

Scripture and Apotropaism in the Second Temple Period

David Lincicum

In the temptation narratives in the Gospels of both Matthew and Luke, the contest is cast as one of scriptural employment. When confronted with his satanic adversary, Jesus is presented to the reader as consummately faithful in quoting three key texts from Deuteronomy to defeat and defuse the temptations offered to him, even when one of these is backed with its own scriptural warrant. When faced with supernatural evil, the best response, the Gospels seem to suggest, is to employ Scripture against the offending party. But were the Gospels alone in that estimation? Can the apotropaic employment of Scripture be seen in other Jewish circles of the Second Temple period? This article is intended to marshal the available evidence for the apotropaic use of Scripture in the period of New Testament formation, and in particular to highlight some of the surprising coincidences of liturgical texts with those employed apotropai-cally. Not only does such evidence aid the interpretation of literary texts such as the Gospels, it also fills out our sense of how Scripture was being engaged “on the ground” in the Second Temple period.

1. Jewish Magic?

A neglected encounter with Scripture in the ancient world is recognizable in a broad nexus of practices and beliefs that we may somewhat imprecisely call “magical.” To speak of magic, especially as something opposed to or distinct from religion (not to mention science or medicine), immediately embroils one in a complex set of debates about the adequacy of our categories, especially one as ideologically freighted as “magic,” to describe the experiences and beliefs of the people of antiquity. One might long for a moratorium on the use of the term “magic,”¹ but it is so well-entrenched in the scholarly literature as a term able to encompass a variety of distinct but related practices that such a call seems likely

¹ In his recent study of the *Testament of Solomon*, Todd E. Klutz (Testament 38-40; 136-38) has highlighted the insufficiency of the category of “magic” as both ideologically freighted and as reductionistic in description of both the genre and content of the *Testament*. One may agree entirely that the category of magic is both imprecise and biased, but it is so well entrenched in the literature as an umbrella term to encompass various practices that it is difficult to avoid, conceptual shortcomings notwithstanding. Cf. Segal, *Magic*; Klutz, *Magic*; Lyons / Reimer, *Virus*.

to go unheeded. For our purposes, it may be preferable to see magic and religion not as two essentially opposed substances, but as two “ideal types” on either end of a spectrum. Both involve encounters with the divine, often with elaborate ritual and for specific and identifiable ends. It seems clear, however, from a myriad of texts that the practitioners themselves were aware of doing something different in adjuring a spirit than in praying to God and that such actions were subject to varying social judgments, and so it does seem justifiable to consider magical practices as a loose but distinct subset of religion, as we do here.²

If at first the concept of “Jewish magic” seems to present a contradiction in terms, one need not read long before being convinced by text after text that apparently magical practices found a reception, if at times an uneasy one, in Jewish life and literature. Even the numerous prohibitions of magical practices testify to its ongoing, if suppressed, importance in Israel’s history. Perhaps most famously, Deuteronomy warns against “the abhorrent practices of those [foreign] nations,” and goes on to list an impressive array of forbidden magical positions and practices: “No one shall be found among you who makes a son or daughter pass through fire, or who practices divination, or is a soothsayer, or an augur, or a sorcerer, or one who casts spells, or who consults ghosts or spirits, or who seeks oracles from the dead” (Deut 18,9b-11 NRSV). Closer to our period of interest, the author of 2 Maccabees ascribes the death of Jewish soldiers to the fact that they were wearing amulets (ιερωμάτια) under their clothes and so had been killed in battle as divine punishment for their misdeed (12,40). The Book of Acts relates approvingly of the burning of magical books as the “word of the Lord grew mightily and prevailed” in Ephesus (Acts 19,11-20). *First Enoch* 8 ascribes the revelation of magical practices to the fallen angels. In the famous passage of the Mishnah, *Sanhedrin* 10, it is said that “All Israelites have a share in the world to come,” except, among others, the one who “utters charms over a wound and says, ‘I will put none of the diseases upon you which I have put upon the Egyptians: for I am the Lord that heals you’” (*m. Sanh.* 10,1 quoting Exod 15,26; *ARN* 32a; cf. *t. Shab.* 6-7 on “the ways of the Amorites”).

² This is basically a compromise between exclusively functionalist and essentialist approaches to the issue. See especially Schäfer, *Magic*; Versnel, *Reflections*. Cf. also Aune, *Magic*; Garrett, *Light*. Aune places more emphasis on the functionalist model of definition, stressing the social deviance involved; thus magic is “that form of religious deviance whereby individual or social goals are sought by means alternate to those normally sanctioned by the dominant religious institution,” and if religious activities fit this description to qualify as magical they must further fit a second criterion: “goals sought within the context of religious deviance are magical when attained through the management of supernatural powers in such a way that results are virtually guaranteed” (1515).

A number of sources from the period also testify to the positive importance of magic, often in the form of apotropaic or exorcistic practices.³ The Book of Tobit acquires its novelistic intrigue from precisely the problem of how Tobias can exorcise the demon Asmodeus. The angel Raphael (as Tobias's relative Azariah) instructs Tobias to burn a certain fish's heart and liver to drive away the demon, and his advice proves successful (6,4-9; 8,2-3). *Jubilees* records that Noah received angelic instruction concerning how to use herbs to heal the illnesses inflicted by demons, which Noah in turn wrote in a book and handed on to his descendants (10,10-14; cf. also the "Preface" to the *Sepher ha-Razim*). In the same passage in the Book of Acts mentioned above, we are told that "when the handkerchiefs or aprons that had touched [Paul's] skin were brought to the sick, their diseases left them, and the evil spirits came out of them" (19,12 NRSV).⁴ The *Testament of Solomon* is an extended tale about the fabled magical and exorcistic might of Solomon.⁵

Given, then, both Deuteronomy's strict prohibitions on the one hand, and the continuing importance of apparently magical practices on the other, it is not surprising to see this ambivalence toward magic persist in later Jewish literature.⁶ Magic, it is often noted, has an essentially conservative character; indeed, many incantations depend precisely upon the extent to which their speaker can repeat with accuracy the spell that has been handed down to him or her. Within Hekhalot literature, the dual impulse toward the conservative and the subversive aspects of magical practice are perhaps nowhere more clearly realized than in the "Sar-Torah" rituals – magical rituals employed in order to

³ A helpful overview is given by Alexander, *Incantations*.

⁴ On the striking endorsement of apparently magical practices in the context of a polemic against magic in Acts 19, and the strategies Luke uses to attempt to distinguish between the two, see Garrett, *Light*; Klauck, *Magic* 97-102, 120; Marguerat, *Magic*.

⁵ Such narratives about Solomon have early roots. Josephus, for example, relates concerning Solomon that "God granted him knowledge of the art used against demons for the benefit and healing of men. He also composed incantations by which illnesses are relieved, and left behind forms of exorcisms with which those possessed by demons drive them out, never to return." Josephus then goes on to tell how the exorcistic cures prescribed by Solomon continued in his own day, with special reference to "a ring which had under its seal one of the roots prescribed by Solomon." See *Ant.* 8,45-49 (translation according to Ralph Marcus's LCL edition); cf. also 11Q11 I,3.

⁶ See, generally, Blau, *Magic*; Blau, *Zauberwesen*; Trachtenberg, *Magic*; Goldin, *Magic*; Schäfer, *Literature*; Kern-Ulmer, *Depiction*. On the interplay between Jewish and Christian magic in later Christian circles, Simon, *Israel* 339-68; Meyer / Smith, *Magic*. Cf. also Barb, *Survival*.

adjure the “Prince of Torah” to gain from him knowledge of the Torah.⁷ The ongoing practice of magic is further attested by the many magical fragments found in the Cairo Geniza,⁸ and the crystallization of magical practices in medieval books like the *Sepher Ha-Razim*⁹ or the *Sword of Moses*,¹⁰ which probably contain an earlier core of material.

Although the prevalence of magical practices and the employment of the divine name and *voces magicae* for theurgical ends have been noted often enough,¹¹ the role Scripture plays in magical rites has been less frequently discussed.¹² This may simply be due to the apparent obviousness of the claim: if there is to be Jewish magic, of course it will depend upon and employ Scripture for its ends. Another reason for such neglect, at least for students of the Second Temple period, concerns the relative lack of material datable to this era. Most magical or apotropaic texts stem from the second century or later. Nonetheless, we do have some earlier examples from Palestine, including texts from the Qumran finds published in the past twenty years or so. In order to try to establish the likelihood of the apotropaic employment of Scripture during the Second Temple period, it may be worthwhile first to survey some later remains and then to try to trace lines of continuity back to the first centuries of the era, insofar as this is possible. While this may be less than ideal in some respects, such measures are necessary to ascertain the ways in which Scripture was being employed “on the ground,” so to speak, and not simply in those texts that have survived the censorship of time. Therefore, we will briefly turn our attention here to the employment of Scripture in three different media: amulets, incantation bowls, and magical papyri, before turning to consider earlier remains.

⁷ See Swartz, *Piety*; Swartz, *Magic*.

⁸ See Schiffman / Swartz, *Texts*; Schäfer / Shaked, *Magische Texte*.

⁹ Margalioth, *Sepher*; Morgan, *Sepher*.

¹⁰ See Gaster, *Sword*. Cf. *PGM IV*.1760-1870, where the title of an incantation is given as “Sword of Dardanos.”

