

Apotropaic Prayer and the Matthean Lord's Prayer

Benjamin Wold

(in *The Devil, Demons and Dualism* (eds. B. Wold, J. Dochhorn, S. Rudnig-Zelt; WUNT2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014)

Among the many studies on early Jewish demonology that are concerned to address the synoptic tradition a great deal has been written about exorcisms and incantations while comparatively little about apotropaic prayer. This observation is especially noteworthy when demonologies preserved in the Qumran scrolls are assessed because apotropaic traditions are nearly as well preserved as exorcistic ones.¹ While a number of articles may be pointed to that address the Qumran apotropaic traditions' locations among magical texts and Jewish liturgy² it is difficult to find more than passing reference to early Jewish apotropaic prayer and the synoptic gospels.³

In the synoptic gospels exorcistic traditions are far more prevalent than apotropaic ones and yet there are at least a few possible instances of apotropaic formulations in them. Two of these are found in Matthew: at the end of the Lord's Prayer (6:13) and the use of Psalm 91 in the Temptation (4:1-11; cf. Lk 4:1-13). In 1966 David Flusser published a groundbreaking article on Jewish apotropaic prayer in which he gives attention to *Aramaic Levi* (4QLev^b ar = 4Q213^a) and the *Plea for Deliverance* (11QPs^a = 11Q5).⁴ Flusser comments on Matthew's version of the Lord's Prayer that although it does not belong to the apotropaic type common matrices found between *Aramaic Levi* and the *Plea for Deliverance*, as well as several other ancient Jewish prayers, "help [us] to understand the last sentence of

1. P.S. Alexander, "The Demonology of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment, vol. 2* (eds. P.W. Flint & J.C. Vanderkam; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 331-53, esp. at 344-48.

2. See esp. E. Eshel, "'Genres of Magical Texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Die Dämonen – Demons* (eds. H. Lichtenberger, A. Lange, K.F. Diethard Römheld; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003) 395-414; "Apotropaic Prayers in the Second Temple Period," in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E.G. Chazon; STDJ 48; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 69-88; and her doctoral dissertation, *Demonology in Palestine during the Second Temple Period* (Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1999) [Hebrew].

3. See L.T. Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance from the Demonic in Early Jewish Texts," in *Studies in Jewish Prayer* (eds. R. Hayward & B. Embry; JSS Sup 17; Oxford: OUP, 2005) 55-74; M. Henze, "Psalm 91 in Premodern Interpretation and at Qumran," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005) who discusses Luke's Temptation at 185-6.

4. D. Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish 'Apotropaic' Prayers," *IEJ* 16 (1966): 194-205 [repr. in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988) 214-25.] 4Q213a see M.E. Stone & J. Greenfield, *Qumran Cave 4. XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*, in G. Brooke, et al. (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996) 25ff.; 11Q5 see F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar & A.S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11. II: 11Q2-8, 11Q20-31*, in F. García Martínez et al. (DJD XXIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998); J.A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPs^a)* (DJD IV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965) 76.

the Lord's Prayer... 'And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.'"⁵ What precisely this "evil" is and the degree to which it is reified is not entirely clear. Indeed whether or not evil is personified is determinative when applying the label "apotropaic." 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 what causes all temptation.⁶ 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.⁷

Flusser's comments on Matthew's prayer have been noted, but to my knowledge little more has been said on the topic. In the discussion to follow I shall adjudicate whether or not Matthew's version of the prayer should be described as "apotropaic" and suggest how this might fit with Matthew's demonology. As a necessary first step in assessing Flusser's conclusion attention to definitions and categories are assessed. In particular the *Plea for Deliverance* and the *Prayer of Levi* will be considered since they are so important for orienting Flusser's comments on the prayer. In conclusion, it shall be suggested how apotropaic prayers in early Jewish literature may inform interpretations of Matthew 6:13.

