

REPATRIATING THE CANAANITE WOMAN IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

CEDRIC E. W. VINE
Andrews University

Abstract

This study argues that Matthew’s replacement of Mark’s “Gentile of Syrophenician origin” with a “Canaanite woman” (Mark 7:26; Matt 15:22) is part of a wider narrative strategy to portray the land of Israel and its cities as a new Sodom, a new Canaan, a new Egypt, and a new Babylon. The study employs Dale Allison’s six intertextual devices (explicit statement, inexplicit citation or borrowing, similar circumstances, key words or phrases, similar narrative structure, and word order, syllabic sequence, and poetic resonance) to demonstrate a consistent authorial intention while identifying contemporary or near contemporary sources that would affirm the likelihood that a first-century Christian audience would have noted such an intention.

Keywords: Gospel of Matthew, Intertextuality, Canaanite woman, Sodom, Canaan, Egypt, Babylon

Introduction

In Matt 15:22, the Evangelist replaces Mark’s “Gentile of Syrophenician origin” (Mark 7:26) with a “Canaanite woman”:¹

¹ By referring to Matthew’s “replacement” of Mark, I am assuming both Markan priority and a literary relationship between the Gospels. Cf. Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Joseph B. Tyson, and William O. Walker, eds., *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985); Mark S. Goodacre, *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001); Robert K. McIver and Marie Carroll, “Experiments to Develop Criteria for Determining the Existence of Written Sources, and Their Potential Implications for the Synoptic Problem,” *JBL* 121 (2002), 667–687. The reference in Matt 10:4 to “Simon the Canaanite” (Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος; cf. Σίμωνα τὸν Καναναῖον, Mark 3:18) does not derive from “Canaanite” or “Cana” but rather from the Aramaic *qan’ān* “enthusiast” or “zealot” (cf. Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον ζηλωτὴν, Luke 6:15). Joachim Gnllka, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, HThKNT 1 (Freiburg: Herder, 1986), 356.

Table 1.

Matt 15:22	Mark 7:26a
καὶ ἰδοὺ γυνὴ Χανααῖα ² ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων ἐκεῖνων ἐξεληθοῦσα ... And behold, a Canaanite woman from that region came out ...	ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἦν Ἑλληνίς, Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ τῷ γένει ... Now the woman was a Gentile, of Syro-phoenician origin

Mark employs the contemporary ethnic marker Ἑλληνίς and geographical denotation of Συροφοινίκισσα.³ In contrast, Matthew uses a term employed by ancient Israelites to designate the inhabitants of the geographical locale they identified as “Canaan”. In Gen 10:19, “Canaan” (MT: כְּנָעַן; LXX: Χανάαν) denotes a geographical territory that includes Tyre and Sidon, Gaza, and Sodom and Gomorrah.⁴ Important for our purposes is that in Second Temple sources, the “Canaanites” (MT: כְּנָעַן; LXX: Χαναανίος; e.g., Gen 12:6; 24:3, 37; 10:11; Num 21:3; Josh 13:3; Judg 1:1) were predominantly associated with Israel’s past rather than its present (Jdt. 5:9–10; Bar. 3:22; Sus. 56; cf. Acts 7:11; 13:19). Samuel Lachs comments in relation to Matt 15:21–28 that while there were no Canaanites at the time of Jesus, the term was commonly used in early rabbinic sources with reference to non-Jews, possibly on the basis of the distinction between Hebrew and Canaanite slaves in Exodus 21.⁵ Such sources wrap non-Jews contemporary to the rabbis in a cloak of early historical associations.

² See variant L: Χανααῖα

³ Diodorus Siculus 19.93.7; 20.55.4; Lucian, Deor. Conc. 4. See Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, Hermeneia 62 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 366.

⁴ Nadav Na’aman, *Canaan in the Second Millennium B.C.E.* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 29, 110. In the LXX, the land of Canaan is referred to as Phoenicia on two accounts, both in relation to the conquest narrative (εἰς μέρος τῆς Φοινίκης, Exod 16:35; οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς Φοινίκης, Josh 5:1). There is conflicting evidence whether the inhabitants of Canaan referred to or thought of themselves as “Canaanites”. Cf. Niels P. Lemche, *The Canaanites and Their Land: The Tradition of the Canaanites*, JSOTSup 110 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991).

⁵ Samuel T. Lachs, *A Rabbinic Commentary on the New Testament: The Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke* (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav; New York: Anti-Defamation League of B’Nai B’rith, 1987), 248–249. The Mishnah refers to “Canaanite slaves,” “Canaanite servants and handmaids,” and contrasts them with “Hebrew slaves” (cf. Ma’as. Š. 4:4; ‘Erub. 7:6; Qidd. 1:3; B. Qam. 8:3, 5; B. Meš. 1:5; Arak. 8:4; cf. Mek. Exod 21:26). The term “Canaanite” is also used for a Phoenician trader (cf. Zech 14:21; Sipre Deut 306; Yal. 1.942; cited in Lachs, *A Rabbinic Commentary on the New Testament*, 249). Boxall suggests, without indicating sources, that when Matthew wrote his Gospel, “Chananaia” was a self-designation of the local Phoenician population. Ian Boxall, *Discovering Matthew: Content, Interpretation, Reception* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 73.

The purpose of this study is to argue that the Evangelist intentionally compares and contrasts Israel and its cities with particular foreign nations and their cities. Matthew's reference to the Canaanite woman should be understood in this context. Glenna S. Jackson argues in her study on Matthew's Canaanite woman that within the Gospel geographical epithets frequently perform a symbolic function, frequently denoting negative stereotypes.⁶ Jackson's study focuses on geographical epithets and their cultural associations. This study widens Jackson's purview by arguing that through the employment of intertextual devices, Israel is variously portrayed as a new Sodom, a new Egypt, a new Canaan, and a new Babylon. In telling the story of Jesus in this manner, the Evangelist seeks to emphasize that Israel has taken on the identity, practices, and mores of those nations subjected to divine judgment in the Hebrew Scriptures.⁷

Intertextuality and the Nature of Allusions

Two important works were published in 1989 which helped promote a renewed interest in intertextuality in biblical studies. The first was a wide-ranging collection of essays edited by Sipke Draisma entitled *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings*, addressing intertextual theory and exegetical practice.⁸ The second was Richard Hays's *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, an investigation into the function of intertextual allusions and echoes to the

⁶ Glenna S. Jackson, *Have Mercy on Me: The Story of the Canaanite Woman in Matthew 15.21-28*, JSNTSup 228 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 68. Examples Jackson discusses include Jesus as a "Nazarene" (Matt 2:23), the Gadarenes (8:28), Simon the *Cananaean* (10:2, 4), Judas *Iscaiot* (10:4b; 26:14), the Samaritans (10:5-6), Jesus the *Galilean* (26:69), and *Mary Magdalene* (27:56, 61; 28:1).

⁷ An important implication of this thesis is that references to "Galilee of the Gentiles" and "Syria" (Matt 4:15, 24) should not necessarily be taken as cryptic allusions to the location of a geographically restricted Matthean community but should rather be viewed as part of a wider narrative strategy to evoke particular land-related associations. Scholars in favor of a Syrian/Antiochene provenance of the Gospel include Burnett H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: MacMillan, 1951), 500-523; Georg Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus*, FRLANT 82 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 37; William R. Farmer, "The Post-Sectarian Character of Matthew and Its Post-War Setting in Antioch of Syria," *PRSt* 3.3 (1976), 236-248; W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew: Commentary Matthew 1-7* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 143-147. On the basis of Matt 15:22, Kilpatrick argued for a Phoenician origin of the Gospel. George D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946), 133.

⁸ Sipke Draisma, ed., *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel* (Kampen, Netherlands: J. H. Kok, 1989).

LXX in a selection of passages from Paul's letters.⁹ Hays briefly discusses Julia Kristeva's and Roland Barthes's broad definition of intertextuality as "the study of the semiotic matrix within which a text's acts of signification occur", according to which all discourse "is necessarily intertextual in the sense that its conditions of intelligibility are given by and in relation to a previously given body of discourse."¹⁰ According to this definition, intertextual criticism focuses on "the cultural codes within which the text operates and of which it is a manifestation."¹¹ This includes the social, the anthropological, or, in more general terms, the historical context of the text. Against this very broad definition of intertextuality, Hays adopts a more limited *author-centered* definition of intertextuality, "focusing on [Paul's] actual citations of and allusions to specific texts."¹² Hays's approach has proved particularly influential in NT studies, resulting in a large body of work focusing on allusions to the Hebrew Scriptures and even earning him the accolade of a slew of imitative titles such as Kenneth Litwak's *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts* and Christopher Beetham's *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*.¹³

⁹ Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 14–21.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 15. Hays (*ibid.*, 15n50, 198n50) cites Julia Kristeva, *Semiotiké* (Paris: Seuil, 1969); *Idem*, *La Révolution du langage poétique* (Paris: Seuil, 1974); Roland Barthes, *S/Z* (Paris: Seuil, 1970). For a comparison of intertextuality and historical-criticism, see Andries G. van Aarde, "Matthew's Intertext and the Presentation of Jesus as Healer-Messiah" in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels, Volume 2: The Gospel of Matthew*, ed. Thomas R. Hatina, LNTS 310 (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 163–167.

