MATTHEW'S GADARENE SWINE AND THE CONQUEST OF JERICHO: AN INTERTEXTUAL READING

Helen Paynter
Centre for the Study of Bible and Violence, Bristol Baptist College

The stories of Joshua's conquest of Canaan are regarded as seriously problematic by many readers of the Bible today. Various attempts have been made to provide a theodicy for these narratives,[1] but one area which has been largely overlooked is whether the New Testament provides a commentary upon them. This paper offers a possible intertextuality between Matthew's gospel and the conquest of Canaan, suggesting that the later text might in this way be functioning as an early commentary upon the older one.

Intertextuality is present when a text enters into dialogue with a prior text by means of such literary devices as shared motifs, formulaic language, and direct quotation.[2] One of the chief tools used in the construction of an intertextual relationship is allusion. As Cynthia Edenburg says, "In allusion, one text constructs a covert level of significance by indirectly invoking another text. For allusion to fulfill its purpose as a signifying device, it must be accompanied by textual markers that alert the audience to an underlying significance."[3]

Detecting such markers is not always simple, however, and intertextual relationships can sometimes appear to lie more in the eye of the beholder than of the author. In order to try to avoid such over-reading, Richard Hays offers several criteria for evaluating whether a putative intertextual allusion is plausible or not.[4] The argument in this paper will be that the postulated textual echoes satisfy his criteria of availability, volume, recurrence, and thematic coherence.

MATTHEW AS RECAPITULATION OF ISRAEL'S HISTORY

It is well established that parts of Matthew's gospel offer a recapitulation of the story of Israel in the life of Jesus. Joel Kennedy, for instance, has demonstrated a detailed network of intertextual links between

[1] See, for example, the constructive conversation between C.S. Cowles, Eugene Merrill, Daniel Gard and Tremper Longman III in C.S Cowles, et al*, Show Them No Mercy: 4 Views on God and the Canaanite Genocide* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003), or the more recent offering by Paul Copan and Matthew Flannagan, *Did God Really Command Genocide? Coming to Terms with the Justice of God* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2014).
[2] K. Nielsen, "Intertextuality and Hebrew Bible," *Vetus Testamentum Supplements* 80 (2000): 17-32; C. Edenburg, "Intertextuality, Literary Competence and the Question of Readership: Some Preliminary Questions," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* (35) (2010): 131-48.
[3] Edenburg, "Intertextuality," 144.
[4] Hays' six criteria are: (1) Availability of the putative intertext to the original readers of the text under study; (2) Volume (the number of explicit repetitions of words or syntactical patterns); (3) Recurrence (how many times the author refers to that passage elsewhere); (4) Thematic coherence (how well the alleged echo fits into the argument); (5) Historical plausibility (the likelihood that the meaning effect would have been understood by its original readers); (6) History of interpretation (whether have other readers have identified the proposed allusion). R. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 29-32.

Matthew 1.1-4.11 and the exodus story.[5] Using a combined methodology which includes historical criticism, literary critical analysis and attention to the theological concerns of the narrative, he has shown that by means of recapitulation, representation and embodiment, the early life of Jesus is being represented by the gospel writer as a passive and active re-enactment of the flight from Egypt and the wandering in the desert. His work was anticipated several decades earlier, *in nuce*, by the work of M.D. Goulder, who described the first five chapters of Matthew as being antitypical of the Joseph and exodus stories.[6]

This paper represents an investigation into the possibility that this recapitulation motif extends further into the gospel, and in particular, whether the conquest of Canaan might in some way be referenced in Matthew's account of Jesus' visit to gentile territory in Matthew 8. While the conquest narratives occupy a large portion of the book of Joshua, the archetypal event is the conquest of Jericho, and the archetypal action is the devotion to destruction (sometimes referred to as 'the ban', or the transliterated Hebrew word *ḥerem*) of the peoples of the land and their cities.

Naturally we would not expect exact correspondence in the telling. The comparisons identified by Joel Kennedy have been marked by both their similarities and their dissimilarities—the latter often occurring, it appears, for a particular polemical purpose. For example, when the temptation of Jesus is compared to Israel's time in the desert, it becomes apparent that one of the main points of the gospel writer appears to be that Jesus was faithful where Israel was not.

