# Deuteronomy in the Matthean and Lucan Temptation in Light of Early Jewish Antidemonic Tradition

MICHAEL MORRIS
University of Dublin, Trinity College
Dublin, Ireland 2

*Abstract:* An ancient antidemonic technique called "apotropaism" is a preventative measure in which a petition or incantation ensures protection from future demonic harm. When examining demonological features in the Synoptic Gospels alongside early Jewish apotropaic tradition, one instance that is given attention is the use of quotations from Deuteronomy by Jesus in the Matthean and Lucan temptations (Matt 4:1-11; Luke 4:1-13). Several scholars point out that Jesus' reliance on Deuteronomy in the context of satanic confrontation is similar to the apotropaic effect of torah observance in the *Damascus Document*. References to this parallel, however, are brief. Neither a substantive analysis of the relationship between the Deuteronomy expressions and early Jewish apotropaism nor a discussion of how apotropaic elements impact broader issues of Synoptic Gospel demonology has been offered. Therefore, in this essay I measure features of the temptation in the double tradition against early Jewish apotropaism, while taking into account the larger demonologies and portrayals of Jesus in Matthew and Luke. The result is a deeper reflection on the Deuteronomy quotations in the temptation in light of Second Temple antidemonic tradition.

*Key Words:* Matthew 4:1-11 • Luke 4:1-13 • Deuteronomy • apotropaism • Qumran demonology • Synoptic Gospel demonology • *Damascus Document*

AMONG THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS are a number of texts that provide insight into early Jewish demonological beliefs and practices. Some of these texts are concerned with defending oneself against demonic influence. This antidemonic orientation is expressed in one of two ways: in the first way, which is "exorcistic," a person is relieved of *current* affliction caused by a demon; in the second way, which is "apotropaic," preventative measures are taken, either by petition or incantation, to ward off *impending* demonic harm. Assessments of exorcistic and

apotropaic works in early Judaism have implications for the study of early Chris-
tian demonology. While most discussions that intersect Qumran studies with anti-
demonic traditions in the NT have typically focused on exorcism,[1] there have been
some recent efforts to broaden the conversation about apotropaic elements in the
Synoptic Gospels.

One instance that is given attention is the use of quotations from Deuteron-
omy by Jesus in the Matthean and Lucan temptations (Matt 4:1-11; Luke 4:1-13).
Several scholars point out that Jesus' reliance on Deuteronomy in the context of
satanic confrontation bears a similarity to apotropaic effects of observing the law
of Moses ("torah") in some early Jewish material.[2] References to this parallel,
however, are brief. Neither a substantive analysis of the relationship between the
Deuteronomy expressions and early Jewish apotropaism nor a discussion of how
apotropaic elements impact broader issues of Synoptic Gospel demonology has
been offered.[3] Therefore, my intention for this essay is to provide a deeper reflec-
tion on the Deuteronomy quotations in the temptation in light of Second Temple
antidemonic tradition.

In this essay, I analyze elements of the temptation pericope as preserved in
the double tradition with the aim of demonstrating the presence of apotropaic
features in the narrative. This is achieved in three stages. First, I note scholarly

---

[1] Two helpful modern surveys of exorcism in the NT are Graham H. Twelftree, *Jesus the
Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus* (WUNT 2/54; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck,
1993); and Eric Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity*
(WUNT 2/157; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002). Both of these works take into account texts from
the Dead Sea Scrolls.

[2] The potential correlation between Jesus' use of Deuteronomy in the temptation and the
effects of adherence to the law of Moses in a passage from the *Damascus Document* is mentioned
by Ernest Best (*The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology* [2nd ed.; SNTSMS 2;
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990] 50) and Benjamin Wold ("Apotropaic Prayer and
the Matthean Lord's Prayer," in *Das Böse, der Teufel und Dämonen – Evil, the Devil, and Demons*
[ed. Jan Dochhorn, Susanne Rudnig-Zelt, and Benjamin Wold; WUNT 2/412; Tübingen: Mohr
Siebeck, 2016] 101-12). Cf. David Lincicum, "Scripture and Apotropaism in the Second Temple
Period," *BN* 138 (2008) 63-87, here 63.

