tion of honor. Noah's curse was not simply a response to his son's dishonorable behavior, but an inspired prediction of the dishonorable character Ham's descendants would bear throughout history. The relationship between Ham's shameful behavior and the "social death" of his descendants was self-evident for interpreters who identified with the Old South's culture of honor.

Under the influence of pro-slavery Bible readers, Gen 9 became identified with the so-called curse of Ham. Although pro-slavery glosses contradicted the story's plain sense, this problem was ignored or finessed, sometimes by "correcting" the text of Gen 9 : 25 to read "Ham the father of Canaan." Of course, such text-critical proposals were not nearly as compelling as the story's unique function in linking slavery and the putative ancestor of black Africans in the words of the man regarded as the patron saint of plantation life. The text's relevance was enhanced for American readers who assumed that, as part of the Bible's primeval history, Noah's pronouncement applied to all post-diluvian societies.

Counter-readings of the text, particularly among abolitionists, reminded American Bible readers that Noah's curse was directed at "Canaanites" and had no doubt been fulfilled in the Israelite conquest under Joshua. Yet despite being discredited in the aftermath of the Civil War, the curse was revived in 20th-century America when opponents of integration saw in it a divine judgment on Hamites' dishonorable and rebellious character. Relying on the ancient identification of Ham's grandson Nimrod with the tower of Babel, segregationist interpreters cast racial integration as an another Hamite-inspired attempt to unify humanity in defiance of God-willed dispersion.

Bibliography: ■ Haynes, S. R., *Noah's Curse: The Biblical Justification of American Slavery* (New York 2002). ■ Peterson, T. V., *Ham and Japheth in America: The Mythic World of Whites in the Antebellum South* (Metuchen, N.J. 1978).

Stephen Haynes

IV. Literature

As if being inappropriately cursed in scripture is qualification enough, Canaan has become a resource for inappropriate cursing ever since. Indeed, although Canaan is the eponymous ancestor of a Semitic people, the curse he receives for his father's crime has been used to justify the enslavement of his father's African descendents. As a result, the association between blackness and slavery has been taken to have biblical justification. The effects of this are fictionalized in André Brink's anti-apartheid novel *Looking on Darkness*, in which the white master's daughter informs her black servants that whereas *her* family members are descendents of Shem and Japheth, the servants' families are the offspring of Ham and Canaan (Brink 1974). Canaan is further cursed by association – even confusion – with Cain. The 16th-century Portuguese scholar Gomes Eanes de Azurara, for example, cites Noah's curse of "Cain" as justification for the enslavement of non-Muslim "Moors"; in Dion Boucicault's anti-slavery play *The Octoroon* (1857), the mixed race heroine confesses that she is unable to marry a white man because she is marked by the curse of Cain (Sollors 1999). Elsewhere, however, scripture has been recruited to challenge racist readings of the curse. In Harriet Beecher Stowe's 1852 *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, for example, an argument regarding slavery is overheard in which the precedent of Canaan is cited and then challenged by reference to Christ's charge to do to others what you would have them do to you (Stowe 1981). S. R. Haynes' informative study *Noah's Curse* lists other such challenges authored by Mark Twain, James Baldwin, and Zora Neal Hurston (Haynes 2002).

Bibliography: ■ Brink, A., *Looking on Darkness* (London 1974). ■ Davis, S., *This Strange Story: Jewish and Christian Interpretation of the Curse of Canaan from Antiquity to 1865* (Lanham, Md. 2008). ■ Goldenberg, D. M., *The Curse of Ham: Race and Slavery in Early Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (Princeton, N.J. 2003). ■ Haynes, S. R., *Noah's Curse: The Biblical Justification of American Slavery* (New York 2002). ■ Sollors, W., *Black nor White yet Both: Thematic Explorations of Interracial Literature* (New York 1997). ■ Stowe, H. B., *Uncle Tom's Cabin or Life Among the Lowly* (Harmondsworth 1981).

