. Vol. 3:1. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986.

Scott, Bernard Brandon. "Jesus as Sage: An Innovating Voice in Common Wisdom." Pages 399- 415 in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue. Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Shepherd, J.M. Review of Eric Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity*. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 28.5 (2004): 218-219.

Smoak, Jeremy D. "May YHWH Bless You and Keep You from Evil: The Rhetorical Argument of Ketef Hinnom I and the Form of Prayers for Deliverance in the Psalms." *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 12 (2012): 202-236.

Sorensen, Eric. *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II.157 Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2002.

Sousa, Matthew E. "The 'Johannine Thunderbolt' in Luke 10:22: Toward an Appreciation of Luke's Narrative Sequence." *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 7.1 (2013): 97-113.

Spencer, Aída Besançon. "The Denial of the Good News and the Ending of Mark." *Bulletin of Biblical Research* 17.2 (2007): 269-283.

Spittler, Russell P. "Testament of Job." Pages 829-868 in vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by. J. H. Charlesworth. Doubleday, 1983.

Sproston, Wendy E. "Satan in the Fourth Gospel." Pages 307-311 in *Studia Biblica 1978: II. Papers on the Gospels*. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 2. Sheffield, 1980.

Stanton, Graham N. Review of Graham H. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus*. *Review of Biblical Literature* (Jan., 2000).

Stec, David M. *The Targum of Psalms: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes*. Vol. 16 of *The Aramaic Bible*. Edited by Kevin Cathcart, Michael Maher, and Martin McNamara. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Stegemann, Hartmut. "The Number of Psalms in *1QHodayot*^{a} and Some of their Sections." Pages 191-234 in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by. Esther G. Chazon. Vol. 48 of *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*. Edited by F. García Martínez. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Stegner, William R. "Wilderness and Testing in the Scrolls and in Matthew 4:1-11." *Biblical Research* 12 (1967): 18-27.

Stenschke, Christoph. Review of Eric Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity*. *European Journal of Theology* 13 (2004): 61-63.

Stevenson, Kenneth W. *The Lord's Prayer: A Text in Tradition*. SCM Press, 2004.

Stokes, Ryan E. "What is a Demon, What is an Evil Spirit, and What is a Satan?" Pages 259-272 in *Das Böse, der Teufel und Dämonen – Evil, the Devil, and Demons: Dualistic Characteristics in the Religion of Israel, Ancient Judaism, and Christianity*. Edited by Jan Dochhorn, Susanne Rudnig-Zelt, and Benjamin Wold. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Stone, Michael E. and Jonas C. Greenfield. "The Prayer of Levi." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112.2 (1993): 247-266.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "The Demonic World of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 51-70 in *Evil and the Devil*. Edited by Ida Fröhlich and Erkki Koskenniemi. Volume 481 of *Library of New Testament Studies*. Edited by Mark Goodacre. T&T Clark, 2013.

___. "'Protect Them from the Evil One' (John 14:15): Light from the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 139-160 in *John, Qumran, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Sixty Years of Discovery and Debate*. Edited by Mary L. Coloe and Tom Thatcher. *Early Judaism and Its Literature* 32. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

___. *1 Enoch 91-108*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Walter de Gruyter, 2007.

___. "Pleas for Deliverance from the Demonic in Early Jewish Texts." Pages 55-73 in *Studies in Jewish Prayer*. Edited by Robert Hayward and Brad Embry. Oxford University Press, 2005.

___. "The Origins of Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Interpretation of Genesis 6:1-4 in the Second and Third Centuries B.C.E." Pages 87-118 in *The Fall of the Angels*. Edited by Christoph Auffarth and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. Volume 6 of *Themes in Biblical Narrative*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

___. "Giant Mythology and Demonology: From the Ancient Near East to the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 318-338 in *Die Dämonen: die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt*. Edited by Hermann Lichtenberger, Armin Lange, and K. F. Diethard Römheld. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2003.

Subramanian, J. Samuel. *The Synoptic Gospels and the Psalms as Prophecy*. Library of New Testament Studies 351. Edited by Mark Goodacre. T&T Clark, 2007.

Sukenik, E. L., ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1955.

Tate, Marvin E. *Psalms 50-100*. Word Biblical Commentary 20. Nelson Reference & Electronic, 1990.

Taylor, Archibald B. "Decision in the Desert: The Temptation of Jesus in Light of Deuteronomy." *Interpretation* 14 (July, 1960): 300-309.

Theobald, Michael. "'Ich sah den Satan aus dem Himmel stürzen…' Überlieferungskritische Beobachtungen zu Lk 10, 18-20." *Biblische Notizen* 49.2 (2005): 174-190.

Tigchelaar, Eibert. "The Poetry of the *Wiles of the Wicked Woman* (4Q184)." *Revue de Qumran* 25 (2012): 621-633.

___. "The Evil Inclination in the Dead Sea Scrolls, with a Re-Edition of 4Q468I (4QSectarian Text?)." Pages 347-357 in *Empsychoi Logoi: Religious Innovations in Antiquity: Studies in Honor of Pieter Willem van der Horst*. Edited by A. Houtman, A. de Jong, and M. Misset-van de Weg. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 73. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

___. Review of Clinton Wahlen, *Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels*. *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38 (2007): 155.