¹¹ These *voces magicae* may be found on almost every page of the Greek magical papyri. Apparently, the association of Hebrew-sounding words and variations on divine and angelic names with magic was so common in antiquity that impostors tried to exploit this for their own ends; cf. Lucian, *Alex.* 32,13. More broadly on the *voces magicae* as instruments of creative alienation, see Versnel, *Poetics*.

¹² But note, e.g., Kayser, *Gebrauch*; Grunwald and Kohler, *Bibliomancy*; Trachtenberg, *Magic* 104-113, “The Bible in Magic”; Schiffman / Swartz, *Texts* 37-42; Naveh / Shaked, *Spells* 22-31; Rebiger, *Verwendung*.

2. Amulets, Incantation Bowls, and Magical Papyri

The phenomenon of prophylactic amulets was an international one.¹³ Amulets were usually inscribed disks of hard metal or gems and were worn on the body or as rings, but they might also consist of incantations written on strips of papyrus, rolled up and placed in containers to be carried or suspended by a chain or strip of leather around one's neck.¹⁴ The wearing of amulets persisted throughout the medieval period,¹⁵ but we have some Jewish, Christian, and Samaritan amulets that date from Roman or early Byzantine times, and in one case, from significantly earlier. Often these are little more than a rough drawing with words or initials inscribed around the perimeter. Sometimes, however, such amulets were either large enough to accommodate more text, contain initials or a few words sufficient to identify the text of Scripture from which a quotation is taken, or consist of strips of papyrus or metal which can more easily hold more words. Though some of these amulets are indebted to Jewish tradition more generally,¹⁶ others are specifically quotations of Scripture.

Samaritan amulets most often quote Exod 15,3,26;¹⁷ 38,8; Num 10,35;¹⁸ 14,14; Deut 6,4; 33,26,¹⁹ texts which emphasize both the incomparability of Yahweh as well as his protective keeping of his people. Jewish amulets exhibit more variety in their indebtedness to Scripture, but still show definite patterns of engagement. We know of several dozen Jewish amulets ranging in date from the late second century to the sixth or seventh and beyond, though many are difficult to date with any precision.²⁰ Joseph Naveh and Shaul Shaked suggest

¹³ See Budge, Amulets; Bonner, Amulets; Bonner, Studies; Kotansky, Exorcistic Amulets.

¹⁴ Cf. the instructions given for the wearing of an amulet in *PGM* IV.256f: "onto a silver leaf inscribe this name of 100 letters with a bronze stylus, and wear it strung on a thong from the hide / of an ass." Translated by E. N. O'Neil in Betz, Papyri.

¹⁵ On later amulets, note Blau, Zauberverwesen 86-96; Blau, Amulet; Budge, Amulets, 212-238 on "Hebrew Amulets"; Schrire, Amulets; Davis, Psalms.

¹⁶ Veltri, Traditions. See also Kotansky, Exorcistic Amulets 263-64, 269 for some hints on the influence of the language of the LXX.

¹⁷ Recall *m. Sanh.* 10,1 where this is the text whispered over the sick for a cure.

¹⁸ Compare the inscribed column, probably Samaritan, with a part of Num 10,35, "Rise, YHWH, may your enemies be scattered," in Noy, Italy, no. 153.

¹⁹ Pummer, Amulets 252. Note also Margain, Amulette; cf. Frey, Corpus 2: no. 1167; Noy / Panayotov / Bloedhorn, Europe, Ach50; and the list that Pummer (Amulets 260-63) provides of 16 Samaritan amulets, though none of these predate the 3rd century C.E.

²⁰ Naveh / Shaked, Amulets; Naveh / Shaked, Spells. In addition, see Montgomery, Amulets; Kotansky, Aramaic Amulets. Indication of amulets published since 1991

that the presence of certain biblical texts in Jewish amulets may be due to their liturgical prominence.²¹ Some especially prevalent texts in Jewish amulets might well be explained in this way; Deut 6,4 notably presents itself.²² Other prominent texts, no doubt because of the especially fitting nature of their subject matter for such uses, include Psalm 91²³ and Zech 3,2.²⁴ One rather late example (ca. 6th century C.E.) can serve to illustrate the way in which a text from Scripture (Exod 15,26) the utterance of which, as we have already had occasion to note, was specifically prohibited in magical contexts by the Mishnah, recurs in later amulets:

An amulet proper for Esther / daughter of ת' ת' ys, / to save her from / evil tormentors, / from evil eye, / from spirit, from demon, / from shadow-spirit, from / [all] evil tormentors, / from evil eye, from /from imp[ure] spirit, / If thou wilt diligently / hearken to the voice of the Lord / thy God, and wilt do that / which is right in his sight, / and wilt give ear / to his commandments, / and keep all his statutes, / I will put none of these / diseases upon thee, which / I have brought upon the Egyptians. / For I am the Lord that healeth thee.²⁵

The function of the biblical citation is striking. Without the first few lines of the amulet to determine the context, it might have been adduced in a prayer for healing. As it stands, the first half of the amulet simply describes the purpose for which the amulet is crafted and worn, no doubt trying to be as explicit and extensive as possible so as to ward off the greatest number of would-be attackers. The quotation from Exodus is apparently thought to “do the work,” as it were, that the amulet is intended to do.²⁶ The scriptural words seem to hold some power in and of themselves, so much so that a certain Esther might want to bear the words not just in memory but in physical form, close to her body to keep her from harm.

may be found in Naveh, Palestinian. Cf. also Müller-Kessler / Mitchell / Hockey, Amulet.

²¹ Naveh / Shaked, Spells 22-31.

²² See, e.g., Naveh / Shaked, Spells, Geniza 25 1,1-3: “Another one ... and say over it the *Shema* seven times, up to its end.” The context unfortunately does not allow us to understand entirely the purpose for which Deut 6,4 is adduced, but it is apparently for healing of some sort. Cf. Naveh / Shaked, Spells Geniza 23 1,4.

²³ On which see especially Kraus, Septuaginta-Psalms 90. On the broader phenomenon of Psalms in amulets, see Collart, *Psaumes*.

²⁴ Naveh / Shaked call this “perhaps the most commonly used verse in the magic texts.” See Spells 25; cf., e.g., Naveh / Shaked, Amulets: Amulet 1,5-6.

²⁵ Text and translation from Naveh / Shaked, Amulets: Amulet 13 // 2-22. Cf. also Naveh / Shaked, Amulets: Geniza 8,21-27. In TS K1.137 // 23-29, Deut 7,15 is quoted followed immediately by Exod 15,26 (Schiffman / Swartz, Texts 38-39, 131-36).

²⁶ Cf. Frankfurter, Power, esp. 464-65.

Two amulets that date from over a millennium earlier than most of these suggest that there was a long period of broad continuity in the making of apotropaic amulets. In 1979 two small silver plaques, inscribed and rolled to be worn as amulets, were discovered in a burial chamber at Ketef Hinnom in Jerusalem in an excavation led by Gabriel Barkay.²⁷ Both amulets apparently contain some form of the priestly blessing, and are likely to date from the 7th - 6th century B.C.E.,²⁸ thus providing our earliest physical witnesses to any biblical text.²⁹ Even though these two amulets date from centuries before the amulets we have just been considering, there are striking correspondences between them. The text of each is short enough to justify quoting them in full. The first amulet (Ketef Hinnom I) reads:

¹...YHW...³the grea[t...who keeps] ⁴the covenant and ⁵[G]raciousness toward those who love [him] and (*alt*: those who love [hi]m;) ⁶those who keep [his commandments...⁷....]. ⁸the Eternal? [...]. ⁹[the?] blessing more than any ¹⁰[sna]re and more than Evil. ¹¹For redemption is in him. ¹²For YHWH ¹³is our restorer [and] ¹⁴rock. May YHWH bles[s] ¹⁵you and ¹⁶[may he] keep you. ¹⁷[May] YHWH make ¹⁸[his face] shine...³⁰

At least three points are worth noting here. First, the amulet seems to quote, at least in some form, the priestly benediction at its conclusion (*ll.* 14b-18), much as the amulets we examined briefly above often make their final point by allowing the biblical text to express the purpose of the entire object. The words are thus given a place of prominence, likely reflecting a belief in their intrinsic power to accomplish specific ends. Second, though the text is too fragmentary to be sure, the amulet preserves a text that bears some resemblance to Deut 7,9. In *ll.* 4-7, the text of the amulet reads:

²⁷ On the Ketef Hinnom amulets, see esp. Barkay, *Benediction*; Barkay et al., *Amulets*. Cf. also Yardeni, *Remarks*; Martin-Achard, *Remarques*, esp. 78-84; McCarter, *Ketef Hinnom*; Waaler, *Date*; Barkay et al., *Challenges*.

²⁸ Note the attempt to revise the date to a late post-exilic time (2nd - 1st century B.C.E.) in Renz, *Inschriften* 447-56. Barkay, et al., *Amulets* 50-52, are probably correct in their refutation of Renz based on new high resolution photographs. If, as appears unlikely, Renz were to be correct in his dating, this would provide further temporally proximate evidence for the claim being here advanced.

²⁹ One of the inscriptions found at Kuntillet 'Ajrud, which may predate these amulets by over a century, also bears a similarity to the priestly blessing, though less pronounced than the Ketef Hinnom amulets. For the inscription, see, e.g., Hadley, *Drawings*, esp. 185-187.