Or, to use a second example, Kennedy demonstrates that Matthew's use of Hosea 11.1 ("out of Egypt I called my son") is more subtle than commonly noticed. In particular, Matthew's placement of the reference during the flight to Egypt (Mt. 2.15) appears counter-intuitive, and Kennedy suggests that Matthew is using this as a device whereby Herod's Judah is equated to hostile, oppressive Egypt, "[Some] scholars appear to misunderstand the relation of geography and movement in the story as it unfolds. Important to note, is that the narrative follows the *movements* of Jesus, and the geographical locations that are cited are a part of this movement" (emphasis original).[7]

This motif of movement rather than location will prove significant to the current investigation.

Indeed, the imprecision of correspondence within this episode appears deeper still, for Kennedy suggests that the flight of the holy family from Judea can be understood to correspond to both flights from Pharaoh –that of Moses as a young man and the exodus event itself.[8]

THEMES IN MATTHEW 8.18-34

Matthew 8 begins with a selection of miracle stories, where Jesus takes action against various forms of sickness in a series of miracles which might be understood as re-creational events. However, in the second

[5] Joel Kennedy, *The Recapitulation of Israel: Use of Israel's History in Matthew 1:1-4:11* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).
[6] Goulder used the criterion of cumulative evidence to 'prove' the typology, and in consideration of the question of how many 'coincidences' are necessary for the case to be made, suggested, "three or four points of correspondence suffice to form a convincing catena." M.D. Goulder, *Type and History in Acts* (London: SPCK, 1964), 2-6.
[7] Kennedy, *Recapitulation of Israel*, 132).
[8] Ibid., 125.

half of the chapter, this confrontation with the de-creational forces of chaos intensifies in the stilling of the storm and the narrative of the Gadarenes, and it is striking that Jesus crosses over a body of water in order to reach the place. It is this portion of Matthew 8 that the current investigation will consider.[9]

Verse 18 appears to open the section, as Jesus states his intention to cross to the other side of the lake. However, he does not actually arrive there until verse 28. Why this proleptic comment? The most likely answer is that it is placed here in order to link the three pericopes: (vv. 19-22; 23-27; 28-34) into a single unit, forming an inclusio with Matthew 9.1.

The approach taken in this investigation, then, is first to consider Matthew 8.18-34 as a literary unity. Particular attention will be paid to thematic links between the pericopes, and to the ways in which these pericopes differ from the parallels in the other synoptic gospels. These may provide a clue to the author's particular purpose in this section. The themes which emerge will then be compared with themes from the Jericho account.

Jesus' response to professions of commitment vv. 19-22, "And a scribe came up and said to him, 'Teacher, I will follow you wherever you go.' And Jesus said to him, 'The foxes have dens, and the birds of the sky have places to live, but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head.' Another of his disciples said to him, 'Lord, permit me first to go and bury my father.' But Jesus said to him, 'Follow me. And leave the dead to bury their own dead.'"[10]

Only Matthew has these sayings here. Mark lacks them altogether; in Luke they occur in expanded form prior to the sending out of the seventy-two. But Matthew has chosen to place them at this point 'somewhat arbitrarily', according to Donald Hagner.[11] However, crediting the gospel writer with literary and theological subtlety, his proleptic comment in verse 18 suggests that these two brief exchanges, and in particular Jesus' 'cryptic' remarks,[12] should be read in the light of what follows.

While Jesus' itinerant ministry would suggest that he often had 'nowhere to lay his head', this could never be more true than when he had crossed into the largely Gentile territory of the Decapolis region. In Nazareth, or Capernaum, or Bethany, he had friends or family to stay with; in the Gadarenes he was a stranger.