Mark Brummitt

Canaan (Place)

I. Hebrew Bible/Old Testament

Both in the HB/OT and the ancient Near East, Canaan (Heb. and Phoen. *knʿn*) had a number of referents which coexisted as early as the second half of the 2nd millennium BCE. The distribution of Canaan over the biblical books is very uneven: Canaan/Canaanite has the highest frequency in Genesis (1.77%), followed by Judges (1.48%) and Joshua (1.44%). Ninety-six of 167 references (48.73%) fall in the Torah, 23/167 (13.77%) in each of Joshua and Judges, i.e., 142 of 167 (85.03%) in Genesis–Judges. There is one reference in Samuel and Kings each, three in Isaiah and Ezekiel each, five in the Twelve Minor Prophets, three in Psalms, one each in Job and Proverbs, three in Ezra/Nehemiah, and four in 1–2 Chronicles. Canaan is completely absent from Jeremiah, Joel, Amos, Jonah, Habakkuk, Haggai, the Megillot, and Daniel. All occurrences of Canaan in Ezra/Nehemiah and 1–2 Chronicles are quota-

tions of the sacred history from Abraham to Joshua, with one notable exception (Ezra 9:1).

1. Bible and Ancient Near East. The primary referent of Canaan, the "precipice" (of the coastal mountain range), seems to be the shore of the eastern Mediterranean from Akko (EA 8.15) to Cilicia (EA 151.50).

i)   This Canaan was ruled by the "kings of *knʿn*" (EA 30.1; 109.46; Judg 5:19; cf. Josh 5:1). The Egyptian province of Canaan was restricted to Israel/Palestine, with Gaza *p3 knʿn* (= "the [city of] Canaan") as capital, bordering on the north the provinces of Amurru (Lebanon) and Upe (southern Syria).

ii) The Phoenicians and their Punic descendants called themselves "Canaanites" and their homeland Canaan.

iii) Canaan can be used as a very general term.

All the three Canaans are also encountered in the HB/OT.

2. The Biblical Geography of Canaan. Although Canaan is an ideologically loaded term in the Bible, a number of references are simply descriptive, notably where Canaan refers to Phoenicia.

a. Canaan = Phoenicia (Canaan B1). This identification forms the background of Gen 10:6: the "sons of Ham" represent the territorial expansion of Egypt (including claims) during the 26th (Saïte) dynasty. The Priestly part of the Table of Nations (Gen 10) is based on a geographical source, the compilation of which started in the 7th century BCE (Knauf 1989: 61–63). If this document once contained the "sons of Canaan" (the Phoenician cities), this part is now missing, being replaced by the post-Priestly section 10:15–19, where 'sons of Canaan like Sidon, Arqa, Arwad, Zemar/Sumurru, and Hamath figure among Canaan's mythical descendants like the Jebusites, Hivites, Heth/Hittites, Girgashites, and Hivites. Gen 10:19 augments that text, already overloaded, with Canaan B4 (see infra). The equation "Canaan = Phoenicia" also applies to Isa 23:11; Ezek 17:4; Obad 20; and possibly, 2 Sam 24:7, if the Hivites are understood as in Josh 11:3. The Canaanite belonging to that Canaan is generally a Phoenician trader (Isa 23:8; Hos 12:7; Zeph 1:11; 14:21; Job 41:6; Prov 31:24), but in at least one instance a trader who need not be a Phoenician (Ezek 16:29). Closely related to "Canaan = Phoenicia" is "Canaan = Philistia" (C. B2), Zeph 2:5, for Philistia shows strong Phoenician cultural influence in the Persian period.

b. Canaan = "The Promised Land." The vast majority of biblical references to Canaan refer to the land promised to Abraham (Gen 11:31–12:5; 17:8) and his descendants and occupied under Joshua. This "land" must be regarded as a largely mythical place, a quality attested both by its borders and its inhabitants. Any attempt to subsume the five "real" Canaans encountered so far (Canaan 1–3, § 1; and Ca-

naan B1–2, § 2b) into only one ideal entity must necesarily lead to a construct that defies geographical logic.

c. The Borders of Canaan in the Bible. This geographically important question is addressed by relatively few texts and left wisely open by most. In the narratives, the following places are explicitly said to lie "in the land of Canaan": Shechem (Gen 12:6; 33:18); Bethel (Gen 35:6) and Ai (Gen 12:8); Mambre and Hebron (Gen 13:18; 23:3, 19; 49:30; 50:5, 13); Ephrat/Bethlehem (Gen 48:7); Arad (Num 21:1–3; 33:40); Gezer (Josh 16:10), Bethshean, Ibleam, Dor, En-dor, Taanach, and Megiddo (Josh 17:11–13, 16); Shiloh (Josh 21:2; 22:9); whereas the following are situated outside it: Haran (Gen 11:31; 12:5); the "cities of the plain" including Sodom (Gen 13:12, but cf. Gen 10:19 for the contrary); Seïr (Gen 36:6–8) and Central Transjordan (Num 32:30, 32; Exod 16:35 with Josh 5:12; but cf. Gen 50:11, and especially Exod 15:14–15: is Canaan a country besides Philistia, Edom and Moab, or does it comprise the three?); notably Mount Nebo (Deut 32:49) and Gilead (Josh 22:9). The altar built by the Transjordanian tribes is both inside (Josh 22:10–11) and outside of it (Josh 22:32).

