

STUDIEN ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT UND SEINER UMWELT (SNTU)

Serie A, Band 18

Herausgegeben von DDr. Albert Fuchs
o. Professor an der Theologischen Fakultät Linz

Die "Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt" (Serie A = Aufsätze) erscheinen seit 1976, mit Originalaufsätzen oder bearbeiteten Übersetzungen sonst schwer zugänglicher Artikel. Inhaltlich werden wissenschaftlich-exegetische Arbeiten bevorzugt, gelegentlich auch historische und philologische Fragen behandelt.

Alle Manuskripte, Korrekturen, Mitteilungen usw., die die Serie betreffen, werden an den Herausgeber, Prof. DDr. Albert Fuchs, Blütenstr. 17, A-4040 Linz, erbeten. Es wird darum ersucht, die Manuskripte in Maschinschrift einseitig beschrieben, spationiert (auch und besonders die Fußnoten) und in druckreifem Zustand einzusenden. Hilfreich ist es auch, wenn die Beiträge zusätzlich auf PC-Diskette geliefert werden können (auf DOS-Basis und in formatiertem Zustand).

Abkürzungen, Zitate und Schreibweise (Angabe von Untertiteln, Reihe usw.) sollten den bisher erschienenen Bänden entsprechen bzw. sich nach LThK² und TRE richten. Hebräische Texte werden bevorzugt in Transkription gedruckt.

Der reprofertierte Satz wird von Dr. Christoph Niemand am *Institut für ntl. Bibelwissenschaft der Kath.-Theol. Hochschule Linz* angefertigt. Griechische und hebräische Texttypen sind im Programm "LOGOS" (Softwarevertrieb Sven Brands, Hebelstr. 2, D-68535 Edingen-Neckarhausen) erstellt.

Anschriften der Mitarbeiter:

Dr. Peter Arzt, Universitätsplatz 1, A-5020 Salzburg

Prof. Dr. Raymond F. Collins, P.O. Box 507, Saunderstown, RI 02874, U.S.A.

Dr. Manfred Diefenbach, Ostenstraße 26-28, D-85072 Eichstätt

Prof. Dr. Marcel Dumais, 223 Rue Main, Ottawa Ont., K1S 1C4, Canada

Prof. Dr. Martin Hasitschka, Karl-Rahner-Platz 3, A-6020 Innsbruck

Dr. Christoph Niemand, Bethlehemstraße 20, A-4020 Linz

Prof. Dr. Wilhelm Pratscher, Rooseveltplatz 10, A-1090 Wien

Prof. Dr. Josef Zmijewski, Kirchstraße 3, D-36039 Fulda

Die von den Mitarbeitern und Rezensenten vertretenen Positionen und Meinungen decken sich nicht notwendigerweise mit denen des Herausgebers.

Copyright: Prof. DDr. A. Fuchs, Linz 1993. Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

Bestelladresse: Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt
A-4020 Linz/Austria, Bethlehemstraße 20

INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

RAYMOND F. COLLINS	
The Transformation of a Motif.	
"They Entered the House of Simon and Andrew" (Mark 1,29)	5
JOSEF ZMIJEWSKI	
Markinischer "Prolog" und Täufertradition.	
Eine Untersuchung zu Mk 1,1-8	41
CHRISTOPH NIEMAND	
Die Täuferlogien Mk 1,7-8 parr.	
Traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen und ihre Bedeutung für die Synoptische Frage	63
MARTIN HASITSCHKA	
Die Parakletworte im Johannesevangelium.	
Versuch einer Auslegung in synchroner Textbetrachtung	97
MARCEL DUMAIS	
Le salut universel par le Christ selon les Actes des Apôtres	113
WILHELM PRATSCHER	
Die Stabilisierung der Kirche als Anliegen der Pastoralbriefe	133
MANFRED DIEFENBACH	
Das Lukasevangelium und die antike Rhetorik	151
PETER ARZT	
Über die Macht des Staates nach Röm 13,1-7	163
ALBERT FUCHS	
Das Elend mit der Zweiquellentheorie	183
REZENSIONEN	245
Die Apostolischen Väter, hg. v. A. Lindemann (Weißengruber)	287
Archiv Bibliographia Judaica, Lexikon deutsch-jüdischer Autoren (Fuchs)	286
Baird W., History of New Testament Research, I (Fuchs)	248
Barrett C.K. - Thornton C.-J., Texte zur Umwelt (Niemand)	283
Barth G., Der Tod Jesu (Fuchs)	280

Becker J., Paulus (Arzt)	266
Betz H.D., Synoptische Studien (Fuchs)	253
Blank J., Studien zur biblischen Theologie (Arzt)	252
Denaux A., John and the Synoptics (Fuchs)	260
Dunn J.D.G., Jews and Christians (Fuchs)	284
Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon, III (Fuchs)	245
Harrington D.J., The Gospel of Matthew (Fuchs)	255
Hartman L., Auf den Namen des Herrn Jesus (Niemand)	281
Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie, Bd. 7 (Fuchs)	277
Johnson L.T., The Gospel of Luke (Fuchs)	257
Klauck H.-J., Die Johannesbriefe (Fuchs)	273
Külling H., Geoffenbartes Geheimnis (Weißengruber)	265
Mach M., Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens (Fuchs)	285
Niebuhr K.W., Heidenapostel aus Israel (Fuchs)	268
Pöhlmann W., Der Verlorene Sohn (Fuchs)	259
Rehkopf F., Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch (Fuchs)	246
Ruckstuhl E. - Dschulnigg P., Stilkritik und Verfasserfrage (Niemand)	262
Sand A., Das Matthäus-Evangelium (Fuchs)	254
Schiefer Ferrari M., Paulinische Peristasenkataloge (Arzt)	271
Schnackenburg R., Die Person Jesu Christi (Fuchs)	278
Schwertner S.M., IATG ² (Fuchs)	245
Söding Th., Die Trias Glaube, Hoffnung, Liebe (Hasitschka)	269
Spicq C., Lexique Théologique (Weißengruber)	247
Strobel A., Der erste Brief an die Korinther (Hasitschka)	268
Stuhlmacher P., Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments, I (Fuchs)	275
Weder H., Einblicke ins Evangelium (Hasitschka)	249
Weiser A., Studien zu Christsein und Kirche (Stowasser)	250
Eingesandte Schriften	288

Herr Prof. Dr. F.W. Horn machte mich brieflich darauf aufmerksam, daß es sich bei seiner in SNTU 17 (1992) 69, Anm. 57 kritisierten Aussage (vgl. *Horn*, Handeln, 191) um ein Versehen handelt.

A. Fuchs

The Transformation of a Motif

"They Entered the House of Simon and Andrew" (Mark 1,29)

1. Mark

1.1 Introduction

In his description of a typical day in the life of Jesus (Mark 1,21-34), the evangelist Mark presents the figure of Jesus entering and then leaving the synagogue in the company of his disciples. Subsequently the little band enters the home of Simon and Andrew, where they are served by the lady of the house. Each of these two places, the house and the synagogue, serves as a locale in which Mark places some of the typical activity of Jesus. In the synagogue, Jesus teaches and exorcises. In the house of Simon and Andrew, he cures Simon's mother-in-law. These localized activities distinguish Jesus from those who have accompanied him.

Mark brings his narration of this typical day's activity to closure with the first of the Markan summaries (Mark 1,32-34). It underscores the role of Jesus as a healer and exorcist. Mark includes his first rehearsal of the messianic secret within this dense summary. Imbedded within it is a narrative detail, reprised by neither Matthew nor Luke, namely, that of verse 33: "And the whole city was gathered around the door". Many contemporary readings of the Markan gospel highlight the significance of this verse - a verse which earlier exegesis could easily dismiss as so much "artless detail".

Those who read Mark from the perspective of contemporary literary criticism note that the setting of the Markan narrative is replete with monumental architecture. The synagogue¹ and the home² are important features of Mark's story. From the narrative standpoint, the door that is innocently introduced in V. 33 belongs to the same kind of setting as the house of Simon and Andrew, which Mark had introduced as the locale for Jesus' first healing miracle.

¹ Mark 1,21.23.29.39; 3,1; 6,2; 12,39; 13,9.

² Mark 1,29; 2,15; 3,25.27; 6,4.10; 7,24; 9,33; 10,10.29.30; 12,40; 13,15.34.35; 14,3 (οἰκία); 2,1.11.26; 3,20; 5,19.38; 7,17.30; 8,3.26; 9,28; 11,17 (οἶκος).

Those who read Mark's gospel from a sociological perspective focus upon the synagogue and the home as significant social indicators. These terms, συναγωγή and οἰκία, do not simply identify space. They designate a kind of space in which the specific activity of significant social groups takes place. These groups are respectively the religious group which gathers in synagogue for prayer and teaching and the family which gathers in the home for a variety of familial activity. From the social standpoint the door is also a barrier which defines limits. It divides those who are inside the home from those who are outside, those who are members of the family from those who are not. Seen from this perspective the door of V. 33 is hardly an innocent feature of the Markan narrative.

The door of V. 33 becomes even more conspicuous when Mark 1,33 is compared with 2,2. From the perspective of Mark's narrative setting we once again have Capernaum (1,21; 2,1), the home (1,29; 2,1) and the door (1,33; 2,2). Once again there is a gathering (1,23; 2,2). When, however, the summary of 1,32-34 is compared with that of 2,1-2, some notable contrasts appear. The first is the size of the crowds. In the first instance (1,33), it is the "whole city" which gathers at the door. Since Jesus' exit from the home has not been mentioned,³ one might presume that the entire city is observing Jesus who, from within the house, cures those who have been brought to him. In the second instance (2,2), Mark graphically states that, "so many gathered around that there was no longer room for them, not even in front of the door". Mark would have his readers understand that Jesus' first foray outside of the city was so impressive that the wouldbe observers are now so numerous that they cannot gather around the door so as to be able to see inside the house. A second feature which contrasts the summary of 2,1-2 with that of 1,32-33 concerns the activity of Jesus. As the Markan narrative gathers in intensity, Mark shifts his focus from Jesus the thaumaturge (1,32, 34) to Jesus "who was speaking the word to them" (2,2). Despite the fact that the crowds are unable to see inside the house, the word of Jesus is addressed to them.

Thirdly, when the home setting of 1,29-34 is compared with that of 2,1-12, one might note that in 1,29-34, Jesus' prototypical disciples, Simon and Andrew, James and John, are in the house with him. In point of fact, the evangelist specifically mentions that Jesus' activity takes place in the home of Simon and Andrew. The narrator introduces 2,1-12 with a report that Jesus was "at home".

³ Cf. 1,35.