I. Defining Apotropaic Prayer in Early Judaism

Flusser describes one of the main characteristics of apotropaic prayer as petitioning "God to avert personal dangers" and "grant heavenly bliss."⁸ Esther Eshel, an important contributor to the study of apotropaic prayer in the period, is clear that apotropaic prayers and hymns in this context are a subcategory of demonology along with exorcism and incantation texts. She describes apotropaic prayers as a "request [for] God's protection from evil spirits."⁹ Elsewhere she says that they are "intended for protection against ... evil ones."¹⁰

Eshel distinguishes further between different apotropaic prayers and hymns by addressing them under four sub-headings.¹¹ When categorizing these traditions she is especially concerned to distinguish between apotropaic prayers vs. exorcisms as well as

5. Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish," 202 devotes considerable attention to comparing these prayers with ones by Rabbi Judah the Prince esp. in Bab. Talmud *Berakhoth* 60b.

6. Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish," 201 "Man comes into temptation because the evil inclination rules over him. If God will deliver us from the rule of the evil inclination, then He will deliver us from evil, which causes all temptation."

7. For excellent treatments of the reification of evil inclination see I. Rosen-Zvi, "Two Rabbinic Inclinations? Rethinking a Scholarly Dogma," in *JSJ* 39 (2008): 1-27; I. Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires: 'Yetzer Hara' and the Problem of Evil in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011).

8. Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish," 201.

9. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 69.

10. Eshel, "Genres," 396.

11. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 70-86. Eshel's four divisions are: (1) Biblical antecedents (Priestly Blessing, Ps 91); (2) non-sectarian apotropaic prayers (*Aramaic Levi*; *Plea for Deliverance*; Jubilees 6:1-7, 12:19-20); (3) sectarian apotropaic prayers (4Q510-4Q511; 4Q444; 6Q18; 1QH^a iv); and (4) incantation texts (4Q560; 8Q5; 11Q11); cf. Stuckenbruck, "Plea for Deliverance from the Demonic".

"sectarian" vs. "non-sectarian" materials. The *Plea for Deliverance* and the *Prayer of Levi*, of particular concern here, are categorized by Eshel as non-sectarian apotropaic prayers along with two passages from *Jubilees* (6:1-7, 12:19-20). When Eshel compares and contrasts apotropaic with incantation texts she finds that in both types of texts demonic beings are viewed similarly: demons control the body, spirit and mind. Another commonality relates to the aetiology of demonic beings: both types of texts rely on the Watcher tradition.¹² However apotropaic prayers are different from incantations in that they petition God to protect one from evil rather than address the evil force directly.¹³ Eshel also observes that apotropaic prayers seek to limit the destruction of an evil spirit in the present whereas incantation texts seek to stop the harm from "now on and forever."¹⁴ This last observation is important for considering the possibility of apotropaic prayer in the context of Matthew's gospel.

Eshel makes impressive strides toward defining apotropaic prayers in early Judaism. One question that arises is whether it is appropriate to refer to incantations and apotropaic texts as "genres" as Eshel does. If "genre" is an appropriate designation perhaps it should be used in a very loose sense.¹⁵ Indeed it is notable that Eshel writes about both apotropaic "hymns and prayers" and uses the terms interchangeably at times. If we are to agree or disagree with Flusser that the Matthew's prayer does not belong to the apotropaic type, delineating more precisely whether apotropaic prayers are a genre is crucial.¹⁶ I would propose that apotropaic petitions should be discussed as a feature of some liturgical works, whether hymns or prayers, and not as a genre per se. Essentially apotropaic petitions are directed to God to deliver one from demonic beings, a term that itself needs attention, and their destruction. They occur in early Jewish liturgical literature, especially in prayers, and when found at Qumran are not limited to the so-called *Yahad* documents.

II. The *Plea for Deliverance* and *Prayer of Levi*

The *Plea for Deliverance* is one of several prayers that Eshel categorizes as apotropaic and is a plea that has come to play a central role in discussions about protection from evil.¹⁷

12. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 86-7; For the relation of Qumran demonology to the Watcher tradition see esp. Alexander, "The Demonology of the Dead Sea Scrolls" and L.T. Stuckenbruck, "Giant Mythology and Demonology," 318-38.

13. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 87-8; see also "Genres," 413. Apotropaic prayers do not adjure evil forces as incantations do—Qumran incantations explicitly use the term "I adjure" (משביע).