Canaan B3, as constituted by the names of those places that are explicitly characterized as lying inside or outside of it, consists of central Israel/Palestine from Arad to the Jezreel. The Priestly narrative within the Torah, by claiming Hebron, Bethel, and Shechem for Canaan, implicitly constitutes a Canaan which consists of the Persian provinces of Idumea, Judea, and Samaria – the core of Canaan B3. The same concept of a "central Canaan" is shared by the book of Joshua, where the distribution of the land to Caleb, Judah, and the "House Joseph" in Josh 14–17 is sharply separated by intervening narratives and other signals from the Transjordanian tribes (Josh 13) and the other tribes 'lost' in the Persian period, notably the Galileans tribes (Josh 18–19).

Explicit delimitations of the borders of Canaan consist mainly of Num 34:1–12 and its parallel Ezek 47:15–20, where curiously Lebanon and southern Syria is included, but Gilead is excluded (creating all the problems discussed in Num 32; Josh 13 and 22) – Canaan B4. These borders cannot derive from the three Asian provinces of the Egyptian New Empire (Upe, Amurru, and Canaan 2), for Pella was part of Egyptian Canaan. They might, however, describe the borders of Egypt's possessions in Asia between 609 and 605 BCE (cf. 2 Kgs 24:7, best rendered: "the king of Babylon had taken over all that belonged to the king of Egypt between the Wadi of Egypt and the River Euphrates"). Canaan-B4 is alluded to in circumscriptions like Gen 10:18–19 (from Gaza to Hamath); Num 13:17–24 (from the Negev to Rehob and

Lebo-Hamath); Josh 13 (and the "tribal borders" in Josh 15–19); David's realm according to 2 Sam 24 : 5–7.

The Egyptian province of Canaan is, however, present in the Bible in Josh 13 : 3–4, where Canaan B5 borders on Amurru. Canaan B5 is more or less identical with Joshua's conquests according to Josh 11 : 16–17; with the borders of the not-yet-conquered land in Judg 1, and the regions covered by Judg 3–21; and with the land of Israel "from Dan to Bersheba" (Judg 20 : 1; 1 Sam 3 : 20; 2 Sam 3 : 10; 17 : 11; 24 : 2, 15; 1 Kgs 5 : 5). In Judg 4 : 2, 23–24, this Canaan even has a king of its own (in opposition to Judg 5 : 18).

Two more delineations of the "promised land" are implicit in the narrative. "The whole land" conquered by Joshua according to Josh 10 : 40–42 (and the narrative Josh 6–10) consists of the kingdom of Judah at the end of the 7th century BCE (Canaan B6). A Babylonian-Persian period variant of this concept is the reduction of the kingdom to the borders of the province of Judea, which is shown to Abraham in Gen 13 : 14–18, and overlooked by Balaam in Num 23–24.

Explicit, again, is the largest definition of the promised land in Gen 15 : 18 (Canaan B7): from the Nile to the Euphrates. Here, the Persian satrapy of "Beyond the River" is easily recognizable. Canaan B7 has, however, some sort of a predecessor in Canaan 1, the whole eastern shore of the Mediterranean, which in turn might have inspired the distinction between Canaanites and the Amorites in Josh 5 : 1.