¹¹ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 15. One implication of such a broad definition of intertextuality is that the intention or, in the words of Jonathan Culler, the "personal core" of the author is replaced by a complex "textual intersubjectivity." With respect to Scripture, this represents a rejection of the concept of the biblical text as an expression of the intentions of an objective divine author. Cf. Jonathan D. Culler, *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics, and the Study of Literature* (London: Routledge, 2002), 164.

¹² Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 15. For a critique of Hays's "minimalist approach," see William Scott Green, "Doing the Text's Work for It: Richard Hays on Paul's Use of Scripture," in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, eds. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 83 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 63.

¹³ Kenneth Duncan Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually*, JSNTSup 282 (London: T&T Clark, 2005); Christopher A. Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians* (Leiden: Brill, 2008). See also C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1953), 31–60; Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM, 1961); Craig A. Evans and William Richard Stegner, eds., *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, JSNTSup 104 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994); Maarten

In line with his narrower *author-centered* definition of intertextuality, Hays distinguishes between “quotation,” “allusion,” and “echo”.¹⁴ The “quotation” represents the most explicit form of reference to another text and is typically introduced by a citation formula (e.g., “as it is written”). It involves the verbatim or near verbatim reproduction of a sequence of words or phrases from the source text. For Hays, an “allusion” usually “imbeds several words from the precursor text, or at least in some way explicitly mentions notable characters or events that signal the reader to make the intertextual connection.”¹⁵ It is assumed that the author intends the reader or audience to pick up on the allusion and that a failure to do so dramatically reduces the meaning of the text. Finally, an “echo” is the least distinct form of intertextual reference. This, according to Hays, may “involve the inclusion of only a word or phrase that evokes, for the alert reader, a reminiscence of an earlier text.”¹⁶ In contrast to an allusion, it is possible for a reader who fails to hear the echo to still make sense of the surface meaning of the text. However, for the reader who hears the echo, surplus significance derived from the source text will help produce an interpretation that extends beyond a literal reading of the text.

Allusions cannot be proved or disproved.¹⁷ This is part of their charm. Here I would echo Umberto Eco in highlighting two dangers when determining the presence of allusions.¹⁸ On the one hand, a reader may overinterpret a text, reading into a text allusions where none were intended, the equivalent of picking out animal shapes in the clouds. Paul Foster has criticized Hays’s approach to allusions for being highly speculative, as a “a radical form of

J. J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form* (Kampen, Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1996), 14–20; R. Michael Fox, ed., *Reverberations of the Exodus in Scripture* (Eugene: Pickwick, 2014); Susan E. Docherty, “Do You Understand What You are Reading?” (Acts 8:30): Current Trends and Future Perspectives in the Study of the Use of the Old Testament in the New,” *JSNT* 38.1 (2015): 112–125; Craig A. Evans, “Why Did the New Testament Writers Appeal to the Old Testament?,” *JSNT* 38.1 (2015): 36–48; David H. Allen and Steve Smith, eds., *Methodology in the Use of the Old Testament in the New: Context and Criteria*, LNTS 579 (London: T&T Clark, 2020).

¹⁴ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 20; Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2016), 10–13. For further refinement of these definitions, see Margaret Daly-Denton, *David in the Fourth Gospel: The Johannine Reception of the Psalms*, AGJU 47 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 9–12; Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 15–24.

¹⁵ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 10.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ Richard Garner, *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry* (London: Routledge, 1990), 1.

¹⁸ Umberto Eco, *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*, trans. Stefan Collini (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

modern reader-response” that is more an exercise in “constructive theology,” a criticism validated for Foster by the wide variety of interpretations of the same NT passages produced using Hays’s approach.¹⁹ On the other hand, a reader may “underinterpret” a text, by overlooking intended allusions, a danger made all the more likely the further removed a reader is from an author. What may have constituted a transparent allusion to a first reader who shared the cultural milieu of an author becomes, with age, footnotes and commentary to later learned readers.²⁰

From an *author-centered* approach, the difficulties involved in determining the presence and nature of an intended allusion suggest the necessity for clear indicators for determining allusions. Hays provides seven tests or “criteria” for determining intertextual allusions:²¹ (1) *Availability*. This rule stipulates that the both the author and addressees must have access to antecedent sources; (2) *Volume*. The number of echoes must be of sufficient volume as to be perceivable by the audience. This is determined by the relative significance of a particular motif in the vehicle text and its rhetorical stress in the tenor text; (3) *Recurrence*. This asks whether the vehicle text has been used elsewhere by the author. If it has, this increases the plausibility of a proposed allusion; (4) *Thematic Coherence*. This deals with the need for the allusion to fit into the line of argument the author is developing; (5) *Historical Plausibility*. This addresses the likelihood of an author constructing a proposed meaning and whether his original audience would have understood it correctly. This rule seeks to avoid anachronistic theological interpretations; (6) *History of Interpretation*. Did later interpreters pick up on the allusion? This question addresses the often arbitrary nature of interpretation. However, this rule is one of the least reliable as a guide for interpretation. Hays draws our attention to the fact that many early Gentile readers of Paul’s letters ignored “Paul’s sense of urgency about relating the gospel to God’s dealings with Israel,” instead reading his writings within their own social and religious context;²²

¹⁹ Paul Foster, “Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament,” *JNT* 38.1 (2015): 109.

²⁰ Dale C. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 17–18.

²¹ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 29–32. For discussion on or variations of these rules, see Michael P. Knowles, *Jeremiah in Matthew’s Gospel: The Rejected-Prophet Motif in Matthean Redaction*, *JNTSup* 68 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 163–165; John Strazicich, *Joel’s Use of Scripture and Scripture’s Use of Joel: Appropriation and Resignification in Second Temple Judaism and early Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 26–27; Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 18–20.

²² Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 31.

(7) *Satisfaction*. Does the proposed interpretation still make sense when rules (1) to (6) fail to provide clear confirmation? This final catch-all rule raises the thorny and often neglected question as to the capabilities of a NT text's first audience and whether or not—and Hays has been critiqued for neglecting this question—they had sufficient Scriptural knowledge to pick up on such allusions.²³ There must, after all, have been some early Christians who knew their Scriptures less well than Paul! In response to this problem, Christopher Stanley has argued in relation to Paul's audiences, and the same principle applies to the audience of Matthew, that we must distinguish between an *informed audience*, a *competent audience*, and a *minimal audience*, each of which would have had a different aural experience of any intertextual device within the primary text.²⁴

Hays identifies a further property of echoes and allusions by appeal to John Hollander's concept of *transumption* or *metalepsis*.²⁵ According to this concept, when one text is linked to another through an allusive echo, "the figurative effect of the echo can lie in the unstated or suppressed (transumed) points of resonance between the two texts."²⁶ An allusive echo evokes a range of associations from the earlier text that extends beyond the specific intertextual link of the echo: "Allusive echo functions to suggest to the reader that text B should be understood in light of a broad interplay with text A, encompass-

²³ Christiaan Beker questions whether Hays is expecting too much on the part of Paul's original audience in assuming that they would pick up on Scriptural allusions in occasional letters addressing specific local concerns. Johan Christiaan Beker, "Echoes and Intertextuality: On the Role of Scripture in Paul's Theology," in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, eds. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 65. Hays's response is that the contingent nature of Paul's letters does not preclude him alluding to Scripture. Richard B. Hays, "On the Rebound: A Response to Critiques of *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*," in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, eds. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 83 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 86.

²⁴ Christopher D. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 62–71. Cf. I. H. Henderson, "Reconstructing Mark's Double Audience," in *Between Author and Audience in Mark: Narration, Characterization, Interpretation*, ed. Elizabeth Struthers Malbon (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009), 6–28; Kathy R. Maxwell, *Hearing between the Lines: The Audience as Fellow-Worker in Luke-Acts and its Literary Milieu*, LNTS 425 (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 29–37. On the problems of defining a Gospel's audience, see Cedric E. W. Vine, *The Audience of Matthew: An Appraisal of the Local Audience Thesis*, LNTS 496 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014), 10–22.