[3] There are some recent works that examine possible apotropaic features in the NT and how
these relate to larger demonological issues (e.g., Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "'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* [ed. Mary L. Coloe and Tom Thatcher; SBLEJL 32;
Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011] 139-60; and Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer," 101-12), but
these do not take into account, to any great extent, the temptation narrative. Others (e.g., Matthias
Henze, "Psalm 91 in Premodern Interpretation and at Qumran," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*
[ed. Matthias Henze; Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerd-
mans, 2005] 168-93, esp. 183-84; Erkki Koskenniemi, "The Traditional Roles Inverted: Jesus and
the Devil's Attack," *BZ* 52 [2008] 261-68; and Michael Morris, "Apotropaic Inversion in the
Temptation and at Qumran," in *Das Böse, der Teufel* [ed. Dochhorn et al.], 93-100) discuss the
temptation in relation to early Jewish antidemonic tradition, but the issue here is Satan's use of Psalm
91 (Matt 4:6; Luke 4:10-11) and the Deuteronomy expressions are given little or no consideration.

views on reasons why the evangelists (or their source) use Deuteronomy in the temptation scene. This will help to highlight the major themes evoked in the narrative. Second, I present possible parallels between early Jewish antidemonic traditions and the temptation. Finally, I measure potential apotropaic features in the temptation against the larger demonologies and portrayals of Jesus in Matthew and Luke.

## I. Deuteronomy in the Temptation

In the double tradition, Jesus is led by the Spirit into the wilderness (Matt 4:1; Luke 4:1-2). The subsequent depiction at its most basic level is of a righteous figure who is confronted by demonic temptation. Jesus is faced with three separate enticements, each of which challenges in some way the nature of his "sonship" and mission.[4] Jesus is portrayed as responding to each temptation with scriptural citations from Deuteronomy. In Matthew the order is Deut 8:3; 6:16; and 6:13, while Luke reverses the order of 6:16 and 6:13.

Jesus, like the Israelites, is tested in the wilderness, and commentators have long noted that the temptation is a recapitulation of the original wilderness accounts.[5] Quoting from Deuteronomy accentuates this recapitulation and depicts Jesus as a representative of the true Israel; he is faithful to the torah, whereas the people of Israel are not. Indeed, Israel's wandering is a fitting model for the temptation, and there are three initial parallels that suggest a relationship between the two episodes. First, the location to which both Israel and Jesus are "led" in order to be "tested" (Matt 4:1; Luke 4:1-2//Deut 8:2-5) is the wilderness.[6] Second, in each instance the subject tested is God's "son" (cf. Matt 3:17; Luke 3:22, 23-38// Deut 1:31; 8:5). Birger Gerhardsson, throughout his study on Jesus' temptations, especially emphasizes the connection between Jesus' and Israel's sonship.[7] Third, the number 40 is given as a time of duration (Matt 4:2; Luke 4:2//Num 14:34).[8]

A final parallel that suggests that the temptation is a recapitulation of the

---

[4] Satan's temptations do not dispute Jesus' status as Son of God but rather challenge the nature of this sonship. This is reflected in the Greek εἰ, which can be translated "*since* you are the son of God." See W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–97) 1:360-61; and François Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50* (trans. Christine M. Thomas; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002) 143. Thus, the *way* in which Jesus is to minister as God's son is tempted by enticement into self-serving power (Matt 4:3; Luke 4:3), forcing God's hand (Matt 4:6; Luke 4:9-11), and idolatry (Matt 4:9; Luke 4:7).

[5] See Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:354; and Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009) 137.

[6] Jeffrey B. Gibson, *The Temptations of Jesus in Early Christianity* (JSNTSup 112; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995) 85-87; and Birger Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son (Matt. 4:1-11 & par.): An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash* (ConBNT 2; Lund: Gleerup, 1966) 36-38.