The fluidity of its delimitations reveal Canaan B3–7 as a theoretical, literary, and/or theological construct (with Canaan B7 > Canaan B4 > Canaan B5 > Canaan B3 > Canaan B6). The same fluidity can be observed concerning Canaan's inhabitants.

d. The Inhabitants of Canaan in the Bible. It should go without saying that the inhabitants of Canaan are simply Canaanites. This is indeed the case in Gen 12 : 6; 24 : 3, 37; 28 : 1–8; 36 : 2; 38 : 2; Judg 1 : 1–3, 9–33; Neh 9 : 24. In general, however, the Canaanites are only part of all the inhabitants of the land (Josh 7 : 9). There are two sets of two people: Canaanites and Perizzites (in which Canaanites might have the connotation of city-dwellers, for Perizzites are "peasants") – Gen 13 : 7; 34 : 30; Judg 1 : 4–5; or Canaanites and Amalekites (non-Arabs versus Arabs) – Num 14 : 24–44. Most popular is a "table of six nations" – "the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Amorites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites"; with variations: Gen 15 : 19–21 (+Kenites, the Kenizzites, the Kadmonites, Rephaim, Girgashites); Exod 3 : 8, 17; 13 : 5 (– Perizzites); Exod 23 : 23; Exod 23 : 28 (– Amorites, Perizzites, Jebusites); Exod 33 : 2; 34 : 11; Deut 7 : 1 (+ Girgashites); Deut 20 : 17; Josh 3 : 10 (+ Girgashites); Josh 9 : 1; 24 : 11 (+ Girgashites); Judg 3 : 5; Ezra 9 : 1

(– Girgashites, + Ammonites, Moabites, and Egyptians); Neh 9 : 8. The individual members of that list need not concern us here. The need for this construction arose – at the latest – during the redaction of the Hexateuch (Gen–Josh), when the land promised to Abraham, Canaan, was finally conquered from the Amorites (Josh 10*).

Notions about the distribution of these fictitious people vary as well (Num 13 : 39; 14 : 25; Deut 1 : 7; 11 : 30; Josh 5 : 1; 11 : 3; Judg 3 : 3). There is not even consensus whether these people are a thing of the past (Gen 12 : 6; 13 : 7) or not (Judg 3 : 5; Ezra 9 : 1)

3. Canaan as a Metaphor. Pre-Israelite Canaan as home of 6 (±) people with abominable behavior (Exod 23 : 23–24, 32–33; 34 : 11–16; Lev 18 : 24–30; Deut 7 : 1–5, 16, 25–26; 12 : 29–31; 18 : 9–14; 20 : 15–18; 1 Kgs 14 : 24; 2 Kgs 16 : 3; 21 : 2–11 [= 2 Chr 33 : 2]; Ezra 9 : 1, 11, 14; 2 Chr 36 : 14) is an early postexilic metaphor used by the returnees from the Golah who claimed, in the name of their newly conceived monotheistic and aniconic god, the return of power in the province of Yehud to them and their newly founded Jerusalem, declaring the Benjaminites and other survivors of monarchic Judah and Israel (as exemplified by the Judeans at Elephantine) to be "pagans." In addition to this fictitious Canaan, which was to be conquered by Joshua, the real Canaan (Phoenicia and Philistia) of the Persian period was, because of its economic preponderance, troublesome enough for Judea, at least, the only place where the local coinage significantly diverges from the Phoenician template. It is basically the latter which is addressed in the curse on Canaan, Gen 9 : 25–27 (the non-P sections of Gen 1–11 are post-P; cf. Schmid: 153–56). "Shem" in Gen 10 : 22 was originally the Assyrian empire at the time of Assurbanipal; now "Shem" is either the Persian Empire with its Aramaic administrative language, or all the inland people – Aramaeans and Arabs – pressing towards the coast. "Japhet" is Jawan (cf. J. Elayi), or Jawan and Madai (Persia) together. The core of the Table of Nations in Gen 10 does not yet share the metaphor of "Canaan the evil." The fact that Canaan belongs to Ham (7th-cent. BCE Egypt) and Eber to Shem (7th-cent. BCE Assyria) simply reflects geopolitical constellations of the time. In the 7th-century BCE *Book of Saviors*, the core of Judges, Canaan is just another enemy like Moab or Midian. Due to the "Canaanite revival" of the 11th–10th centuries BCE, there were real Canaanites in Jezreel and along the coast and the Jordan for Israel to fight well into the 9th century BCE, but not thereafter. The idea of Canaan as the "completely other," opposed to Israel from its very beginnings, is, in scholarship until recently (A. Alt; N. Gottwald), the essentialist apotheosis of a polemical metaphor from Judean theopolitical debates of the early 5th century BCE. At the end of

that century, returnees, Benjaminites, and Samarians had settled as one biblical Israel under the cover of a common Torah. Canaan as the "other" was a thing of their common past (with the exception of Phoenicians and Philistines), and now biblical scribes had no problem admitting that they, too, spoke the "language of Canaan" (Isa 19 : 18).