³⁰ This reproduces the translation and suggested restorations of Barkay, et al., *Amulets*, which is the most recent and full edition of the amulets, complete with new readings based on enhanced photographs (on which see Barkay, et al., *Challenges*).

הברית ו [ה]חסד לאהב [י or ו] ושמרי ...]

This displays a suggestive similarity with Deut 7,9:

האל הנאמן שמר הברית והחסד לאהבו ולשמרי מצותו

The key terms “covenant,” “steadfast love,” and “toward those who love” and “who keep” are all present in both texts. Indeed, the editors of Ketef Hinnom I have taken some clue from the parallel in Deuteronomy (and also in Dan 9,4 and Neh 1,5) in their suggested restorations.³¹ Third, though the surviving lines are too fragmentary to produce a fully convincing restoration, surely it is important that “Evil” (הרע) is mentioned in *l.* 10.³² The second amulet may help to discern the importance of this feature.

The second silver amulet, Ketef Hinnom II, is somewhat shorter than the first and reads as follows:

[For PN, (the son/daughter of) xxx] ¹h/hu. May h[e]/²sh[e] be blessed by Yahweh, ³the warrior [or: helper] and³³ ⁴the rebuker of ⁵[E]vil: May Yahweh bless you, ⁶keep you. ⁷May Yahweh make ⁶his face shine ⁷upon you and ⁸grant you p[ea]ce.³⁴

Two aspects of this amulet deserve to be highlighted. First, the quotation of the priestly benediction functions in the same position and probably in the same role as in the first amulet, itself constituting the request for blessing for which the amulet was conceived. Second, here Yahweh is called “the rebuker of [E]vil” (*ll.* 4-5a; ב[ר]ע).³⁵ The language is reminiscent of Zech 3,2, a text that recurs frequently in apotropaic contexts. To invoke Yahweh as the one who rebukes evil is to invoke him for a prophylactic or apotropaic end. Such

³¹ See Barkay et al., Amulets 55-57; cf. Waaler, Date 49-51, though his reading needs to be revised in light of the new version offered by Barkay, et al. There need not be a strict choice made between these parallel texts since the question is probably to be construed as one of parallel traditions, perhaps liturgical, rather than direct sources. All of these, however, seem to stand within an identifiable line of interpretation and reflection on the great announcement of the divine character in Exod 34,6-7; cf. Fishbane, Interpretation 341-345.

³² The capitalization of “Evil” reflects the conviction of Barkay, et al., that the articular form of the Hebrew word is intended to express evil *par excellence* (Amulets 58-60).

³³ I have omitted from the translation of Barkay, et al., a repetition of the word “and” here that can only have been a typographical error, having no basis in the Hebrew restoration they offer.

³⁴ Barkay, et al., Amulets 68.

³⁵ The Hebrew verb נער normally takes the ב preposition, as here. See Gen 37,10; Ruth 2,16; Isa 17,3; 54,9; Jer 29,27; Nah 1,4; Zech 3,2; Ps 106,9 (though not in Ps 9,6; 68,31; 119,21; Mal 2,3, 3,11).

language further strengthens the possibility that the reference to “the Evil” in Ketef Hinnom I should be construed as a plea for protection from demonic or antagonistic supernatural forces of some kind. Prophylactic incantation texts are known from contemporaneous non-Israelite remains,³⁶ and it is very likely that “these artifacts both served as amulets and that their function falls in line with similar amulets whose inscriptions invoke divine protection for the wearer through the use of one of the tradition’s most famous prayers.”³⁷ We know that the priestly blessing continued to play a role in apotropaic contexts throughout the centuries,³⁸ and the Ketef Hinnom amulets serve as a witness to the roots of the tree whose branches we find flowering in Late Antiquity.

Rather close in content to the later amulets, though different in form and perhaps more specialized in purpose, are the Aramaic incantation bowls from Babylon and Mesopotamia.³⁹ Probably meant to be buried near the perimeter of one’s dwelling for prophylactic reasons, such bowls usually consist of texts of incantations written in spirals or columns inside a bowl against specific demonic threats. Though such bowls are more remote from our concern with the Second Temple period, both in terms of date (3rd-6th century C.E.) and geographical distance, it is worth highlighting the important role that quotations of Scripture play in some of these bowls. While several incantation bowls have come to light in which Scripture plays a constitutive role,⁴⁰ two are particularly noteworthy in connection with our concern here. The first, found near modern

³⁶ For two such incantation texts, see Albright, *Text*; Cross / Saley, *Incantations*; Gaster, *Hang-Up*; Conklin, *Arslan Tash I*. The authenticity of these tablets was questioned by some in the 1980s, but their authenticity has recently been staunchly defended; see von Dijk, *Authenticity*; Pardee, *Documents*.

³⁷ Barkay, et al., *Amulets* 68. It should be noted that this is a shift from the position previously advanced in his 1992 essay (Barkay, *Benediction* 185), based, once more, on enhanced photographs enabling better readings of the text.

³⁸ See Naveh / Shaked, *Amulets: Geniza 7,33-37* (= TS K1.127; also in Schiffman / Swartz, *Incantation Texts* 113-22); Isbell, *Corpus* no. 66; cf. Yardeni, *Remarks* 185; Naveh / Shaked, *Spells* 26-27. Note also the remarkable adaptation of the priestly benediction in IQS 2,1-4 to include both blessing and cursing. And note further *Tg. Ps.-J. Num* 6,24 and *Sifre Num* 6,24 (which also quotes Ps 91,11). For these latter two, see Eshel, *Prayers* 70-71.

³⁹ On Aramaic Incantation Bowls, see Montgomery, *Texts*; with the important notes and corrections by Epstein, *Texte*; Epstein, *Gloses*. See also Isbell, *Corpus*; Isbell, *Bowls*; Isbell, *Story*; Naveh / Shaked, *Amulets*; Naveh / Shaked, *Spells*; Gordon, *Bowls*; Geller, *Spells*; Moriggi, *Bowls*.

⁴⁰ Interesting to note, in addition to the two discussed below, is an incantation bowl that quotes Num 10,35, a text often used in Samaritan amulets (cf. above). See Naveh / Shaked, *Amulets: Bowl 3*. Cf. also Kaufman, *Bowl*, for a bowl which consists of Jer 2,1-3 and Ezek 21,21-23 in both Hebrew and Targumic renditions.

day Baghdad, combines three texts we noted above, Zech 3,2, Deut 6,4 and Ps 91,1. In fact, after quoting Zech 3,2, the text intersperses the individual words of Deut 6,4 with those of Ps 91,1 to form a single text (e.g., “Hear, he that dwells, O Israel, in the secret place, the Lord,” etc.).⁴¹ The second bowl, whose origin remains obscure, is apparently a curse text against a named individual (“Judah son of Nanay”) rather than a protective charm against demonic forces or beings.⁴² It is especially notable for the litany of biblical texts it produces, more than any other extant bowl. It quotes, in order of their appearance in the text, Ps 69,24,26; Exod 22,23; Deut 28,22,35,28;⁴³ Lev 26,29; Micah 7,16-17; Deut 29,19.⁴⁴ In this bowl a somewhat different appeal to the scriptural text may be discerned, no doubt connected to its purpose as a curse rather than a prophylactic. Rather than appealing to the force of scriptural words for protection, the petitioner requests that his or her enemy be cursed by taking up the language of the biblical curses. The petitioner even requests, “May the following verse apply to him ...”⁴⁵ and goes on, “And the following may apply to Judah son of Nanay ...”⁴⁶ The language of Scripture supplied the powerful, indeed even divine, curses with which to curse one’s worst enemy.⁴⁷

If magic has an “international character”⁴⁸ in the ancient world this may be seen most clearly in the amalgam of incantatory texts we have come to call the Greek magical papyri.⁴⁹ Ranging widely in date, provenance, cultural background, and religious affinity, these texts testify to the widespread importance of magic in the period of Late Antiquity, even if that very “wideness” limits

⁴¹ Naveh / Shaked, Amulets: Bowl 11; cf. the similar practice in the *Havdala de-Rabbi 'Aqiva* §9 noted in Nitzan, Prayer 364. Another incantation bowl contains both Deut 6,4 and Zech 3,2 in near proximity; see Isbell, Corpus no. 35 = Montgomery, Texts no. 26; cf. also the quotation of the *Shema* in the “De Menil Bowl” Part III.3 in Isbell, Bowls 18.

⁴² Naveh / Shaked, Amulets: Bowl 9; cf. Gager, Tablets 205-207, no. 109.

⁴³ Note the 2nd century epitaph from Euboea which also quotes Deut 28,22,28. See Robert, Malédiction, esp. 244-250; cf. *IG* XII, 9.955, 1179; *SIG* 3.1240; Trebilco, Communities 68-69.

⁴⁴ Deut 29,19 is, of course, a text of some importance in IQS 2; cf. also the probable allusion to Deut 29,18-19 in Heb 12,15.

⁴⁵ Naveh / Shaked, Amulets: Bowl 9, ll. 6-7a (ויתקים עליה קראה דכתיב).

⁴⁶ Naveh / Shaked, Amulets: Bowl 9, l. 7b (יתקים עליה על יהודה בר נני).