[7] See Gerhardsson, *Testing of God's Son*, 19-24.

[8] Ibid., 42: "Jesus' forty days in the wilderness corresponds to Israel's forty years."

Israelites in the wilderness is the correspondence of the types of tests faced. Yet, whereas the Israelites fail their tests, Jesus prevails. When Jesus is hungry (Matt 4:2-4; Luke 4:2-4), he does not grumble against God as Israel does (Exodus 16; Numbers 11) but rather relies on God for sustenance. Whereas Israel puts Yhwh to the test (Exod 17:7), Jesus refuses to do so (Matt 4:7; Luke 4:12). Jesus' repudiation of idolatry (Matt 4:10; Luke 4:8) calls to mind Israel's weakness in this matter (Exodus 32). The allusion in Jesus' temptation to Israel's wilderness wanderings is, according to some, made explicit by Jesus' quotations from the law in response to Satan. Not only does Jesus renounce the very temptations that confronted Israel; he renounces them *using Deuteronomy*. As Charles Kimball explains, the citations from Deuteronomy "contrast Jesus' victory with Israel's failure and thereby represent an antithetical Israel-Christ typology."[9]

The extent to which scholars associate Israel's wilderness wanderings and Jesus' temptation vary in manner and degree. For instance, Gerhardsson goes so far as to suggest that the temptation is an example of early Christian midrash intimately tied to Israel's testing. 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.

By citing Deuteronomy, Jesus invokes what one might call an authoritative "proof-text" to reject each of Satan's temptations. Given that Satan also uses Scripture in the temptation account (Matt 4:6; Luke 4:10-11), another scholarly view is that the dialogue between the devil and Jesus resembles a rabbinic dispute. W. D. Davies and Dale Allison comment that "[i]t 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."[10] Whether Deuteronomy is cited to evoke the stories of the Israelites, 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 antidemonic tradition.

## II. Qumran Antidemonic Traditions

In a 2008 article, David Lincicum engages the "apotropaic employment of Scripture in the Second Temple period."[11] He surveys the use of Scripture in

---

[9] Charles A. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel* (JSNTSup 94; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994) 89.

[10] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:352; cf. Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. John Marsh; Oxford: Blackwell, 1972) 254-55; Gibson, *Temptations of Jesus*, 115; and Bovon, *Luke 1*, 145.

[11] Lincicum, "Scripture and Apotropaism," 81.

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.[12]

The two earliest amulets mentioned are from the Ketef Hinnom site near Jerusalem from between the seventh and sixth centuries B.C.E.[13] These 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 (lines 14-18) and, perhaps, in Ketef Hinnom II (lines 5-8). In Ketef Hinnom I and (possibly) Ketef Hinnom II the word רע appears with the definite article, leading some to interpret this as a request for protection from "not just anything evil, but rather *all* Evil."[14] The phrase הגער ברע (translated "the rebuker of Evil") is found in Ketef Hinnom II (lines 4-5), suggesting possible exorcistic connotations.[15] Lincicum notes the possibility that Ketef Hinnom I (lines 4-7) contains text based on Deuteronomy.[16] The amulet's text is fragmentary, however, 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.[17] In addition to these amulets Lincicum discusses relevant passages from the Dead Sea Scrolls, namely, *Songs of the Sage* (4QShir^a and 4QShir^b, 4Q510 and 4Q511), 4Q560 (4QExorcism ar), and *Apocryphal Psalms* (11QapocrPs, 11Q11).

The historical spectrum presented by Lincicum demonstrates that the apotropaic use of Scripture, possibly beginning with the use of the Priestly Blessing in the Ketef Hinnom amulets, was a common practice throughout antiquity. Lincicum initiates his study of scriptural apotropaisms in Jewish practice by comparing them to the 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 antidemonic praxis in a way that suggests a direct influence on the Matthean and Lucan account. Ernest Best and Benjamin Wold, however, raise the possibility that a passage in the *Damascus Document* offers a "connecting point" between early Jewish apotropaic function and the use of Deuteronomy in the temptation.[18]

---

[12] Specifically, Lincicum assesses "the employment of Scripture in three different media: amulets, incantation bowls, and magical papyri" (ibid., 66).