²⁵ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 18–21. Cf. John Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981).

²⁶ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 20.

ing aspects of A beyond those explicitly echoed.”²⁷ The link between text B to the earlier text A intimates at a wider range of corresponding links between the two texts. This raises the question as to how a reader sympathetic to the author may determine the extent of the intertextual interplay intended by the author. How wide is the intended range of corresponding links? When Jesus cried out, “Eloi, Eloi, lema sabachthani?” in Mark 15:34, did the Evangelist intend his readers to understand the cry as invoking Ps 22:1 alone, the whole of Ps 22, or something in between? Scholars are split over the question.²⁸ Independent of any intention on the part of the author, the effects of such an echo or allusion on a reader can extend well beyond intertextual resonances. The phrase “I have a dream” evokes for many not just the events of August 28, 1963, but rather a wider movement that continues unto the present. A first-century CE Jewish auditor of the Gospel would have heard Jesus’s words as evoking Ps 22 *and* its regular use within contemporary synagogue worship settings.²⁹ Extra-textual connotations are evoked by intertextual links.

In terms of the text-mediated communication event between author and audience, Hays’s rules are eclectic in nature, touching on all three elements in the communication process. It is difficult to determine how much of text A should be employed in the interpretation of text B.³⁰ How strong is the metalyptic effect? In 1993, Dale Allison, with a similar interest to Hays in determining authorial intention, suggested six text-focused devices by which an author may allude in one text to another text.³¹

²⁷ Ibid. Hays is not the first to draw our attention to this effect. C. H. Dodd argued at length that “the unit of reference was sometimes wider than the usually brief form of words actually quoted” (p. 61). See Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 26, 61–110. Barnabas Lindars states that “very often a quotation is intended to evoke the whole passage from which it has been selected.” Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 14. Against this position, see Lidija Novakovic, “Matthew’s Atomistic Use of Scripture: Messianic Interpretation of Isaiah 53:4 in Matthew 8:17,” in Hatina, *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels*, 146–162.

²⁸ For Mark 15:34 as evoking the whole of Ps 22, see Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 97–98; Johannes A. E. van Dodewaard, “La force évocatrice de la citation: mise en lumière en prenant pour base l’Évangile de S Matthieu,” *Bib* 36.4 (1955): 486–487; Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 90; Ville Auvinen, “Jesus and the Devout Psalmist of Psalm 22,” in *Jesus and the Scriptures: Problems, Passages and Patterns*, ed. Tobias Hägerland (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016), 132–147. See Foster’s critique of such readings in Foster, “Echoes without Resonance,” 100–101.

²⁹ Rivka Ulmer, “Psalm 22 in Pesiqta Rabbati: The Suffering of the Jewish Messiah and Jesus,” in *The Jewish Jesus: Revelation, Reflection, Reclamation*, ed. Zev Garber (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2011), 106–128. Cf. the later application of Ps 22 to Esther in Meg. 15b.

³⁰ Foster, “Echoes without Resonance,” 109.

³¹ Allison, *The New Moses*, 19–20. See also chapters one to five in Dale C. Allison,

These devices include: (1) explicit statements in which an author makes a straightforward comparison (e.g., “And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of man be lifted up,” John 3:14); (2) inexplicit citations or borrowing in which an earlier text is “transplanted without acknowledgment” (e.g., the reproduction of part of LXX Exod 4:19 LXX in Matt 2:20); (3) similar circumstances in which an “event may be intended to recall another circumstantially like it” (e.g., Joshua’s crossing of the Jordan is patterned after Moses’s crossing of the Red Sea, Josh 4:23);³² (4) key words or phrases by which one “may dress up a story with the words of another that is like it and well known” (e.g., shared wording between Gospel accounts of the feeding of the five thousand and Elisha’s miraculous feeding of a hundred men with twenty loaves of barley in 2 Kgs 4:42–44); (5) similar narrative structures in which an author patterns the structure of his/her text upon the structural pattern of another (e.g., B. W. Bacon’s pentateuchal structure of Matthew?);³³ and (6) similar word order, syllabic sequence, and poetic resonance (e.g., the use of ἐν ἀρχῇ in John 1:1 to evoke Gen 1:1 LXX).

Allison’s text-related devices are more focused than Hays’s more general rules. Of his six devices, (1) and (2) are readily recognized. The other devices are, however, indistinct and require considered judgment. In the absence of devices (1) and (2), Allison provides the following guidelines.³⁴ First, an intended allusion can only be demonstrated in the absence of (1) and (2) if there is a combination of devices (3) to (6) present. The presence of one of devices (3) to (6) does not in and of itself prove an allusion. One swallow does not make a summer. Nevertheless, the more devices that can be demonstrated to be present, recognizing that many are somewhat ambiguous and involve a distanced reader’s judgment, the greater the probability of an intended allusion. Secondly, if it can be shown that a text’s proposed subtext belonged to a book or tradition of which the author is aware, this increases the probability of an allusion. Three inexplicit citations of Deuteronomy in Matthew 4 would suggest a deep awareness on the part of the Evangelist of this particular subtext and affirm the possibility within the Gospel of exodus-conquest allusions.³⁵ Thirdly, a type should be prominent rather than obscure,

Studies in Matthew: Interpretation Past and Present (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005). Garner notes a similar spectrum to Allison, ranging from the explicit citation to the use of language too common to arrest the attention of the reader. Allusions function somewhere in the middle. Garner, *From Homer to Tragedy*, 2.

³² For parallels between Joshua and Moses, see Allison, *The New Moses*, 23–28.

³³ Benjamin W. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew* (London: Constable and Company, 1930), 145–261.

³⁴ Adapted from Allison, *The New Moses*, 21–23.

³⁵ Cf. Deut 8:3/Matt 4:4; Deut 6:16/Matt 4:7; Deut 6:13/Matt 4:10.

borrowed from a text that is likely to have been well-known to an original audience. The purpose of an allusion is, after all, to illustrate and explain rather than obfuscate. How we judge whether a text was well-known to an original audience is dependent upon how we define the audience. If we define the Gospel's audience narrowly in terms of a Matthean community represented by characters and groups in the text (i.e., Peter represents the leader of the Matthean community and the other disciples represent the members of the community), then the capabilities of the text-derived audience reflect those of the author.³⁶ If, however, we posit a wider audience for the Gospel, one whose identity is not limited to the values of the text, then a broader selection of ancient texts must be used to reconstruct its capabilities.³⁷ Fourthly, the probability of a particular allusion is enhanced if it can be demonstrated that other ancient authors employed similar typology.³⁸

The Land of Israel as Non-Israelite Territory

I will now consider a selection of pericope in light of Allison's six text-related devices. In a number of these pericope devices (1) and (2) are absent. Nevertheless, if we assume a consistent authorial intention, their presence in other pericope increases the probability that the more ambiguous devices

³⁶ For reconstructions of the Matthean community, see J. Andrew Overman, *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: A Study of the Social World of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990); David L. Balch, *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991); Anthony J. Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); David C. Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998); Anders Runesson, "Rethinking Early Jewish-Christian Relations: Matthean Community History as Pharisaic Intragroup Conflict," *JBL* 127.1 (2008): 95–132.

³⁷ For a heterogeneous Gospel audience, see Vine, *The Audience of Matthew*, 118–127. Cf. Richard Bauckham, "For Whom Were Gospels Written?," in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, ed. Richard Bauckham (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 9–48; Edward W. Klink, ed., *The Audience of the Gospels: The Origin and Function of the Gospels in Early Christianity*, LNTS 353 (London: T&T Clark, 2010).

³⁸ I would draw your attention to Lampe and Woollcombe's definition of typology as "the establishment of historical connections between certain events, persons, or things in the Old Testament and similar events, persons, or things in the New Testament." Geogfrey W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woollcombe, *Essays on Typology* (London: SCM, 1957), 39. Anthony Thiselton distinguishes between allegory which "postulates a parallel, correspondence, or resonance between *two sets of ideas*" and typology which, broadly speaking, "postulates a parallel or correspondence between *two sets of events or persons*." Anthony C. Thiselton, *Hermeneutics: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 84.

(3) to (6) have been used by the Evangelist to further the purposes for which he employs devices (1) and (2). I will start with those pericopes in which the more explicit devices are present to establish the Evangelist’s practice of associating the land of Israel either with earlier periods of its history or with foreign nations and cities known for their depravity. In this context, Matthew’s Canaanite woman stands out as an exemplar figure who reverses expectations, a faithful Canaanite who is contrasted with an unfaithful “Canaanite” Israel (cf. Matt 8:5–13).