14. Eshel, "Genres," 413.

15. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 86; the title of her article "Genres of Magical Texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls" also raises questions about the use of "genre" in reference to apotropaic prayer.

16. Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish," 202 moves in this direction when he writes: "[i]t is natural that an 'apotropaic' prayer, like other types of prayer, is not exempt from other motifs; prayers of another kind can as well contain 'apotropaic' sentences." The *Plea for Deliverance* and the *Prayer of Levi* also are not as a whole apotropaic and when Flusser brings observations about "apotropaic sentences" to bear on the Mt 6:13 he still interprets "evil" as a non-apotropaic element.

17. See M.T. Brand, *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and its Nature* (JAJS 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013) 207-14; Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 47.

However, when the preceding definition of apotropaic prayer is applied to the *Plea for Deliverance* questions arise about its fit. Indeed the appropriateness of this categorization depends on the interpretation of the prayer and its designations for evil, especially as they occur in the terms *שטן* and *יצר רע*.

The *Plea for Deliverance* serves as the beginning point for Flusser's 1966 article. In it are references to evil, evil beings and products of evil. Attention will only be given here to a few of the final lines of the prayer found in 11Q5 xix lines 1-18 (cf. par. 11Q6 15–16).¹⁸ The *Plea for Deliverance* is structured on Psalm 51, and at lines 15-16 alludes to Psalm 119:133 and replaces "iniquity" (*אָוֹן*) with *שטן* and *רוח טמאה*. Lines 13-16 read:¹⁹

Forgive me my sins, O Lord [*Tetragram*], 14 and cleanse me from my iniquity. Grant me a spirit of faith and knowledge, and let me not stumble 15 in transgression. Let not S/satan [*שטן*] rule over me [*אל תשלט בי שטן*] nor an unclean spirit [*רוח טמאה*]; let neither pain nor the evil 16 inclination [*יצר רע*] possess my bones [*ירשו בעצמי*].

Identifying the relationship between and meaning of *שטן*, "unclean spirit," and "evil inclination" is crucial to understanding the purpose of this prayer. The result of one's interpretation determines whether this is a prayer for protection from evil forces or for help for the addressee to overcome a non-personified evil inclination.

The coupling of *שטן* and "unclean spirit" in these lines have received considerable attention from Armin Lange. While his point of departure is the "spirits of impurity" in Zechariah 13:2, an impressive number of other passages are treated as well, one of which is the *Plea for Deliverance*.²⁰ Lange is clear that the unclean spirit here is not a state of mind, but rather a demonic being.²¹ Moreover Lange understands that *שטן* is used indeterminately and that "both 'satan' and the 'unclean spirit' describe different types of demonic beings by whom the praying person fears to be ruled."²²

Lange argues that "pain" and "transgression" are further manifestations of demonic rule over the petitioner, which take the form of "sins," "iniquity," and "transgression."

18. The prayer is not dominated by apotropaic elements, in the preceding lines: the author extols God for his compassion and mercies on all living creatures (ll. 1-9), and also thanks God for saving him from death caused by his sins (ll. 10-11).

19. Lange, "Consideration Concerning," 262 argues that the *Prayer of Levi* is literarily dependent on the *Plea for Deliverance*; the *Prayer of Levi* is presented here to further illustrate the personification of evil in the *Plea for Deliverance*.

20. Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 57-8 also views Zech 13:2 as formative.

21. A. Lange, "Considerations Concerning the 'Spirits of Impurity' in Zech 13:2," in *Die Dämonen – Demons* (eds. H. Lichtenberger, A. Lange, K.F. Diethard Römheld; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003) 261; Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish," 205 refers to the "evil inclination" and understands that this is associated with unclean spirits, which emerge from Satan, and cause pain and disease. However Flusser explains too that this "[d]isease, in turn, was seen as a result of sin, which again is a product of man's evil inclination."

22. Lange, "Consideration," 261; in support of reading *שטן* indeterminately he cites Num 22:22, 32; 1Kgs 5:18; Job 1:6-12; 2:1-10; Zech 3:1-2; 1Chr 21:1; *Jub* 23:29; 46:2; 50:5; 4QDib-Ham 1-2 iv 12; 4Q213a 1 I 17. The *Similitudes of Enoch* also support this reading (esp. *אֲבִי־רִיבְרִי* in *1En* 40:7; cf. *1En* 53:3; 56:1; 62:11; 63:1; 65:6). Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 58 comments that the "juxtaposition with 'unclean spirit' may suggest that 'satan' is not a proper name".