While the setting is clearly a home, the evangelist does not identify the home owner nor does he specifically state that the disciples were inside the home. The home serves as a literary motif by which the evangelist highlights Jesus' desire to be apart from the crowds,⁴ a function of the "Messianic secret".⁵

Since the settings and summaries of Mark's gospel are among those passages in which the evangelist's editorial hand is clearly at work,⁶ one might conclude from the way in which the motif of the home occurs in 1,29-2,2 that the home is a significant literary motif in the Markan narrative. A reading of Mark's gospel confirms that this is indeed the case. The evangelist places a significant part of Jesus' activity within the home.

1.2 *The House (οἰκία) as a Narrative Setting*

Within the house (οἰκία) of Simon and Andrew Jesus cures Simon's mother-in-law (1,29). Within the home of Levi, the tax collector (2,15), Jesus utters his first mission statement: "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick; I have come to call not the righteous but sinners" (2,17). The setting for this pregnant statement is a controversy which ensued over Jesus' having dinner with tax collectors and sinners. Mark tells his story in such a way that the mission statement is uttered in the hearing of Jesus' disciples and for their benefit. The third identifiable home in which Mark locates some of Jesus' most significant activity is that of Simon the Leper (14,3). Again there is a controversy, this time over the anointing of Jesus. The controversy serves as a setting for a significant utterance of Jesus, issuing in the solemn culmination, "Truly I tell you, where the good news is proclaimed in the whole world, what she has done will be told in memory of her" (14, 9).

1.2.1 Three other passages in Mark's gospel identify a house as the locale of Jesus significant activity, but do not specify the house in which this activity takes place. Jesus' discourse with the Syrophenician woman is located in a home in the region of Tyre (7,24). From that house Jesus performs an exorcism-from afar for the benefit of the daughter of the Gentile woman.

⁴ See 1,45.

⁵ Cf. 7,24.

⁶ Apropos 1,32-34 and 2,1-2 see *G. van Oyen, De Summaria in Marcus en de Compositie van Mc 1,14-8,26* (SNTA, 12), Leuven 1987, 58-64.71-74.

1.2.2 Within the narrative unit which features Jesus the teacher (8,27-10,45),⁷ Mark's Jesus twice makes use of a house as a place within which to instruct his disciples. Immediately after the second passion prediction Jesus dialogues with the disciples (9,33-37) while in a home in Capernaum, presumably the house (οἶκος) into which Jesus had entered when he was previously in Capernaum (2,1).⁸ This dialogue culminates in the mission statement of 9,37, "whoever welcomes one such child in my name welcomes me, and whoever welcomes me welcomes not me but the one who sent me".

Mark's redactional hand is quite visible in the setting of this dialogue, in which the mention of the house provides an important architectural element. Otherwise, narrative followed by a dialogue is a characteristic feature of Mark's compositional style.⁹ The double reference to a place in V. 33 reflects Mark's work, as does the repetition of cognate verbs in VV. 33-34 (διελογίζεσθε; διελέχθησαν).¹⁰ In Mark's gospel Jesus is the supreme interrogator,¹¹ especially in the unit on Jesus the teacher. Ἐπερωτάω is one of Mark's favorite words.¹² In V. 33 Mark uses this verb to portray Jesus the teacher who instructs his disciples according to the established patterns of Socratic dialogue.¹³ The narrative unit on Jesus the teacher had begun¹⁴ (8,17-30) with this same pattern of Socratic dialogue.

1.2.3 After Jesus' public conflict with the Pharisees on the issue of divorce, the disciples come to him in the house (10,10) and question him about the mat-

⁷ See *V.K. Robbins*, *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-rhetorical Interpretation of Mark*, Philadelphia 1984, 158-163.

⁸ Matthew has apparently taken this to be Jesus' own home town (εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν, Matt 9,1), but the Markan narrative is indeterminate on this point.

⁹ See *F. Neirynck*, *Duality in Mark: Contributions to the Study of the Markan Redaction* (BETL, 31), Leuven 1988, 115-119.

¹⁰ See *Neirynck*, *Duality*, 94.77-82.

¹¹ See Mark 8,27.29; 9,11.16.21.28.33; 10,3.36.38.

¹² Mark uses the verb twenty-five times (5,9; 7,5.7; 8,23.27.29; 9,11.16.21.28.32.33; 10,2.10.17; 11,29; 12,18.28.34; 13,3; 14,60.61; 15,2.4.44) as compared with Matthew's use of the verb eight times and Luke's use of it seventeen times. Four of Matthew's eight and four of Luke's seventeen uses of the verb have been taken over from Mark (Matt 17,10; 22,23.35; 27,11; Luke 8,30; 9,18; 20,27; 21,7).

¹³ See *R. Riesner*, *Jesus als Lehrer* (WUNT, 2/7), Tübingen 1984, 435.

¹⁴ See 8,17-30.

ter which had been under discussion.¹⁵ This second question-and-answer session located within a house (οἰκία) incorporates a pattern of dialogue in which the roles are reversed from what they were in the first instance. Then it was Jesus who posed the questions, now it is the disciples who ask.

The house in which the questioning and instruction on divorce takes place is identified neither by reference to its owner nor by reference to its geographical location. Since Mark appends the dialogue with the disciples on divorce to the conflict story, the house in which the dialogue takes place must be - at least from a narrative point of view - a house located in the region of Judea and beyond the Jordan (10,1). This appears to be Markan code for some enigmatic foreign region.¹⁶ This home lying somewhere in the great beyond (10,10) clearly serves to separate the instruction of the disciples from the conflictual dialogue with the Pharisees (10,3-9). As such, the location of Jesus' instruction of the disciples in the unspecified house of 10,10 has a function consistent with the apartness function of the home at Capernaum in Mark 2,2.

The home located "somewhere" (10,10) is the locale in which Jesus explains his public teaching for the benefit of the disciples, just as the Capernaum home of 9,33 was a place for Jesus to teach the twelve. It is the twelve (9,35), rather than the disciples, who receive instruction from Jesus in the Capernaum home. This designation of the recipients of Jesus' instruction as the twelve may well be due to the fact that the pericope (9,33-37) culminates in a mission statement. In Mark, the group of disciples associated with the mission are identified as the twelve.¹⁷

1.3 Mark's Use of οἰκία

This rapid overview of six passages in which Mark uses the term οἰκία to identify a narrative setting suggests that the term comes from the evangelist's own redactional efforts: Mark locates Jesus' significant activity in a private home. He identifies three home owners who offered hospitality to Jesus, namely, Simon and Andrew, Levi, and Simon the Leper. Two homes are located in Capernaum (1,29; 9,33), and two of them are located in far away places (7,24; 10,10).

¹⁵ See R.F. Collins, *Divorce in the New Testament*, Collegeville 1992, 65-103.

¹⁶ See E.St. Malbon, *Narrative Space and Mythic Meaning in Mark*, San Francisco 1986, 41-42.

¹⁷ See Mark 3,14-15; 6,7; 9,35.

Jesus cures Simon's mother-in-law at home; from a home he performs an exorcism from afar. The home is also the place where Jesus pronounces some significant discourse. Within the Markan narrative, Jesus speaks about his own mission (2,15-17) and the mission of his disciples (9,33-37). Within a home, Jesus privately instructs the disciples about the halakah (10,10-12) to be drawn from the creation story. Mark's redaction of the setting for this instruction clearly indicates that Mark intends his readers to understand that Jesus instructed his disciples separately, that is, apart from the curious crowds and the hostile Pharisees.

1.4 A Pattern of Usage

The resumptive *πάλιν* of 10,10 indicates that Mark wants his reader to know that it is an old pattern which is occurring. In fact, Mark's use of the motif of the private instruction of the disciples in 10,10 is parallel with three earlier occurrences of this motif in the Markan gospel (Mark 4,10; 7,17; 9,28). In all four episodes, we find a recurrent pattern: 1) a mention of the disciples as subject of the verb, 2) the verb "to ask", 3) the identification of the object of the inquiry, that is, what Jesus has said or done. In response to the disciples' query, Jesus offers instruction on the parables (4,11-12, 13-20), on defilement (7,20-23), on prayer (9,29), and on divorce (10,11-12).

In their Markan configuration, all four of these instructions are instructions for the disciples - presumably the disciples of Jesus within the Markan community. From Mark's description it is clear that only those disciples who probe further can understand the meaning of Jesus' parables (4,10; 7,17). The use of the plural, *παραβολάς* (4,10), indicates that this is a generic observation rather than a specific one. Only Jesus' disciples can understand his parables, that is, with the interpretation which Jesus, serving as the *angelus interpres*, can provide.¹⁸

The parallelism between Jesus' instruction on parables and his words on defilement is particularly close (4,10-12; 7,17-23). In each instance the enigmatic statement which prompts the disciples' question is a parable. In both cases the Markan Jesus addresses the theme of the disciples' lack of understanding (4,13; 7,18) and makes a statement in two parts - another telltale sign of Markan redaction - the second part of which is introduced by a specific textual marker, (*λέγει*, 4,13; *ἔλεγεν*, 7,20). In both instances, Mark's narrative highlights the

¹⁸ See, however, 12,12.

private nature of the disciples' question and Jesus' response: in 4,10 Mark explicitly states that Jesus was *κατὰ μόνας*; the *ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου* of 7,17¹⁹ serves the same purpose. In 7,17 Mark²⁰ gives narrative form to the notion of Jesus' apartness with the mention of Jesus entering into the house (*οἶκος*).

In terms of narrative theory, the evangelist has shown the apartness of Jesus by stating that Jesus had entered the house apart from the crowd. The house symbolizes the apartness of Jesus. That the house functions in Mark's narrative in this fashion comes to the fore a few verses later, when the evangelist relates that Jesus "entered a house and did not want anyone to know he was there" (7,24). In this respect it should be noted that it is Jesus who takes the initiative in going apart. A singular form of the verb "to enter" (*εἰσῆλθεν*) is used in 7,17 and 24, just as it is in 2,1 and 9,28:²¹ Jesus enters the house.

As a symbol of Jesus' apartness, the house can serve as a metaphor for the intimacy which Jesus enjoys with his disciples. It is in the house that Jesus can enjoy private discourse with his disciples. This symbolic value of the house is clearly seen in the short pericope which follows the account of Jesus' healing a boy possessed by a spirit. In this little scene (9, 28-30), Mark, as the narrative theorists would say, both shows (*εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς οἶκον*) and tells about (*κατ' ἰδίαν*) Jesus' apartness. Once apart, Jesus can instruct his disciples.

1.5 *Οἶκος as a Narrative Setting*

In Mark 10,10, the evangelist uses *οἰκία* to designate the locale of Jesus' instruction of his disciples and as a symbol of the intimacy that exists between Jesus and his disciples. The expressive pattern within which the term is employed is paralleled in other narratives where the privacy of Jesus is expressed by means of the formulaic *κατὰ μόνας/κατ' ἰδίαν* (4,10; 9,28) or by means of an *οἶκος* formulation (7,17; 9,28). *Οἶκος* thus designates the house with a singular narrative and symbolic function. In this respect there seems to be little difference between Mark's use of *οἶκος* and *οἰκία*.