Discussions on the meaning of the dead burying their own dead have centred largely on the question of whether the man's father had already died (and he was wishing to return to perform his filial death duties), or whether the man was asking to wait at home until his father died.[13] Certainly this seems to be the relevant question to account for Jesus' words in their immediate context. However, the graphic language used (just

[9] In his comprehensive analysis of Moses typology in Matthew, Dale Allison considers whether Matthew 8 and 9 in fact represents an antitypology with the plagues of Egypt; he notes B.W. Bacon's structural analysis of both texts, and the 3x3 + 1 pattern they both contain. However, he concludes that there is not enough similarity between them in other respects, and that the 3x3 + 1 structure is a common device, extending even to Goldilocks and the Three Bears. D. J. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 207-13.
[10] Translations are the author's own.
[11] Donald Hagner, *Matthew 1-13* (WBC: Dallas: Word, 1998), 212.
[12] Ibid., 213.
[13] See, for example, J. Nolland, *Matthew* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 367.

try imagining Jesus' words literally) draws our attention to the theme of death, which will prove to be relevant in the forthcoming narrative, where the (metaphorical) dead dwell among the (literal) dead.

So, in view of the story to come, full of references to tombs and demons (traditionally associated with the places of death[14]), it may be that Matthew's placement of this conversation in this position is a deliberate action to foreground the issue of death and its associated phenomenon of uncleanness.[15] Without casting doubt on their undeniable comment on the theme of discipleship, these remarks begin to draw our attention to the inhospitality, threat and impurity facing Jesus as he crosses to the other side of the lake.

THE CONFRONTATION WITH THE STORM VV. 23-27

The shared imagery with the Jonah story has long been noted, with commentators at least as early as Cyril of Jerusalem[16] (identifying points of parallel between the stories. John Nolland notes these similarities, but cautions that "the desire to see significance in the Gospel journey into Gentile territory for the Jonah link has to reckon with the fact that Jonah was at this point journeying *away from and not towards* his role in Nineveh" (emphasis mine).[17] This might not be so surprising, however, given that if Matthew's account does represent a recapitulation of the story of Jonah, he will be at pains to show Jesus re-enacting it without the faults and defects of his predecessor. Thus the issue is not so much the direction of travel as the reversal of Jonah's disobedience in the obedience of Jesus. Jonah was fleeing from his mission to the Gentiles; Jesus was obediently going towards Gentile territory. In the light of the passage that follows in Matthew, the possible 'mission to the Gentiles' theme here is noted and will be discussed later.

One of the striking differences between the accounts is the description of the storm.[18] Matthew uses the term σεισμὸς μέγας ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, (a great earthquake in the sea). By contrast, Mark has λαῖλαψ μεγάλη ἀνέμου (a great windstorm) and Luke λαῖλαψ ἀνέμου (a windstorm). The effect of Matthew's choice of word is to focus our attention on the sea rather than the wind, which is not mentioned until Jesus establishes calm in verse 26.

The mythological resonances of the sea as a place of chaos, a "frightening monster, once roused" should be noted.[19] In Hebrew thought the sea is an ambiguous, dangerous place, constantly pushing back at the order imposed upon it by God in Genesis 1, yet under his control (cf. Job 38.8-11). As it was with Israel's ancient near-eastern neighbours, the sea is sometimes personified in the Hebrew Bible as Rahab (Job 26.12; Isa. 27.1) or Leviathan (Ps 74.12-14; Job 41). Similar images are found in the apocalyptic literature

[14] C. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 285.
[15] Indeed, the exact species of animal referred to as ἀλώπηξ in verse 20 is unclear, and it is not impossible that it is jackals that are intended. Cf. Jdg. 15.4 in LXX and O. Margalith, 'Samson's Foxes,' *Vetus Testamentum* (1985), 226.
[16] Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechetical Lecture XIV, in *The Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril, Archbishop of Jerusalem*, ed. E. Gifford (Oxford: James Parker, 1893), 98.
[17] Nolland, *Matthew*, 371.
[18] There are four main differences between Matthew's account of the storm and its synoptic parallels. Two of them – the order of embarkation and Jesus' use of ὀλιγόπιστοι (men of little faith) – seem to relate to Matthew's emphasis on discipleship which is clearly evident in this part of the gospel. A third difference, the omission of the cushion, is probably done in order to avoid a clash with verse 20 (Nolland, *Matthew,* 370).
[19] Ibid.

of both testaments and the intertestamental literature (e.g. Dan. 7.3, 1 Enoch 60.16; Rev. 13.1), and the sea is also a place of judgment (Exod. 15.4-5; 1 Enoch 60.9; Rev. 15.2[20]).