⁴⁷ Such curses are not adequately accounted for in the critique of some theories of language offered by Thiselton, Power, although his general point is well-taken.

⁴⁸ Naveh / Shaked, Amulets 27.

⁴⁹ Preisendanz, Papyri; Betz, Papyri; Daniel / Maltomini, Supplementum. For introductory issues, see the extensive survey in Brashear, Papyri; Nock, Papyri.

their usefulness for our understanding of any one stream of religious tradition such as Judaism or Christianity. Nevertheless, perhaps in part due to the international reputation of Jews as magicians in the ancient world,⁵⁰ we find numerous aspects of Jewish influence in the papyri.⁵¹ Throughout the papyri are preserved names of biblical figures,⁵² especially Moses,⁵³ partial midrashic traditions that can be mutually illuminated by rabbinic literature,⁵⁴ and evidence of some broader dependence on Jewish Scripture.⁵⁵ For example, the famous “tested charm of Pibechis for those possessed by demons” (*PGM* IV.3007-86) is replete with echoes of Jewish Scripture, although some garbled epithets (e.g., “the god of the Hebrews, Jesus” in *l.* 3020f) show that the incantation cannot be considered Jewish in its entirety. In the course of the incantation, the reciter says, “I conjure you by the one who appeared to Osrael [*sic*] in a shining pillar and a cloud by day, who saved his people from the Pharaoh and brought upon Pharaoh the ten plagues because of his disobedience” (*ll.* 3030ff).⁵⁶ Similar epithets are used to adjure the God of Israel throughout the incantation. It must be admitted, however, that Pibechis’ charm is somewhat unique among the papyri,⁵⁷ and in general we do not find the same patterns of citing Scripture there as in the amulets and incantation bowls. Further, while some of the papyri may be dated early and others show evidence of preserving prior tradition,⁵⁸ to

⁵⁰ See Simon, *Israel* 340-43; further, note Stern, *Authors*: nos. 137 (Pompeius Trogus) and 221 (Pliny the Elder).

⁵¹ See, e.g., IV. 1227-64; IV. 3007-86; etc. For the question of Jewish influence in the papyri, note Gager, *Moses* 140-152; Betz, *Formation*; Sperber, *Themes*; Smith, *Elements*; Brashear, *Papyri* 3426-3428; Betz, *Magic*.

⁵² Betz, *Formation*, notes that Moses (V.96-171; VII.619-27; XIII.1-3, 21, 343f., 724, 731f., 970, 1057, 1077), Jacob (XXII.b) and Solomon (IV.850-929, 3039f) are mentioned.

⁵³ In addition to Betz cited in the previous note, see esp. Gager, *Moses* 140-152, who emphasizes, however, that the mention of Moses is hardly a sufficient condition for the ascription of certain traditions in the papyri to Jewish origin.

⁵⁴ Sperber, *Themes*.

⁵⁵ Cf. Judge, *Use*; Leonas, *Septuagint*.

⁵⁶ Translated by W.C. Grese in Betz, *Papyri* 96.

⁵⁷ But see the somewhat similar tablet adduced in Deissmann, *Studies* 271-300, which he calls “An Epigraphic Memorial of the Septuagint.” Cf. also Alexander, *Elements*, esp. 1074-1075.

⁵⁸ Daniel / Maltomini, *Supplementum*, vol. II: nos. 70, 71, 72, 52, 73, 67, are all to be dated in or before the 1st century C.E., and so they show that the types of spells found in the generally later Greek magical papyri had earlier currency and preserve earlier forms (although these six do not display any specifically Jewish elements); cf. further the chronological list in Brashear, *Papyri* 3491-3493.

base any conclusion on the presence of an element in the Greek magical papyri would be suspect. Any Jewish influence is certainly not “one-way” and it is difficult to draw any conclusion about the Jewishness of any particular document with any broad strokes.

3. Early Apotropaic Texts

Clearly, many of these texts are quite late, none earlier than the second century, except the amulets from Ketef Hinnom. They do, however, stand in a line of tradition that stretches back to the Second Temple period. To examine these older texts in light of the more recent produces some intriguing and suggestive results.

While many texts of the Second Temple period highlight stories of or references to exorcisms (esp. the Synoptic Gospels), the Dead Sea Scrolls have provided us with the most direct evidence for the praxis of exorcisms and incantations. Practices that might be described, once more only roughly,⁵⁹ as ‘magical,’ find a significant, though not ubiquitous, presence in the Qumran manuscripts.⁶⁰ Philip S. Alexander has suggested that such remains might be broadly divided into two main groups: texts concerned with “divination, augury and prediction of the future” on one hand,⁶¹ and texts concerned with “defence against demons and evil spirits” on the other.⁶² This latter group will concern us here, and in particular three texts that evince an appropriation of Scripture for prophylactic ends and might variously be termed “liturgical-apotropaic”

⁵⁹ Brooke (Deuteronomy 18.9-14) argues that “[a]lthough some aspects of this practice might be labeled by modern scholars as ‘magic,’ nowhere do the Qumran texts speak clearly and positively of anything that might be associated with the list of forbidden practices in Deut. 18.9-14” (81). Especially significant is the presence of Deut 18,9-14 in 11QT 60,16-20 with no muting, omission, or alteration of the prohibition of the practices there proscribed.

⁶⁰ Generally, note Alexander, Incantations 364-366; Alexander, “Wrestling”; Alexander, Magic; Lange, Position; Frölich, Demons; Brooke, Deuteronomy 18.9-14.

⁶¹ Including the “brontologion” in 4Q318 (on which see, e.g., Geller, Documents); the “horoscope” in 4Q186 and the “horoscope/physiognomy” in 4Q561 (on these two, note esp. Albani, Horoscopes, who, however, cautions against assuming that such texts were endorsed by the Qumran community). One might also mention the evidence from Josephus that Scripture(?) was studied by the Essenes to ascertain the future: “There are some among them who profess to foretell the future, being versed from their early years in holy books, various forms of purification and apophthegms of prophets; and seldom, if ever, do they err in their predictions” (*J.W.* 2.159, LCL).

⁶² Alexander, Wrestling; Alexander, Magic.

(11Q11; 4Q510-11) or incantatory or theurgic (4Q560).⁶³ In these texts, Scripture does not figure as prominently or formulaically as in the later amulets and incantation bowls, but when these findings are placed in comparison with the latter, their relevance for our discussion is enhanced.

The manuscript known as 11Q11 (= 11QPsAp^a) is a fragmentary scroll containing four psalms, only one of which (IV) comprises a psalm from the canonical psalter.⁶⁴ Significantly, this last psalm, which is also the most fully preserved, is the 91st, with a few overall minor differences from the MT.⁶⁵ At least one of these differences, whatever its origin may be, lends to the psalm a more universal applicability: a shift from “I will say” (אמר) to “Whoever says” (האומר) in v.2. Following a suggestion by the scroll’s first editor, J. van der Ploeg, E. Puech has argued that the scroll contains the four “songs for making music over the stricken (הפגיעים)” mentioned in the list of David’s compositions in 11Q5 (= 11QPs^a) 27,9-10.⁶⁶ If so, this would be an early identification of Psalm 91 with its later rabbinic description as a “song for the stricken / oppressed” (*b. Shebu.* 15b; cf. *y. Shab.* 6,2), and stands in strong continuity with the presence of Psalm 91 in apotropaic texts that we noted earlier in our discussion.⁶⁷ The other psalms in the collection, though more fragmentary, are clearly exorcistic in nature, specifically naming demons as the objects of Yahweh’s subjugation (e.g., Ps. I frag A,9; Ps. II 1,3-5, Ps III 4,5-7). Further indications of their apotropaic nature include mention of Solomon (I,3),⁶⁸ and

⁶³ Further on the theme of exorcism at Qumran, note also 4QPrNab (=4Q242): a Jewish exorcist [גִּזְר] from the exile forgives Nabonidus his sin and he is healed; and 1QapGen ar 20:16-29, esp. 28-29: Abram lays his hands on the king and prays for the removal of the evil spirit. Further, Flusser, *Qumran*, suggests that the phrase “Let Satan and an impure spirit not rule over me” in 11Q5 19.15 is a midrashic paraphrase of Ps 119,133b: “Let all iniquity not rule over me” (217), and the difference suggests that the “Plea for Deliverance” in 11Q5 might be classifiable as an apotropaic prayer. Note also the fragmentary “curse” texts (4Q280; 5Q14) and incantation / hymnic texts (4Q444; 6Q18? 8Q5?). Unfortunately, 4Q230-31 (Catalogue of Spirits^{a-b}), which would likely be relevant to our discussion, are listed as “could not be located” in *Tov, Texts*.

⁶⁴ For 11Q11, see van der Ploeg, *Psaume xci*; van der Ploeg, *Rouleau*; Puech, 11QPsAp^a; Puech, *Psaumes*; Sanders, *Liturgy*; García Martínez / Tigchelaar / van der Woude, *Qumran 181-205* (pls. XXII-XXV, LIII). Note also Delcor, *L’ utilisation*.

⁶⁵ See Sanders, *Liturgy* 230-33 for comparison.

⁶⁶ Cf. 1 Sam 16,14-23. See esp. Puech, 11QPsAp^a. For 11Q5 27, see Sanders, *Psalms* 91-93; Sanders, *Compositions* 213-15 (who also follows Puech’s suggestion).