The impression is confirmed when we look at two other places in which Mark uses *οἶκος* as a locale for Jesus' significant activity (2,1; 5,38). In Mark 1,29

¹⁹ Cf. 7,14.

²⁰ Note the use of the double locality, *εἰς οἶκον, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου*. See *Neiryneck*, Duality, 95. Apropos Mark's duality in spatial references, see also *Malbon*, Narrative Space, 61-62.

²¹ Cf. 5,39.40.

the home (*οἰκία*) of Simon and Andrew had served as the setting for a healing narrative; in 7,24 a home (*οἰκία*) in a far away land serves as a setting for an exorcism from a distance. In Mark 2,1 Jesus is at home (*οἶκος*), when they bring the paralytic to him. The domestic location of the healing is dramatized as the narrative continues and the evangelist uses the house to function as a barrier of access to Jesus, thereby underscoring the difficulty of the miracle (2,4).²² Jesus is "at home" as he heals and teaches.

Similarly, Jesus raises a twelve-year old girl from the dead in the home of Jairus (*οἶκος*, 5,38). The story of Jesus' raising Jairus' daughter comes in two parts (5,21-24 and 35-43). A striking example of the evangelist's predilection for duality, the use of the sandwich technique is a well-known feature of Markan composition.²³ In the example at hand, that of the narrative about Jairus' daughter, the sandwich technique shows the hand of the evangelist at work. As was the case with Mark's narration of the cure of the paralytic (2,1-12), the house serves a significant narrative function in the account of the raising of Jairus' daughter. The house provides a privatized locale in which Jesus raises the young girl from the dead, witnessed only by a small group of five persons, that is, the young girl's parents and the three disciples who were with Jesus (Peter, James and John). The latter three are witnesses to this miracle at home, just as they were to the cure of an older woman at home in 1,29-31.

In Mark's narrative account, there is one additional mention of the home (*οἶκος*), which might, at first sight, appear to be so insignificant that it is easily overlooked. This is found in 3,20,²⁴ "then he went home" (*ἔρχεται εἰς οἶκον*). In Mark's narrative this short sentence serves as a transitional verse, with contrasting and attracting features. The topographical contrast with 3,13a, "he went up the mountain" (*καὶ ἀναβαίνει εἰς τὸ ὄρος*) is apparent. 3,20 tells the reader that Jesus has shifted the locale of his activity.

The focus of attention is on Jesus; we recognize the Markan motif of Jesus' entering a house!²⁵ The narrative suggests, however, that the twelve, who were

²² Cf. Luke 5,19.

²³ See Mark 3,20-21 and 31-35 with 3,22-30; 5,21-24.35-43 with 5,25-34; 6,7-13 and 6,30 with 6,14-29; 11,12-14 and 11,20-25 with 11,15-19; 14,1-2 and 14,10-11 with 11,3-9; 14,53-54 and 66-72, with 14,55-65.

²⁴ = 3,19b in NRSV.

²⁵ See Mark 5,38; 7,17; 9,28.

μετ' αὐτοῦ,²⁶ also went to his home: "so that they (αὐτοῦς) could not even eat". This domestic detail continues the motif of Jesus' presence at home.²⁷ Jesus' home is not, however, a place of solitude. The crowds invade the privacy of Jesus. Jesus' presence at home attracts the crowds. This motif had already been found in 2,1-2, as Mark invites the reader to recall by means of his use of a resumptive πάλιν in 3,20. Thus there is narrative consistency between the transitional 3,20 and other Markan uses of the domestic motif.

The similarity between Mark's transitional 3,20 and 2,1-2 suggests that the home of 3,20 is Jesus' home in Capernaum. In neither instance, however, does the evangelist actually state that Jesus had a home in Capernaum. The Markan narrative suggests, nonetheless, that the home of 2,1 and 3,20 is a seaside home,²⁸ therefore presumably located in Capernaum-by-the-sea. Matthew's redaction of the cure of the paralytic certainly locates the setting of the story in Jesus' home town (Matt 9,1). Again in 9,33 Mark relates that Jesus entered into a home in Capernaum.

Mark uses the mention of Jesus' presence at home in 3,20 as a transitional verse. The verse can serve as a transitional element in the present essay, since it brings to completion those passages in which the house - οἰκία in 1,29; 2,15; 7,24; 9,33; and 14,3; οἶκος in 2,1; 3,20; 5,38; 7:17; and 9,28 - serves as a setting for various scenes in the Markan narrative.

1.6 "Going Home"

There are a number of passages in which a house otherwise figures in the Markan story. The mention of the crowds being sent home in 8,3 is simply a narrative detail, intended to highlight the seriousness of the situation. In four other pericopes, however, going home or being sent home is an important element in a miracle story. The motif serves to establish the effectiveness of Jesus' miraculous activity. Jesus tells the paralytic (2,11) and the Gerasene demoniac (5,19) to go home. The blind man whom Jesus met as he came to Bethsaida was sent home (8,26). In these instances the ability to go home serves to demonstrate the effectiveness of the miracle. On the other hand, the Syrophenician woman went home (7,30). There she discovered that her daughter had been healed from afar by Jesus.

²⁶ Cf. 3,14.

²⁷ Cf. Mark 2,1,4.

²⁸ See Mark 2,13; 4,1.

Within these four miracle stories, Jesus' command to go home, addressed to the sometime possessed man at Gerasa is particularly important. It constitutes the first part of the commission which the former demoniac received from Jesus: "Go home to your friends, and tell them how much the Lord has done for you, and what mercy he has shown you" (5,19). The liberated man responds eagerly: "And he went away and began to proclaim in the Decapolis how much Jesus had done for him; and everyone was amazed" (5,20).

The healing of the demoniac in the region of the Gerasenes was a borderline experience. In crossing the sea, Jesus crossed traditional limits; he went "beyond the sea". The sea was a barrier which Jesus easily crossed.²⁹ The exorcism is located on the other side of the sea and in the country of the Gerasenes. The geographic duality of Mark's setting of the scene clearly betrays the hand of the evangelist at work.

Once cured, the demoniac wishes to be with Jesus (ὅτι μετ' αὐτοῦ ἦ), that is, to join the company of the twelve.³⁰ Jesus does not allow him to do so. Rather he sends away the man who has experienced his presence and power, with the command that he tell his own folks (τοὺς σοῦς) how much the Lord had done and how he had mercy. This double description of what the former demoniac is commanded to announce is characteristically Markan. In fact, both clauses describe but a single reality.³¹ The καί which joins them together is an exegetical καί. What the Lord had done for the demoniac was, in fact, an act of mercy.

The pair of verses (VV. 19-20) describes the commissioning of a missionary and as well as the fact that the one who has been commissioned does what he has been told.³² He had been told to make an announcement (ἀπαγγέλλω)³³ and he did it. The sometime demoniac preached about the deeds of the Lord Jesus in the Decapolis, before Jesus himself preached in that region (7,31).³⁴ His proclamation anticipates the presence of Jesus; he goes before the way of the

²⁹ Cf. Malbon, *Narrative Space*, 77.100.

³⁰ Cf. Mark 3,14.

³¹ Neiryck considers them to be synonymous expressions. See *Neiryck*, *Duality*, 103.

³² Neiryck considers the command-fulfillment schema as yet another expression of Markan duality. See *Neiryck*, *Duality*, 119-121.

³³ See 5,14 and 6,30. Cf. 16,10.13.

³⁴ Cf. Malbon, *Narrative Space*, 27. One should note that 5,20 and 7,31 are the only two passages in which the Decapolis figures in Mark's narrative.

Lord. In fulfilling his mission the missionary has implicitly identified Jesus as Lord. He had been told to announce what the Lord had done (V. 19); he announced what Jesus had done (V. 20). Response to his proclamation was enthusiastic: everyone was amazed.

It was "at home" (εἰς τὸν οἶκον, 5,19) that the once and sometime demoniac preached to his own.³⁵ It was there that the news of the Lord's having mercy was announced to the people. Thus, the house of the Gerasene demoniac appears as a locus of evangelization. In this respect the Gerasene's house (οἶκος), as a motif in missionary discourse, has a function similar to the house (οἰκία 6,10) in Mark's narrative of the commissioning of the twelve, that is, the Markan missionary discourse (6,6b-13). Jesus tells the twelve, prototypical apostles that they were,³⁶ "Wherever you enter the house, stay there until you leave the place". Jesus entered houses in order to do his ministry and instruct his disciples, the twelve were commanded and expected to do likewise.

1.7 *The House in Missionary Discourse*

The house is, in fact, a significant motif in missionary discourse - and not only because the house is a locus of evangelization. The house, wherein the apostle preaches, normally stands in contrast with the house from which the apostle has come. Two significant passages in Mark's gospel bear this out. The one is a logion on the prophet, found in all four gospels.³⁷ Its Markan version is, "Prophets are not without honor, except in their hometown, and among their own kin, and in their own house" (Mark 6,4). The other saying is a formal logion which the Markan Jesus addresses to a skeptical Peter, "Truly I tell you, there is no one who has left house (οἰκία) or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or fields, for my sake and for the sake of the good news, who will not receive a hundredfold now in this age - houses (οἰκία), brothers and sisters, mothers and children, and fields with persecutions - and in the age to come eternal life" (10,29-30).

³⁵ Neiryneck considers εἰς τὸν οἶκον and πρὸς τοὺς σοῦς as another example of Markan duality. See *Neiryneck*, Duality, 94.

³⁶ See Mark 3,14, where the preferable reading of the text includes Jesus naming the twelve as apostles.

³⁷ Matt 13,57; Mark 6,4; Luke 4,24; John 4,44. Cf. *G.Thom.* 31. On the Johannine version of the logion, see *R.F. Collins*, *These Things Have Been Written*. Studies on the Fourth Gospel (Louvain Theological and Pastoral Monographs, 2), Louvain-Grand Rapids 1990, 141-143.

Mention of the gospel in the protasis and of persecutions in the apodosis indicates the use made of this traditional logion in Christian missionary circles.³⁸ Otherwise the saying may well be Jesuanic in its core. The Palestinian setting, the radicalism of wandering discipleship, the almost physical nature of the reward in this life, and the eschatological nuance characterize it as a traditional saying. Radical discipleship demands leaving one's home; but new homes are to be created for those who follow Jesus. New kinship ties are to replace those left behind. The missionary has left one house, his house of origin, but will enter into many houses where he will find himself at home, in the presence of many brothers and sisters.