Capernaum and the “Galilee of the Gentiles” (Matt 4:15–16)

Although technically not alien territory, the Evangelist characterizes Capernaum as being in “Galilee of the Gentiles” (Matt 4:15). After hearing about the arrest of John, Jesus “withdrew to Galilee,” making his home in “Capernaum by the sea, in the territory of Zebulun and Naphtali” (4:13).³⁹ This was to fulfil, notes the Evangelist, that which had been spoken through the prophet Isaiah. He then explicitly quotes (device 1) from an independent Hebrew source of Isa 9:1–2, influenced by the LXX, as indicated in the shared wording underlined in the table below:⁴⁰

Table 2.

Isa 8:23–9:1 LXX	Matt 4:15–16
<p>Τοῦτο πρῶτον ποίει, ταχὺ ποίει, <u>χώρα Ζαβουλων, ἢ γῆ Νεφθαλιμ</u> <u>ὁδὸν θαλάσσης</u> καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν <u>παραλίαν κατοικοῦντες καὶ πέραν</u> <u>τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν,</u> <u>τὰ μέρη τῆς Ἰουδαίας. ὁ λαὸς ὁ</u> <u>πορευόμενος ἐν σκότει, ἴδετε φῶς μέγα·</u> <u>οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν χώρα καὶ σκιᾷ</u> <u>θανάτου, φῶς λάμψει ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς.</u></p>	<p>γῆ Ζαβουλῶν καὶ γῆ Νεφθαλίμ, <u>ὁδὸν θαλάσσης, πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου,</u> <u>Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν, ὁ λαὸς ὁ</u> <u>καθήμενος ἐν σκότει</u>⁴¹ <u>φῶς εἶδεν μέγα,</u> <u>καὶ τοῖς καθημένοις ἐν χώρα καὶ σκιᾷ</u> <u>θανάτου φῶς ἀνέτειλεν αὐτοῖς.</u></p>

³⁹ In Matt 2:22–23, Joseph, after being warned in a dream, moves to Nazareth, described as being in the district of Galilee (τὰ μέρη τῆς Γαλιλαίας). This was to fulfil the words of the prophet, that Jesus would be called a Nazorean (cf. Judg 13:5, 7; 16:18). Nazarene became the designation for a Christian in Syriac texts. Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*, Hermeneia 61A (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989), 150.

⁴⁰ Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. (Ramsey, NJ: Sigler Press, 1991), 104–106; Pierre Bonnard, *L’Évangile Selon Saint Matthieu* (Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1963), 48; Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 380; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 193.

⁴¹ B^{nc} D W σκοτία.

The Evangelist has dropped many of the verbs from Isa 8:23 LXX, condensing the verse into a sequence of geographic locations in which the lands of Zebulun and Naphtali and their qualifiers—“towards the sea” and “beyond the Jordan” serve in apposition to “Galilee of the Gentiles”.⁴² This is not intended as a description of the ethnic makeup of Galilee nor as an indication that Jesus’s ministry primarily took place among Galilean Gentiles.⁴³ Nor is it intended as a proleptic reference to the mission to the nations in Matt 28:16–20.⁴⁴ Instead, the reference to the lands of Zebulun and Naphtali evokes an earlier era of Israel’s history when the land was inhabited by those who revered the name of Yahweh. This same land is now pejoratively portrayed as “Galilee of the Gentiles”. What caused this detrimental transition?

The answer is found in the prophet’s description, affirmed by the Evangelist, of those that dwell in the land as being in darkness (תְּשֻׁבָה/ἐν σκοτει, Isa 9:1; Matt 4:15).⁴⁵ In Isaiah, this darkness represents a spiritual darkness that resulted from Israel’s practice of ancestor worship.⁴⁶ The prophet accuses the people of the land of consulting with “mediums and necromancers” (אֲלֹהֵי הַדְּמָיּוֹת וְרוּחַ הַמְּדַבְּרִים), of consulting “the dead on behalf of the living for teaching and for instruction” (Isa 8:19). It is these occult practices that resulted in the characterization of the region as being in “the shadow of death” (ἐν χόρρα καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου, LXX Isa 9:1). Divine judgment took the form of Assyrian oppression, recalling for the prophet the earlier oppression of Israel by the Midianites in the days of Gideon (Isa 9:4; 10:24–27; cf. Judg 6:1–7:25). Judgment involved the introduction, according to 2 Kgs 17:24–41, of non-Hebrew peoples from Babylon, Cuthah, Avva, Hamath, and Sepharvaim into the lands of Zebulun and Naphtali,

⁴² This does not, of course, suggest a geographic equivalence of Galilee and the lands of Zebulun and Naphtali and their qualifiers. Cf. John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 2005), 172–177.

⁴³ Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 195. Contra Davies, there is little to affirm the suggestion that Matthew’s reference to Galilee of the Gentiles reflects a Christian pro-Galilee and anti-Jerusalem bias. William D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, Brown Judaic Studies 186 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 299–300.

⁴⁴ Contrast with Francis Wright Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Commentary* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981), 114; Matthias Konradt, *Israel, Church, and the Gentiles in the Gospel of Matthew*, trans. Kathleen Ess (Waco: Baylor University Press; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 274–275.

⁴⁵ Here I concur with Anders Runesson that the reference to ὁ λαὸς in Matt 4:16 is intended by the Evangelist to refer to Jews living in Galilee. Anders Runesson, *Divine Wrath and Salvation in Matthew: The Narrative World of the First Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016), 297–298.

⁴⁶ Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 385. Cf. Luz’s rejection of any link between Matthew’s use of the quotation and its original meaning. Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 196.

an explanation of the prophet’s description of the land as “Galilee of the Gentiles” (Isa 9:1; cf. Matt 4:15).⁴⁷ Josephus describes these non-Hebrew peoples as five nations and identifies those from Cuthah in Persia as the Samaritans of his day (*Ant.* 9:288–290). The author of 1 Maccabees refers to “all Galilee of the Gentiles” (πάσαν Γαλιλαίαν ἀλλοφύλων, 1 Macc 5:15), further evidence that the Evangelist’s use of “Galilee of the Gentiles” would have resonated with an enduring social memory.

The Evangelist’s explicit citation of Isa 9:1–2 to characterise Capernaum and the rest of Galilee in this manner raises for a reader familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures dark connotations of spiritual apostasy from an earlier era of Israel’s history during which Galilee became the dwelling place of non-Israelites due to divine judgment.⁴⁸ The land is subject to judgment, in need of a great light.

Capernaum imitates Babylon (Matt 11:23)

In Matt 11:23, Jesus declares, “And you, Capernaum, will you be exalted to heaven? No, you will be brought down to Hades.” This is an inexplicit citation (device 2), whether from the LXX or MT remains unclear, of the taunt song addressed to the rebellious King of Babylon in Isa 14:11–20 (cf. Luke 10:15).⁴⁹

Table 3.

Ascent to Heaven	
καὶ σύ, Καφαρναούμ, μὴ ἕως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθῆσῃ; And you, Capernaum, will you be exalted to heaven? (Matt 11:23)	σύ δὲ εἶπας ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ σου εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβήσομαι, ἐπάνω τῶν ἀστρῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ θήσω τὸν θρόνον μου, καθιῶ ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῷ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν, ἀναβήσομαι ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν, ἕσομαι ὅμοιος τῷ ὑψίστῳ. You said in your mind, “I will ascend to heaven; I will set my throne above the stars of heaven; I will sit on a lofty mountain, upon the lofty mountains toward the north; I will ascend above the clouds; I will be like the Most High.” (Isa 14:13–14 LXX)

⁴⁷ Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 383–385; Heinz Giesen, “Galiläa — mehr als eine Landschaft: bibeltheologischer Stellenwert Galiläas im Matthäusevangelium,” *ETL* 77.1 (2001): 32–33.

⁴⁸ Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 195. Cf. the Evangelist’s use of Isa 6:9–10 in Matt 13:14–15 to equate his own generation with the idolatrous pre-exilic generation of Isaiah.

⁴⁹ Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew*, 91–92; Bonnard, *Matthieu*, 166; Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 268–269.

Table 4.