[13] See ibid., 69.

[14] Gabriel Barkay et al., "The Amulets from Ketef Hinnom: A New Edition and Evaluation," *BASOR* 334 (2004) 41-71, here 68.

[15] See Gabriel Barkay et al., "The Challenges of Ketef Hinnom," *Near Eastern Archaeology* 66 (2003) 162-71; eidem, "Amulets from Ketef Hinnom," 41-71; Lincicum, "Scripture and Apotropaism," 69-71.

[16] Lincicum, "Scripture and Apotropaism," 69-70.

[17] Lincicum notes that "none of these [Samaritan amulets] predate the 3rd century C.E." (ibid., 67 n. 19)

[18] See n. 2 above.

Lines 4-5 of CD-A 16 are 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.[19]

In the *Book of Jubilees*, "Mastema" (משטמה) is depicted as the leader of the evil spirits (e.g., *Jub.* 10:8; 11:5). Philip S. Alexander notes that, in early Judaism, Mastema "seems identical to Belial, to Satan, to Melchiresha, and possibly also to Beelzebub and Abaddon."[20] Thus, according to this passage in the *Damascus Document*, sustained adherence to the torah results in repelling Mastema, the chief of evil beings equivalent to "Satan" in the temptation account.[21]

Menahem Kister interprets the Qumran passage within the framework of community, and he observes that returning to the law entails joining the *yahad* ("community").[22] That is, true torah observance takes place within the elect community, and once an individual is within the community Mastema will be turned away. The concept that adhering to the torah effectively fends off demonic evil is associated with the "genre of 'apotropaic prayers.'"[23] Furthermore, Kister's interpretation suggests that every individual outside the community is possessed and

[19] Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997–98) 1:565. Joseph M. Baumgarten and Daniel R. 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" ("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. James H. Charlesworth; Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995] 4-57, here 39). Cf. 4Q271 4 ii 6-7.

[20] Philip S. Alexander, "The Demonology of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, with Andrea E. Alvarez; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 2:331-53, here 341. Loren T. Stuckenbruck notes that "mastema" may not always be a proper name in the Dead Sea Scrolls. He further observes that in the *Damascus Document* the term, which can mean "animosity," could possibly serve simply as a negative description of a hostile being ("The Demonic World of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Evil and the Devil* [ed. Ida Fröhlich and Erkki Koskenniemi; LNTS 481; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013] 51-70, esp. 65).

[21] On "Satan" in the Matthean and Lucan narratives, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:355; and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke (I–IX): Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB 28; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981) 514.

[22] Menahem 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* (ed. Robert A. Kugler and Eileen M. Schuller; SBLEJL 15; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999) 167-84.

[23] Ibid., 170.

that the act of joining the *yaḥad* is exorcistic. In Kister's words, "[t]hose who do not belong to the sect are considered to be possessed by evil spirits, while the sect is immune from them. . . . 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."[24] Therefore, Kister understands membership in the Qumran community, characterized by fidelity to the torah, to have both apotropaic and exorcistic powers. Kister's persuasive interpretation of the *Damascus Document* opens up an avenue for approaching Deuteronomy in an early Jewish antidemonic context. Indeed, David Flusser and Esther Eshel have long noted that "the law" is one of several common features in apotropaic prayers.[25]

Two sides of the same coin are presented by Lincicum and Kister; on the one side *invoking* Scripture wards off demons, and on the other *obedience* to the torah also wards them off. In the temptation, Jesus affirms his *obedience* to the law when he *invokes* Deuteronomy to oppose the devil. Therefore, a case can be made that Lincicum's and Kister's observations about warding off the demonic are present in Jesus' temptation. Although Kister's observations on community do not relate directly to the temptation account, the apotropaic effect of relying on the torah described in the *Damascus Document* is analogous to Jesus' quotation of Deuteronomy in the face of demonic confrontation. Likewise, Jesus' reliance on the law fits well within the pattern of apotropaic prayer outlined by Flusser and Eshel. Nevertheless, if Jesus practices apotropaism in his encounter with the devil, this carries with it implications for Jesus' power, authority, and relationship to Satan.