1.8 *The House in other Discourse Material*

In Mark's gospel Jesus also speaks about a house (οἰκία) in two parables, each of which has some eschatological significance. In the saying of 3,26-27,³⁹ a thrice-mentioned house serves as a metaphor for the kingdom of Satan. In a Markan parable which grounds an exhortation to eschatological vigilance, the Parousia is likened to a householder who returns from a journey at an unexpected hour (13,34-36). The reference to the slaves (δούλοι) is clearly an allusion to the disciples.⁴⁰ The "master of the house" (ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας) is a not so veiled reference to the Parousiac Lord, who shall return after some delay.

Five additional references to a house appear in Mark's discourse material (οἰκία, in 12,40 and 13,15; οἶκος in 2,26 and 11,17 [2x]). These mentions of the house are not as significant for the present course of inquiry as are the above-mentioned use of this vocabulary, but they must be cited for completeness' sake. In Mark's eschatological discourse, reference to a house provides a graphic detail which lends immediacy to the speech: "the one on the housetop must not go down or enter the house to take anything away" (13,15). The warning against the scribes in 12,38-40 includes, as part of the description of their deviant behavior that, "they devour widows' houses". The citation of Isa 56,7 in 11, 17 provides

³⁸ See R. Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium*, II (HThK, 2/2), Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1977, 145; E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her. A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*, New York 1983, 147.

³⁹ Some authors suggest that this saying is rooted in the Q tradition. See, for example, R. Syy, *Jesus and the Unclean Spirit: The Literary Relation Between Mark and Q in the Beelzebul Controversy (Mark 3:20-30 par)*, in: *Louvain Studies* 17 (1992) 166-180, 170-174.

⁴⁰ Cf. Pesch, *Mk II*, 315.

Mark with two uses of $\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ in which the noun designates the temple at Jerusalem, "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations" (11,17). Previously, reference to the biblical story about David's eating the bread of Presence⁴¹ had allowed the Markan Jesus to call the Jerusalem temple "the house of God" (2,26).

1.9 Conclusion

This rapid overview of Mark's use of $\alpha\iota\kappa\iota\alpha$ - $\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ vocabulary confirms the initial suggestion that the "house" is not an insignificant feature in the Markan narrative. It serves an important narrative function insofar as it provides a significant setting for Mark's story. Use of the motif is, moreover, an important element in the rhetorical appeal of the Markan Jesus. By means of the house motif, with its concomitant kinship themes, Mark enables his Jesus to discourse in such a way that his message intersects with the real lives of those to whom he is speaking. It reaches them at home, as it were.

When the Markan story is read with due attention paid to the social circumstances of its composition, it is clear that his narrative reflects the social organization of the Christian communities of his time.⁴² The home was a locus of evangelization.⁴³ The house church was the basic unit of ecclesial organization. It was at home that Christians were catechized. There it was that the eucharist was celebrated. There it was that they experienced the powerful presence of the Lord. There they discussed the meaning of his life and teaching. There they awaited his return as Lord.

In this regard it is interesting to note that classic form criticism had long ago drawn attention to the Christian gathering, over and against early Christian missionary activity, as the most likely Sitz-im-Leben of the miracle story.⁴⁴ With their emphasis on the power of the thaumaturge, these stories have a (low) christological emphasis. Nonetheless, their point is that the power of Jesus, the divi-

⁴¹ See 1 Sam 21,1-7.

⁴² See R.F. Collins, *Small Groups: An Experience of Church*, in: *Louvain Studies* 13 (1988) 109-136, esp. 109-115.

⁴³ See W. Vogler, *Die Bedeutung der urchristlichen Hausgemeinde für die Ausbreitung des Evangeliums*, in: *TLZ* 107 (1982) 785-792.

⁴⁴ See, for example, M. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, Tübingen 1966, 90-91. Substantially this material is contained in an earlier English-language translation of the work: *From Tradition to Gospel*, New York n.d., 93-95.

nely-empowered thaumaturge, continues to live within the narrow circle of his disciples.

This social situation of the church in the decades immediately following upon the death and resurrection of Jesus contributes to the "engaged" character of the Markan story of Jesus and his disciples. This is quite clear in the parable of Mark 13,34-35, to which the exhortation on vigilance is appended. It was in a home that Christians gathered. There they rehearsed their awaiting of Jesus as Lord. There they could identify themselves as servants of this same Lord and as brother and sister to one another. With Gerd Theissen,⁴⁵ one might suggest that the sympathetic families of Simon and Andrew (1,29) and of Simon the Leper (14,3) might each have been the nucleus of a later local community, the church at home.

Mark portrays Jesus discussing the meaning of his teaching at home (2,15; 7,17; 9,33; 10,10; cf. 4,10; 7,17). To a great degree Mark's description reflects the situation of the Christians of his day who were engaged in discussing the meaning of Jesus' teaching when they came together at home. It was at home that they prayed and learned about prayer (9,29). It was there that they learned about living in a manner that was in keeping with the Jesus tradition (10,10). Those in need had experienced the powerful presence of Jesus at home (1,29; 2,1; 5,38; 7,24), just as the Christians of Mark's day experienced the powerful presence of Jesus at home. At home one could experience the power of Jesus (7,30), even when Jesus was somehow absent.

Evangelizers like Paul left their homes (cf. 10,29), and were received into other homes (6,30), where they were to find brothers and sisters (10,30). It was from the home and in the home that the word was spoken, a word that was so powerful that it could not be restricted to a single home (2,1-2). First century Christians might even have had the impression that, as they waited for the return of their eschatological Lord, the master of the house, the whole world was looking at and listening to what was happening in the Christian home.

⁴⁵ See *G. Theissen, Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity*, Philadelphia 1978, 17.

2. Matthew

2.1 Introduction

Mark first introduced the motif of the home into his narrative when he described Jesus entering the house of Simon and Andrew in the company of James and John (1,29). From the perspective afforded by the hypothesis of Matthean dependence on Mark, it is interesting to note that Matthew's account of the cure of Simon's mother-in-law (Matt 8,14-15) is somewhat different from that of his Markan *Vorlage*. Since Matthew's style of narrating the miracle tales is somewhat more succinct than that of Mark, it comes as no surprise that Mark's short tale is shorter still in Matthew. Matthew has omitted from the setting of the story not only the departure from the synagogue, rendered inappropriate by the just completed long discourse on the mountain, but also mention of the presence of Andrew, James and John.

The focus of the Matthean story is clearly on Jesus and Peter. The evangelist accentuates the person and role of Jesus in various ways, that is, by introducing the proper name of Jesus, by changing the number of the verb of motion from the plural to the singular, and by identifying Jesus as the one who saw that the mother-in-law was sick.⁴⁶ By writing that "Jesus entered Peter's house" (8,14) the evangelist accentuates the person and role of Peter. Peter is the only disciple cited by name in the little pericope.⁴⁷ He is identified as "Peter", that is, by the symbolic name which will later be given to him. As the evangelist tells his story, he anticipates the changing of Simon's name, whose significance will be explored in 16,18.

Matthew's way of dealing with Mark's first mention of the house that Jesus entered may provide a clue for understanding Matthew's possible transformation of the house motif. In fact, although *οἰκία-οἶκος* vocabulary appears in Matthew about as often as it occurs in Mark - *οἰκία* twenty-six times⁴⁸ as compared with Mark's eighteen, *οἶκος* nine times as compared with Mark's thirteen,

⁴⁶ Cf. Mark 1,29-31, where the entire group enters the house and where they tell Jesus' about the woman's illness.

⁴⁷ See A.J. Nau, *Peter in Matthew. Discipleship, Diplomacy, and Dispraise ... with an Assessment of Power and Privilege in the Petrine Office* (Good News Studies, 36), Collegeville 1992, 72.

⁴⁸ See Matt 2,11; 5,15; 7,24.25.26.27; 8,6.14; 9,10.23.28; 10,12.13.14; 12,25.29 (2x); 13,1.36.57; 17,25; 19,29; 23,13; 24,17.43; 26,6.

thus, thirty-five uses of *οἰκία-οἶκος* as compared with Mark's thirty-one uses of these terms - Matthew uses the motif in a different way. An initial impression of this difference is to be gleaned from Matthew's redaction of the Markan passages in which *οἰκία-οἶκος* vocabulary appears.

2.2 *The House as a Narrative Setting*

As far as those Markan passages where a house serves as a narrative setting for Jesus' significant activity are concerned, Matthew has retained the house of Simon the leper (26,6) as a setting for the story of Jesus' anointing. The cure of the mother-in-law takes place in Peter's house (8,14). The discourse on Jesus' mission no longer takes place in a house identified as belonging to Levi; rather it takes place simply in "the house" (9,10).⁴⁹ The narrative flow of Matthew's story implies that this house is not Levi's house; it would appear to be some other house, perhaps Jesus' own. Matthew places the raising of Jairus' daughter in a house (9,23). This house is not identified, as in Mark, as the house of the leader of the synagogue (*ἀρχισυνάγωγος*); rather it is the house of the leader (*ἄρχων*). The revised phraseology may stem from Matthew's own on-going argument with the scribes and Pharisees, who epitomize evil in his account.

On the other hand, Jesus' dialogue with the Canaanite woman is not situated in a home, nor is she told to go home, there to find her healed daughter (15,21-28; cf. Mark 7,24-30). Matthew has, nonetheless, intercalated into the latter scene a mission statement which includes the mention of a house, namely, "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (15,24).

Matthew's tendency to delete references to the house from his settings is even more pronounced when we look at Matthew's redaction of those Markan texts in which Jesus addressed significant discourse to his disciples in the context of a house. Mark locates the interpretation of the parable on defilement in the house, "When he left the crowd and entered the house, his disciples asked him about the parable" (Mark 7,17). Matthew has deleted the reference to the house. In the Matthean setting the disciples solemnly approach Jesus, "then the disciples approached (*προσελθόντες*) and said to him, 'Do you know that the Phari-

⁴⁹ On the change of name from Levi to Matthew, see *R. Pesch, Levi-Matthäus (Mc. 2.14/Mt. 9.9; 10.3): Ein Beitrag zur Lösung eines alten Problems*, in: *ZNW* 59 (1968) 40-56. The change of name may have contributed to Matthew's variant rendering of the house setting in 9,10.

sees took offense when they heard what you said" (15,12). The evangelist reserves to Peter, however, the role of inquisitive spokesperson (V. 15).

A similarly solemn approach to Jesus on the part of the disciples⁵⁰ introduces Matthew's version of the instruction on true greatness: "At that time the disciples came (προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταί) to Jesus and asked, ... " (18,1). With this as his introduction Matthew has completely eliminated Mark's description of Jesus taking the initiative in instructing his disciples as well as the location of the scene in a house at Capernaum (Mark 9,33).