Tonstad, Sigve K. "'The Father of Lies,' 'the Mother of Lies,' and the Death of Jesus (John 12:20-20-33)." Pages 193-208 in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*. Edited by R. Bauckham and C. Mosser; Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2008.

Trudinger, Paul. "The 'Our Father' in Matthew as Apocalyptic Eschatology." *Downside Review* 107.366 (1989): 49-54.

Twelftree, Graham H. *In the Name of Jesus: Exorcism Among the Early Christians*. Baker Academic, 2007.

___. "Exorcism in the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics." Pages 135-143 in *Jesus in the Johannine Tradition*. Edited by R. T. Fortna and T. Thatcher. Westminster John Know Press, 2001.

___. *Jesus the Miracle Worker*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1999.

___. *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II. Reihe 54 Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1993.

___. *Christ Triumphant: Exorcism Then and Now*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1985.

Van Bruggen, Jacob. "The Lord's Prayer and Textual Criticism." *Calvin Theological Journal* 17 (1982): 78-87.

Van der Ploeg, Johannes P. M. "Un petit rouleau de psaumes apocryphes (11QPsAp[a])." Pages 128-139 in *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt, Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn zum 65. Geburstag*. Edited by G. Jeremiah, J.-W. Kuhn, and H. Stegemann. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.

___. "Le Psaume XCI dans une recension de Qumran." *Revue Biblique* 72 (1965): 210-217.

Van Henten, Jan W. "The First Testing of Jesus: A Reading of Mark 1:12-13." *New Testament Studies* 45.3 (July, 1999): 349-366.

Van Tilborg, S. "A Form-Criticism of the Lord's Prayer." *Novum Testamentum* 14 (1972): 94- 105.

VanderKam, James C. "The Demons in the *Book of Jubilees*." Pages 339-364 in *Die Dämonen: die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt*. Edited by Hermann Lichtenberger, Armin Lange, and K. F. Diethard Römheld. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2003.

___. *The Book of Jubilees*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

___. "The Angel Story in the Book of Jubilees." Pages 151-170 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon and Michael Stone. Vol. 31 of *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*. Edited by F. García Martínez and A. S. Van Der Woude. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Vögtle, Anton. "The Lord's Prayer: A Prayer for Jews and Christians?" Pages 93-117 in *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy*. Edited by J. J. Petuchowski and M. Brocke. London: Burns and Oates, 1978.

Vollenweider, Samuel. "'Ich sah den Satan wie einen Blitz vom Himmel fallen' (Lk 10 18)." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 79 (1988): 187-202.

Wahlen, Clinton. *Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II. Reihe 185 Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

Webster, Brian. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXIX: Indices and an Introduction to the* Discoveries in the Judaean Desert *Series*. Edited by Emanuel Tov. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.

Weeks, Stuart, Simon Gathercole, and Loren Stuckenbruck, eds. *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions with Synopsis, Concordances, and Annotated Texts in Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Syriac.* Fontes et Subsidia ad Bibliam pertinentes 3. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.

Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy 1-11.* The Anchor Bible vol. 5. New York: Doubleday, 1970.

Wenham, David. , "The Sevenfold Form of the Lord's Prayer in Matthew's Gospel." *Expository Times* 121.8 (2010): 377-382.

Williams, Travis B. "Bringing Method to Madness: Examining the Style of the Longer Ending of Mark." *Bulletin of Biblical Research* 20.3 (2010): 397-418.

Wilson, Alistair I. "The Disciples' Prayer: A Fresh Look at a Familiar Text." *The Reformed Theological Review* 57 (1998): 136-150.

Wintermute, O. S. "Jubilees (Second Century B. C.): A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 35-142 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol. 2.* Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Doubleday, 1985.

Wold, Benjamin G. "Apotropaic Prayer and the Matthean Lord's Prayer." Pages 101-112 in *Das Böse, der Teufel und Dämonen – Evil, the Devil, and Demons: Dualistic Characteristics in the Religion of Israel, Ancient Judaism, and Christianity.* Edited by Jan Dochhorn, Susanne Rudnig-Zelt, and Benjamin Wold. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

___. "Demonizing Sin? The Evil Inclination in *4QInstruction*." Forthcoming in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity.* Edited by L. T. Stuckenbruck and C. Keith. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Wright, Archie T. "Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism: The Watcher Tradition as a Background to the Demonic Pericopes in the Gospels." *Henoch* 28 (2006): 141-159.

___. *The Origin of Evil Spirits: The Reception of Genesis 6:1-4 in Early Jewish Literature.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II.198 Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

___. "Prayer and Incantation in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 75-88 in *Studies in Jewish Prayer.* Edited by Robert Hayward and Brad Embry. Oxford University Press, 2005.

Wright, N. T. "The Lord's Prayer as a Paradigm of Christian Prayer." Pages 132-154 in *Into God's Presence: Prayer in the New Testament*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2001.

___. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Vol. 2 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.