⁶⁷ The implications of the apotropaic usage of this psalm for the quotation of Ps 91,11 in the temptation narrative in Matt 4 and Luke 4 are suggestive.

⁶⁸ Or *l. 2* in some editions (e.g., Sanders, *Liturgy*).

the explicit use of the tetragrammaton (e.g., 11Q11 frg. A l. 3; 2,4.10.11; 3,4, etc.).⁶⁹ In the judgment of Puech, then, this scroll comprises “the oldest known Hebrew magical ritual from the Second Temple era.”⁷⁰ The fact that one major portion of this scroll is solely devoted to a quotation of the biblical text for prophylactic ends should not go unnoticed.⁷¹

A second example of a liturgical-apotropaic text from Qumran provides evidence of a different stance toward combating hostile evil forces.⁷² While 11Q11 addresses demons and Belial directly in the manner of an exorcism, the closely related texts 4Q510 and 4Q511 (= 4QShir^{a-b} or 4QSongs of the Sage^{a-b}) appear to be more concerned with preventative measures.⁷³ This may suggest that while 11Q11 envisages a situation in which a “breach” has already been made by demonic forces into the community, 4Q510-11 has daily maintenance of the defenses against such forces in mind.⁷⁴ Perhaps the most striking aspect of these texts is that, were it not for a few key phrases, the songs would appear to be normal liturgical compositions. But the *Maskil* clearly states the purpose of the praise:

And I, a Sage, declare the splendour of his radiance in order to frighten and terrify all the spirits of the ravaging angels and the bastard spirits, demons, Lilith, owls and [jackals...] and those who strike unexpectedly to lead astray the spirit of knowledge, to make their hearts forlorn.⁷⁵

⁶⁹ Puech, 11QPsAp^a 401-403; Puech, Psaumes 80-81. On the power of the divine name, see further the 3rd-2nd century B.C.E. work of Artapanus, *apud* Eusebius, *H.E.* 9.27.24-26.

⁷⁰ Puech, 11QPsAp^a 403 (“le plus ancien rituel magique hébreu connu de l’époque du second temple”). He further suggests that the scroll may itself have served an apotropaic function as an amulet (Psaumes 81), but this seems somewhat unlikely, especially given the fact that the scroll probably contained four complete psalms. The scroll may have been a personal copy while not itself an amulet.

⁷¹ Concerning the famous incantation in *PGM* IV.3007-86, mentioned above, Knox, (Exorcism 202) writes, “Here we seem to have a series of liturgical exorcisms which were intended to effect their purpose without endangering the loyalty of the exorcist of [*sic*; or?] the patient to the religion of the Bible.” While this seems to be a somewhat unpersuasive conclusion to draw for the papyri, the conclusion suits 11Q11 rather well.

⁷² So Eshel, Prayers, though Eshel draws the difference between apotropaic prayer and incantation in starker relief than we do here.

⁷³ For text and commentary, see Baillet, Qumrân 215-262 with pls. LV-LXXI; Nitzan, Hymns 53-63; Nitzan, Prayer 227-72, 359-365; Beyer, Texte 129-30.

⁷⁴ So Alexander, Wrestling; Alexander, Demonology.

⁷⁵ 4Q510 1.4-6 (translation of García Martínez / Tigchelaar). Cf. 4Q511 8,4; 35,6-8; 48; 49+51.2-3. See also Lange, Position 432.

The songs, however, are chiefly comprised of the praises of God rather than, as in some later magical texts, descriptions and refutations of the demonic. To this end, Scripture is employed throughout the songs, although, as in the *Hodayot*, the language is thoroughly allusive.⁷⁶ Especially intriguing is 4Q511 frag. 8, which appears to have been heavily indebted to Psalm 91.⁷⁷ Moreover, 4Q511 frag. 30 is a sustained engagement with Isa 40,12, a verse that also recurs in later magical contexts.⁷⁸ These songs are admittedly less straightforwardly dependent upon the words of Scripture than some later examples, but this may be a function of their genre as hymns rather than as incantations *per se*. Nevertheless, as Nitzan concludes from her extensive investigations of the songs, they “provide us with ancient antecedents and sources for some of the forms, motifs and biblical verses used in later incantations.”⁷⁹

Finally, 4Q560 (= 4QExorcism ar) preserves the fragments of what appears to be an early exemplar of a magical recipe book.⁸⁰ Whether Beelzebub should be read in *l.* 1 or not,⁸¹ the text is clearly preoccupied with naming potential assailants in the manner of later magical texts (frag 1 I,2-6).⁸² For example, the pair “fever and chills” (אשׁא וערידה) in I.4 is ubiquitous in later incantations.⁸³ What is more, Penney and Wise have suggested that I.4 may preserve a partial quotation of Exod 34,7.⁸⁴ On this point, the text is too fragmentary to be sure, but in light of the general tendency to quote scriptural texts to lend power to incantations, it would certainly not be surprising to find a text quoted in such a context. While 4Q560 is only preserved fragmentarily, what we can see of this

⁷⁶ See esp. the works by Nitzan listed in the bibliography.

⁷⁷ See Alexander, *Wrestling* 320-21; Puech, 11QPsAp^a 400.

⁷⁸ Isa 40,12 also occurs in Naveh / Shaked, *Amulets: Amulet 15 ll.* 17-23 and *Bowls 12a* and *12b*. Cf. also *Sepher Ha-Razim* 1,225-30 (Morgan, *Sepher* 42).

⁷⁹ Nitzan, *Hymns* 63.

⁸⁰ For text and commentary, see Penney and Wise, *Power*; Naveh, *Fragments*; according to E. Tov, *Texts*, the text is to be published in DJD XXXVII. Alexander, *Demonology* 345, suggests that 4Q560 is “probably a non-sectarian text pressed into service at Qumran,” and that it preserves “the remnants of a recipe book containing the texts of amulets, which a professional magician would have copied out and personalized for a client’s use.”

⁸¹ Naveh takes issue with Penney / Wise on this point, suggesting that the word should be read as “and heart” instead (followed, e.g., by *DSSSE*).

⁸² See esp. Penney / Wise, *Power*, for connections to later incantations.

⁸³ See, e.g. Naveh / Shaked, *Amulets: Amulet no. 2 l.* 2, 8, 12; no. 3 *l.* 22; no. 4 *ll.* 28-29, etc. As I hope to show elsewhere, the pairing, while in some ways natural, may also be derivative from Deut 28,22.

⁸⁴ Penney / Wise, *Power*.

text suggests that there is a surprising degree of continuity in ‘magical’ or theurgic practices across the centuries.⁸⁵

4. Scripture in Apotropaic Texts in the Second Temple Period

What, then, shall we conclude about the presence and force of Scripture in liturgical-apotropaic and ‘magical’ texts? Several conclusions should be emphasized. Clearly, the later texts found in amulets, bowls, and especially in the Greek magical papyri preserve much more elaborate and formulaic incantations than we find in the Second Temple period. The eventual deposit of Jewish apotropaic incantations we encounter, for example, in the Cairo Geniza, is a reservoir that was fed by many streams, and a number of cultural, religious, and geographical factors, many of which are irrecoverable to us now, exerted influence on the shape and content of those later texts.

Nevertheless, although the evidence from the Second Temple period is not as formalized or elaborate as later ritual incantations, some basic elements of continuity across the centuries are discernible. In this regard, it is instructive to compare the evidence garnered from Qumran with that of the later Geniza texts (which, in turn, are a fairly representative example of other later Jewish incantations). Schiffman and Swartz suggest that the following elements characterize most incantatory texts from the Cairo Geniza:

1. The divine figures are invoked in the name of God.
2. They are then adjured to do specific or general tasks for the client or magician.
3. The client is usually specified by name.
4. The ailments from which the client is to be protected or the benefits to be acquired are then elaborated in extensive lists, so as to include as many functions as possible. These lists are followed by specific application to the case at hand.
5. These requests are reiterated and ensured by the recitation and quotation of biblical verses and other formulae.
6. The incantation comes to a formal end with the formula ‘Amen’ or ‘Selah’.⁸⁶

To take each of these briefly in turn will demonstrate both the continuity and the discontinuity between the two bodies of material.

1. The exorcistic psalm scroll 11Q11 preserves at the beginning of two of its four psalms a reference to Yahweh by name (Ps I: ביהוה; Ps II: בשם יהוה), which may have served as an invocation in each case. One major difference from the later incantation texts, however, is the apparent lack of any address to

⁸⁵ See esp. Naveh, *Fragments*.