Therefore the one praying seeks assistance directly from God in the form of a "different mental attitude"—by which he means the "spirit of faith and knowledge" in line 14—rather than, for instance, angelic assistance or direct divine intervention. The demons exert influence vis-à-vis negative attitudes and qualities and what is needed to counter them is "a different *orientation* of the praying person."²³

Lange indicates disagreement with Flusser about the interpretation of the unclean spirit. He footnotes Flusser as an example of the viewpoint that the unclean spirit is a state of mind and Lange is right that this is the general impression given by Flusser.²⁴ However it would seem that Flusser also agrees that the unclean spirit is in fact an evil spirit.²⁵ A more clearly identifiable difference between how these two scholars understand the unclean spirit is that Flusser sees it as having emerged from Satan, while Lange understands "satan" as indeterminate and a fellow demon.²⁶ It is more how $\eta\psi$ is interpreted that distinguishes Flusser and Lange and less so their understandings of the unclean spirit. Whereas Lange views "satan" and the unclean spirit as two demons, Flusser concludes that Satan and the evil inclination are identical and that both lead one to temptation and sin.²⁷

How $\eta\psi$ and the "unclean spirit" are understood is critical to resolving another interpretive difficulty in the *Plea for Deliverance*. The petition for protection from them is intertwined with a request for the forgiveness of sins and freedom from the evil inclination and pain. Evil in the passage is both personified and esoteric; it is both internal and external. That $\eta\psi$ and the "unclean spirit" are demonic beings is convincing, as indeed is the view that the relationship of these beings to other expressions of evil is about causation. However, and importantly, Lange does not view the *Plea for Deliverance* as a prayer for protection from these evil forces, but rather as a petition for assistance in overcoming an *orientation*.

Flusser does not adequately resolve how the evil inclination, "Satan," and the unclean spirit relate to one another. While he expresses the view that the unclean spirit is an evil spirit, he would seem to gloss over distinctions between Satan, the evil spirit and the evil inclination. Indeed he understands at one point that Satan and the evil inclination are the same.²⁸ In terms of identifying the purpose of the *Plea for Deliverance*, Flusser would seem to put most emphasis on it being a prayer for deliverance from the evil inclination. Asking God for help to overcome the evil inclination is surely different than a request for assistance to overcome S/satan and evil spirits.

23. Lange, "Considerations," 262, italics mine.

24. Lange, "Considerations," 261 fn. 33 cites the entire article and not a specific page.

25. Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish," 205 "These texts reveal that the original 'spirit of impurity' had obtained the meaning of 'impure spirit', synonymous with 'evil spirit', in the popular trend of Jewish piety at the time of Jesus. In the Qumrân Psalms Scroll too, the term 'spirit of impurity' bears not the rabbinic but the popular connotation."

26. Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish," 205.

27. Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish," 199-200 Flusser compares with a private prayer by Rabbi Judah the Prince (Bab. Talmud *Berakhoth* 60b): "May it be thy will ... to make us familiar with Thy Torah and to make us adhere to Thy commandments and do not bring us into the grasp of sin, transgression and iniquity, nor the grasp of temptation and disgrace, Let the evil inclination not rule over us, Keep us away from a bad man and a bad companion."

28. Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish," 199-200 addresses the meaning of "Satan," focusing on *Baba Bathra* 16a, and concludes that "Satan, evil inclination, and the Angel of Death are identical; in any case, both Satan and the evil inclination bring man to fall."

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 the *Plea for Deliverance* should even be referred to as apotropaic. According to Lange the demonic beings manifest their rule over the praying person by pain and the evil inclination. One might summarize that the response of the prayer, in this interpretation, is to deal with the symptom rather than the cause. It is ultimately the *orientation* that is addressed and not the demons. Indeed if the *Plea for Deliverance* were straightforwardly apotropaic then it would petition God to ward off the demons.

