

Canaanite woman's daughter

It seems that there has long been some degree of confusion in regard to the healing of a Canaanite woman's daughter by Yahshua Christ, an event described at Matt. 15:21-28 and Mk. 7:24-30, and especially among Israel Identity adherents. While the descriptions of the event are often abused by the promoters of universalism, they actually refute universalism. Yet those who understand the Old Testament and the curses against the Canaanites are left to wonder just how and why Yahshua Christ had shown mercy toward this particular woman, and this issue has been the cause for much debate. This short essay shall endeavor to clear up any confusion surrounding this event.

First, it must be noted that the accounts of this event provided by Matthew and Mark differ significantly. It must be understood that no gospel account can be regarded as a full and complete record of any particular event. Rather, each writer witnessed, or recorded from witnesses, all or parts of an event seen from a certain perspective, writing down those portions of the event which were notable, as they were remembered. Therefore, piecing the accounts together we can create a more complete picture of the event as a whole.

The Canaanite woman is identified as a "Greek, a Syro-Phoenician by nation" in Mark's gospel, in the A.V. Translation. The word rendered "nation" is *genos* (Strong's #1085), and is more properly rendered "race". (The 9th edition of the Liddell & Scott *Greek-English Lexicon* defines *genos* primarily as "race, stock, kin" and then "generally, race, of beings". Secondly, W.E. Vine in his *An Expository of New Testament Words*, [although not entirely perfect] on the word "kind" [*genos*] agrees generally with Liddell & Scott.) Newer translations render the term "birth", however I must interpret *genos* as "race" here since Mark could hardly have known where the woman was born, and because "Syro-Phoenicia" was never a nation at any time, for the term is a geographical description, even though it is not found in secular Greek writings until Lucian wrote circa 160 A.D. Strabo, in his description of Syria, notes that "Some writers divide Syria as a whole into Coelo-Syrians and Syrians and Phoenicians, and say that four tribes are mixed up with these, namely Judaeans, Idumaeans, Gazaeans and Azotians, and that they are partly farmers, as the Syrians and Coelo-Syrians, and partly merchants, as the Phoenicians" (*Geography*, 16.2.2), and it can be shown that in Strabo's time (ca. 64 B.C. To 25 A.D.) some of these terms had a quite different meaning than they had in more ancient times. Mark, possibly being a Greek himself, or at least a somewhat Hellenized Judaeon (Markos is a Greek, not a Hebrew name), and writing in Greek for a Hellenized audience, identifies the woman by Greek standards: as a Greek by language and custom (as opposed to the Judaeans and

Edomites of whom many resisted Greek customs, as did other peoples of the Near East), and a Syro-Phoenician by race. Here Mark's intent seems to be that the woman belonged to one of those tribes native to Syrian Phoenicia, rather than being a Greek or Roman inhabitant of Phoenicia: for there were many Greek and Roman colonists in the Near East at this time. Ancient Palestine was just as confused concerning race and nationality as New York and many other major cities are today. Mark was doing the best he could to describe this woman with the terms used by the Greeks of his time. He would have identified the woman as a Greek, Roman, Aramaean, or Judaeon by race, if such had been the case, hence Mark's distinction.

The word "Greek" is actually *Hellene*, and its use here by Mark is understood in its historical context. *Hellene* was never used to define any specific tribe, nation, or kingdom. Rather, the term came to be used among the tribes of the region and islands about the Aegean who came to use a similar language and customs, namely the Ionians, Danaans, Pelasgians and Dorians. Later there were sub-divisions of these, such as Boeotians, Macedonians, Argives, etc. Those of other tribes, such as the Phoenician colonists of Caria (Miletus) and Thessaly, adopting the language, were also later subsumed into the Hellenic culture, becoming known as "Greeks". Those peoples of other tongues outside of the culture, whether or not they were just as civilized, were labeled "Barbarians". It must be remembered, however, that at this early time all of these peoples were of White Adamic stock. Even later, with the rise of the Hellenistic period – after Alexander the Macedonian had conquered most of the Adamic world (or *oikoumene*)– people from many other tribes having adopted the same language and customs readily became known as "Greek", much as happens in any empire, and such as the term "American" is so loosely used today.