Descent to Hades	
ἕως ἄδου καταβήσῃ· No, you will be brought down to Hades [...]. (Matt 11:23)	κατέβη δὲ εἰς ἄδου ἡ δόξα σου, But your glory has gone down to Hades, [...]. (Isa 14:11 LXX; cf. 14:12)
	νῦν δὲ εἰς ἄδου καταβήσῃ καὶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς. But now you will descend into Hades and into the foundations of the earth. (Isa 14:15 LXX)
	[...] καταβαινόντων εἰς ἄδου. [...] who will go down to Hades. (Isa 14:19 LXX)

Both passages are laments referring to a day of judgment (ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, Isa 14:4 LXX; ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως, Matt 11:22, 24). In Isaiah, Babylon will be left desolate (ἔρημον, Isa 14:23 LXX), a similar fate later applied in the Gospel to Jerusalem (cf. ἔρημος in Matt 23:38). This inexplicit citation would strongly suggest that the Matthean Jesus equated the failure of Capernaum to repent, declared in Matt 9:1 to be his home town (τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν), with the blasphemous self-exalting rebellion of the King of Babylon.⁵⁰ Capernaum is closely associated with Babylon.

The Flight from Sodom and Jerusalem (Matt 24:15–20)

In material not found in Mark but shared with Luke, the Matthean Jesus contrasts through explicit statements (device 1) the cities of Galilee with Sodom and Gomorrah (cf. Matt 10:15; 11:23–24; Luke 10:12).⁵¹ Such statements support the possibility that elsewhere in the Gospel the Evangelist associates Jerusalem with Sodom. In Matt 24:15–20, Jesus warns his audience that when they see the desolating sacrilege standing in the holy place, as predicted by the prophet Daniel (device 1), then those in Judea “must flee to the mountains.”⁵² The one on the housetop is not to return to the house to collect his belongings. The one in the field, must not return to get a coat. These warnings, while based on the predictions of Daniel, also contain strong allusions to Lot’s flight from Sodom.

⁵⁰ Contrast this with the view of Luz, who argues that there is no evidence at this point in the narrative that Capernaum had rejected Jesus. As such, he takes this Matt 11:23 as a proleptic reference to the experience of later readers. Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary*, Hermeneia 61B (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 152.

⁵¹ Runesson, *Divine Wrath*, 399.

⁵² Michael P. Theophilos, *The Abomination of Desolation in Matthew 24:15* (LNTS 437: London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2012).

In terms of shared key words and phrases (device 4), Lot, like those in Judea, is told to feel “to the mountains” (εἰς τὸ ὄρος, Gen 19:17 LXX; cf. εἰς τὸ ὄρος, Matt 24:16).⁵³ Lot, similarly to those in Judea, is told not to “look back or stop anywhere in the Plain” (Gen 19:17). Similar circumstances (device 3) are intimated when Jesus warns that those in Judea may have to flee when pregnant. In the Lot account, upon escaping Sodom, Lot’s two daughters get him drunk and sleep with him in order to get pregnant (Gen 19:30–38). Such parallels are not unique to Matthew and are present in Mark 13:14–18. Unique to Matthew, however, is a further possible allusion to the Lot account. In Genesis, it is the righteous (MT: קִיָּץ; LXX: ὁ δίκαιος, Gen 18:23) who are to be delivered from Sodom. In the Gospel, those who flee Jerusalem are to pray that their flight is not on the Sabbath (Matt 24:20), a concern in Isa 58:2, 13–14 of the righteousness, righteousness being a prominent motif within the Gospel (e.g., Matt 1:29; 5:45; 9:14; 10:41; 13:17, 43, 49; 23:29, 35; 25:37, 46).⁵⁴ The likelihood of a first reader picking up such resonances is enhanced in light of the Lukan Jesus’s explicit statement (device 1), evidence of a consistent early Christian memory, commanding his reader to “Remember Lot’s wife” (Luke 17:32; cf. 1:1–4).

Such parallels, whether a reflection of Matthew’s sources or his own redactional emphasis, characterize Jerusalem, elsewhere described as the ‘holy city’ (cf. Matt 4:5; 27:53), as Sodom. Associating Israel with Sodom is not unique to the Evangelist but rather reflects prophetic denunciations in the Hebrew Scriptures of Israel as Sodom and Gomorrah (device 5):

Hear the word of the LORD,
 you rulers of Sodom!
 Listen to the teaching of our God,
 you people of Gomorrah! (Isa 1:10)

For Jerusalem has stumbled
 and Judah has fallen,
 because their speech and their deeds are against the LORD,
 defying his glorious presence.
 The look on their faces bears witness against them;
 they proclaim their sin like Sodom,

⁵³ 1 Macc. 2:28; 2 Macc. 5:27; 10:6. Cf. Beare, *Matthew*, 470; W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew: Commentary on Matthew 19-28* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 347.

⁵⁴ Benno Przybylski, *Righteousness in Matthew and His World of Thought*, SNTSMS 41 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980). On the significance of innocent or righteous blood in the Gospel, see Catherine Sider Hamilton, *The Death of Jesus in Matthew: Innocent Blood and the End of Exile*, SNTSMS 167 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

they do not hide it.
Woe to them!
For they have brought evil on themselves. (Isa 3:8–9)

But in the prophets of Jerusalem
I have seen a more shocking thing:
they commit adultery and walk in lies;
they strengthen the hands of evildoers,
so that no one turns from wickedness;
all of them have become like Sodom to me,
and its inhabitants like Gomorrah. (Jer 23:14)⁵⁵

In Gen 18:23, 25, Sodom is characterized as an abode of the wicked in which not even ten righteous persons could be found. In other canonical and extra-canonical sources Sodom becomes a byword for total divine judgment, an instance of Yahweh's severest response to human depravity in which no remnant survives.⁵⁶ The author of Jubilees emphasizes this enduring typological function: "And thus the LORD will execute judgment like the judgment of Sodom on places where they act according to the pollution of Sodom" (16:6). It is in this prophetic tradition that the Evangelist stands. He prepares his readers for the possibility that they may have to flee their city of origin and adopt the lifestyle and mentality of a wandering refugee.

The examples considered so far include a number of explicit devices used by the Evangelist to associate the land of Israel and its cities with "Galilee of the Gentiles," Babylon, and Sodom. Non-Israelite connotations are applied to Israel. In the following additional examples of this narrative strategy, the devices employed are less explicit, predominantly consisting of devices (3) to (6).

Foreign Lands in the Birth Narrative of Jesus (Matt 2:1–23)

The identity of the land in the birth narrative of Jesus varies greatly depending upon which character's point of view the reader adopts.⁵⁷ In Matt 2:1–2, magi from the east observe a rising star (*ἀστέρα*, 2:2; cf. *ἄστρον* in Num 24:17 LXX) and journey to Judea, enquiring as to the presence of the child who has been born king of the Jews (cf. *ἀναστήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ Ἰσραηλ* in Num 24:17 LXX).⁵⁸ They have come to pay him homage, bearing gifts of gold, frankincense

⁵⁵ Cf. Ezek 16:48; Asc. Isa 3:10.

⁵⁶ Deut 32:32–33; Isa 1:9; 13:19; Jer 49:18; 50:40; Zeph 2:9; 3 Macc 2:5; 2 Esdr 2:8; 2 Pet 2:6; Jude 7; T. Naph. 3:4; T. Ash. 7:1; T. Isaac 5:27; *Jub.* 36:10.

⁵⁷ See Mieke Bal's discussion on focalization in Mieke Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017), 132–148.

⁵⁸ Cf. the extended discussion on the magi and the star in Chrysostom, *Hom.*

and myrrh (Matt 2:11). The magi evoke traditions in the Hebrew Scriptures (device 3) that foreigners would come to the land of Israel to honor a righteous sovereign who would rule on behalf of Yahweh (Ps 72:1, 9–11; cf. Isa 60:3, 14).⁵⁹ The enduring appeal of such motifs is testified in later Jewish sources which refer to foreigners coming to the land of Israel bearing gifts to present to Israel's sovereign (cf. Pss. Sol. 17:31; 1 En 53:1).⁶⁰ If we accept that the magi from the east echo such traditions, then from their point of view, they have come to the land of Israel in search of its new sovereign. Their presence testifies to a land over which divine sovereignty has been reasserted. These positive land associations are reinforced through the explicit citation (device 1) of Micah 5:2 in Matt 2:6 (cf. γῆ Ἰουδα, Matt 2:5; see also “Bethlehem of Judea,” 2:1, 5).⁶¹

However, when we focus on the Gospel character of Joseph, we observe a number of allusions to the OT journey of Joseph from the land of Canaan to the land of Egypt.⁶² Here the land of Judah is portrayed as the equivalent of Canaan. These associations are overlaid with a third layer of devices associating the birth of Jesus with the Exodus account of the birth of Moses.⁶³ These point to the land of Judah as having Egypt-like qualities. Support for the assertion that Matthew combines in the same narrative a variety of subtexts is found in his practice of combining quotes from the Hebrew Scriptures into what Hays describes as interwoven scriptural intertexts. Hays cites the following examples:⁶⁴

Matt. 6:1–10.