Moreover, the earthquake imagery brings to bear eschatological images from the latter prophets and pseudepigrapha, such as Haggai 2.6, 21 and 2 Baruch 27.7. The use of σεισμός within the gospel itself appears to have eschatological overtones: it is found at the crucifixion (27.54), the resurrection (28.2), and in Jesus' 'end times' discourse in 24.7.

This pericope, then, reveals Jesus as the calm queller of chaos, rebuking[21] the sea and restoring order, in an action which has creation and re-creation resonances.

THE DEMONIACS IN THE GADARENES VV. 28-34

Matthew's telling of this story is very different from Mark's and Luke's, and this is indicative of the particular emphasis with which he wished to imbue his narrative. The main points of comparison are summarised in Table 1 (below).

[20] cf. Ryken, et al, *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery* (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1998), 765-6.
[21] The use of ἐπιτιμάω should not be over-interpreted, but is consonant with the postulated theme of personification of chaos.

Table 1. Comparison of the Gadarene narrative in the synoptic gospels

	Matthew	**Mark**	**Luke**
Location	**Gadarenes**	**Gerasenes**	**Gerasenes**
Description of the man/ men	Two Demonised Comes out from the tombs Very violent No name	One With an unclean spirit Living in the tombs Unbindable Distressed, self-harming Named Legion	One Having demons Living in the tombs Guarded, but unbindable Driven by the demons into the desert Named Legion
Opening words by the man/ men	Son of God Have you come to torment me before the time?	Jesus, son of the Most High God I adjure you by God not to torment me	Jesus, son of the Most High God I beg you do not torment me
Direct speech of Jesus	'Go'	'Come out of him you unclean spirit… What is your name?'	'What is your name?'
Demons' request	Demons request to go into the pigs – direct speech	Demons request to go into the pigs – direct speech	Demons request to go into the pigs – indirect speech
Consequence for demons and pigs	Pigs plunge down steep bank into the sea and drown	Pigs plunge down steep bank into the sea and drown	Pigs plunge down steep bank into the sea and drown
Consequence for onlookers	Herdsmen flee and tell Townsfolk request Jesus' departure	Herdsmen flee and tell Townsfolk afraid, Townsfolk request Jesus' departure	Herdsmen flee and tell Townsfolk afraid, Townsfolk request Jesus' departure
Consequence for the man		Man found sitting, clothed, and in his right mind Man requests to accompany Jesus, request denied, sent into the Decapolis	Man found sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed, and in his right mind Man requests to accompany Jesus, request denied, sent into the whole city
Overall impression	Conquest	Healing	Healing

Several differences may be relevant for our enquiry.[22] Strikingly, Matthew's description of the men lacks anything to evoke sympathy in the reader. Mark describes the distress of his condition, and their self-

[22] There are two other chief differences. Matthew's account is much shorter than Luke's or Mark's, and that it has quite a different flavour from these parallel accounts. The most obvious difference is that Matthew has two men, whereas the parallel synoptic accounts describe only one man. This has been discussed extensively in the literature, and can be related to Matthew's general propensity to 'double'. (E.g. some authorities tie it up with Matthew 18.16 (by the evidence of two or three witnesses) which in turn links to Deut. 19.15 (e.g. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on his Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*, 2d. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 158; others consider that Matthew is compensating for similar stories he has omitted (e.g. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 282). The second evident difference is Matthew's reference to the 'Gadarenes', while Mark and Luke position the story in the 'Gerasenes'. However, the text-critical issues in all three synoptics are complex, and it is far from clear whether Matthew has genuinely deviated from the putative Markan tradition here, or whether the textual propagation has introduced an apparent deviation. (See, for example, the discussion in Nolland, *Matthew,* 373-4.) In either case, what

harming behaviour; Luke shows him being abused by human as well as supernatural forces. But Matthew's men represent sheer, raw, threat: described as demonized (δαιμονιζόμενοι), and very violent (χαλεποὶ λίαν).[23] Likewise at the conclusion of the pericope, Luke and Mark are concerned to show the man healed, clothed and sane, whereas Matthew follows the demons into the pigs and pays no further attention to the men themselves.