On the other hand Matthew, a tax collector who may have been a Levite, seemingly much more aware of the woman's race from a Hebrew perspective, properly identifies the woman as a Canaanite, by the actual tribe of her lineage. While Matthew was also writing in Greek, he must have used this ancient term with purpose, for the name "Canaanite" is virtually unknown to the secular Greek writers, and would probably have faded into oblivion if not for the Scriptures (aside from modern archaeology). The Greeks were much more apt to label people by Greek geographical names rather than by tribal names, as we even find occurring in the Old Testament, and in secular writings the peoples of the Levant are named in the manner seen in the citation from Strabo provided above. Surely the woman of the event discussed here was indeed a Canaanite.

In Matthew's account of the incident, the Canaanite woman accosted Yahshua, and He ignored her. His disciples, evidently having failed to discourage the woman, became annoyed with her, and asked Yahshua to send her away, yet they were not admonished for such behavior. Now this

is hardly any way to treat a prospective “Christian”, one may think, and a situation only understood once one realizes that such a prospect simply did not exist. This must be compared to the reception which certain others, being Israelites, had received, such as those found at John 1:47, Luke 13:16 and 19:9. And it is not merely because the Canaanite woman was not a Judaeen Israelite that she received such treatment. Contrast the reception which she received to that of the Roman centurion as described at Matthew 8:5-7. While the same event is described somewhat differently at Luke 7:1-10, nevertheless the effect is the same. The Romans were, in fact, “lost” Israelites, having descended from a portion of Judah which emigrated to Europe at a very early time. Paul knew this, and it is evident throughout the epistle addressed to them.

At Matthew 15:24 Yahshua Christ repeats His very commission in response to the Canaanite woman’s plea. This commission is repeated throughout the New Testament, i.e. Matt. 1:21, 2:6; 10:6; 18:11; Mark 12:29; Luke 1:16, 54, 67-80; 2:25-34; 19:10; 24:21; John 1:31, 49; 12:13; Acts 1:6; 28:20 et al. Now it is clear both in the Old Testament prophets and throughout the New Testament, that Christ came only for the “lost sheep of the house of Israel”, those ancient Old Testament Israelites who from the days of the Judges unto the Assyrian and Babylonian deportations had been emigrating into Europe, and who eventually formed the Christian Nations of the Medieval period: the White races of today. Yet, as Paul explains to the Ephesians, “lost” Israel having been alienated from Yahshua until His redemptive sacrifice on the cross, His earthly ministry remained among the Judaeen Israelites, those who retained their relationship with Him through the Old Covenant.

So while Yahshua informs the Canaanite woman that He was sent only for the “sheep”, the children of Israel (cf. Ezekiel chapter 34), He then informs her that it is not proper to take the bread of the children (which is His favor) and throw it to the dogs, which is effectively calling the Canaanite woman a dog. While the term “dog” is often used derisively of people in Scripture, one example where it stands out is where it is used in the 22nd Psalm, a messianic prophecy foreseeing the crucifixion of Christ: “For dogs have compassed me: the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet ... Deliver my soul from the sword; my darling from the power of the dog.” (Psa. 22: 16, 20). Knowing that it is the Canaanite-Edomite leaders of Judaea who were primarily responsible for the crucifixion, those who claim to be Judaeans, but are not (Rev. 2:9; 3:9), the dog-people are brought to light in this statement by Yahshua to the Canaanite woman. Paul later warns about the dog-people (Ph’p. 3:2), as Yahshua also had previously (Matt. 7:6). The woman was certainly not a dog merely because she was sinful, for Christ often professed that He had come for sinners (i.e. Matt. 9:9-13). Surely she WAS a Canaanite, bearing the curses of both Canaan and Cain!

When in ancient times the children of Israel had left Egypt, and were presented with the land of Canaan, they were warned that if they did not drive out or destroy all of the Canaanites, then the Canaanites would become a source of great trouble to them (i.e. Num. 33:55; Josh. 23:13). Of course, the children of Israel did fail to drive out all of the Canaanites (i.e. Jdgs. 3:1-6). All of this must have been foreseen by Yahweh, of course, yet – as Paul explains in 2 Thess. chapter 2 (and see Rom. 16:25-27), the mystery of iniquity had not been fully revealed in the Old Testament scriptures – many of which are also parables difficult to understand – yet it is revealed in the Gospel. On which account we are provided with such parables as that of the wheat and the tares, and the warning that both must grow together until the time of the end, which is the harvest (Matt. 13:24-30, 36-43). When the children of Israel failed to destroy the Canaanites from among them, they lost their commission to do so, and were therefore left to suffer from them. Neither was it the purpose of Christ in His earthly ministry to destroy them; for there are many other Old Testament prophecies concerning the ultimate destruction of all of the enemies of Yahweh at the end of this age (i.e. Obad. 8-9, 18; Mal. 1:1-5; Zech. 14:21; Matt. 13:30, 41-42; 25:31-46; Rev. 20:13-15).