⁵⁹ Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*, updated ed., AYBRL (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 179. Luz rejects any allusion to Isa 60:6 or similar OT traditions. Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 137–138.

⁶⁰ Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 249–250.

⁶¹ Cf. with Bethlehem in Zebulun (Josh 19:15–16). Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 134. Note the variant textual to γῆ Ἰουδα in D, τῆς Ἰουδαίας.

⁶² On the possibility of a possible allusion to the journey of Jacob to Egypt (Gen 46:2–7), see Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 144–145; Richard B. Hays, *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014), 39; Idem, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 113. Heinz Giesen comments on the importance of geographical settings, “In Mt 1 und 2 geht es jeweils um Namen Der geographische Weg von Betlehem über Ägypten nach Israel und schließlich nach Nazaret in Galiläa bestätigt das.” Giesen, “Galiläa,” 28.

⁶³ More generally, Raymond Brown suggests that the formula citations in Matt 2, “by mentioning *Bethlehem*, the city of David, *Egypt*, the land of the Exodus, and *Ramah*, the mourning-place of the Exile, offer a theological history of Israel in geographical miniature.” Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 217.

⁶⁴ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 187.

Table 5.

Passage in Matthew	Interwoven scriptural intertexts
Matt 2:6	Mic 5:1–3 + 2 Sam 5:2
Matt 4:14–16	Isa 9:1–2 + Isa 42:6–7
Matt 11:29	Sir 51:27 + Jer 6:16
Matt 21:5	Isa 62:11 + Zech 9:9
Matt 27:39	Ps 22:7 + Lam 2:15

These interwoven citations serve, according to Hays, to “beckon the reader to recall to different scriptural contexts simultaneously and to reflect upon the way in which each one illuminates the other, or to discern how both subtexts contribute to a nuanced interpretation of events narrated in the Gospel.”⁶⁵

Joseph’s Flight from the ‘Land of Canaan’ to the Land of Egypt

A number of parallels may be identified in the journey to Egypt of Joseph, Mary and the child to Joseph’s journey from Canaan to Egypt in Genesis (cf. land of “Canaan” in Gen 33:18; 37:1; 42:5, 7, 13, 32; 44:8; 45:17, 25; 46:6). Similar circumstances and wording are found in both accounts (devices 3 and 4). There is a threat to life, whether it be famine in the case of the Joseph of Genesis (Gen 41:25–27) or the murderous intentions of a despotic ruler in the case of the Joseph of the Gospel (Matt 2:13). Both Josephs receive dreams that lead, directly or indirectly, to them journeying to Egypt (cf. MT: ׀ִןִּי; LXX: ἐνύπνιον in Gen 37:5 and ὄναρ in Matt 2:13). In Genesis, Joseph interprets his ordeal of slavery in Egypt as part of God’s plan to save the rest of his family. He repeatedly asserts that it was God that ‘sent’ him to Egypt (MT: ׀ִיִּלְאָּ ׀ִיִּלְאָּ; LXX: ἀπέστειλέν με ὁ θεός; Gen 45:15; cf. 45:7, 8).⁶⁶ In the Gospel, Joseph is sent by divine intervention to Egypt in order to ensure the safety of his family (Matt 2:13). Less certain but nevertheless possible shared wording and motifs (device 4) include references to stars (ἀστέρες, Gen 37:9 LXX; τὸν ἀστέρα, Matt 2:2), disputed sovereignty, whether it be the right to rule the house of Jacob in the case of Joseph or Judea in the case of Herod (Μὴ βασιλεύων βασιλεύσεις ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ἢ κυριεύων κυριεύσεις ἡμῶν; Gen 37:8 LXX; Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως, ὁ τεχθεις βασιλεύς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, Matt 2:1–2), and the importance of worship (προσεκύνουν, προσκυνήσαί, Gen 37:9, 11 LXX; προσκυνῆσαι, Matt 2:2). These multiple devices invite the reader to associate the geographical departure point of Joseph’s journey to Egypt with that of the earlier Joseph—the land of Canaan.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ Ibid., 186.

⁶⁶ Cf. Philo, *Migr.* 22.

⁶⁷ Cf. Chrysostom, *Hom. Matt.* 8:3.

What connotations might the association of the land of Israel with the land of Canaan have had for a first-century reader of the Gospel familiar with canonical and extra-canonical traditions? First, while Canaan may on occasion have been subject to famine (Gen 42:5; Jdt. 5:10; Acts 7:11), under normal conditions it was remembered as an outstandingly verdant and productive land, a land “flowing with milk and honey” (אֶרֶץ זָבַת חֵלֶב וְדָבַשׁ, e.g., Exod 3:8, 17; 13:5; Lev 20:24; Num 13:27).⁶⁸ These rich natural resources enabled the population to flourish, for the development of seven strong and populous nations (ἔθνη μεγάλα; Deut 7:1 LXX; ἔθνη ἑπτὰ, Acts 13:19).⁶⁹

Second, Canaan is frequently portrayed in the Hebrew Scriptures as a land noted for two particular sins, child sacrifice and illicit sexual practices (e.g., Lev 20:23; Deut 12:31; 18:10–12).⁷⁰ In Lev 18:3, Israel is commanded not to act as those who live in the “land of Egypt” (אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם) nor in the “land of Canaan” (אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן). In the biblical tradition, the moral failings of the Canaanites can be traced back to Canaan’s exposure of Noah, as a result of which he was cursed to be the “lowest of slaves” to his brothers (Gen 9:27). Second Temple sources testify to the longevity of this tradition (cf. 4Q252 2:5; 4Q254 1:2; *Jub.* 7:10; Philo, *Sobr.* 32). These inhabitants of the lands were subject to divine judgment, which occurred when the land was given by Yahweh, the ultimate owner of the land, as a ‘possession’ (לְאֻחֻזָּה, cf. Deut 32:49) to the Israelites.⁷¹ Due to Israel’s failure to implement the command to drive out the inhabitants of the land, Yahweh permitted, according to Judg 3:1, some Canaanites and those from the other nations (LXX: τὰ ἔθνη) to remain in the land to test (LXX: πειράσαι) Israel to see if they would remain faithful to him.⁷² In later Second Temple traditions, avoiding intermarriage with Canaanite women, a designator for non-Jewish women, is presented as a test of faithfulness. Rebecca warns Jacob not to take a Canaanite wife in *Jub.* 25:1 because of “their unclean deeds: for all their deeds are fornication and lust, and there is no righteousness with them, for (their deeds) are evil” (cf. *Jub.* 27:10; *T. Jud.* 14:6). On balance, it is likely that associating the land of Israel with the land of Canaan would have raised more negative than positive connotations for a first-century reader of the Gospel aware of such traditions.

⁶⁸ Josephus describes it as a γῆν ἀρίστην τῶν Χαναανίων (*Ant.* 4.116; cf. 5.77).

⁶⁹ These are listed in Deut 7:1 as the Hittites, the Girgashites, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites. Cf. Josh 3:10; 24:11. In most biblical references, five or six nations are listed (e.g., Exod 3:8; 13:5).

⁷⁰ Arie Versluis, *The Command to Exterminate the Canaanites: Deuteronomy 7* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 286–320.

⁷¹ Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 4.116.

⁷² Cf. *Jub.* 22:20–21.

The Birth of Jesus in the 'Land of Egypt'

Our next series of devices relate to the Jesus child as a Moses-like figure (cf. Matt 1:20; 2:2, 8–9, 11, 13–14, 20–21).⁷³ From the point of view of the child, the Gospel's 'land of Judah' (2:5–6) is the setting for dark and disturbing events which, through similar circumstances (device 3), recall Israel's earlier period of bondage in the land of Egypt. In Exodus, a king and his nation feel threatened by the high birth rate of an alien people (Exod 1:8–9). In the Gospel, a king and 'all Jerusalem' react with fear at the news of the birth of a child (Matt 2:1–3). In Exodus, the king issues a command to kill all new-born Hebrew boys (Exod 1:15–22). In the Gospel, King Herod issues a command to kill all the children in and around Bethlehem (Matt 2:16).⁷⁴ In Exodus, Pharaoh's attempts to kill the Hebrew boys are thwarted by the Hebrew midwives (Exod 1:17). In the Gospel, the magi frustrate Herod's plan to kill the child by secretly travelling home another way (Matt 2:7–12). Finally, Joseph takes the "child and his mother" back to "the land of Israel" (τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ [...] εἰς γῆν Ἰσραὴλ, Matt 2:21) just as Moses took his "wife and his sons" back to "the land of Egypt" (τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὰ παιδιά [...] εἰς Αἴγυπτον, Exod 4:20 LXX).