A similar pattern is found in the nature of the exchange of words between Jesus and the demonized man/men. In Mark and Luke, Jesus has a conversation with him and asks his name. Legion is described as falling at Jesus' feet and begging Jesus not to torment him. By contrast in Matthew, there is no conversation and the men remain unnamed; the comment about being tormented is made while the men are coming threateningly towards Jesus, and is phrased in terms that sound more like a challenge than an entreaty. In fact, the reference to it not yet being the time (ὁ καιρὸς) of tormenting (βασανίζω), both Matthean words suggestive of the last judgment,[24] indicates that it is the demons speaking to Jesus rather than the man himself. In Mark and Luke it is less clear whether the men are, at this point, speaking with their own voices or not.

The two men are described, in language used neither by Mark nor Luke, as χαλεποὶ λίαν. This phrase is often translated 'very violent' or similar, although the root meaning of χαλεπός refers more generally to a human or animal which is 'troublesome' to some degree. In fact, χαλεπός is only found in in one other place in the New Testament, in 2 Timothy 3.1, where Paul is referring to the persecution of the church. It is found once in the Septuagint, in Isaiah 18.2, rendering the Hebrew נוֹרָא (niphal of ירא), and used of the 'mighty and conquering' Ethiopians. However it is a common word in the intertestamental writings, particularly in Maccabees,[25] where it is often used to refer to the troubles suffered by the faithful Jews under Antiochus Epiphanes. In the choice of this word, our writer may be linking these men with the aggressors in historical narratives of pagan threat.

The power and fearsomeness of the demoniacs in the Gadarenes is such that they obstruct free movement, "so that no one was able to pass by via that road" (v.28). At this point, Jesus' words of verse 20 (the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head) may return to the reader's mind. This is a hostile place, where it is dangerous to travel and impossible to dwell. And Jesus' reputation has gone ahead of him, as the men and their demons instantly recognise and confront him. This is no neutral tourist trip; it is a power encounter from the moment that Jesus embarks to cross the lake.

Matthew describes the men as "demonized"; that is, possessed by δαίμονες. In contemporary Jewish thought, δαίμονες were the souls of the Nephilim, the offspring of the 'Watchers'. The Watchers ('sons of God' in the Genesis account) were the angels which had descended to earth and mated with human women (Gen. 6.1-4; 1 Enoch 6-7; Jub. 5.1-2). These creatures were permitted to roam on the earth, creating

is to be noted is that whether the general area of the Gerasenes is intended, or the more specific location of the Gadarenes, Jesus has crossed over into territory largely inhabited by Gentiles.

[23] Matthew's choice of the word χαλεπος will be discussed below.

[24] See Mt. 13.30; 18.34, and Gundry, *Matthew,* 159.

[25] See, for example, 2 Macc. 4.16; 6.3; 4 Macc. 8.1; 9.4.

affliction, oppression, and destruction (1 Enoch 15.11) until the day of consummation and judgment (1 Enoch 16.1). Such mythological undertones may be resonating between Matthew's account.

Evident throughout this sparely narrated pericope are the linked themes of uncleanness and chaos/decreation. In the previous episode the forces arrayed against Jesus are symbolised in the chaos-monster imagery of the storm. Here the decreation theme is intensified even further with the themes of: δαίμονες; the ritually impure dead[26] among whom the demonized men live; and the pigs[27] into which the demons pass. When the unclean spirits of the unclean men enter the unclean pigs and plunge off the cliff into the sea, even though Matthew does not use the Lukan word ἄβυσσος (abyss), it is clear that a mighty act of re-creation, a sovereign ordering of chaos, is being represented as the forces that oppose God are consigned to oblivion.[28]

This short pericope in Matthew's gospel, then, is much more than a mission into Gentile territory; it is a power confrontation with the spiritual powers controlling the region.[29] We note, however, that the power balance is not equally distributed. The demonized men come out of the tombs towards Jesus with belligerent words, but Jesus does not match their aggression. The demons have held enormous sway, and they can bluster very effectively, but in the end Jesus only utters a single word in the whole narrative to expel them forever. This is, in fact, an effortless act of conquest.