Pace Lange, the *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.²⁹ That demonic beings afflict people with pain and suffering can be easily justified (4QExorcism ar = 4Q560). The purpose of the *Plea for Deliverance* is to be delivered from demons, the cause, in order to avoid pain and the evil inclination from ruling over the addressee.³⁰ The request to be "cleansed from iniquity" and be "given the spirit of faith and knowledge" serve as counterparts to "stumbling" and being afflicted by demons.³¹ While evil is multifaceted in this prayer, as are the petitions in regard to it, the apotropaic elements should be seen as central.

The *yetzer ra* in the *Plea for Deliverance* is not an inward part of a person, but parallel to "satan" and "unclean spirit" and therefore also an outward force. According to Eibert Tigchelaar such personification is part of a broader development demonizing sin (cf. 4Q436 1 i-ii).³² This is similar to *Barkhi Nafshi* where the *yetzer ra* is rebuked (גערטה יצר רע).³³ On the one hand this may be describing the warding off of a demonic being or evil spirit.³⁴ On the other hand it is described along with negative tendencies (e.g. stiff neck;

29. Stuckenbruck, "Pleas for Deliverance," 57 "Here we have to do with the most classic of a prayer against the demonic."

30. The verb ירש in the final line of the prayer, ירשו בעצמי ("possess my bones"), has been discussed as having the sense of "control over," see Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 76; cf. Alexander, "The Demonology," 348 "the Community's defence against demonic intrusion is strongly reminiscent of its defence against impurity."

31. Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish," 203 charts a "Pattern of Topics" found in several prayers identified as apotropaic, "protecting from sin" and "forgiving sin" are found in every prayer analysed. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 74 refers to this as Flusser's "typology" and comments that he "detected clusters of these elements in some Second Temple era texts" such as the *Prayer of Levi*, *Plea for Deliverance*, and the Lord's Prayer in Matthew and Luke. That a cluster of motifs may be observed is esp. helpful and yet this typology should not be used to define apotropaic, if this were the case then the Lord's Prayer would in fact be "apotropaic."

32. E.J.C. Tigchelaar, "The Evil Inclination in the Dead Sea Scrolls, with a Re-edition of 4Q468I (4QSectorian Text?)," in *Empsychoi Logoi: Religious Innovations in Antiquity; Studies in Honor of Pieter Willem van der Horst* (eds. A. Houtman, A. de Jong & M. Misset-van de Weg; AJEC 73; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 352.

33. Tigchelaar, "The Evil Inclination," 351 writes: "the verb גער, 'to rebuke', is commonly used with satan or evil spirits, and the question is whether here the verb is used metaphorically, as a mere synonym of הסיר or שלח, 'remove' or 'send away', or in a technical sense." Tigchelaar considers that *yetzer ra* here may belong to the category of vices such as the "adulterousness of the eyes" (cf. CD ii 16).

34. Cf. Zech 3:2 וְיִאמְרָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי־הַשָּׁטָן יִגְעַר יְהוָה בְּךָ הַשָּׁטָן וְיִגְעַר יְהוָה בְּךָ; 1QM xiv 10 וְרוּחֵי חֲבָלוֹ גְעַרְתָּהּ

haughty eyes) and may simply be a personification of vices.³⁵ The study of the personification of evil, whether related to *yetzer* or not, have been the subject of several studies on Qumran demonology.³⁶

The Aramaic *Prayer of Levi* is another, and related, apotropiac prayer that uses שטן indeterminatively.³⁷ In fragment 1 line 17 of the Aramaic *Prayer of Levi* is a petition to God not to allow "any satan to rule over me" (אל תשלט בי כל שטן).³⁸ The Greek *Prayer of Levi*, which corresponds to this, allows us to view the immediate context more fully. Verses 7-12 read:

7 *Make far* from me, O Lord, the unrighteous spirit, and *evil* thought and *fornication*, and *turn* pride *away* from me. 8 Let there be shown to me, O Lord, the holy spirit, and counsel, and *wisdom and knowledge* and grant me *strength*, 9 ... in order to do that which is pleasing to you and *find favour before you*, and to praise your words with me, O Lord. . . . *And that which is pleasant and good before you*. 10 And *let not any satan have power over me*, to make me stray from your path [καὶ μὴ κατισχυσάτω με πᾶς σατανᾶς πλανῆσαί με ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ σου]. 11 And have mercy *upon me, O Lord, and bring me forward, to be your servant* and to minister well to you 12 so that wall of your peace is around me, and let the shelter of your power shelter me from evil [σκεπασάτω με ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ].³⁹

The *Prayer of Levi* requests protection from evil forces (i.e. "any satan") and at this point is nearly identical to the *Plea for Deliverance* in its petition. The request for shelter from "evil" uses the substantive κακός and could be interpreted as "harm" or "ill" and alternatively in the moral sense of "wickedness." Similar questions about the meaning and distinction between "pain" and the "evil inclination" in the *Plea for Deliverance* arise here in regard to the κακός from which the addressee is to be sheltered. Note that κακός is not straightforwardly the same "evil" (ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ) referred to in Matthew 6:13.

A few preliminary comments may be made about the *Plea for Deliverance*, the *Prayer of Levi* and the Matthean Lord's Prayer. First, although time does not allow a

ממנו ובהתרשע אנשי ממשלתו שמרתה נפש פדותכה.

35. Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 47 concludes more firmly than Tigchelaar, stating that the "context points indeed to *yetzer's* identification with and evil tendency rather than a demonic being."

36. See esp. L.T. Stuckenbruck, "Prayers of Deliverance from the Demonic in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature," in *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity, and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity* (eds. I.H. Henderson & G.S. Oegema; JSRZ-St. 2; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 2006) 146-65.

37. Lange, "Considerations," 262 understands that the *Prayer of Levi* is using *Plea for Deliverance*.

38. DJD XXII, 29; Stuckenbruck, "Plea for Deliverance," convincingly sees this expression in the *Prayer of Levi* and *Plea for Deliverance* as part of the same tradition as *Jubilees* 1:20 ("do not let the spirit of Beliar rule over them"), 10:3-6 ("do not let the evil spirits rule over them"), 12:19-20 ("save me from the hands of evil spirits, which rule over the thought of the heart of man").

39. DJD XXII, 32 see also M.E. Stone and J.C. Greenfield's work on the Greek manuscript in, "The Prayer of Levi," *JBL* 112/2 (1993): 247-66, italics represent extant Aramaic portions.

thoroughgoing analysis of the broader context of verses 9-12 of the *Prayer of Levi*, one would be hard pressed to make a case that the entire prayer is apotropaic. In both the *Plea for Deliverance* and the *Prayer of Levi* apotropaic elements are found in longer prayers that are not dominated by apotropaic petitions. Second, both 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."⁴⁰

Finally, while the *Prayer of Levi* is generally requesting to be distanced from unrighteousness, the *Plea for Deliverance* requests forgiveness of sins: "Forgive me my sins, O Lord, and cleanse me from my iniquity." In the Lord's Prayer the request that God forgive debts (Mt 6:12; cf. 6:14-15) precedes the petition to be rescued from evil.

III. Apotropaic Prayer in Matthew

In his study on demonology in Matthew's Gospel, Martin Rese makes a helpful observation which provides context for considering apotropaic prayer there.⁴¹ In Rese's view Matthew's Jesus conquers demons until the end of the era whereas in Mark Jesus' victory over the demons is a sign that the new era has arrived.⁴² If one follows Ernest Best in viewing exorcistic activities after the defeat of Satan at the Temptation in Mark's Gospel as a "mopping up operation," then there is some logic that apotropaic prayer has no room in the context of Mark.⁴³ Unless one takes the $\tau\acute{\iota}\ \epsilon\mu\omicron\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\omicron\iota\acute{\iota}$ (Mk 5:7) as a type of inverted apotropaic formula to ward off Jesus, which is highly unlikely, then there is little sign of apotropaic tradition in Mark.