Evidence for allusions to Moses and the land of Egypt is not restricted to similar circumstances. The Evangelist intentionally draws the reader's attention to the exodus account when he recalls the words of the prophet (Hosea) in Matt 2:15. This explicit statement (device 1), rather than a reflection of the LXX as is typical elsewhere in the Gospel, intentionally reflects the Hebrew text of Hos 11:1, thereby permitting the close association of the journey out of Egypt of Jesus the 'son' with that of Israel, Yahweh's son (Exod 4:22):⁷⁵

Table 6.

Matt 2:15	Hos 11:1
ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ⁷⁶ ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου "out of Egypt I have called my son"	ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ "out of Egypt I recalled his children" (LXX)
	מִמִּצְרַיִם קָרָאתִי לְבָנִי "out of Egypt I called my son" (MT)

⁷³ Beare, *Matthew*, 81–82; Allison, *The New Moses*, 140–165; Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 180.

⁷⁴ Contrast Brian M. Nolan, *The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1-2 in the Setting of the Gospel* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 36.

⁷⁵ Bonnard, *Matthieu*, 29; Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew*, 101; David Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew*, NCB (London: Oliphants, 1972), 85; Beare, *Matthew*, 82; Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 262; Allison, *The New Moses*, 140–142.

⁷⁶ D L 'Eξ 'Eγύπτου

Important for our discussion is the fact that in its original context, the ‘my son’ of MT Hos 11:1 refers to Israel, something of which the Evangelist would have been well aware, an indication, in the words of W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, of an early Christian practice of portraying Jesus “as repeating or recapitulating certain experiences of Israel.”⁷⁷

Further, upon the death of Herod, Joseph is told to return to the “land of Israel” for “those who were seeking the child’s life are dead (Matt 2:20). This is commonly recognized to be an implicit citation (device 2) of Exod 4:19 LXX in which Moses is commanded to return to Egypt following the death of Pharaoh:⁷⁸

Table 7.

Matt 2:20	τεθνήκασιν γὰρ	οἱ ζητοῦντες	τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ παιδίου
Exod 4:19 (LXX)	τεθνήκασιν γὰρ πάντες	οἱ ζητοῦντές σου	τὴν ψυχὴν

The presence of similar circumstances, shared words and phrases, and explicit and implicit citations suggest an additional association of the land of Israel during the birth and childhood of Jesus with the land of Egypt in the time of Moses.

A number of scholars have highlighted various aggadic traditions about the birth of Moses that further reinforce these allusions to the land of Egypt.⁷⁹ For example, in Josephus, *Ant.* 2.210–216, God appeared to Amram the father of Moses in a dream and told him not to despair about his wife’s pregnancy in light of Pharaoh’s command that all Hebrew boys should be killed (cf. Matt 2:1:18–21). In Matt 1:18–21, an angel encourages Joseph not to worry about the pregnancy of Mary. According to LAB (Pseudo-Philo) 9:10, Miriam the sister of Moses is told by the Spirit of God that through her brother he will save his people. In Matt 1:21, Joseph is told by an angel in a dream that his wife, Mary, will bear a son who “will save his people from their sins.” Josephus retells how Pharaoh was told by one of his *sacred scribes* of the birth of Moses

⁷⁷ Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 263.

⁷⁸ Bonnard, *Matthieu*, 29–30; Hill, *Matthew*, 86; Nolan, *The Royal Son of God*, 36; Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 193; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 119; Allison, *The New Moses*, 142–44; Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 217, 20; Giesen, “Galiläa,” 27.

⁷⁹ Renée Bloch, “Methodological Note for the Study of Rabbinic Literature,” in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism, 1: Theory and Practice*, ed. William S. Green (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press for Brown University, 1978), 61–66; Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 192–193; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 131; Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 114–116; Allison, *The New Moses*, 144–160. Against haggadic influence, see Nolan, *The Royal Son of God*, 82–89.

and how, if he were reared, he “would bring the Egyptian dominion low, and would raise the Israelites” (*Ant.* 2:205).⁸⁰ In response, Pharaoh commands that every male child be cast into the river (2.206). This is a development of the biblical tradition in which Pharaoh’s command to kill is indiscriminate and not aimed at any one particular usurper.⁸¹ A parallel is found in the Evangelist’s account of the chief priests and *scribes* of the people informing Herod that a ruler would arise from Bethlehem in the land of Judah (Matt 2:4–6; cf. Mic 5:2). In response, Herod issues a command that the babies in and around Bethlehem two years and under be slaughtered (Matt 2:16). These shared circumstances and words, assuming that they reflect traditions that predate the writing of the Gospel, would further reinforce for a cognizant audience the Egypt allusions identified above.⁸²

What connotations might Egypt have had for a first-century reader of the Gospel aware of such associations? First, in both biblical and extra-biblical sources Egypt is portrayed as a place of slavery and suffering.⁸³ Later generations were required to intentionally shape their remembrance of the exodus in a manner that ensured that memories of harsh slavery were reinforced and positive memories of Egypt’s rich natural resources were downplayed (Exod 12:1–28; 13:8–9, 14–16; Deut 6:21–22; 16:3), a process encapsulated in the repeated command to “Remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt” (וְזָכַרְתָּ כִּי עֶבֶד הָיִיתָ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם, Deut 15:15; cf. 16:12; 24:18, 22; *Jub.* 49:2; *Ant.* 4.212; *m. Ber.* 1.5; *m. Pesah* 10.5).⁸⁴ The Mosaic covenant required Israelites to distance themselves from the types of lives they had in Egypt (e.g., Lev 18:3). Egypt was remembered as a center of idolatrous worship, an ever-present temptation to Israel (*Isa* 19:11; *Sib. Or.* 3.601–610;

⁸⁰ Arabia would be the preferred option if Matt 2:11 includes an allusion to *Isa* 60:6 (“A multitude of camels shall cover you, the young camels of Midian and Ephah; all those from Sheba shall come. They shall bring gold and frankincense, and shall proclaim the praise of the LORD.”). For arguments against Egyptian origin, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 228–229.

⁸¹ Richard T. France, “Herod and the Children of Bethlehem,” *NovT* 21.2 (1979): 105.

⁸² Ulrich Luz concludes, “In Jesus the exodus from Egypt is repeated and completed.” Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 146.

⁸³ Cf. Exod 13:3, 14; 20:2; Deut 5:6; 6:12; 7:8; 8:14; 13:5, 10; Josh 24:17; Judg 6:8; Jer 34:13; Mic 6:4; Philo, *Mos.* 1.36, 247; *Somn.* 1.114; Josephus, *Ant.* 6.89; 12.11; *Jub.* 46:14; 49:6.

⁸⁴ Israel’s treatment of the alien, for example, is to be generous, in stark contrast with how they were treated as aliens in the land of Egypt (Exod 22:21; 23:9; Lev 19:34; Deut 10:19; Josephus, *Ant.* 4.238–239). See José E. Ramírez Kidd, *Alterity and Identity in Israel: The גַּר in the Old Testament*, BZAW 283 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999).

5:278–280, 487–488).⁸⁵ A failure to distance themselves from such practices and mores would result in a renewed experience of slavery.⁸⁶ They were never to return to Egypt (Deut 17:16; cf. Jer 42:18–19; 43:2). Second, Egypt had limited positive associations. In 1 Kgs 11:17, 40, it is a place of refuge.⁸⁷ This continued to be the case during later periods of Seleucid oppression (2 Macc. 1:1, 10). Other biblical sources testify positively to the wisdom of Egypt (1 Kgs 4:30), something to be appreciated but surpassed.⁸⁸ Hope is even held out that Egypt will become a center of Yahweh worship (Isa 19:19–25; *Sib. Or.* 5.501). Again, on balance, it is more likely that a first-century reader of the Gospel aware of such traditions would have inferred more negative than positive associations with the Evangelist’s use of exodus-Egypt allusions.