REFLECTIONS OF THE CONQUEST

This paper will argue that the writer of Matthew's gospel has used multiple allusions to alert his audience to echoes of the Canaanite conquest in the life of Jesus.

Considering Matthew 8.18-34 as a literary unity, guided by the proleptic announcement in verse 18, we have identified a number of themes in the unit. We will now consider these in comparison with the Jericho narrative in Joshua 6 and the preceding chapters.

First, Jesus crosses a body of water, by means of a miracle involving the control of the forces of nature, into a place of threat; Matthew's use of χαλεποὶ λίαν appears designed to foreground the idea of pagan menace. Jesus has come to a place where he expects no hospitality and is indeed greeted with hostility. Parallels with Israel crossing into the land of Canaan will be apparent. Israel crosses the Jordan by means of a miracle which involves the heaping up of water far away (Josh. 3.16). However, the direction of travel is exactly contrary in the two cases: Israel journeys into Canaan, and Jesus crosses away from Israel (or into its hinterland). We need not regard this as a conclusive negation of the hypothesis, however. As discussed

[26] See, for example, Num. 5.2; 9.6; 19.6,22; 31.19.
[27] Lev. 11.24-28.
[28] John Nolland points out the similarity of the language used about the demons and the villagers. The demons implore Jesus (παρεκάλουν, v.31), then going out, they go into the pigs (ἐξελθόντες ἀπῆλθον, v.32); in terror the herdsmen go (ἀπελθόντες, v.33) into the village, and the villagers go out (ἐξῆλθεν, v.34) from the village, before imploring (παρεκάλεσαν, v.34) Jesus to depart. This extends the image of uncleanness from the demons and pigs to the people of the town (Nolland, *Matthew,* 376).
[29] Cf. France, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 343.

above, Joel Kennedy considers a similar problem with regard to the flight into Egypt (Jesus) being compared by the gospel writer to the flight from Egypt (Moses/Israel). The reader's focus is directed towards the movements, not their direction. Similarly, Jonah's flight from Nineveh is paralleled with Jesus' journey towards the Gentile place. We will consider the rhetorical effect of the unexpected destination shortly, but for now we note that Jesus is, like Israel, crossing from a place of familiarity—even 'safety'— into a place of inhospitality, which has not yet been brought into submission to the rule of God.[30]

We have seen that the first century Jewish understanding of δαίμονες was associated with the Nephilim of Genesis 6 and the intertestamental literature. It is striking, then, in the light of Matthew 8.28, where the demoniacs are depicted as "so fierce that no-one could pass that way", that the Nephilim have also been described in similar terms. In Numbers 13.31-33, Moses's spies describe them guarding the land of Canaan: "We are not able to go up against the people, for they are stronger than we[…] There we saw the Nephilim, the sons of Anak of the Nephilim, and we were as grasshoppers in our eyes, and so we were in their eyes." It is likely that the Nephilim are also referred to in Joshua 11:21-22, here as the Anakim who have been conquered: "Joshua came at that time and cut off the Anakim from the hill country, from Hebron, from Debir, from Anab, and from all the hill country of Judah and from all the hill country of Israel."

We noted above that, unlike in Mark and Luke, the cleansing of the demoniacs is not cast by Matthew as an act of mercy, but rather as a power confrontation between Jesus and the demons. This, of course, is immediately redolent of many of the conquest stories in Joshua, not least that of Jericho. It is this evident contest for supremacy which forms the central backbone of the paralleling motif.