In the *Damascus Document* xvi lines 4-5 we read that "on the day on which one has imposed upon himself to return to the law of Moses, the angel Mastema will turn aside from following him, should he keep his words." This passage provides an interesting point of reflection on Matthew's prayer. Unlike the Temptation in Mark, in Matthew Jesus is not so much *defeating* Satan once and for all as *turning him away* with scripture. In CD it is by

40. Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish," 203-4 commenting on Syriac Psalm 3 writes that "'lead us not into temptation' belongs to the provenance of contemporary stock phrases in this category of prayer. The pattern of praying for protection against temptation or being found in any trying predicament reflects the frame of mind during the last century of the Second Temple....But there is a basic difference between these prayers from Qumran and the biblical Psalm: the Psalm does not demonize the sin – no Satan, impure spirit, willing spirit. It seems that this development is a further proof that the belief in demonic powers which was parallel to the belief in positive spiritual powers inside and outside of man was a late phenomenon in ancient Judaism."

41. M. Rese, "Jesus und die Dämonen im Matthäusevangelium," in *Die Dämonen – Demons* (eds. H. Lichtenberger, A. Lange, K.F. Diethard Römheld; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003) 463-75.

42. Rese, "Jesus und die Dämonen," 473 "Im Mt ist Jesu Vollmacht über die Dämonen anders als im Mk noch nicht ein Zeichen der Äonenwende; endgültig wird Jesu die Dämonen erst am noch ausstehenden Ende des Äons besiegen."

43. E. Best, *The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) 61 "We have argued that he [Jesus] defeated Satan conclusively at the time of the temptation in the desert and that thereafter his activities against the demons were in the nature of mopping up operations."

returning to torah that Mastema is turned away from the addressee.⁴⁴ Jesus is not using apotropaic formulations to ward off the devil but demonstrating how adherence to the torah turns Satan away. In fact it is striking that when the devil tempts Jesus he evokes Psalm 91:11 (Mt 4:6). By using a psalm that is well known (e.g. 11Q11) for protection against demons, the devil performs an apotropaic reversal.⁴⁵ Matthew's Temptation, although it does not exhibit apotropaic formulas on the lips of Jesus, provides context for the demonology to follow. Satan and his minions were not defeated once for all and even in a Post-Easter era Jesus' followers remain in an epoch where the devil and demons are active. This suggests that an apotropaic interpretation of Matthew 6:13 is at least possible rather than reinforce that other formulations are present in the gospel.

The ambiguity of Matthew's, and the *Didache's*, ending of the Lord's Prayer is well known.⁴⁶ The genitive τοῦ πονηροῦ hides whether this is the neuter πονηρόν ("evil") or masculine πονηρός ("Evil One") and grammar cannot resolve which is to be read.⁴⁷ In support of translating the end of Matthew 6:13 as "Evil One," commentators sometimes note the prayer in *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch* (21:19-25).⁴⁸ More frequently Sirach 33:1 is cited as a parallel in favor of the interpretation "evil." Sirach 33:1, which is not a prayer, reads: "No evil will befall the one who fears the Lord, but in trials such a one will be rescued again and again." Deciding whether a request for deliverance from demonic evil is present in 6:13b or not depends on the interpretation of the final Greek phrase. 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. Matthew 5:37 describes the taking of oaths in reference to the "evil one" (ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ) and lends credence to reading the ending of Matthew's Lord's Prayer as apotropaic.

Lurking in the background to questions about whether evil is hypostatized in Matthew 6:13 are larger questions about eschatological orientation and the Lord's Prayer. While it seems unnecessary to argue for a strict "eschatological" horizon from the beginning to the end of the prayer, an otherworldly perspective may well be present throughout. Indeed the difference between "evil" and the "Evil One" is not only about demonology but also the possible presence of an "apocalyptic" worldview. The apotropaic prayers found at Qumran

44. M. Kister, "Demons, Theology and Abraham's Covenant (CD 16:4-6 and Related Texts)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings from the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Sections Meetings* (eds. R.A. Kugler & E. Schuller; Atlanta: SBL, 1999) 178-81.

45. Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers," 73-4. Although 11Q11 is categorized as an incantation text, it also has apotropaic elements. Esp. important for Mt 4:6 is *Sifre* on Num 6:24 (similarly cf. Targum *Ps.-Jn.* on Num 6:24) which cites Ps. 91:11 and is considered to be an anti-demonic text. "Another thing, 'And guard you [וישמרך],' that is from the demons [המזיקים], as it says, 'For He commands his angels over you, to guard you [וישמרך] in all your ways' (Ps 91:11)." See H.S. Horowitz, *Siphre d'Be Rab: Siphre ad Numeros adjecto Siphre zutta* (Leipzig: Gustav Fock, 1971) 44.

46. With the exception of the addition (8:2): ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

47. This same ambiguity in the genitive is present in Mt 5:37 (cf. esp. 2 Thess 3:3); note that Mt 13:19 (ἐρχεται ὁ πονηρὸς) demonstrates preference for the masc. "evil one"; cf. Jn 17:15 where Jesus also prays that his followers be protected from either the "evil one" or just "evil".

48. Esp. 21:23 "Restrain the angel of death, and let thy glory appear and the might of thy beauty be known."

are expressions of an otherworldly perspective, and yet one could cite many other Jewish prayers in which every day needs are the focus of the petition.

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.⁴⁹ The otherworldly expressions in the Lord's Prayer resonate strongly at the beginning (6:9-10): The address to a heavenly father and especially that his heavenly kingdom come upon earth. Less clear is whether 6:11-12 relate to life in this world—straightforward issues of daily sustenance and usury—or whether these verses also have an otherworldly point of view. The longing for bread may be for heavenly manna⁵⁰ and the issue of forgiving debts is motivated by eschatological judgment and not simply this worldly consequences.⁵¹ When adjudicating whether Matthew 6:13b is a type of apotropaic petition or not the interpretation of the entire prayer may be at stake.

Conclusions

Questions about definitions have proven useful not only for thinking about Matthew's prayer, but also the *Plea for Deliverance*. While it is acknowledged that demonic being(s) are present in the *Plea for Deliverance*, the purpose of the prayer has been interpreted at times as less concerned about being protected from personified evil spirits as from a non-reified and internal threat. If the *Plea for Deliverance* is not serious about warding off evil spirits (i.e. "things") then this prayer should not be assessed as apotropaic. If the *Plea for Deliverance* is categorized as "apotropaic" without a rigorous definition in use, then its relevance for assessing Matthew 6:13 becomes deeply confused. "Apotropaic" should not be used so loosely as to include vague requests to avert personal dangers but rather it should be used to describe a petition to God to ward off an *evil spirit*.

Whether or not Matthew 6:13b belongs to the apotropaic type is, in part, a question of categories. As a category "apotropaic" may be discussed as a component of some early Jewish prayers. If Matthew's prayer contains an apotropaic formulation, one need not label the whole of the Lord's Prayer as "apotropaic." This may be a petition for deliverance from malevolent forces inserted into the framework of a more "traditional" prayer. If 6:13b is a request for deliverance from demonic evil and is part of the original form of the prayer then otherworldly perspectives possibly found elsewhere in the Lord's Prayer could come more clearly into view.

If it is correct to view such a petition being made in 6:13b, more might be said about this plea's place within the evangelist's demonology.⁵² On the one hand, if Matthew's prayer belongs to the historical Jesus, then his relationship to demons is different than that found in Mark. On the other hand, if an apotropaic formulation is found in Matthew's prayer, either inherited from Q or his own editorial activity, the significance of Jesus life, death and

49. See esp. M.J. Goff, "Discerning Trajectories: 4QInstruction and the Sapiential Background of the Saying Source," in *JBL* 124/4 (2005): 657-73; *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (eds. L.M. Wills & B.G. Wright; Atlanta: SBL, 2005).

50. τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον translated as either "bread for the morrow" or "daily bread" will also influence views on the orientation of the Lord's Prayer.

51. W.D. Davies & D.C. Allison, *Commentary on Matthew I-VII: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew, vol. 1* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000) 594.

52. Davies & Allison, *Commentary on Matthew*, 615 write that "'the evil one' never equals Satan in Hebrew or Aramaic literature."

resurrection differ between Matthew and Mark. If the early church is instructed how to ward off personified evil, and "evil" is defined as demonic activity, then the final defeat of the Satan and demonic beings lies in the future rather than perhaps the past.