In place of Mark's "Then in the house the disciples asked him again about this matter" (Mark 10,10), Matthew has "His disciples said to him" (19,10). Similar structural, thematic and linguistic features show the dependence of Matt 19,3-12 on Mark 10,2-12, but Matthew has eliminated the domestic setting for the disciples' further investigation of the matter at hand, that is, the discussion on divorce.

Reference to the house is likewise omitted from Matthew's instructional appendix to the story of Jesus' healing a boy possessed by a spirit. Whereas Mark 9,28 had read, "When he had entered the house, his disciples asked him privately ...", Matt 17,19 reads: "Then the disciples came to Jesus privately and said... (τότε προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταί τῷ Ἰησοῦ κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπον). Matthew's emendation of the Markan text retains the Markan οἱ μαθηταί ... κατ' ἰδίαν, but the domestic setting for the dialogue has disappeared in favor of Matthew's typical solemn approach (προσελθόντες)⁵¹ of the disciples to Jesus.

In 17,19 (cf. Mark 3,28) Matthew has deleted the house from the setting of the discussion on exorcism and prayer. He has, nonetheless, retained the Markan theme of privacy. By his editorial omission of the house in 17,19 Matthew has effectively served to eliminate the house as a metaphor for Jesus' intimacy with his disciples in his gospel. With the omission of Mark 7,24 from the story about the Syrophenecian, he has also eliminated another passage in which the symbolism of the house was patent.

⁵⁰ Wilkins notes that this is an example (see also 15,23; 16,25; 17,6, 13; 19,10) of Matthew adding unique material containing the term μαθητής which is not found in his sources. See *M.J. Wilkins, The Concept of Disciple in Matthew's Gospel as Reflected in the Use of the Term μαθητής* (NovTestSuppl, 59), Leiden 1988, 133.

⁵¹ Mark had used a more simple form of the verb. Mark's singular number of the participle places the emphasis on Jesus' entrance rather than on the disciples' approach, as is the case in Matthew.

Matthew's retention of the privacy motif at 17,19 contrasts with the elimination of the privacy theme from his introduction to the pericope which offers the reason for Jesus speaking in parables. Whereas Mark 4,10 provided a setting in which Jesus was alone (*κατὰ μόνους*) when the disciples came to ask about his parabolic language, Matt 13,10 again offers a scene which features the disciples' solemn approach: "Then the disciples came (*προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταί*) and asked ...".

Early in his narrative Mark (Mark 2,1-12) set the story of the healing of the paralytic at home (*ἐν οἴκῳ*), that is, in a house which he locates in Capernaum. Without naming the city, Matthew locates the scene in Jesus' "own town" (*εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν*, 9,1), but does not specifically mention a house even though the narrative detail of the story requires the reader to place the scene in a house.

The seemingly innocent reference to the house (*οἶκος*) in Mark 3,20 reflects much of that evangelist's thoughts relative to the use of the house motif. The short pericope in which it is contained (Mark 3,20-21), one which describes the people's reaction to Jesus, has been completely removed from Matthew's revision of the Markan text.

In sum, whereas the house (*οἰκία-οἶκος*) is a significant narrative motif in the Markan gospel, its function in Matthew's account is clearly less significant. In Mark the house functions as a place for the manifestation of Jesus' compassionate power. It is a place of intimacy between Jesus and his disciples and a privileged locus for his activity as their teacher. Matthew has retained the house as the locale for the cure of Peter's mother-in-law and for the raising of the daughter of Jairus, and preserves the mention of a house as the narrative setting for Jesus' discourse with Matthew the tax collector and with Simon the Leper. Otherwise, the house has virtually disappeared as a setting for scenes in Matthew's narrative. Specifically, one must note that Matthew has radically eliminated the house as the locale for Jesus' particular instruction of his disciples. On the other hand, Matthew has often replaced Mark's house motif with a scene wherein the disciples formally approach Jesus and discourse with him.

2.3 "Going Home"

What has Matthew, the redactor, done with the Markan discourse material wherein Jesus speaks about a house?

What he has done with Mark's "go home" motif (Mark 2,11; 5,19; 7,30; 8,3, 26) is striking. The Markan Jesus commands the paralytic to go home (2,11). Matthew retains the command (9,6),⁵² but underscores the reality of the miracle by stating that the paralytic did, in fact, go home (9,7). Mark had left the fulfillment of the command to the readers' imagination. Matthew's use of the command-fulfillment schema not only brings the miracle story to a neat conclusion, it also recalls the divine authority implicit in the command and human responsiveness to that authority.⁵³ On the other hand, and insofar as the use of the house motif is concerned, it has simply been imbedded within the miracle story schema.

In addition, Matthew has eliminated any mention of the Canaanite woman going home (15,28; cf. Mark 7,30). The proof element within his version of the miracle story has been reduced to a laconic, "and her daughter was healed instantly". By omitting the story of the cure of the blind man (Mark 8,22-26), Matthew has also incidentally omitted the command to go home which Jesus addressed to the once blind man (Mark 8,26). From the public soliloquy with which the feeding story begins (15,32; cf. Mark 8,3), Matthew has also eliminated the mention of the homes of the four thousand.

Matthew's most striking omission of Mark's "go home" motif is undoubtedly the command given to the Gerasene demoniac to "Go home to your friends, and tell them how much the Lord has done for you, and what mercy he has shown you" (Mark 5,19). Arguably this omission may stem from Matthew's notion that Jesus' ministry is to the lost sheep of the house of Israel and that his disciples are to exercise a similar mission during his lifetime (15,25; 10,6). Not only does the once possessed man not proclaim Jesus to be Lord in the Decapolis (Mark 5,20), but the Matthean Jesus does not enter the Decapolis.⁵⁴ The activity which Mark locates in the Decapolis is placed on the mountain by Matthew (Matt 15,29-31; cf. Mark 7,31-37). By eliminating Jesus' command to the demoniac, Matthew has eliminated a command that the proclamation of the good news be made outside of Israel. He has also deleted a privileged passage wherein the home is a setting for the announcement of the Lord's mercy.

⁵² With editorial emendation of the first part of the command.

⁵³ Cf. Matt 1,21-22.25-26.

⁵⁴ Cf. Matt 4,25.

2.4 *The House as a Motif in Discourse*

When we look at Matthew's rendition of the discourse material in which the Markan Jesus used *οἰκία-οἶκος* vocabulary, we find that Matthew continues to alter the house tradition.

2.4.1 This is apparent in the three Markan missionary passages in which the house figures as a significant motif (Mark 6,4,10; 10,29-30). In his extended missionary discourse (Ch. 10), Matthew has radically reworked the Markan logion, "Wherever you enter a house, stay there until you leave the place" (Mark 6,10). In its stead, Matthew has "Whatever town or village you enter, find out who in it is worthy, and stay there until you leave" (10,11). Matthew's version of the logion betrays his ethical interest, but he has also shifted the missionaries' venue to a town or village (*πόλιν ἢ κώμην*), in a way similar to that in which he located the cure of the paralytic in a town rather than a home (9,1). With respect to the narrative of that cure (9,1-8), Matthew has even eliminated the homey detail of the bearers going through the roof so as to provide the paralytic with access to Jesus (cf. Mark 2,4; Luke 3,19). In Matthew's gospel the house no longer functions as a barrier as it does in Mark.⁵⁵

Having transformed the Markan missionary logion (10,11; par. Mark 6,10), Matthew expatiates on entrance into the town with a reflection on entrance into the house: "As you enter the house (*οἰκία*), greet it. If the house is worthy, let your peace come upon it; but if it is not worthy, let your peace return to you" (10,12-13). Matthew's ethical interests are apparent in this redactional insertion into the Markan material. Since Matthew has written about both the town and the house, his editorial work allows him to expand on Mark 6,11 by an editorial explanation of when it is appropriate to shake the dust from one's feet, namely, "as you leave that house or town" (10,14). The addition reflects Matthew's redactional interplay of town and house.

The two other Markan missionary logia in which the house motif occurs are also transformed by Matthew, albeit not as radically. From Mark's "prophets are not without honor, except in their hometown, and among their own kin, and in their own house" (Mark 6,4), Matthew has deleted "and among their own kin"

⁵⁵ In his redaction of the Markan tale of the cure of the paralytic, Matthew has also eliminated Mark 2,2, with its mention of the people who could not find room, not even at the door.

(13,57). In comparison with this minor revision, Matthew's version of the logion on wandering discipleship (19,29) has been substantially altered.

Mark had solemnly introduced "there is no one who has left house or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or fields, for my sake and for the sake of the good news, who will not receive a hundredfold now in this age - houses, brothers and sisters, mothers and children, and fields with persecutions - and in the age to come eternal life" (Mark 10,29-30). Matthew has otherwise situated the solemn introductory lemma,⁵⁶ trivialized the motif of leaving home, and, in his simplification, deleted the reference to "houses" from Mark 10,30. Matthew's version of the logion is "everyone who has left houses or brothers or sisters or father or mother or children or fields, for my name's sake, will receive a hundredfold, and will inherit eternal life" (19,29). By substituting a plural οἰκίας for Mark's singular οἰκίαν, Matthew has transformed the motif from that of leaving home to that of abandoning one's possessions. Redaction-critical analysis of Matthew's gospel has led several commentators to suggest that at least some members of the Matthean community were relatively affluent.⁵⁷ By his use of a plural οἰκίας, Matthew may be reflecting the social situation of the community for which he was writing. In any case, Matthew's emendation of the logion substantially alters the leaving home motif found in Mark. He has abandoned the notion of a missionary leaving his home of origin in order to embrace another or other households.

2.4.2 Mark also used the home motif in two parables whose perspective is that of the kingdom to come, the parable of the strong man's house (Mark 3,24-27) and the parable of the man going on the journey (Mark 13,34-37). Matthew's narrative does not contain the latter parable.⁵⁸ Its exhortation on vigilance, "Therefore, keep awake - for you do not know when the master of the house will come, in the evening, or at midnight, or at cockcrow, or at dawn" (Mark 13,37) has been adopted and adapted by Matthew who has used it as the first of a series of logia on vigilance, which is appended to the parable of Noah and the flood (24,42). In Matthew's syncopated version of Mark 13,37 the "master of the

⁵⁶ Matthew has inserted the logion on judgment (19,28) immediately after the ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν lemma, thereby removing its function as an enhancement of the logion on radical discipleship (cf. Mark 10,29-30).

⁵⁷ Compare Matt 10,9 with Mark 6,8 (cf. Luke 6,3).

⁵⁸ There are, however, similarities between Mark 13,34 and the Matthean setting (25,14-15) of the parable of the talents which Matthew has taken from the Q source (Matt 25,14-30; Luke 19,11-17).

house" (ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας) has been replaced by "your Lord" (ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν): "Keep awake therefore, for you do not know on what day your Lord is coming". By means of this editorial emendation, Matthew has accentuated the vision of Jesus as Lord, but he has effectively eliminated the image of the householder as a powerful metaphor of the parousiac Lord.