In summary, the Evangelist has combined in the infancy narrative contrasting land associations from various OT traditions. This affirms the observation of Richard France that, “the *Old Testament* background to Matthew is not a given book or passage of scripture, but a bewildering variety of texts and motifs brought in as occasion demands.”⁸⁹ From the magi’s perspective, they have come to the “land of Judah” in search of its new sovereign. Allusions to the Genesis account of Joseph’s sojourn in Egypt suggest, however, that Matthew’s “land of Judah” also serves as the equivalent of the famine-hit land of Canaan from which Joseph journeyed to Egypt, a place of refuge and security. In addition, numerous devices evoking Moses-related traditions imply that the Gospel’s land of Judah also evokes the land of Egypt at its very worst, as a place of bondage and persecution.

The Land of Canaan and the Temptation of Jesus (Matt 4:1–11)

A number of allusions may be identified in the temptation of Jesus both to Israel’s sojourn in the wilderness and to Joshua’s conquest of Canaan. Turning stones into bread evokes through explicit statement (device 1, “it is written”; Deut 8:3//Matt 4:4) and key words (device 4; cf. MT מִן הַלֶּחֶם and LXX $\text{\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\iota}$ in Exod 16:3, 4 with $\text{\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\iota}$ ‘bread’ in Matt 4:3) how God led Israel for forty years in the wilderness, “in order to humble you, testing you to know what was in your heart, [...] He humbled you by letting you hunger, then by feeding you with manna, [...], in order to make you understand that one

⁸⁵ On idolatry, see also Ezek 20:7–8; 30:31; 2 Bar. 58:1 (OT Pseudepigrapha). Cf. Chrysostom, *Hom. Matt.* 8:6.

⁸⁶ Yahweh promised to bring upon Israel the same diseases he had brought upon Egypt if they were unfaithful to the covenant (cf. Exod 15:26; Deut 28:27, 60, 68; *T. Dan* 5.8 [OT Pseudepigrapha]).

⁸⁷ Garrett Galvin, *Egypt as a Place of Refuge*, *Forschungen zum Alten Testament* 2/51 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).

⁸⁸ Josephus identifies the source of this wisdom as the Chaldeans (*Ant.* 1.168).

⁸⁹ France, “Herod and the Children,” 100–101.

does not live by bread (MT: מִן־הַלֶּחֶם ; LXX $\alpha\rho\tau\omega$) alone, but by every word that comes from the mouth of the LORD” (Deut 8:2–3; Matt 4:4).⁹⁰ The second temptation to test the protective care of the Lord by jumping off the pinnacle of the Temple relates through explicit statement (device 1) the temptation Israel would face once they had become established in the land of Canaan to presume on God’s protective care as they did at Massah (cf. Deut 6:16//Matt 4:7). The final temptation involves the use of similar circumstances (device 3) to evoke Yahweh showing Moses on Mt. Nebo the extent of the Promised land (Deut 34:1–3) when the devil took Jesus up a ‘very high mountain’ εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν λίαν and offered him all the kingdoms of the world if he would bow down and worship him (Matt 4:8–10). Jesus responds to the devil’s request by explicitly quoting Deut 6:13 (device 1), an injunction to Israel to worship the Lord alone once they reach the Promised Land, where they will face the temptation to forget the God of the exodus and serve other gods (6:12–15).⁹¹ Each of the temptations Jesus faces alludes to different stages in the exodus-conquest narrative.⁹²

The presence of three explicit statements from Deuteronomy in the temptation account affirms strong authorial awareness of the book and strengthens the possibility of the intentional use of other allusions to the exodus-conquest narrative. For example, the temptations take place over forty days and nights (ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα καὶ νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα,⁹³ Matt 4:2), a possible allusion through the use of key phrases (device 4) to the forty days and nights spent by Moses up the mountain (τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας, Exod 24:18 LXX; cf. 34:28; Deut 9:18, 25–26; and Elijah in 1 Kgs 19:8), and/or the forty days during which twelve representatives of Israel spied out the land of Canaan (τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας, LXX Num 13:25) that resulted in the ‘sons’ of Israel (οἱ υἱοὶ, Num 14:33 LXX; cf. ὁ υἱός μου, Matt 3:17) spending forty years in the wilderness as a result of their failure to trust in Yahweh (cf. τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη [...] τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας, 14:33–34).⁹⁴

Deuteronomy is a presentation of the law to those about to enter the land of Canaan (e.g., Deut 6:1–3), suggesting to the reader of the Gospel familiar with this particular subtext that with the baptism and temptation of Jesus, we are embarking upon a new conquest, the reestablishment of the

⁹⁰ Wilhelm Wilkens, “Die Versuchung Jesu nach Matthäus,” *NTS* 28.4 (1982): 487.

⁹¹ Allison, *The New Moses*, 170–172.

⁹² Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 76, 117–119. For a critique of this position, see Davies, *Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, 45–46.

⁹³ C ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντας καὶ τεσσαράκοντας νύκτας.

⁹⁴ Siegfried Schulz, *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972), 178–179; Allison, *The New Moses*, 166–169.

kingdom.⁹⁵ The Evangelist tells through the use of similar circumstances (device 3) of a Jesus who is baptized in the Jordan, who is affirmed by a divine pronouncement, and who uses the law of Deuteronomy in a setting of spiritual warfare, elements that evoke an OT Joshua (LXX, Ἰησοῦς) who was affirmed by divine pronouncement, who passed through the Jordan, and who took with him into the land of Canaan the law of Deuteronomy (cf. Josh 1:1–9 LXX). It would be a mistake to dismiss such allusions on the basis that they do not exactly match the narrative sequence of the exodus-conquest account. Instead, we may affirm that the Evangelist has combined multiple subtexts, not always in narrative sequence, to the OT exodus and conquest accounts.⁹⁶ The implication of these devices for our purposes is that Jesus is presented as a new Joshua reconquering the equivalent of the land of Canaan, a land polluted by a foreign deity impersonating the God of the exodus.⁹⁷

Conclusion

This study has not exhausted the numerous land associations present in the Gospel of Matthew. We have not considered, for example, the land-related allusion in Matt 24:15 to Dan 9:27 (cf. 11:31; 12:11). Nor have we considered allusions less explicitly related to land but nevertheless related to this thesis such as the explicit citation of Isa 6:9–10 in Matt 13:14–15 by which Jesus associates first-century Israel with the spiritually apostate generation of the exile (cf. Isa 29:13//Matt 15:8–9). Nevertheless, through a number of explicit and implicit examples I have sought to demonstrate that the land of Israel and its various cities are variously associated with non-Israelite Sodom, Egypt, Babylon, and, particularly relevant for this study, Canaan. This subsummation of the land of Israel under alternative land identities is a

⁹⁵ Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 352. For Joshua as a second Moses and the crossing of the Jordan as a re-enactment of the crossing of the Red Sea, see Jean Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Theology of the Fathers*, trans. Wulston Hibberd (London: Burns and Oates, 1960), 261–275; Mark E. Biddle, “Literary Structures in the Book of Joshua,” *Review & Expositor* 95.2 (1998): 191–192; Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 116–120; Zev Farber, *Images of Joshua in the Bible and Their Reception*, BZAW 457 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016), 34–38. Cf. Dodewaard, “La force évocatrice de la citation,” 487–488; Brandon D. Crowe, *The Obedient Son: Deuteronomy and Christology in the Gospel of Matthew*, BZNW 188 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), 159–166.

⁹⁶ Here I accept Wilhelm Wilken’s argument that Matthew has developed his account independent of Luke-Q. Wilkens, “Die Versuchung Jesu.” See also Allison’s arguments against those who “have played the new Moses and new Exodus themes against each other, as though emphasis upon one must lead to de-emphasis upon the other.” Allison, *The New Moses*, 199.

⁹⁷ Joshua E. Leim, *Matthew’s Theological Grammar: The Father and the Son*, WUNT 2/402 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 73–77.

deeply prophetic move and may be viewed as comparable to Isaiah's prophetic denunciation of Israel as Sodom and Gomorrah (Isa 1:10) or to the figurative use of "Babylon" in the Apocalypse.⁹⁸ Israel, frequently described in the Gospel as an "evil and adulterous generation" (Matt 12:39; 16:4; cf. "faithless and perverse generation," 17:17), is presented in the garb of other nations and cities that were subject to divine judgment.

Matthew's reference to the Canaanite woman (Matt 15:22) should be understood in this context. This faithful Canaanite shines forth as an exemplar figure who has risen above her national identity. In this respect she represents a challenge to "Canaanite" Israel while at the same time offering hope to readers, wherever and whenever located, that they may rise above their own national situation.

⁹⁸ Rev 14:8; 16:19; 17:5; 18:2, 10, 21. Cf. 1 Pet 5:13.