One of the distinctive features of the so-called 'holy wars' of the conquest is that they are conducted by God on behalf of his people, in the face of greater forces, superior weaponry, or other improbable circumstances for victory.[31] Indeed Gerhard von Rad identifies several features related to this action of Yahweh on behalf of his people, among which are the following: the enemy is identified as Yahweh's enemy; the people of Israel are exhorted to have faith; and the enemy is shown to lose courage.[32] Thus, for example, Rahab tells the spies, "I know that the LORD has given the land to you, and that the dread of you has fallen upon us, and that all the inhabitants of the land have melted away before you… our hearts melted and there was no spirit left in any man before you, for the LORD your God, he is God in the heavens above and the earth below" (Josh. 2.8-11).

Similar features to these are clearly identifiable in the power confrontations of the storm on the lake and the demoniacs of the Gadarenes. The exhortation to trust God happens in the first of the two stories, where Jesus urges his disciples, "Why are you fearful, ὀλιγόπιστοι"; the designation occurring only in Matthew. Identification of the enemy as being the enemy of God is clear in the second story. A group of men has disembarked onto the shore, but the demons, speaking through their victims, immediately single

[30] Of course, given the strong witness in Matthew that Jesus was not wholly welcomed in his own country either, there may be reason to think that the 'conquest' parallels, if there are any, will also be found in other, Judean and Galilean, narratives. This is outside the scope of the current investigation.
[31] See, for example de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, trans. J. McHugh (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1961), 262.
[32] Gerhard von Rad, *Holy War in Ancient Israel*, trans. M. Dawn (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1991), 44-47.

out—by title, not personal name as in Mark and Luke—the one man who bears the power of God. "What is between you and us, Son of God? Have you come here before the time to torment us?" (Mt. 8.29). And the enemy is afraid, "The demons implored him, saying, 'If you cast us out, send us into the herd of pigs'" (v.31). Finally, and perhaps most strikingly, both these power contests are won 'easily', without a visible struggle. Jesus only has to rebuke the wind and waves for calm to be restored (v.26). The narrative of the Gadarenes is remarkable with regard to how much the demons have to say for themselves, compared with Jesus' single word, 'Go' (v.32).

One of the distinctive features of the Jericho conquest is its pattern of sevens. For seven days the nation circles the city, on the seventh day it circles it seven times, before the walls fall. There is no corresponding numerology in Matthew 8. However, when the significance of the 'sevens' in Joshua is appreciated, links between the narratives are once more apparent.

Mircea Eliade has described how traditional societies regard the territory surrounding their inhabited space as a foreign, chaotic space, peopled by ghosts, demons and foreigners.[33] The act of settling in such territory is therefore an act of chaos-subduing; a performance of cosmogony, where the primordial work of creation is recapitulated. Building on this work, Philip Stern used ancient-near-eastern parallels and the philological study of the word *ḥerem* (generally translated "devote to destruction" or "put to the ban"), to argue that the *ḥerem* of Joshua carried a cosmogonic import. With regard to the Jericho account, he has argued that the stylisation of the pattern of sevens is reminiscent of the creation account in Genesis 1.[34]

As discussed above, there is a number of places where the quelling of chaos appears strongly in the Matthean narrative. The role of the sea, threatening and then being subdued by Jesus, has been noted; this motif recurs when the sea is used in the Gadarene narrative as a place of judgment for the demonised pigs. This creation-recreation theme is reinforced further by the eschatological hints that occur in the narratives: the earthquake and the reference by the demons to the time of judgment (which is then immediately anticipated by Jesus' actions).

A further link to the idea of conquest and *ḥerem* is the theme of uncleanness/ impurity which is so strong in the literary unit. Anticipated in verse 21, it is triply intensified with the appearance of men who live among the dead, unclean demons, and pigs; and Matthew's reduplication of παρακαλέω, ἐξέρχομαι and ἀπέρχομαι incline us to extend this quality of uncleanness into the villagers. The power confrontation which takes place is thus cast in terms of the purging of uncleanness, an important motif in the ancient conquest theology. Thus, for example, the Deuteronomist says of the spoils of the Canaanite conquest, "You shall not bring an abomination into your house and become devoted to destruction as it is" (Deut. 7.26), and later, "Out of the cities that the LORD your God is giving you as an inheritance, you shall keep alive nothing that breathes, for you shall utterly devote them to destruction… as the LORD your God has commanded you, that they may not teach you to do all the abominable practices they do" (Deut. 20.16-18).