Compassion for one's enemies is a noble trait, and a sign of humility which any good king, general, or righteous nation should have. (Of course, examining history, neither the Canaanite-jews nor their Canaanite Islamic arab cousins have ever had compassion for their enemies.) There was a custom in the ancient world, that a defeated enemy, or an accused wrongdoer, or anyone else who may have fallen into disfavor, if he should prostrate himself before a general or ruler, and grasping the cloak of such a one admit his fault and then beg for mercy or forgiveness, arousing the compassion of his master he would receive as much, or at least be granted a lesser punishment than what was expected. In the same manner, a peasant or other common citizen would do likewise, seeking relief from some trouble, or to be granted some other favor by a ruler. The ancient histories are replete with examples of such incidents, and this account of the Canaanite woman's actions falls into the same pattern. When the Canaanite woman admitted to Yahshua Christ that she was indeed a dog, while professing that He could indeed heal her daughter, she both recognized Him as having been sent by Yahweh God, and surrendered to the truth of the Word. Having such a surrendered enemy making supplication before Him, while at the same time admitting the truth of the Word, Yahshua had no choice but to show mercy to her, since by His own Word the destruction of His enemies was still afar off, and since she volunteered such submission in supplication as her statement demonstrates: "... yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table." By this act of mercy, Yahshua also fulfilled the truth of the Scripture, i.e. Proverbs 16:7: "When a man's ways please Yahweh, He maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." Yahshua had no choice

but to grant this act of mercy to the Canaanite woman, as an example of His own teaching!

Here it must be noted, that Yahshua Christ had healed the daughter of the Canaanite woman in body only. For she requested “that He would cast forth the devil out of her daughter” (Mk. 7:26), and He granted her request: “the devil is gone out of thy daughter” (7:29) she having received nothing more than what she had desired (cf. Matt. 15:28, “be it unto thee even as thou wilt”). When a veterinarian heals a dog, it is restored into a whole dog, not into a sheep! The woman’s daughter was likewise healed bodily, but she was still a Canaanite. She is not an Adamite, having the Adamic Spirit! For one to be granted eternal life, one must first have that Spirit which Adam had (cf. Gen. 2:7; 3:22; 1 Cor. 15:35-38). The Spirit which Adam had is handed down, like his image, as part of the genetic code, as Paul explains in 1 Cor. 15:44: “It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body”. Producing offspring of mixed races, one is hewing out “broken cisterns, that can hold no water” (Jer. 2:13). For this reason the apostle Jude refers to those who “have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam” (the fornicating race-mixers, i.e. 1 Cor. 10:8; Rev. 2:14; Micah 6:5) as “clouds without water, trees ... without fruit, twice dead” (Jude 11-12), and likewise Peter calls these same people “wells without water” (2 Pet. 2:17). They are “without water” because they are devoid of the Spirit of Yahweh. They are “twice dead” because once they die bodily, they are also as good as dead spiritually! The Canaanites, products of the race-mixing fornication (Jude 7) called by Jude the “error of Balaam”, can never be anything but what they already are, having descended partly from Cain, partly from the Rephaim and partly from non-Adamic races (i.e. Gen. 15:19-21), and therefore not having the Spirit, can never enter into the Kingdom or Covenants of Yahweh, which the Scriptures expressly reserve for Israelites only!