The logion of Matt 24,42 is followed by the Q logion on the thief in the night (24,43-44; cf. Luke 12,39-40). In this eschatological warning, Matthew's Jesus speaks about an owner of the house (οἰκοδεσπότης) who, had he known, "would not have let his house (οἰκία) be broken into" (Matt 24,43; cf. Luke 12,39). Matthew has carefully crafted his discourses. As often as not, they are composites of material coming from different sources.⁵⁹ This is certainly true of Matt 24,37-44, where the evangelist makes use of Q material (VV. 37-41; cf. Luke 17,26-36), Mark (V. 42),⁶⁰ and more Q material (VV. 42-44; cf. Luke 12,39-40). "House" serves as a catchword linking together the latter two units of this disparate material.

The Q logion on the thief in the night is not without some parallel with the logion on the strong man (12,29-30).⁶¹ Matthew has taken over the logion on the strong man from his Markan source (12,25-30; cf. Mark 3,23-27). The rhetorical question and consequent reflection in 12,29 retains Mark's two references to the house. Matthew's initial rhetorical question and his setting of the scene differ from that of Mark (12,25-26; cf. Mark 3,23-26). Unlike Mark, Matthew does not identify the discourse as a parable.⁶² He has, moreover, modified the Markan phrase on the division of Satan so that it has become a saying on the division of Satan's kingdom. For our purposes it is significant to note that, whereas Mark contained a conditional sentence, the protasis and apodosis of which respectively speak of a house divided and a house standing, Matthew has a gnomic statement which affirms that "no city or house divided against itself will stand" (12,25). Once again Matthew has introduced the πόλις into his story. He has underscored the importance of unity for the city and for the house.

⁵⁹ Cf. *Collins*, *Divorce*, 153-154.

⁶⁰ This verse has not been taken over by Luke.

⁶¹ Cf. Mark 3,27; Luke 11,21-22. In the Lukan version of the logion the house has become a palace (αὐλήν).

⁶² This may be due to the compulsiveness with which Matthew treats of his themes. In Matthew's gospel, Jesus' discourse in parables is to be found in 13,3-53.

The πόλις also occurs in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount,⁶³ which Matthew has composed on the basis of materials coming from different sources, all of which he has carefully crafted into a coherent unit. In the passage on the light of the world (5,14-16), Matthew has introduced a Markan *marshal*, in the form of a rhetorical question (Mark 4,21), into a unit which is largely of his own making. Matthew characterizes Mark's lamp as giving light to "all in the house (πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ; 5,15). The phrase is absent from Mark - and from Luke! - but it contributes to the formation of a nice parallelism between the house and the city, to which Matthew, redactor, has made reference in 5,14.

2.4.3 As we look at the Matthean redaction of those passages in the Markan story in which the earlier evangelist has used οἰκία-οἶκος vocabulary, we should, for completeness' sake also consider the Matthean redaction of Mark 12,40 and 13,15 as well as Mark's reference to the temple as the house of God in 2,26 and 11,17. Mark's reference to the scribes' devouring the houses of widows is found only in the form of a textual variant in the series of woes directed to the scribes and Pharisees (23,14).⁶⁴ On the other hand, the homey detail about someone taking things from the house at the time of the eschatological crisis is retained by Matthew (24,17; cf. Mark 13:15). Matthew has also retained the Markan references to the temple as the house of God (12,4, cf. Mark 2,26; 21,13, cf. Mark 11,17), although he has dropped from the biblical catena at 21,13 the Isaian and Markan reference to the house of God as a house of prayer "for all the nations".

2.4.5 This rapid survey of the Matthean redaction of the discourse material in Mark in which οἰκία-οἶκος vocabulary appears confirms the impression that one gains from looking at the Matthean redaction of the Markan narrative material. To a large extent Matthew has eliminated the motif of the house from his version of the Markan discourse material. Matthew has, moreover, modified some of that discourse material in such a way that Mark's vocabulary is maintained, but the theme of the house has been changed. In particular, one might note Matthew's tendency to overshadow Mark's house by reference to the city (πόλις), a redactional procedure akin to Matthew's replacement of Mark's house as a setting for his narrative with a scenario in which the disciples solemnly approach Jesus, their teacher and Lord.

⁶³ See 5, 14 and 5,35, where Jerusalem is identified as the city of the great king.

⁶⁴ "That ver. 14 is an interpolation derived from the parallel in Mk 12,40 or Lk 20.47 is clear", writes *B.M. Metzger*, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, London-New York 1971, 60.

2.5 *Unprecedented Appearances of the House in Narrative Settings*

Our survey of Matthew's redaction of the Markan *Vorlage* has thus far allowed us to pass in review sixteen of Matthew's twenty-six⁶⁵ uses of οἰκία and four of his nine uses of οἶκος. Let us now examine those passages of Matthew's gospel in which the οἰκία-οἶκος vocabulary appears without its having been in Matthew's Markan source.

2.5.1 A first series of passages consists of those pericopes in which Matthew introduces a house into his narrative setting (2,11; 13,1, 36; 9,28). In 2,11 Matthew informs his readers that, "on entering the house", the wise men from the East saw the child with Mary his mother and that there they knelt down and paid him homage.

2.5.2 In 13,1 Matthew introduces the sermon on parables with his own narrative setting, "That same day Jesus went out of the house and sat beside the sea". At this point in his narrative Matthew has thoroughly reworked the settings of his Markan source (Mark 4,1), which did not make reference to a house. Just prior to beginning the Sermon in Parables, Matthew had indicated (12,46.47) that Jesus' mother and brothers were standing "outside". In this way Matthew suggested, but did not explicitly affirm, that Jesus was in a house. Unlike his Markan source (Mark 3,20) Matthew had not mentioned Jesus' entrance into a house. In 13,1, nonetheless, the evangelist makes explicit the implications of his borrowing of Mark 3,31-35 as a source of 12,46-50 by citing Jesus' exit from the house. The house in question is presumably the house at Capernaum,⁶⁶ but Matthew does not explicitly say so.

That Jesus is sitting and in a boat⁶⁷ beside the sea (13,1-2) while delivering the first part of the sermon in parables serves to underscore the fact that Jesus is not in the house as he speaks. His presence outside of the house draws the crowds like a magnet.⁶⁸ Interestingly, while "sitting" is the normal posture of the teaching rabbi, Matthew has deleted Mark's reference to Jesus' "teaching" in pa-

⁶⁵ That is, if the variant reading at 13,14 is included.

⁶⁶ See Matt 4,13; 9,10.28.

⁶⁷ Gnllka's Seekanzel. See *J. Gnllka, Das Matthäusevangelium, I* (HThK, 1/1), Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1986, 477.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

rables (Mark 4,1). Apparently Matthew reserves the idea of teaching to the explanation of the law.⁶⁹

2.5.3 After Jesus had expounded four parables to the crowds, he left the crowds and entered the house (13,36), where the disciples asked him for an explanation of the second parable, the parable of the wheat and the tares: "Then he left the crowds and went into the house. And his disciples approached him, saying, 'Explain to us the parable of the weeds in the fields'".

Matthew's redactional hand is apparent throughout the entire pericope of the explanation of the parable of the wheat and the tares.⁷⁰ It is also quite visible in the actual setting of the scene. Matthew's use of the house as a locus for Jesus' separation from the crowd and his intimate presence with the disciples seems to have a Markan ring.⁷¹ He appears to have borrowed the motif from Mark 7,17, where the disciples ask Jesus about the parable on defilement. In addition to transposing the verse from its location in the Markan sequence,⁷² Matthew has emended it in various fashions. For our purposes, two emendations are most noteworthy. First, Matthew has introduced the characteristic solemn approach of the disciples to Jesus (προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ). Secondly, the disciples, as good pupils, ask for an explanation. Their asking for an explanation⁷³ separates them from the crowds. By asking, they show that they have begun to understand the meaning of what Jesus had said.

⁶⁹ See *J. Lambrecht*, *Out of the Treasure. The Parables in the Gospel of Matthew* (Louvain Theological and Pastoral Monographs, 10), Louvain-Grand Rapids 1992, 156.

⁷⁰ See *J. Jeremias*, *The Parables of Jesus*, New York ²1972, 82-84.

⁷¹ Apropos the house setting of 13,36, Gnilka has noted that the house is the locus of community catechesis. See *Gnilka*, *Mt I*, 500.

⁷² Wilkins suggests that it is an expansion from Mark 4,34. See *Wilkins*, *Concept*, 146.

⁷³ In his reworking of Mark 7,17 *ad locum* (15,12), Matthew has deleted the reference to the house and introduced the solemn approach of the disciples. Matthew concludes his lengthy insertion (15,12b-15) into the Markan verse with Peter serving as spokesperson for the disciples and asking for an explanation of the parable (on defilement). In the New Testament the verb *φράζειν* is used only in Matt 13,36 and 15,15. Asking for an explanation is not the only function that Matthew attributes once to the disciples and at another time to Peter. See, for example, Matt 16,19 and 18,18, in reference to binding and loosing.

2.5.4 The story of the payment of the temple tax (17,24-27) comes from the Matthean Sondergut.⁷⁴ The pericope focuses on the role of Peter as someone who has learned from Jesus. The scene is set in Jesus' home in Capernaum:⁷⁵ "When they reached Capernaum ... and when he came home" (VV. 24-25). This last expression, literally, "into the house", implies that Jesus had a home in Capernaum. In 17,25, Jesus the teacher takes the initiative and singles out Peter for instruction. The subject matter for the instruction will, incidentally, continue to be an issue for the church of Matthew's day. Matthew's Peter, the number two hero of his story, had received domestic instruction on the topic.

2.5.5 In these two passages (13,36-53; 17,24-27) the disciples receive instruction from Jesus in the house. In Matt 9,28 the evangelist sets the healing of two blind men in the house. The narrative (9,27-31), which has no sequential parallel in Matthew's Markan source, seems to be a literary doublet of Matthew's story of Jesus' cure of two blind men on the roadside near Jericho (20,29-34). The latter story is Matthew's version of the cure of blind Bartimaeus (Mark 10,46-52), but Matthew has multiplied the number of blind men, obviating the mention of Bartimaeus by name.

The *Numeruswechsel* and the creation of the shorter literary doublet for 9,27-31 are most likely the result of Matthew's compositional theory. The evangelist seems to give evidence of an almost compulsive tendency to collect and organize as he tells his story of Jesus. Instruction for the disciples is found in chapters 5-7 and parables in chapter 13. The systematic collection of Jesus's miracles is located in chapters 8-9. The evangelist comments on these messianic works (τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 11,2) by means of a brief dialogue between the disciples of John (the Baptist) and Jesus (11,2-6). A short catena of passages from Isaiah (29,18; 35,5-6, 42,18; 26,19) is used to explain that the wonderful activities of Jesus are to be understood "according to the scriptures" (11,5).⁷⁶ This explanation generalizes what the reader of Matthew's gospel already knows from the evangelist's formulaic use of Isa 53,4 in 8,17.