[33] Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*, trans. W. Trask (London: Harcourt, 1959), 29-36.
[34] P. Stern, *The Biblical Ḥerem: A Window on Israel's Religious Experience* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 141.

CONCLUSION: INTERTEXTUALITY AS TWO-WAY DIALOGUE

We have identified a significant range of thematic similarities between Matthew's Gadarene account and the conquest of Jericho, as narrated in Jericho. These are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2: Thematic links between Matthew 8:18-34 and the conquest of Jericho

Miraculous crossing of water
Exhortation to trust
Journey into 'hostile' territory
Quelling of chaos/ cosmogony
Power encounter with hostile, impure, pagan threat/ spiritual powers – Nephilim motif?
Destruction of what is impure
'Effortless' conquest

The language of 'typology' is regarded with some suspicion today, due to justifiable concern over its tendency to invite naïve Christological interpretations of Old Testament texts. Nonetheless, that certain Old Testament themes and narrative patterns recur in the New Testament should not be overlooked as a consequence of this wariness. It is helpful to focus not on any putative forward intention of the Old Testament text, but on the backward glance of the New Testament. In this regard, the concept of intertextuality is helpful.

Intertextuality is by no means a straightforward phenomenon; as Julia Kristeva has shown, all communication takes place within a network of prior texts, which cannot be wholly identified.[35] Moreover, texts often develop in dialogue with one another, and it is not always easy to collapse their relationship into that of a prior and a dependent text. However, in the situation of New Testament – Old Testament intertextuality, the chronology of textual history is fairly straightforward, so the relationship between them is relatively easy to simplify to a later, dependent, text and a prior text. Nonetheless, the dialogue between the two texts remains a two-way process.

First, it allows the prior text to shape the understanding of the later. This is how the recapitulation of Israel in the life of Jesus is generally understood; with particular focus on his consequent representation of Israel and its theological sequelae.[36] Part of the interpretive role of the prior text is in establishing a paradigm with which the later text is compared, whether consciously or subconsciously. Any deviations from this paradigm are then naturally foregrounded in the reader's appreciation. Of particular interest in this regard is the way in which, as we have seen, the geographical locations in Matthew are distinctly different from the

[35] Julia Kristeva, "Word, Dialogue, Novel," in *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon S. Roudiez; trans. T. Gora et al (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980), 64-91.
[36] See, for example, N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (London: SPCK, 1992), 400; R. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel: with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 210.

equivalent ones in the Hebrew Bible. When the presence and role of the intertextuality is understood, the unexpected direction of Jesus' travel is revealed as an important part of the gospel writer's skilful commentary. If Jesus' journey across the water into the Gadarenes is understood in terms of a recapitulation of the conquest, the direction of his journey highlights to us that the 'unconquered' place is now not Canaan but the Gentile territories around it. This is thus the in-breaking of the eschatological reality of extending the kingdom 'to the ends of the earth'. Moreover, the destruction of the demonized pigs bears many of the hallmarks of *ḥerem*: the total destruction of what is impure, the quelling of chaos and the new-creational act. Unlike the prior text, however, this *ḥerem* is bloodless. It is a conquest over the forces of evil, not those they have afflicted.

But, second, the intertextuality can be used by the later author to make a particular interpretation of the prior text. So it is possible that Matthew is intentionally commenting on the conquest narratives by means of this creative recapitulation. How might the actions of Jesus be understood in that regard? A community is shaped by the narratives they tell themselves. When the story is told differently, it can be a collective act of repentance. Perhaps Jesus' bloodless conquest should be viewed as a redemptive act; a Christ-shaped re-enactment of the old story. It may be that future work in this area will shed more light on the difficult narratives of conquest in Joshua.