Bibliography: ■ Finkelstein, I., "City-states to States: Polity dynamics in the 10th–9th centuries B.C.E.," in *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and their Neighbors, from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina* (eds. W. G. Dever/S. Gitin; Winona Lake, Ind. 2003) 75–83. ■ Görg, M., "Kanaan," *NBL* 2 (Zürich et al. 1995) 438–39. ■ Helck, W., "Kanaan," *LÄ* 3 (Wiesbaden 1980) 309–10. ■ Houtman, C., "Die ursprünglichen Bewohner des Landes Kanaan im Deuteronomium: Sinn und Absicht der Beschreibung ihrer Identität und ihres Charakters," *VT* 52 (2002) 51–65. ■ Killebrew, A. E., *Biblical Peoples and Ethnicity: An Archaeological Study of Egyptians, Canaanites, Philistines, and Early Israel* (Leiden/Boston, Mass. 2005). ■ Knauf, E. A., *Ismael* (ADPV 7; Wiesbaden ²1989). ■ Knauf, E. A., *Josua* (ZBK 6; Zürich 2008). ■ Kratz, R. G., "The Second Temple of Jeb and of Jerusalem," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (eds. M. Oeming/O. Lipschits; Winona Lake, Ind. 2006) 247–64. ■ Niemann, H. M., "Das Ende des Volkes der Perizziter: Über soziale Wandlungen Israels im Spiegel einer Begriffsgruppe," *ZAW* 105 (1993) 233–57. ■ Schmid, K., *Literaturgeschichte des Alten Testaments: Eine Einführung* (Darmstadt 2008). ■ Schmitz, Ph. C., "Canaan (Place)," *ABD* 1 (New York et al. 1992) 828–31. ■ Tammuz, O., "Canaan – a Land without Limits," *UF* 33 (1993) 501–43. ■ Uehlinger, C., "The 'Canaanites' and other 'pre-Israelite' Peoples in Story and History (Part I)," *FZPhTh* 46 (1999) 546–78. ■ Uehlinger, C., "The 'Canaanites' and other 'pre-Israelite' Peoples in Story and History (Part II)," *FZPhTh* 47 (2000) 173–98. ■ Weippert, M., "Kanaan," *RLA* 5 (Berlin/New York 1980) 352–55.

Ernst Axel Knauf

II. Judaism

Jewish texts from the beginning struggle with the problem of how Israel could have taken a country by force and annihilated its inhabitants. *Jubilees* 10 : 27–34 explains that the land of Lebanon as far as the river of Egypt is called Canaan because Canaan settled there even though it had not come to him by lot; therefore, his father Ham warned him, "you and your children will fall in the land … and you will be uprooted forever." Canaan, "after founding the land now called Judea, named it Chananaia after himself" (*Ant*. 1.134). When the descendants of Canaan finally settled in Africa, they still pleaded before Alexander the Great that Canaan and its coast belonged to them but were countered by Gebiha: Canaan is a slave to his brothers, and whatever property a slave has belongs to his master (*bSan* 91a). Israel thus is the legitimate owner of the country. *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Yishmaʿʾel Beshallaḥ* 1 explains Exod 13 : 17–18: God led the Israelites not by the direct route into the country because the Canaanites, who heard that the Israelites were entering the land, "went and burned the crops, cut down the trees, tore down the buildings and stopped up the wells." Since God had promised the Israelites a country "full of all good things" (Deut 6 : 11), he led them through the wilderness for forty years so that the Canaanites would repair what they had destroyed." Only then could they take over the land. But another tradition claims that Canaan, on hearing that Israel was entering the land, willingly got up and cleared out ahead of them; as a reward, God named the country after Canaan and gave him a land as beautiful as his own, i.e., Africa (*MekhY Pisḥa* 18).

Bibliography: ■ Berthelot, K., "Philo of Alexandria and the Conquest of Canaan," *JSJ* 38 (2007) 38–56. ■ Feldman, L. H., *"Remember Amalek!" Vengeance, Zealotry, and Group Destruction in the Bible according to Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus* (Cincinnati, Ohio 2004). [Esp. 134–46]

Günter Stemberger

III. Christianity

In the modern era, the term "land of Canaan" has been invoked prophetically and metaphorically in a variety of ways, though all references point to Canaan as a place of God's presence. It may be a spiritual home, the kingdom of God, the heavenly Jerusalem, the eternal rest; or it may be a physical place – a land of plentitude and freedom, the promised land in the here and now.