⁸⁶ Schiffman / Swartz, *Incantation Texts* 60.

various angels by name. Rather, the psalms address themselves variously to God, to fellow worshipers, or to the demonic enemy, and the change of person sometimes makes it especially difficult to be sure who is being addressed or adjured

2. and 4. These two elements do not appear as distinctive categories in the Qumran texts. In 11Q11 the benefits sought are expressed in general terms as the deliverance from evil (esp. 5,8-12; 6,5-13). In 4Q560, there may be more specificity. The first column is certainly concerned with enumerating a list of potential demonic assailants for the purpose of securing deliverance from them (i.e., #4). It is just possible, though difficult to be certain because of the fragmentary state of the text, that there are the remnants of specific indications of a benefit required (i.e., #2). Does the reference to a “midwife” (וילדתה) in 1,2 refer to a demonic threat or to an incantation specifically asking for the safety of a birth?⁸⁷

3. The Qumran evidence does not preserve the name of any specific client, nor do we find the expression “N. son of N.” as in later incantation manuals. Perhaps 4Q560, if it had been more fully preserved, is the most likely text to have contained such a reference, containing, apparently, the remnants of a magical “recipe book.” Perhaps, however, it is worth mentioning that the psalms in 11Q11 have a certain generalizing tendency, making them more fit for use as instructions in exorcistic praxis.⁸⁸ For example, Ps III (=11Q11 5,4-6,3) is in the form of instructions to the afflicted one (“When] he comes upon you in the nig[ht,] you shall [s]ay to him ...”). We have noted above the difference in Ps 91,2 from “I will say” (MT) to “Whoever says” or “He who says” (11Q11 6,4).

5. The presence of Scripture is especially prominent in 11Q11, but also to be found in 4Q510-11, while 4Q560 is too fragmentary for any definite conclusions. The fact that the fourth psalm in 11Q11 is scriptural in its entirety suggests that, whatever the precise bounds of the Qumran canon or psalter at that time, this “song for the afflicted” was most likely explicitly ascribed to David (cf. 11Q11 5,4) and was seen to have a certain anti-demonic power. If the third psalm in the scroll was viewed as scriptural by the sect, the conclusion is strengthened further. What is more, 4Q510-11, while certainly more allusive than 11Q11 or than later incantations, is significantly indebted to Scripture (recall the major allusions to Ps 91 and Isa 40,12). Its lack of explicitness may be accounted for by consideration of its purpose (preventative rather than exorcistic) and genre (song rather than incantation *per se*).

⁸⁷ Cf. Penney / Wise, Power 634-635. Cf. *Sepher ha-Razim* 2,120-30 (Morgan, *Sepher* 54).

⁸⁸ So also Eshel, Prayers 73-74.

6. Finally, 4Q560 is too fragmentary to preserve any concluding formula. 4Q511 is fragmentary at the conclusion of the first song (frag 8,2-4), but preserves a double “Amen” at the end of frags. 63-64 col. 4,3. It is not clear, however, that the significance of this should be pressed into service of comparison, because, as we have repeatedly noted, the function of 4Q510-11 is liturgical-apotropaic rather than incantatory *per se*. The ends of the psalms in 11Q11 are often missing or fragmentary, but Puech has suggested that each ended with “Amen. Amen. *Selah*.”⁸⁹ *Selah* is preserved at 6,3 and, significantly, at 6,14, the end of Ps 91, whereas it is missing in the MT. The fragments seem to allow the space for this liturgical conclusion in each case, and it seems probable that it was found at the conclusion to each psalm.

This comparison is both revealing and suggestive. It is revealing in that it demonstrates a significant degree of continuity with later practice, but perhaps an equal degree of discontinuity. Many elements are similar in the Qumran material and the later incantations, as this comparison has made clear. Equally clear, however, is the degree of fluidity and lack of formula in the earlier material, especially as compared to the later incantations which seem to thrive on formulae for their very efficacy. Perhaps both aspects may be related to broader dynamics of the processes of memory and tradition.

The comparison is suggestive in that it highlights what may be an overly stringent dichotomy: liturgical vs. apotropaic practice. With the exception of the fragmentary 4Q560, the other major incantatory texts from Qumran that we have examined are explicitly liturgical (4Q510-11, 11Q11). On the one hand, this may simply be due to the accidents of history, and to draw any significant conclusion from this fact alone would be irresponsible. Further, the media in which these texts are preserved may be significant; we do not have amulets from Qumran like those from Ketef Hinnom or later sites, and it is less clear how such amulets might have functioned liturgically. On the other hand, we noted above that Naveh and Shaked suggested that the presence of significant biblical texts in incantations was due to their liturgical prominence.⁹⁰ A certain progression from liturgy to apotropaism is not difficult to imagine. After all, to move from praying imprecatory psalms to praying exorcistic psalms is but a short distance, and surely the scriptural proclamation of the power and glory of God heard in the synagogue or house of study would not be forgotten when faced with supernatural danger.

⁸⁹ Puech, 11QPsAp^a.

⁹⁰ Naveh / Shaked, Spells 22-31.

5. Conclusion

To move from a recognition of the general importance of the apotropaic employment of Scripture in the Second Temple period and a sense of its connection to contemporaneous liturgical practice to a specific 'apotropaic interpretation' of any one text is a perilous process. Deuteronomy, for example, does not figure prominently in any of the three texts we have examined from Qumran, although there may be a trace of it (or one of its traditions) in Ketef Hinnom I and much more in later incantation texts. Yet we know that Deuteronomy was central to much liturgical activity of the Second Temple period (not least at Qumran). No direct lines can be drawn from liturgy to apotropaism, but the present investigation should render a twofold sensitivity in considering the reception of Scripture in the Second Temple period: first, a sensitivity to the widespread apotropaic notion of the power of Scripture's words may cause us to reconsider our view of its reception in liturgical contexts, for example, in the *tefillin* and *mezuzot*.⁹¹ Second, and related to the first, such knowledge renders one sensitive to the disputed, public territory the scriptural text would have been. It reveals Scripture as a powerful text, but also as a public text, a plot of contested ground, a word *déjà lu*. To examine the presence of Scripture in its literary reception in the Second Temple period remains, of course, of paramount concern; the views provided by these encounters should, however, lend those examinations both a depth and a sensitivity they might otherwise lack. The identifiable continuities with later traditions imply that Scripture was likely to have been employed in that manner more widely than the remains we now possess would otherwise lead us to believe.

Summary

The apotropaic employment of Scripture in the Second Temple period has been relatively neglected. This article, therefore, seeks to investigate the evidence by first examining later remains in amulets, incantation bowls, and the Greek magical papyri and then tracing lines of continuity back into the Second Temple period, focusing especially

⁹¹ For connections between amulets and *tefillin*, note *m. Šabb.* 6:2; Jerome, *Comm. Matt.* on 23,5; cf. Simon, *Israel* 354; Yardeni, *Remarks* 185. Note also the rabbinic warnings against the magical use of *tefillin* in *b. 'Erub.* 96b; cf. Schürer, *History* II:480; Tigay, *Term*, esp. 51 n.32; but note also the word 'phylactery' transliterated into (Christian) Palestinian Aramaic in Naveh / Shaked, *Spells: Amulet no. 32*. For *mezuzot*, note the Talmudic discussion of why the *mezuzah* should be affixed nearest to the street: "R. H̄anina of Sura says, So that it should protect the entire house" (*b. Men.* 33b, Soncino ed., 209), followed immediately by a citation of Ps 91,5. Cf. *b. Men.* 43b; *y. Pe'ah* 1,1, 15d; *Tg. Cant.* 8,3; *b. Men.* 32b. See also Jansson, *Magic*.

on three extant texts from Qumran. Ultimately, a high degree of confluence between liturgical and apotropaic texts is suggested.

Zusammenfassung

Die apotropäischen Praktiken der Schrift in der Zeit des Zweiten Tempels wurden bisher mehr oder weniger vernachlässigt. Dieser Artikel untersucht daher das Belegmaterial, indem zuerst die Überreste von Amuletten, Beschwörungsgefäßen und griechischen magischen Papyri untersucht werden, um dann die Kontinuität bis in die späte Zeit der Zweiten Tempelperiode weiter zu verfolgen, besonders konzentriert auf drei noch vorhandene Texte von Qumran. Schließlich wird ein hohes Maß der Querverbindungen zwischen liturgischen und apotropäischen Texten angenommen.

Bibliographie

- Albani, M., Horoscopes in the Qumran Scrolls, in: Flint, P.W. / VanderKam, J.C. (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment, II.* Leiden / Boston 1999, 279-330.
- Albright, W.F., An Aramaean Magical Text in Hebrew from the Seventh Century B.C.: *BASOR* 76 (1939) 5-11.
- Alexander, P.S., Incantations and Books of Magic, in: Schürer, E. (ed.), *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135)*, III.1. Revised English version by Vermes, G. / Millar, F. / Goodman, M., Edinburgh 1986, 342-379.
- Alexander, P.S., Jewish Elements in Gnosticism and Magic c. CE 70 - c. CE 270, in: Horbury, W. / Davies, W.D. / Sturdy, J. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism, III. The Early Roman Period*, Cambridge 1999, 1052-1078.
- Alexander, P.S., *Magic and Magical Texts: EDSS I*, 1998, 502-504.
- Alexander, P.S., The Demonology of the Dead Sea Scrolls, in: Flint, P.W. / VanderKam, J.C. (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment, II.* Leiden / Boston 1999, 331-353.
- Alexander, P.S., "Wrestling Against Wickedness in High Places". Magic in the Worldview of the Qumran Community, in: Porter, S.E. / Evans, C.A. (ed.), *The Scrolls and the Scriptures. Qumran Fifty Years After (JSP.S 26/ RILP 3)*, Sheffield 1997, 318-337.
- Aune, D., Magic in Early Christianity (ANRW 2.23.2), 1507-1557.
- Baillet, M., Qumrân grotte 4.III (4Q482-4Q520) (DJD VII), Oxford 1982.
- Barb, A.A., The Survival of Magic Arts, in: Momigliano, A. (ed.), *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, Oxford 1963, 100-125.
- Barkay, G. et al., The Amulets from Ketef Hinnom. A New Edition and Evaluation: *BASOR* 334 (2004) 41-71.
- Barkay, G. et al., The Challenges of Ketef Hinnom. Using Advanced Technologies to Reclaim the Earliest Biblical Texts and Their Context: *NEA* 66 no. 4 (2003) 162-171.
- Barkay, G., The Priestly Benediction on Silver Plaques from Ketef Hinnom in Jerusalem: *Tel Aviv* 19 (1992) 139-192.
- Betz, H.D., Jewish Magic in the Greek Magical Papyri (PGM VII.260-71), in: Schäfer, P. / Kippenberg, H.G. (ed.), *Envisioning Magic. A Princeton Seminar and Symposium (SHR 75)*, Leiden 1997, 45-63.