Therefore, that Yahshua Christ had in this one instance granted mercy to an enemy – which Scripture shows that the Canaanites are – does not give Israelite Christians an excuse to embrace the other races into fellowship. The woman was told to “go thy way”. She wasn’t even told to “repent” or to “sin no more”, she was still a dog – as was her daughter – and they could not possibly be made into “sheep”. Neither she nor her daughter were granted eternal life, and she could not have been expected to somehow have become a Christian. What the woman did receive was a crumb: it cost Yahshua nothing to grant the woman’s request. It was more expedient to grant the woman her wish, tossing the dog a bone as a reward for her supplication and honesty – for the woman certainly realized that she was not one of the children. Imagining that Yahshua Christ intended to bring an alien into the New Covenant, which He made exclusively with the house of Israel and the house of Judah (not “spiritual” Israel nor “spiritual” Judah; cf. Jer 31:31 ff.) is to imagine that He would commit an act of fraud. Paul

knew as much, and so at Gal. 3:15 he explained that even a covenant between mere men, once confirmed, no one could change or add to. And so here Paul explains that the New covenant is made only for the Anointed Seed (where the A.V. has “which is Christ”, rather than “which are the Anointed”), for the Israelites, and not with the other lines descended from Abraham, such as Edomites and Ishmaelites. The word at Matt. 15:28 which is rendered “faith” by the A.V., *pistis* (Strong’s #4102), is simply and literally “trust”, “faith” or “belief”, here used (and this is important) without the Greek Article. This should be contrasted to the use of *pistis* with the Greek Article when it is used to denote “The Faith”. When an Article appears with a Greek noun, it references a particular object, and not just any one of that type of object. Often this is distinguished in English with capital letters. In the N.T. with *pistis* it specifies “The Faith”, and not just any faith, or belief. The Canaanite woman had faith, but she certainly could not be a partner in “The Faith”, which is the Israelite acceptance of their redemption by Yahshua Christ, culminating in the New Covenant. Simply believing does not earn those of other races “salvation” (Matt. 7:21-23; 22:1-14; cf. Amos 3:2), an impossible thing to begin with! For “thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble.” (James 2:19).

In the days of the Old Testament, Israel was instructed to sanctify themselves by the sword, and they failed. The day is coming, however, when all Israel shall indeed be sanctified by Yahweh their God, i.e. Ezek. 37:21-28; Rev. 19:6-10; 21:10-27. Yet in this day, Israelite Christians are admonished to sanctify themselves by the Word of Yahweh (i.e. Eph. 5:26; John 15:3; 17:17; 1 Pet. 2:9-10). “For the word of Yahweh is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the division of soul and spirit, and of joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” (Heb. 4:12). Therefore, Yahshua’s healing of the Canaanite woman’s daughter does not mean that true Israelite Christians must accept the so-called “Jews for Jesus”, universalism, multiculturalism, or any of the other false doctrines of the humanists. The Word of Yahweh insists that Israelite Christians seek to uphold the laws of Yahweh, which are written in their hearts (i.e. Jer. 31:33; Rom. 2:15; Heb. 8:10), and to oppose evil (i.e. Rom. 12:9, 21; Ph’p. 3:2; Eph. 6:13; 1 Thes. 5:22; 3 John 11; James 4:7; Rev. 2:2 et al.). Yahweh God had separated the nations which descended from Adam (i.e. Deut. 32:8; Acts 17:26), and therefore universalism and racial “diversity” are evil! The mixing of the races is fornication (i.e. 1 Cor. 10:8; Jude 7). Hence a true adherence to the Word of Yahweh results in the sanctification of the obedient Israelite, since the Word insists that the Israelite separate himself from the other races – as Paul explains at 2 Cor. 6:11-18, for example, although this passage, like many others in Paul’s writings, suffers from corrupted translations. For instance, “thing” in the text of 2 Cor. 6:17 was added by the translators of the A.V. Rather, “the unclean” are the non-

Israelite peoples, who were NEVER cleansed by the blood of Christ! They are the “them” in the admonition to “come out from among them” earlier in the same verse! The cleansing of Israel – and ONLY Israel – by the sacrifice of Yahshua Christ was a matter of prophecy, i.e. Jer. 31:33; 33:8; Ezek. 36:25, 27, 33; 37:23, and it is now a matter of fact. The other races were never cleansed by Yahweh, and therefore they are “the unclean”. Therefore neither do today’s so-called “churches”, the organized religious cults, along with all of the “liberal” western governments, have license to act as they have been: taking the plates and loaves of the children, dumping them onto the floor as if they were crumbs, and letting all of the dogs fill their vile bellies! This is what they do today with unbridled “immigration”, foreign missions, foreign aid, “free” trade, and especially the billions of dollars which each year we both send to, and expend in defense of, that Canaanite-Edomite state in Palestine which so deceptively calls itself by the name “Israel”.

BILL FINK