Given the penchant for typological interpretation among Protestants in the Reformed tradition (especially among Puritans), the land of Canaan foreshadowed the kingdom of heaven. Giovanni Diodati (d. 1649), Beza's successor in Geneva, expressed this view in observing that "the deliverance out of Egypt was a figure of the redemption by Christ; and the pilgrimage through the wilderness, an image of the elect's life in the world; and the land of Canaan, a shadow of the heavenly kingdom." In England, William Perkins articulated the standard Puritan figurative interpretation of Canaan: "As the Israelites went through the red sea (as through a grave) to the promised land of Canaan; so we must knowe, that the way to the spiritual Canaan, even the Kingdom of heaven, is by dying unto sin." Indeed, Abraham himself knew that Canaan "was but a type of heaven." In his commentary on the Gospel of John, the Scottish Presbyterian George Hutcheson (d. 1678) noted that the Christ that John preached "is the Author, and the Sacrament he administered, a means of entry into the heavenly *Canaan*."

In the American context, references to Canaan or the land of Canaan have remained fundamentally ambiguous. On the one hand, Anglo-European immigrants identified America as their Canaan. For Puritans, whose typological interpretation of the Bible linked their own history to biblical events, America became their Canaan, the promised land, or Israel. They fled Egypt (England), crossed the

desert (the Atlantic Ocean!), and arrived in the blessed land of Canaan (and so-named their towns). This typological mold, casting America as the new Israel, a conjoining of biblical typology and American nationalism, persisted through the revolutionary era and well into the period of nation building. Nicholas Street likened the British kings to "Pharaoh in keeping the Americans from reaching their Canaan" (Street: 69–70). In the early 18th century, the Presbyterian clergy of Ulster announced that "God has appointed a Country [America] for them to Dwell in," a place where they would be free from "the Bondage of Egipt and goe to yᵉ land of Canaan" (Miller: 5).

On the other hand, christianized African American slaves experienced a different kind of Canaan – a condition of freedom from the oppressive white master. Whereas Puritans expressed the Canaan motif within a developed interpretive literary tradition, African Americans expressed theirs in spontaneous song, slave spirituals. The best known slave spiritual, "Go Down Moses" (also known as "Let My People Go"), relates the story of Israel's oppression, deliverance, and eventual entry into "fair Canaan's land." The following verses capture this theme (Epstein: 365):

> This world's a wilderness of woe,
> Oh let my people go!
> O let us on to Canaan go,
> Oh let my people go!
>
> What a beautiful morning that will be!
> Oh let my people go!
> When time breaks up in eternity,
> Oh let my people go.

The mention of "Canaan" refers to heaven, though in other spirituals, mention of the promised land had a decidedly this-worldly intent. Frederick Douglass, who as a young man escaped from slavery, described this two-fold meaning: "A keen observer might have detected in our repeated singing of 'O Canaan, sweet Canaan, / I am bound for the land of Canaan,' something more than a hope of reaching heaven. We mean to reach the *North*, and the North was our Canaan" (Douglass: 159). "Let God's Saints Come In" expressed this theme in song: "Canaan land is the land for me, / And let God's saints come in" (Allen: 76). After slavery ceased, the language of Canaan still persisted among African Americans as a metaphor for freedom and opportunity. Descriptions about leaving the South often invoked Canaan language, whether in the context of the 19th-century "back to Africa" movement or black migrations to the western plains or the "great migration" to northern industrial cities beginning in the second decade of the 20th century. Indeed, so entrenched is the notion of "Canaan" within African American history that numerous recent studies invoke "Canaan" in their titles (e.g., see F. M. Bordewich 2005; A. J. Raboteau 2001; L. R. Rodgers 1997; J. F. Sensbach 1998).