- Betz, H.D., *The Formation of Authoritative Tradition in the Greek Magical Papyri*, in Meyer, B.F. / Sanders, E.P. (ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, III. Self-Definition in the Graeco-Roman World*, London 1982, 161-170.
- Betz, H.D. (ed.), *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, Including the Demotic Spells*, Chicago / London 1986.
- Beyer, K., *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband*, Göttingen 1994.
- Blau, L., *Amulet*: JE I (1901) 546-550.
- Blau, L., *Das altjüdische Zauberwesen*, Strassburg 1898.
- Blau, L., *Magic*: JE VIII (1904) 255-257.
- Bonner, C., *Magical Amulets*: HTR 39 (1946) 25-54.
- Bonner, C., *Studies in Magical Amulets, Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian*, Ann Arbor 1950.
- Brashear, W.M., *The Greek Magical Papyri. An Introduction and Survey; Annotated Bibliography (1928-1994) (ANRW 2.18.5)*, Berlin / New York 1995, 3380-3684.
- Brooke, G.J., *Deuteronomy 18.9-14 in the Qumran Scrolls*, in: Klutz, T.E. (ed.), *Magic in the Biblical World. From the Rod of Aaron to the Ring of Solomon (JSNT.S 245)*, London / New York 2003, 66-84.
- Budge, E.A.W., *Amulets and Talismans*, New Hyde Park, NY 1961 (= Repr. of *Amulets and Superstitions*, 1930).
- Collart, P., *Psaumes et amulettes*: Aeg 14 (1934) 463-467.
- Conklin, B.W., *Arslan Tash I and Other Vestiges of a Particular Syrian Incantatory Thread*: Bib. 84 (2003) 89-101.
- Cross, F.M. Jr. / Saley, R.J., *Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of the Seventh Century B. C. from Arslan Tash in Upper Syria*: BASOR 197 (1970) 42-49.
- Daniel, R. / Maltomini, F., *Supplementum Magicum I-II (Papyrologica Coloniensia XVI.1-2)*, Opladen 1990, 1992.
- Davis, E., *The Psalms in Hebrew Medical Amulets*: VT 42 (1992) 173-178.
- Deissmann, A., *Bible Studies*, Edinburgh²1903.
- Delcor, M., *L'utilisation des psaumes contre les mauvais esprits à Qoumran*, in: Cazelles, H. (ed.), *La Vie de la Parole. De l'Ancient au Nouveau Testament*, Paris 1987, 61-70.
- Epstein, J.N., *Gloses babylo-araméennes*: REJ 73 (1921) 27-58; 74 (1922) 40-72.
- Epstein, J.N., *Zum magischen Texte (JAOS 1912, 434 seq.)*: JAOS 33 (1913) 279-280.
- Eshel, E., *Apotropaic Prayers in the Second Temple Period*, in: Chazon, E.G. (ed.), *Liturgical Perspectives. Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls (STDJ 48)*, Leiden / Boston 2003, 69-88.
- Fishbane, M., *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, Oxford 1985.
- Flusser, D., *Qumran and Jewish "Apotropaic" Prayers*, in: Flusser, D., *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*, Jerusalem 1988, 214-225.
- Frankfurter, D., *Narrating Power. The Theory and Practice of the Magical Historiola in Ritual Spells*, in: Meyer, M. / Mirecki, P. (ed.), *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power (RGRW 129)*, Leiden / New York 1995, 457-476.
- Frey, J.B., *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum. Recueil des inscriptions juives qui vont du III^e siècle avant Jésus-Christ au VII^e siècle de notre ère, I-II*, Rome 1936-1952.
- Fröhlich, I., *Demons, Scribes, and Exorcists in Qumran*, in: Dévényi, K. / Iványi, T. (ed.), *FS Alexander Fodor in Honour of his 60th Birthday (Budapest Studies in Arabic 23)*, Budapest 2001, 73-81.

- Gager, J.G. (ed.), *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*, Oxford / New York 1992.
- Gager, J.G., *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism* (SBLMS 16), Nashville 1972.
- García Martínez, F. / Tigchelaar, E.J.C. / van der Woude, A.S., *Qumran Cave 11.II. 11Q2-18, 11Q20-30* (DJD XXIII), Oxford 1998.
- Garrett, S.R., *Light on a Dark Subject and Vice Versa. Magic and Magicians in the New Testament*, in: Neusner, J. et al. (ed.), *Religion, Science, and Magic*, Oxford / New York 1989, 142-165.
- Gaster, M., *The Sword of Moses*, in: Gaster, M., *Studies and Texts in Folklore, Magic, Medieval Romance, Hebrew Apocrypha and Samaritan Archaeology, I-III*, London 1925-28, I: 289-337 (introduction and translation), III: 69-103 (Hebrew text).
- Gaster, T.H., *A Hang-Up for Hang-Ups. The Second Amuletic Plaque from Arslan Tash: BASOR 209* (1973) 18-26.
- Geller, M.J., *More Magic Spells and Formulae: BSOAS 60* (1997) 327-335 (pls. I-IV).
- Geller, M.J., *New Documents from the Dead Sea. Babylonian Science in Aramaic*, in: Lubetski, M. / Gottlieb, C. / Keller, S. (ed.), *Boundaries of the Ancient Near Eastern World. A Tribute to Cyrus H. Gordon* (JSOT.S 273), Sheffield 1998, 224-229.
- Goldin, J., *The Magic of Magic and Superstition*, in: Schüssler Fiorenza, E. (ed.), *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*, Notre Dame / London 1976, 115-147.
- Gordon, C.H., *The Aramaic Incantation Bowls in Historic Perspective*, in: Brettler, M. / Fishbane, M. (ed.), *Minhah le-Nahum. Biblical and Other Studies, FS Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of his 70th Birthday* (JSOTSup 154), Sheffield 1993, 142-146.
- Grunwald M. / Kohler, K., *Bibliomancy*, in: *JE III* (1902) 202-205.
- Hadley, J.M., *Some Drawings and Inscriptions on Two Pithoi from Kuntillet 'Ajrud: VT 37* (1987) 180-211.
- Isbell, C.D., *Corpus of the Aramaic Incantation Bowls* (SBLDS 17), Missoula, MT 1975.
- Isbell, C.D., *The Story of the Aramaic Magical Incantation Bowls: BA 41* (1978) 5-16.
- Isbell, C.D., *Two New Aramaic Incantation Bowls: BASOR 223* (1976) 15-23.
- Jansson, E.-M., *The Magic of the Mezuzah in Rabbinic Literature*, in: Haxen, U. / Trautner-Kromann, H. / Goldschmidt Salamon, K.L. (ed.), *Jewish Studies in a New Europe. Proceedings of the Fifth Congress of Jewish Studies in Copenhagen 1994 under the auspices of the European Association for Jewish Studies*, Copenhagen 1998, 415-425.
- Judge, E.A., *The Magical Use of Scripture in the Papyri*, in: Conrad, E.W. / Newing, E.G. (ed.), *Perspectives on Language and Text, FS H. Andersen in Honour of his 60th Birthday*, Winona Lake, IN 1987, 339-349.
- Kaufman, S.A., *A Unique Magic Bowl from Nippur: JNES 32* (1973) 170-174.
- Kayser, C., *Gebrauch von Psalmen zur Zauberei: ZDMG 42* (1888) 456-462.
- Kern-Ulmer, B., *The Depiction of Magic in Rabbinic Texts. The Rabbinic and the Greek Concept of Magic: JSJ 27* (1996) 289-303.
- Klauck, H.-J., *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity. The World of the Acts of the Apostles*, Edinburgh 2000.
- Klutz, T.E., *Reinterpreting "Magic" in the World of Jewish and Christian Scripture*, in: Klutz, T.E. (ed.), *Magic in the Biblical World. From the Rod of Aaron to the Ring of Solomon* (JSNT.S 245), London / New York 2003, 1-9.