### III. Jesus and Scriptural Apotropaism

When assessing the various layers of meaning attached to Jesus' use of Deuteronomy it is important to consider the *way* in which the quotations are expressed. Each quotation, except in Luke 4:12, is introduced with the perfect passive γέγραπται ("it is written").[26] According to Joseph A. Fitzmyer, γέγραπται is one

[24] Ibid., 172. This argument is formed in large part by Kister's evaluation of "sectarian dualism" in texts such as the *Damascus Document* and the *War Scroll* (1QM).

[25] David Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish 'Apotropaic' Prayers," *IEJ* 16 (1966) 194-205; Esther Eshel, "Apotropaic Prayers in the Second Temple Period," in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19-23 January, 2000* (ed. Esther G. Chazon, with Ruth Clements and Avital Pinnick; STDJ 48; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 69-88; eadem, "Genres of Magical Texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt – Demons: The Demonology of Israelite-Jewish and Early Christian Literature in Context of Their Environment* (ed. Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and K. F. Diethard Römheld; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003) 395-415.

[26] Luke 12:4 instead employs the introductory formula εἴρηται ("it is said"), which is the perfect passive of λέγω.

of several introductory phrases attached to scriptural quotations found throughout the NT.[27] Fitzmyer organizes the scriptural quotations in the NT that are introduced with a formula into four categories. The quotations from the temptation are included in the first category, what he calls "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."[28] By classifying the quotations in this way Fitzmyer emphasizes that the citations from Deuteronomy summon the actual, literal force of the original source—in this case the torah. Thus, by introducing the quotations with γέγραπται, Jesus is portrayed as appealing to the true and authoritative meaning of Deuteronomy rather than merely adapting scriptural maxims to fit his current situation, as would be the case with other categories of quotations.

Fitzmyer raises two significant points. First, various NT quotation formulae, including γέγραπται, are similar 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. Fitzmyer states, "[T]he 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 early Christian writings with the contemporary Qumran material than with the later Mishnaic.[29] Second, quotations introduced with a formula, such as Jesus' references to Deuteronomy, convey a "realistic potency." That is, Jesus explicitly cites the torah as opposed to merely alluding to it, and is thereby invoking the literal, original source.[30] 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.

[27] See Joseph A. 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* (SBLSBS 5; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974) 3-58 [page references are to the reprint edition]). Fitzmyer focuses specifically on Scripture quotations in Qumran and NT literature. He arranges the quotations according to three main types of introductory formulae: (1) "to write," (2) "to say," (3) and "other formulae." Introductory phrases that fit into the category "other formulae" include the so-called fulfillment formulae in the NT of which Jesus is the subject. "It is written" (γέγραπται) belongs to the first group. The phrase also is roughly equivalent to Hebrew phrases found in some Qumran passages, including כיא כן כתוב ("for it is written," 1QS 5.15) and כאשר כתוב ("as it was written," 1QS 8.14). .

[28] Ibid., 16.

[29] Ibid., 15-16. Still, similarities between scriptural quotations in the Christian works and rabbinic literature most certainly do exist. While most introductory formulae in the Mishnah involve אמר ("to say"), the root כתב ("to write," which would align with γέγραπται) is also used. See Bruce M. Metzger, "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah," *JBL* 70 (1951) 297-307.

[30] See Fitzmyer, "Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations," 7-8.

The expression γέγραπται is not an antidemonic formula. It appears through-
out the NT in various situations, most of which have nothing to do with demons.[31]
Yet, in the temptation narrative there is a context of demonic confrontation and,
potentially, an antidemonic function of observing the torah. Therefore, the very
nature of Jesus' quotations, which γέγραπται helps to characterize, could indicate
that the invocations of Deuteronomy serve not only as "proof-texts" for Jesus'
refusal of Satan's enticements, but *in themselves* may be a forceful and authorita-
tive rebuttal of Satan's challenges.