Bibliography: ■ Allen, W. F. et al., *Slave Songs of the United States* (Baltimore, Md. 1992). ■ Diodati, G., *Pious Annotations Upon the Holy Bible* (1651), in *The Digital Library of Classic Protestant Texts* (www.solomon.tcpt.alexanderstreet.com; accessed December 1, 2009). ■ Douglass, F., *Life and Times of Frederick Douglass* (New York 1962). ■ Epstein, D. J., *Sinful Tunes and Spirituals: Black Folk Music to the Civil War* (Urbana, Ill. 1977). ■ Hutcheson, G., "An Exposition of the Gospel of Jesus Christ According to John (1657)," in *The Digital Library of Classic Protestant Texts* (www.solomon.tcpt.alexanderstreet.com; accessed December 1, 2009) 15. ■ Miller, K. A. et al., *Irish Immigrants in the Land of Canaan: Letters and Memoirs from Colonial and Revolutionary America, 1675–1815* (New York 2003). ■ Perkins, W., "A Cloud of Faithful Witnesses (1618)," *The Digital Library of Classic Protestant Texts* (www.solomon.tcpt.alexanderstreet.com; accessed December 1, 2009). ■ Street, N., "The American States Acting over the Part of the Children of Israel in the Wilderness and Thereby Impeding Their Entrance into Canaan's Rest," in *God's New Israel: Religious Interpretations of America's Destiny* (ed. C. Cherry; Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1971).

David W. Kling

IV. Literature

Seen as Moses saw it – from a distance – Canaan signifies the unachievable goal. Thus in Jules Verne's *From the Earth to the Moon* (1865), the moon is likened to Canaan. But Canaan can also represent hope: in African America tradition, it is a place of sanctuary from slavery (Raboteau 2001). In *The Grapes of Wrath* (1939), John Steinbeck likens California to Canaan insofar as it is a place of hope and fecundity, but also because its residents often prove hostile to newcomers. Indeed, Canaan often signifies a promised but not pristine land; settlement thus combines opportunity with supersession. In rabbinic literature, the conquest of Canaan (Josh 1–11) represents the assertion of Judaism over paganism (Kygier 2005); in early church writings, it functions as an allegory of the mission to synagogues (Ambrose, *Jos.* 13.79). In both tracts and sermons, European settlers identify the Americas as a new Canaan. Its natives are treated as a source of potential pollution (Johnson Silva). This is fictionalized in Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Maypole of Merry Mount* (1837), in which puritans regard a New England maypole as a symbol of the continuing thrall of "Egypt" ("old" England) and the lure of this Canaan's inhabitants (Heath 2007). The conquest of Canaan has served as a paradigm for the displacement of other indigenous peoples, most notably, in the development of Afrikaner colonialism in South Africa (Prior 1997). But Canaan also features in the critique of colonialism: in Alicia Ostriker's poem "The Story of Joshua," the conquest narrative is punctuated with biblical calls for compassion (Ostriker 1994); in "Canaanite, Cowboys, and Indians," Robert Allen Warrior shows that liberationist movements *towards* Canaan can lead to a loss of liberty for its inhabitants.

Bibliography: ■ Heath, W., "Thomas Morton: From Merry Old England to New England," *Journal of American Studies* 41 (2007) 135–68. ■ Krygier, R., "Did God Command the Extermination of the Canaanites?: The Rabbis' Encounter with Genocide," *Conservative Judaism* 57 (2005) 78–94. ■ Ostriker, A., *The Nakedness of the Fathers* (New Brunswick, N.J. 1994). ■ Prior M., *The Bible and Colonialism: A Moral Critique* (Sheffield 1997). ■ Raboteau, A. J., *Canaan Land: A Religious History of African Americans* (Oxford 2001). ■ Silva, C., "Miraculous Plagues: Epidemiology on New England's Colonial Landscape," *Early American Literature* 43 (2008) 249–75. ■ Steinbeck, J., *The Grapes of Wrath* (London 2006). ■ Verne, J., *From the Earth to the Moon* (London 1974). ■ Warrior, R. A., "A Native American Perspective: Canaaites, Cowboys, and Indians," in *Voices from the Margin: Interpreting the Bible in the Third World* (ed. R. S. Sugitharajah; Maryknoll, N.Y. 1991) 188–94.

Mark Brummitt

V. Music

In Handel's oratorio *Joshua* (1747) to a libretto by Thomas Morell, the conquest of Canaan, the promised land, is the main theme. Handel's *Israel in Egypt* (1738–39), based for the most part directly upon biblical texts (primarily excerpts from Exodus and the Psalms possibly compiled by Charles Jennens, the librettist of Handel's *Messiah*, or even by the composer himself) also touches upon this subject, albeit very briefly.