- Klutz, T.E., *Rewriting the Testament of Solomon. Tradition, Conflict and Identity in a Late Antique Pseudepigraphon* (LSTS 53), London / New York 2005.
- Knox, W.L., *Jewish Liturgical Exorcism: HTR* (1938) 191-203.
- Kotansky, R.D., *Greek Exorcistic Amulets*, in: Meyer, M. / Mirecki, P. (ed.), *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power* (RGRW 129), Leiden / New York 1995, 243-277.
- Kotansky, R.D., *Two Inscribed Jewish Aramaic Amulets from Syria: IEJ 41* (1991) 267-281.
- Kraus, T.J., *Septuaginta-Psalm 90 in apotropäischer Verwendung: BN 125* (2005) 39-73.
- Lange, A., *The Essene Position on Magic and Divination*, in: Bernstein, M. / García Martínez, F. / Kampen, J. (ed.), *Legal Texts and Legal Issues. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies*, Cambridge 1995 (STDJ 23), Leiden 1997, 377-435.
- Leonas, A., *The Septuagint and the Magical Papyri. Some Preliminary Notes: BIOSCS 32* (1999) 51-64.
- Lyons, W.J. / Reimer, A.M., *The Demonic Virus and Qumran Studies. Some Preventative Measures: DSD 5* (1998) 16-32.
- Margain, J., *Une nouvelle amulette samaritaine portant le texte d'Exode 38:8: Syria 59* (1982) 117-120.
- Margalioth, M., *Sepher Ha-Razim. A Newly Recovered Book of Magic from the Talmudic Period*, Jerusalem, 1966.
- Marguerat, D., *Magic and Miracle in the Acts of the Apostles*, in Klutz, T.E. (ed.), *Magic in the Biblical World. From the Rod of Aaron to the Ring of Solomon* (JSNT.S 245), London / New York 2003, 100-124.
- Martin-Achard, R., *Remarques sur la bénédiction sacerdotale Nb 6/22-27: ETR 70* (1995) 75-84.
- McCarter, P.K., *The Ketef Hinnom Amulets (2.83)*, in: Hallo, W.W. (ed.), *The Context of Scripture, II. Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World*, Leiden 2000, 221.
- Meyer, W.M. / Smith, R. (ed.), *Ancient Christian Magic. Coptic Texts of Ritual Power*, San Francisco 1994.
- Montgomery, J.A., *Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur* (University of Pennsylvania, The Museum, Publications of the Babylonian Section 3), Philadelphia 1913.
- Montgomery, J.A., *Some Early Amulets from Palestine: JAOS 31* (1911) 272-281.
- Morgan, M.A., *Sepher Ha-Razim. The Book of Mysteries* (SBLTT 25/ PS 11), Chico 1983.
- Moriggi, M., *Two New Incantation Bowls from Rome (Italy): AS 3.1* (2005) 43-58.
- Müller-Kessler, C. / Mitchell, T.C. / Hockey, M.I., *An Inscribed Silver Amulet from Samaria: PEQ 139.1* (2007) 5-19.
- Naveh, J. / Shaked, S., *Amulets and Magic Bowls. Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity*, Jerusalem / Leiden 1985.
- Naveh, J. / Shaked, S., *Magic Spells and Formulae. Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity*, Jerusalem 1993.
- Naveh, J., *Fragments of an Aramaic Magic Book from Qumran: IEJ 48* (1998) 252-261.
- Naveh, J., *Some New Jewish Palestinian Aramaic Amulets: JSAI 26* (2002) 231-236.
- Nitzan, B., *Hymns from Qumran – 4Q510-4Q511*, in: Dimant, D. / Rappaport, U. (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10), Leiden 1992, 53-63.
- Nitzan, B., *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12), Leiden / New York 1994.
- Nock, A.D., *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World, I*, Stewart, Z., (ed.), Cambridge, Mass. 1972, 176-194 (= *Greek Magical Papyri: JEA 15* [1929] 219-235).

- Noy, D. / Panayotov, A. / Bloedhorn, H. (ed.), *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis*, I. Eastern Europe (TSAJ 101), Tübingen 2004.
- Noy, D., *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe*. I. Italy (excluding the City of Rome), Spain and Gaul, Cambridge 1993.
- Pardee, D., *Les documents d'Arslan Tash. authentiques ou faux?: Syria 75 (1998) 15-54.*
- Penney, D.L. / Wise, M.O., *By the Power of Beelzebub. An Aramaic Incantation Formula from Qumran (4Q560): JBL 113 (1994) 627-650.*
- Preisendanz, K. (ed.), *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*, I-II, repr. Stuttgart 1973-74.
- Puech, É., *Les deux derniers psaumes davidiques du rituel d'exorcisme, 11QPsAp^a IV 4-V 14: in Dimant, D. / Rappaport, U. (ed.), The Dead Sea Scrolls. Forty Years of Research (STDJ 10), Leiden 1992, 64-89.*
- Puech, É., *11QPsAp^a. Un rituel d'exorcismes. Essai de reconstruction: RevQ 14 (1990) 377-408.*
- Pummer, R., *Samaritan Amulets from the Roman-Byzantine Period and their Wearers: RB 94 (1987) 251-263.*
- Rebiger, B., *Die magische Verwendung von Psalmen im Judentum*, in: Zenger, E. (ed.), *Ritual und Poesie. Formen und Orte religiöser Dichtung im alten Orient, im Judentum und im Christentum (HBS 36)*, Freiburg 2003, 265-281.
- Renz, J., *Die althebräischen Inschriften, I. Text und Kommentar*, Darmstadt 1995.
- Robert, L., *Malédiction Funéraires Grecques: CRAI (1978) 241-289.*
- Sanders, J.A., *A Liturgy for Healing the Stricken (11QPsAp^a = 11Q11)*, in: Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, 4A. Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers*, Tübingen / Louisville, Ky. 1997, 216-233.
- Sanders, J.A., *David's Compositions (11Q5 27.2-11)*, in: Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, 4A. Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers*, Tübingen / Louisville, Ky. 1997, 213-215.
- Sanders, J.A., *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs^a) (DJD IV)*, Oxford 1965.
- Schäfer, P. / Shaked, S., *Magische Texte aus der Kairoer Geniza I-III (TSAJ 42, 64, 72)*, Tübingen 1994-1999.
- Schäfer, P., *Jewish Magic Literature in Late Antiquity and Early Middle Ages: JJS 41 (1990) 75-91.*
- Schäfer, P., *Magic and Religion in Ancient Judaism*, in: Schäfer, P. / Kippenberg, H.G. (ed.), *Envisioning Magic. A Princeton Seminar and Symposium (SHR 75)*, Leiden 1997, 19-43.
- Schiffman, L.H. / Swartz, M.D., *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts from the Cairo Genizah. Selected Texts from Taylor-Schechter Box K1 (STS 1)*, Sheffield 1992.
- Schrire, T., *Hebrew Amulets. Their Decipherment and Interpretation*, London 1966.
- Segal, A. F., *Hellenistic Magic. Some Questions of Definition*, in: van den Broek, R. / Vermaseren, M. J. (ed.), *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions (EPRO 91)*, Leiden 1981, 349-375.
- Simon, M., *Verus Israel. A Study of the Relations Between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (135-425)*, Oxford 1986.

- Smith, M., The Jewish Elements in the Magical Papyri, in: Richards, K.H. (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers Series 25*, Atlanta, GA 1986, 455-462.
- Sperber, D., Some Rabbinic Themes in Magical Papyri: *JSJ* 16 (1985) 93-103.
- Stern, M., *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, Jerusalem 1974.
- Swartz, M.D., Magical Piety in Ancient and Medieval Judaism, in: Meyer, M. / Mirecki, P. (ed.), *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power (RGRW 129)*, Leiden / New York 1995, 167-183.
- Swartz, M.D., *Scholastic Magic. Ritual and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism*, Princeton 1996.
- Thiselton, A.C., The Supposed Power of Words in the Biblical Writings: *JTS* 25 (1974) 283-299.
- Tigay, J.H., On the Term Phylacteries (Matt 23:5): *HTR* 72 (1979) 45-53.
- Tov, E. (ed.), *The Texts from the Judaean Desert. Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series (DJD XXXIX)*, Oxford 2002.
- Trachtenberg, J., *Jewish Magic and Superstition. A Study in Folk Religion*, New York 1939.
- Trebilco, P.R., *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor (SNTSMS 69)*, Cambridge 1991.
- van der Ploeg, J.P.M., Le Psaume xci dans une recension de Qumran: *RB* 72 (1965) 210-217 (with pls VIII-IX).
- van der Ploeg, J.P.M., Un petit rouleau de psaumes apocryphes (11QPsAp^a), in: Jeremias, G. / Kuhn, H.W. / Stegemann, H. (ed.), *Tradition und Glaube. Festgabe für K.G. Kuhn*, Göttingen 1971, 128-139 (with pls II-VII).
- Veltri, G., Jewish Traditions in Greek Amulets: *BJGS* 18 (1996) 33-47.
- Versnel, H.S., Some Reflections on the Relationship Magic-Religion: *Numen* 37 (1991) 177-197.
- Versnel, H.S., The Poetics of the Magical Charm. An Essay in the Power of Words, in: Mirecki, P. / Meyer, M. (ed.), *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World (RGRW 141)*, Leiden 2002, 105-158.
- von Dijk, J., The Authenticity of the Arslan Tash Amulets: *Iraq* 54 (1992) 65-68
- Waler, E., A Revised Date for Pentateuchal Texts? Evidence from Ketef Hinnom: *TynBul* 53 (2002) 29-55.
- Yardeni, A., Remarks on the Priestly Blessing on Two Ancient Amulets from Jerusalem: *VT* 41 (1991) 176-185.

David Lincicum
 Keble College
 Oxford OX1 3PG
 United Kingdom
 E-Mail: davidlincicum@hotmail.com