In addition to considering the nature of Jesus' expressions, it is worthwhile
to review whether it is tenable to interpret Jesus as utilizing an apotropaic method.
In Eshel's and Bilhah Nitzan's assessment of Qumran antidemonic passages, they
note that, unlike exorcistic formulae, which are intended permanently to subjugate
an adversary, apotropaic tactics are more restrained and, to some extent, tempo-
rary.[32] Eshel states, "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."[33] In other words, the preventative nature of apotropaic prayer seeks
simply to ward off demonic evil but not to vanquish it completely.

This limited or reserved antidemonic approach would not be compatible with,
for example, Best's interpretation of Mark's temptation. According to Best, the
narrative in Mark portrays the ultimate and total defeat of Satan by Jesus. The
subsequent exorcisms performed by Jesus in Mark's Gospel are simply "the mak-
ing real of a victory already accomplished. The exorcisms are mopping-up opera-
tions 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."[34] This

---

[31] Some examples of quotations introduced with γέγραπται are Matt 2:5; Luke 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 NT uses of
γέγραπται along with Hebrew equivalents in the OT and Dead Sea Scrolls, see Fitzmyer, "Use of
Explicit Old Testament Quotations," 8-10.

[32] This is especially clear in Eshel's and Nitzan's discussions on the sage's recitation of an
apotropaic hymn in *Songs of the Sage* (4Q510, 4Q511). Nitzan contrasts the "time of activity" in
exorcistic incantations with *Songs of the Sage*. She explains that an exorcism incantation "is intended
to bring about an immediate and permanent halt to the supernatural activity. On the other hand, 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" (Bilhah Nitzan, *Qumran
Prayer and Religious Poetry* [trans. Jonathan Chipman; STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994] 248; see also
eadem, "Hymns from Qumran – 4Q510-4Q511," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*
[ed. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992] 53-63). Similarly, Eshel
highlights various features of Qumran apotropaic texts. One of these features is the "eschatological
character" in passages such as those found in *Songs of the Sage* that indicate a "temporary destruc-
tion" of a demonic adversary as opposed to the more final nature of exorcistic incantations. See
Eshel, "Genres of Magical Texts," 408-13; eadem, "Apotropaic Prayers," 79-88.

[33] Eshel, "Genres of Magical Texts," 413.

[34] Best, *Temptation and the Passion*, 15.

understanding of Satan's defeat in Mark does not allow for a temporary action against Satan by Jesus in the temptation. In contrast, however, a vanquished or absent Satan is probably not depicted at the beginning of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke.

Robert C. Branden argues that Jesus' conflict with Satan is central to the plot of Matthew.[35] Brandon assesses key aspects of Matthean demonology, including the meaning of exorcism, to show that Satan is an active and opposing presence throughout the ministry of Jesus. Similarly, Susan R. Garrett argues that, in Luke's writings, Jesus' battle against Satan helps to enact the plan of God's salvation.[36] One way this battle is fought out is in Jesus' and the disciples' exorcistic activity.[37] Thus, the role of Satan and his demonic forces in Luke, as well as the "pushback" against Satan and the demonic from Jesus and his followers, is a fundamental component of the actualization of Jesus' salvific mission and ministry.

Given these views it would be appropriate for Jesus, when confronted by Satan at the beginning of his ministry, to rebuff the devil in a forceful yet impermanent manner. Certainly the demonologies of Matthew and Luke are complex, and a detailed analysis of potential apotropaic features in light of these demonological traditions is necessary. At a functional level, however, there does not appear to be a conflict between an apotropaic response by Jesus and the roles of Satan and demons in Matthew and Luke.