As Ruth Smith has pointed out, the treatment of Canaan was controversial in English biblical debates at the time, and the agenda of the Handel oratorios constituted a defence of the Bible as well as a political appropriation of the heroic and "patriotic" nature of the Israelite struggle (Smith 1995: 247–53).

Jules Massenet's (1842–1912) last oratorio, *La terre promise* (The Promised Land, 1897–99), treats the conquest of Canaan in three parts, setting biblical texts which the composer had selected. The three parts are "Moab (The Alliance)," "Jericho (The Victory)," and "Canaan (The Promised Land)," each with a biblical motto corresponding to its plot (Deut 4 : 1–2; Josh 6 : 20; and Josh 22 : 6, respectively). In the first part, Moses prepares the people for the entry into Canaan; the second part treats the fall of Jericho (Josh 6); the third part praises the people for their faith in God and expresses the people's praise of God. (See also "Jericho. Music" for a discussion of other musical settings based on the fall of Jericho.)

Settings based on narratives from the books of Moses and Joshua may or may not reflect notions of Canaan. To my knowledge, the topic has not yet been subject to systematic scrutiny. As an example of an individual reception of the notion of Canaan into a broad narrative context (here based on parts of Genesis), one could mention Andrew Lloyd Webber's pop cantata *Joseph and the Amazing Technicolor Dreamcoat* to a text by Tim Rice (rev. twice; final version 1972), which among many other items contains the song "Those Canaan Days."

Bibliography: ■ Ross, C./J. Snelson, "Lloyd Webber: (2) Andrew Lloyd Webber," *Grove Music Online* (www.oxfordmusiconline.com; accessed March 7, 2010). ■ Smith, R., *Handel's Oratorios and Eighteenth-Century Thought* (Cambridge 1995). ■ Smith, R., "Handel's English Librettists," in *The Cambridge Companion to Handel* (ed. D. Burrows; Cambridge 1997) 92–108. ■ Smither, H. E., *A History of the Oratorio*, 4 vols. (Chapel Hill, N.C. 1977–2000).

Nils Holger Petersen

See also →Canaan (Person); →Canaanites; →Conquest of the Land

Canaan, Conquest of

→Conquest of the Land; →Israel

Canaan, Curse of

→Ham (Person)

Canaan, Settlement of

→Conquest of the Land

Canaanite Movement

The "Canaanite" movement was a coterie of Jewish intellectuals and artists in pre-state Palestine in the 1940s that rose to prominence in the early years of Israeli statehood (1948–53) by articulating a social, cultural, and political ideology in opposition to the prevailing Zionism. The group referred to themselves as ʿIvriyim tseʿirim ("Young Hebrews"); the pejorative nickname *Kenaʿanim* ("Canaanites") is attributed to the poet Avraham Shlonsky.

The root idea of "Canaanism" was that the polity that was developing in the *Yishuv* and that achieved sovereignty in 1948 had nothing to do with Jewish peoplehood or Judaism, which it regarded as Diaspora phenomena, but was rather the recrudescence of the pre-Judaic Hebrew identity of biblical and pre-biblical antiquity. The chief expositor of this ideology was the Hebrew poet Yonatan Ratosh, also known as Uriel Shelah (Uriel Halperin; b. Warsaw 1909; d. Tel Aviv 1981), but its architect was A. G. Horon, also known as Adya Gur (Adolphe Gourevitch; b. Kiev 1907; d. Tel Aviv 1975). Horon was a Semiticist working in Paris in the 1930s. From his studies of the ancient Near East and in the wake of the findings at Ugarit (Ras Shamra) in 1928, Horon advanced the notion that the Hebrews of the Bible were part of a larger autochthonous entity that inhabited the eastern Mediterranean in the Bronze Age (ca. 3300–1200 BCE) and included Phoenicians, Ammonites, Edomites, Amorites, Moabites, and Canaanites. These peoples were united linguistically, culturally, and politically. This view of the ancient Near East negated the central premise of Zionism: the historical existence of

DSM-IV will benefit from the extensive research and interest in diagnosis generated in large part by DSM-III. The development of DSM-IV is proceeding through three stages of empirical documentation, including literature reviews, analysis of unpublished data sets, and field trials. This paper discusses the rationale, process, and limitations of the literature reviews. Textbooks from Iv Literature. literature british literature (texas). perrine's literature: structure, sound, and sense. All Study Materials from Iv Literature. english iv vocabulary2011-08-05. COMPANY. About Us Contact Help.