⁷⁴ *Wilkins*, Concept, 199 describes it as the only Petrine passage which he classifies as unique Matthean material.

⁷⁵ *Gnilka* suggests that, since the setting is Capernaum, the evangelist is thinking about Peter's house. See *J. Gnilka*, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, II (HThK, 1/2), Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1986, 116 (cf. p. 114).

⁷⁶ See the κατὰ τὰς γραφάς of 1 Cor 15,3-4.

From the standpoint of his own compositional techniques, it was necessary for the evangelist to collate Jesus' miracles before applying to them the comprehensive scriptural apologetic found in 11,5. Thus a story of the cure of the blind was included in the collection of miracle stories (Matthew 8-9). Isa 29,18 speaks, however, of the eyes of the blind (plural) who shall see. In order to show that Jesus literally fulfilled the scriptural program, Matthew had to portray Jesus as healing more than a single blind person.⁷⁷ Hence the duplication of the blind men in 9,27-31. Matthew's own narrative consistency⁷⁸ then led to the introduction of a second blind man on the road near Jericho, whose Markan source (Mark 10,46-52) served as the *Vorlage* for both 20,29-34 and 9,27-31.

Matthew's redactional creation of 9,27-31 is set in the house: "When he entered the house, the blind men came to him; and Jesus said to them ..." (V. 28). Insofar as the focus is on Jesus' entering the home, the setting bears some similarity with Mark's language and theme. At this juncture in his narrative, Matthew has, moreover, been following the Markan sequence. The miracle story which Matthew has narrated just previously, namely, the raising of the daughter of Jairus was likewise located in a house, just as it was in Matthew's Markan source (9,23; cf. Mark 5,38). By placing the cure of the blind men in a house, Matthew provides a form of closure for this collection of miracles, which began with a house motif (8,8.14) and ends with a house motif (9,23.28). The house in which the blind men were cured provides, moreover, an isolated (or secret) setting for this otherwise unreported miracle story.

2.6 *Matthew's Use of Q*

2.6.1 A second series of passages in which *οἰκία-οἶκος* vocabulary appears in Matthew, but not in Mark, comprises discourse material taken over from Q, Matthew's second major source. The Q tradition's most significant speech about a house, "the house built upon the rock", is the final pericope (7,24-27) of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount. Luke has similarly placed this Q material at the

⁷⁷ Another interesting example of the Matthean Jesus' literal fulfillment of the scriptural program is to be found in 21,7, wherein Jesus is portrayed as riding into the city astride two animals (cf. Zech 9,9 as quoted in 21,5).

⁷⁸ Similar examples of Matthean consistency are to be found in 10,3 and 5,32. The identification of Matthew as a tax collector reflects the giving of Matthew to the tax collector featured in the vocation story of 9,9-13 (cf. Mark 2,13-17). Although the formulation is somewhat different, the exception clause of 5,32 is consistent with the exception clause in 19,9.

conclusion of his Sermon on the Plain (Luke 6,47-49). Each of these literary versions of the parable of the house mentions the house (*οικία*) four times. When Matthew's version is compared to that of Luke, however, it is clear that Matthew has sharpened the contrast between the two houses which appear in the parable and that he has accentuated the foundation of the house as the element which is of decisive importance in determining the fate of the structure.

By respectively qualifying the respective house-builders as a wise man and a foolish man Matthew has accentuated the contrast between the two parts of the logia. The wise person is one who builds a house upon rock, whereas a foolish individual builds a house on sand. The contrast between wise and foolish persons is a stock motif within the wisdom tradition but it does not appear in Luke's version of the Q logion.

A synoptic reading of the two versions of the saying allows Matthew's more sharply antithetical formulation of the material to come even more clearly into view:

Matt 7,24-27

Everyone then who hears these words of mine and acts on them will be like a wise man who built his house on rock. The rain fell, the floods came, and the winds blew and beat on that house, but it did not fall, because it had been founded on rock.

And everyone who hears these words of mine and does not act on them will be like a foolish man who built his house on sand. The rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat against that house, and it fell - and great was its fall.

Luke 6,47-49

I will show you what someone is like who comes to me, hears my words, and acts on them. That one is like a man building a house, who dug deeply and laid the foundation on rock; when a flood arose, the river burst against that house but could not shake it, because it had been well built.

But the one who hears and does not act is like a man who built a house on the ground without a foundation. When the river burst against it, immediately it fell, and great was the ruin of that house.

Space does not permit a complete analysis of the pericope, but it may prove useful to cite a few differential elements. For example, Matthew's version lacks the quasi-narrative introduction found in Luke, "I will show you what someone is like who comes to me".⁷⁹ Matthew's wording, with its systematic emphasis on "the fall": οὐκ ἔπεσεν, ἔπεσεν, ἢ πτώσις (as compared with Luke's οὐκ ἴσχυσεν

⁷⁹ For a comparative analysis of the Q material see *A. Polag, Fragmenta Q. Textheft zur Logienquelle, Neukirchen/Vluyn* ²1982, 38-39.

σαλευσαι, συνέπεσεν, τὸ ῥῆγμα), contrasts the result of the storm with much finer focus than does Luke's version. Moreover, Matthew's description of the calamity, with its apocalyptic tone, is verbally identical in both parts of the logion: "the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat against that house" (VV. 25.27).

In Matthew's more strictly antithetical presentation of the two parts of the logion there is an increased emphasis upon the foundation on which the house is built. Matthew's "who built his house on rock" is a more concise narrative formulation than is Luke's "building a house, who dug deeply and laid the foundation on rock". The brevity of Matthew's description is consistent with the general terseness of the Matthean text, but it is clear that it also draws a sharp contrast between the respective foundations of the houses in the two parts of the parable: there is a house built on rock and another built on sand. The Matthean contrast is much sharper than is the contrast found in the Lukan version of the logion.

Matthew's concise formulation also emphasizes the foundation "on rock" (ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν) in a way that is not found in Luke. That focus is further highlighted when Matthew describes the reason why the house was able to sustain the ravages of the storm. It was able to do so "because it had been founded on rock" (in comparison with Luke's "because it had been well built"). Matthew's concise formulation also allows for a sharp contrast to be drawn between the action of the wise man who built his house on rock and the foolish man who built his house on sand (ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον; in comparison with Luke's "on the ground without a foundation").

2.6.2 Minor differences between Matthew and Luke characterize the four one-liners which speak about a house and which Matthew has taken over from Q (11,8; 12,44; 23,38; 24,43). A Q logion on John the Baptist appears in 11,8, "Look, those who wear soft robes are in royal palaces (οἴκοις)". The clarifying οἴκοις is not present in the Lukan parallel (Luke 7,25), which otherwise evinces some differences from the Matthean version of the logion. In 12,44 the soliloquy attributed to the unclean spirit includes the reflection, "I will return to my house" (οἶκος), just as it does in the Lukan parallel (11,24).⁸⁰ In the lament over Jerusalem, the Matthean Jesus proclaims, "See, your house is left to you, desolate"

⁸⁰ There are several differences in the extant Greek versions of this saying which do not generally affect the translation of the verses into English.

(23,38),⁸¹ an allusion to Jer 22,5. In this traditional saying the house (οἶκος) is clearly a reference to the Jerusalem temple. Finally, and as has been previously noted, Matthew has inserted into his formal eschatological discourse a saying about an owner of the house who, had he known, "would not have let his house (οἰκία) be broken into" (Matt 24,43).

2.6.3 A house appears in another passage in which Matthew, the evangelist, works with his Q source. This is the story of the healing of the centurion's servant (8:5-13; cf. Luke 7,1-10), wherein Matthew, but not Luke, mentions that the servant is lying paralyzed "at home". That narrative detail may be inferred from 8,8 and may reflect a Matthean insight that Jesus acts from afar on behalf of Gentiles.⁸²

2.7 *A Different Kind of Missionary Saying*

2.7.1 The other two mentions of a house (οἶκος) in Matthew's gospel are mission statements. One pertains to the mission of Jesus (15,24), the other to the mission of the twelve apostles⁸³ (10,6). The Matthean pericope on the cure of the daughter of the Canaanite woman (15,21-28), includes a comment by Jesus relative to the scope of his mission, "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel". As most mission statements, this logion reflects the vision of the early church rather than a statement of the historical Jesus.⁸⁴ The logion is a Matthean insertion into a narrative which the evangelist has essentially taken over from his Markan source (Mark 7,24-30). In reworking the earlier narrative, Matthew has deleted Mark's reference to two houses, the one in which the dialogue between Jesus and the woman took place (Mark 7,24), and the one in which the possessed girl was at home in her bed (Mark 7,30).

The mission statement of 15,24 presumably derives from early Christian discussions on the Gentile mission. It affirms the church's conscious awareness that Jesus' own mission was to Israel. As "Lord", however, he was able to effect

⁸¹ Ἐρημος is not present in the Lukan version of the logion Luke 13,35). Neither is it found in the Codex Vaticanus and several of the ancient versions. Some authors are of the opinion that the adjective was added to the Matthean text in order to make it more conformable with the text from Jeremiah. See Metzger, Textual Commentary, 61.

⁸² Matthew locates the scene in Capernaum (8,5), which he has previously described as lying in Galilee of the Gentiles. See 4,13-17.

⁸³ I have briefly commented upon Matthew's use of "twelve apostles" in: Collins, These Things, 73-78.

⁸⁴ Cf. R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, Oxford² 1968, 150-163.

healing from afar. In comparison with the Markan pericope, the Matthean version of the story has a much more pronounced christological interest. Not only does it contain the mission logion of 15,34 but a thrice-repeated invocation of Jesus as Lord appears on the lips of the Canaanite. In the first instance Jesus is addressed as Lord and Son of David. In Mark, there is no mission statement and there is but a single formal address of Jesus as Lord (Mark 7,28; cf. Matt 15,27).

Matthew's rendition of the dialogue with the Canaanite may be compared with his version of the dialogue with the centurion (8,5-13). In both instances there is a healing from a distance. In both instances Jesus praises the faith of the petitioner. There is also a manifest parallelism between 8,13, "Let it be done for you according to your faith'. And the servant was healed in that hour", and 15,28, "Let it be done for you as you wish'. And her daughter was healed instantly".⁸⁵ In many respects the two scenes are parallel, the one focusing on males, the other on females. They share a common perspective, namely, the significance of Jesus' mission for Gentiles.