Apotropaic tradition is in harmony with both the style of Jesus' expressions and larger demonological implications in Matthew and Luke. Another question that arises is how an understanding of an apotropaic use of Scripture in the temptation influences the interpretation of Jesus' relationship to the devil in the broader context of an evangelist's theology. If apotropaisms are viewed as tools for powerless individuals by which one must utter a particular formula or adhere to certain halakic statutes in order to be rescued from evil, there may be some hesitation in interpreting Jesus as relying on an apotropaic tactic in his conflict with Satan. In response to this concern, I would emphasize the *nature* of apotropaic prayer. Some prayers take the form of petitions to God for deliverance uttered by a righteous yet defenseless character. An example of this type is the *Plea for Deliverance*. Another type, however, places a hymn of praise on the lips of an exalted sage, and this too serves apotropaic purposes. An example of this is the *Songs of the Sage* (4Q510, 4Q511). According to Nitzan, the sage is able to employ rather harmless words for

[35] Robert C. Branden, *Satanic Conflict and the Plot of Matthew* (Studies in Biblical Literature 89; New York: Peter Lang, 2006).

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

[37] For instance, Garrett states, "Jesus' success in this struggle [against Satan] is directly tied to his success and to the success of his followers at casting out demons and healing, because the authority that Jesus exerts and in turn delegates to his followers he gains at Satan's expense" (*Demise of the Devil*, 37).

a forceful and specific purpose because he has a unique/elevated status.[38] Far from being a characteristic of helplessness, an apotropaic tactic can be indicative of the power of the one who uses it.

In comparison with these two forms of apotropaism, Jesus' citation of Deuteronomy is unlike an apotropaic plea; from a theological standpoint it is unlikely that Matthew or Luke would depict Jesus in such a weak and dependent manner. Instead, the use of Deuteronomy resembles the *Songs of the Sage* insofar as the individual's status allows for an invocation of something innocuous for antidemonic purpose. Therefore, an apotropaic expression does not limit the authority or ability of Jesus.

## IV.  Conclusions

There are points of comparison between Jesus' citation of Deuteronomy in the temptation and early Jewish antidemonic traditions. When Kister's views on the torah are brought to bear on the scriptural quotations in the temptation, Jesus is seen to use Scripture to emphasize further his own adherence to the law. This is entirely compatible with another use of Scripture, which could simultaneously be at work in the temptation, namely, the antidemonic value of citing Scripture as outlined by Lincicum. Furthermore, introducing the quotations with the formula γέγραπται may suggest that Jesus' words are intended to be a forceful repudiation of Satan and a literal invocation of the torah.

An interpretation of Jesus' expressions as apotropaic is not directly incompatible with the Gospels' depiction of Satan and demons and their continuing adversarial roles. On the contrary, a potent yet impermanent warding off of Satan at the beginning of Jesus' ministry fits into the larger demonologies in Matthew and Luke. It is also the case that use of an apotropaic technique does not necessarily indicate weakness or dependence on the part of the practitioner; indeed the *Songs of the Sage* provide precedent for interpreting apotropaic prayer as a tactic suitable for one acting in authority.

Apotropaisms by their nature are a temporary way of battling the demonic. If apotropaisms are present in the temptation, one might conclude that this underscores that evil is not here intended to be permanently destroyed. Jesus is seen as dealing with the symptom rather than the cause. Yet this is an issue that any interpreter of the temptation needs to confront regardless of whether apotropaic

---

[38] Nitzan writes that the Sage "has a fixed religious feeling of election, mission and mystical closeness to God, such as that expressed in the songs of the Thanksgiving Scroll. This same feeling accompanies him during his struggle with demonic or destructive forces. He therefore feels no need for any particular praxis, and recites regular sectarian poetry for magical purposes" (*Qumran Prayer,* 271).

elements are identified. In Jesus' wilderness testing, he successfully rejects the devil's assaults, but the devil remains active throughout the rest of Jesus' ministry. If it is correct to view Jesus as using an apotropaic expression by citing Deuteronomy in order to oppose evil, the significance lies in a portrayal of Jesus responding to the demonic in line with responses to external evils in early Jewish tradition. Indeed, Jesus' apotropaic activities would have been not only well known to his contemporaries but also used by them.