2.7.2 In missionary discourse of chapter ten, the first of Jesus' instructions to the twelve is: "Go nowhere among the Gentiles, and enter no town of the Samaritans, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (10,5-6). The mission to the lost sheep of the house of Israel is entrusted to the twelve. The mission of Jesus (15,28) is theirs. When compared with 15,28 the expanded mission statement of 10,5-6 explicates the fact that the mission to the house of Israel reflects early Christian dialogue about the mission to the Gentiles.

The idea that the mission of the twelve apostles is identical with that of Jesus is consistent with Matthew's overall vision of the twelve, as disciples, learning from Jesus and continuing his same mission. Jesus preached, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come near" (4,17);⁸⁶ the twelve are sent to proclaim the good news, "the kingdom of heaven has come near" (10,7). In the great finale of Matthew's gospel, the disciples are instructed to teach all nations everything that Jesus had commanded them (28,20). The content of the message of the disciples

⁸⁵ The parallelism is more apparent in Greek than it is in the English of the NRSV. The NRSV's translation does not reflect the use of ἡ ὥρα ἐκέλευν as the temporal indication of the cure in both narratives.

⁸⁶ In similar fashion the Matthean John the Baptist proclaimed "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come near" (3,2). Thus a chain has been created: John, representing the tradition - Jesus - the disciples. This chain of tradition is similar to that found in rabbinic schools where teaching was handed down from one generation of rabbis to the next.

is the same as that of Jesus, but Jesus' resurrection and authorization provides the occasion for the breakout of the message. Prior to the resurrection it was limited to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; after the resurrection it is extended to all nations. A new generation of disciples is to be made from among all the nations.

2.8 An Overview

This overview of passages in which Matthew has made use of *οικία-οἶκος* vocabulary has revealed that the house is a significant motif in his narrative. Yet it is otherwise significant from what it is in Mark. In Matthew the house has been liberated from its attachment to the "Messianic secret". It does not seem to function in any particularly significant fashion as a symbol of Jesus' intimacy with his disciples and the privileged locale of his instruction to them. Nor does the house seem to reflect the social situation of the early Christian proclamation of the gospel, as it does in Mark.

In fact, Matthew has deleted or radically transformed many of the Markan references to the house. He has introduced the house of Peter (8,14) and Jesus' house (2,11; 9,10.28; 13,1.36; 17,25). In Jesus' home, Peter is singled out as a disciple who merits particular instruction (17,24-27). A house, perhaps that of Jesus', is introduced as the setting for the cure of two blind men not otherwise attested in the tradition (8,28) and as the setting for a cure from a distance (8, 6).

In the discourse material, the house motif figures significantly in the Sermon on the Mount and the Missionary Discourse. In the instruction, there is mention of light shining in the house (5,14) and the houses respectively built on rock and sand (7,24-27). In the commission, there is mention of a mission to the house of Israel (10,6), like that of Jesus' himself (15,24), and of a house that is worthy and one that is not, both located within some town or village to which the twelve disciples have been sent (10, 12-14).

2.9 A Key to the Transformation of the House Motif

Some insight into Matthew's use of the house motif may be gleaned from a pericope in which the house as such does not appear but in which the house is certainly on the horizon. That passage appears in the Matthean Sondergut, wherein, after having pronounced Simon blessed, Jesus solemnly states: "You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church (*οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*), and the gates of Hades will not prevail against it. I will give you the keys of

the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven" (16,18-19). The image is that of a house built on a rock with Peter as its doorkeeper.⁸⁷

In its present formulation, Matthew's metaphor is mixed. Peter appears both as the rock on which the house is built and as the doorkeeper of the house. The mixed metaphor may have resulted from Matthew's juxtaposition of two originally independent logia used by the Palestinian Jewish-Christian church. In the Jewish tradition, the key of David - and Matthew's Jesus clearly belonged to the house of David! - was a symbol for the authority given to the teachers of the Law. The Q tradition makes use of the traditional motif in an isolated woe addressed, in Luke 11,52, to lawyers: "Woe to you lawyers! For you have taken away the key of knowledge; you did not enter yourselves, and you hindered those who were entering".

Matthew, systematic and creative writer that he is, has inserted this woe into the collection of woes in chapter 23. His editorial hand had clearly been at work in the formulation of the Q logion in 23,13: "But woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you lock people out of the kingdom of heaven. For you do not go in yourselves, and when others are going in, you stop them". The implication is clear: the scribes and the Pharisees, epitome of evil as they are in Matthew's narrative,⁸⁸ have maliciously used the keys given to them in order to prevent people from entering the kingdom of heaven.

Matthew's harshly worded argument with the scribes and Pharisees reflects not so much the *Sitz-im-Leben* of Jesus as it does the social situation of his own community. The time was a decade or so after the destruction of Jerusalem. The house which was the temple of Jerusalem (12,4; 21,13) had become desolate (23,38). It was a period in which the various Jewish sects were vying with one another for recognition and hegemony as God's true people.⁸⁹ From the diversity a new synthesis would emerge, a synthesis which J. Andrew Overman calls "formative Judaism". Matthew's Jewish Christian community was one of the competing parties. Over and against his community was Phariseism, the historical antecedent of rabbinic Judaism.

⁸⁷ Cf. "Keys of the Kingdom", in: *Anchor Bible Dictionary* IV, 31-32.

⁸⁸ See *J.D. Kingsbury, Matthew as Story*, Philadelphia²1988, 19-24.

⁸⁹ See *J.A. Overman, Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community*, Minneapolis 1990.

Phariseeism, as the Judaism which would later develop recalled, had its heroes, the great rabbis. Two of the greatest names were those of Hillel and Shammai. Neither they nor their disciples saw eye-to-eye on every issue of biblical interpretation. The Mishnah would recall some of these differences, attributing them respectively to the house of Hillel (*beth Hillel*) and the house of Shammai (*beth Shammai*).⁹⁰ The keys given to Matthew symbolize the authority given to him as a teacher of the Law. He was, as it were, the legendary chief rabbi of the Matthean community, a householder similar to other legendary householders such as the great rabbis Hillel and Shammai. His was the house which Jesus built.

2.9.1 This perspective may help to clarify two other aspects of Matthew's use of the house motif. The first is the ambiguity which surrounds the house of Jesus (2,11; 9,28; 13,1,36; 17,25). In 2,11 there is mention of a home in which the wise men from the East kneel down and pay homage to Jesus. That house is located in Bethlehem. Once Jesus has begun his Spirit-filled mission, he seems never to have returned to the house in Bethlehem. There is also a seaside house appearing in a variety of narrative sequences in which the seaside house seems to be Jesus' own home (9,28; 13,1,36; 17,25), but the evangelist never makes explicit the implications of his wording in this regard.

On the other hand, Matthew 9,1 represents a striking reworking of Mark 2,1. Mark mentions the presence of Jesus in Capernaum, where "it was reported that he was at home". Scholars have long conjectured that Mark had the house of the fishermen Simon and Andrew in mind (2,29)⁹¹ as he set the scene of Jesus' withdrawal from the great numbers of people who followed him. In his recasting of the setting, Matthew no longer writes about Capernaum nor does he write about Jesus being at home - although the miracle story which follows is obviously located in a house. Rather, Matthew tells his readers that Jesus went to his own city (9,1). The implication clearly is that Jesus is at home in a city by the sea.

Is the house in which Jesus is at home Peter's house? The evangelist leaves his readers in a cloud of unknowing. Perhaps the ambiguity has been deliberately intended. The house which looms large in the Matthean perspective is the

⁹⁰ See, for example, M. Git. 9,10.

⁹¹ See, for example, E. Ravaratto, La 'casa' del vangelo di Marco é la casa di Simone Pietro?, in: *Antonianum* 42 (1967) 399-419.

house built on the rock. Peter is the doorkeeper of that house. The house of Peter is the house that Jesus built. The realization that Peter's house is Jesus' house may well explain why Matthew is so ambiguous in regard to the domestic settings which he introduces into his narrative.

2.9.2 Does, in fact, that house loom so large on Matthew's narrative perspective? This brings us to another important feature of Matthew's use of the house motif. That is its presence in the Sermon on the Mount. The Sermon is addressed to Jesus' disciples (5,1), presumably the twelve of them (10,1). They are formally instructed on the interpretation of the Law and the prophets (esp. 5, 21-48) and they are challenged to have a righteousness exceeding that of the scribes and Pharisees. They are described as the light, a light which gives light to all in the house (5,14). It has already been noted that it is Matthew who has introduced the reference to the house into the simile. Is it too much to suggest that at this point the evangelist already has the house of Peter, that is the church, in mind as he writes about the light shining in the house?

The suggestion may be gratuitous were it not for two facts, namely, that Matthew has self-consciously introduced the mention of the house in 5,14 and that he brings the Sermon on the Mount to a close with reference to a house, actually two houses which are then compared with one another. Obviously the more important of the two houses is the house built on rock (7,25). It is only a metaphor, a metaphor, that is, for the activity of everyone who hears Jesus' words and acts on them.

2.9.3 One ought not treat the Matthean Jesus' *mashalim* as if they were mere allegories. On the other hand, among the evangelists it is clearly Matthew who most readily resorts to an allegorical interpretation of figurative language. One need only cite his interpretation of the parable of the wheat and the tares (13,36-43), his rendition of the parable of the great feast, with its interpretive addendum (22,1-14), and his version of the parable and the tenants (21,33-41) as cases in point.

With this in mind, it is all the more striking that Matthew has encompassed the major portion of the Sermon on the Mount within an imaginative domestic framework. The image of the house is clearly applied to those who hear Jesus' words and do them. This is precisely what is to be expected of those who belong to the house of Peter, the *beth Cephas*.

Indeed, even if one were to allow Matthew's similes to function essentially as similes, it is nonetheless clear that the evangelist envisages that those whose be-

havior - unlike that of the scribes and Pharisees and that of the gentiles⁹² - corresponds to Jesus' words, including his prophetic interpretation of the law are like light shining in a house, perhaps a house built on rock. It is difficult to escape from the suggestion that it is within the house which is the church that life in keeping with Jesus' words is lived. In any case, it is patently clear that in Matthew's gospel the house functions as a powerful metaphor and that this use of the house motif is far more significant than is the use of the house to designate a physical locale for Jesus' activity.

By way of conclusion to this essay, we need only to recall that almost immediately after the conclusion to the Sermon on the Mount comes a juxtaposition of two stories about a house. Despite his offer to go and cure the centurion's servant who was lying paralyzed at home, Jesus did not do so (8,5-13). In contrast, Jesus did enter the home of Peter and there effected the cure of Peter's mother-in-law (8,14-17). The contrast shows the importance of the house motif in Matthew's gospel. It is Peter's house that Jesus entered. That is not surprising for the house built on the rock is Jesus' own house.

⁹² See 6,5-8.