TRADITION AND OLD TESTAMENT IN MATT 27:3-10
Douglas J. Moo
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Deerfield, Illinois 60015

Matthew's narrative of Judas' death is climaxed by the
last, and perhaps the most complex of his *Reflexionszitate*.
In keeping with other quotations of this type, uncertainties
concerning the source(s) and textual basis exist, complicated
in this case by the problematic reference to Jeremiah. The
disparate elements of the quotation and their close relation-
ship to the details of the narrative, along with apparent
contradictions to the parallel narrative in Acts 1:17-20,
suggest the existence of a creative exegetical procedure.
And many would call this procedure a midrash./1/ The legitimacy
of this designation can be determined only after the close-knit
threads of narrative and quotation have been unravelled. It
will be convenient to proceed by examining the quotation first
and then the relationship of the narrative and the quotation.

I. The Quotation

The text of the citation is drawn mainly from Zech 11:13,
although several important elements find no counterpart in
Zechariah. In view of the ascription of the citation to
Jeremiah, these extraneous elements are best explained by
supposing that a passage from that prophecy has influenced the
quotation./2/ It will be necessary to test this hypothesis
by looking closely at the relationship between the quotation,
the narrative and suggested background passages from Jeremiah.
The complexity of the textual background and the freedom with
which the texts are used warrant a phrase-by-phrase
investigation of the citation. For convenience of reference,
I include here the MT and LXX of Zech 11: 12b-13:

וישקלו את־שכרי שלשים כסף: ויאמר יהוה אלי השליכהו
אל־היוצר אדר היקר אשר יקרתי מעליהם ואקחה שלשים הכסף
ואשליך אתו בית יהוה אל־היוצר:

καὶ ἔστησαν τὸν μισθόν μου τριάκοντα ἀργυροῦς.
13καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρός με Κάθες αὐτοὺς εἰς
τὸ χωνευτήριον, καὶ σκέψαι εἰ δόκιμόν ἐστιν,
ὃν τρόπον ἐδοκιμάσθην ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. καὶ ἔλαβον
τοὺς τριάκοντα ἀργυροῦς καὶ ἐνέβαλον αὐτοὺς
εἰς τὸν οἶκον κυρίου εἰς τὸ χωνευτήριον.

καὶ ἔλαβον τὰ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια (Matt 27:9b) is a fairly
straightforward rendering of the beginning of the second major
clause in Zech 11:13. As in 26:15, Matthew uses the word
ἀργύριον, which may be a reflection of his Markan *Vorlage*
(cf. Mark 14:11)./3/ ἔλαβον is probably to be understood as
a third person ('impersonal') plural, as against the first
person singular of the LXX./4/ This modification may reflect
the tradition, since Matthew presents the priests as 'taking'
the money (v 6--λάβοντες τὰ ἀργύρια). Since ἀργύρια is perhaps
a reflection of Matthew's Markan source, no decision can be
reached regarding the textual background of the phrase.

τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ τετιμημένου (Mt 27:9c) is closer to MT
than to LXX, which deviates considerably from the Heb. The
personalized τετιμημένου perhaps depends on a vocalization of
הַיְקָר 'the price' as הַיָּקָר 'the honored one' (cf. the Pesh.)./5/
τιμή beautifully captures the irony inherent in יקר
('excellence'), while retaining the basic meaning of 'price,'
since τιμή can convey either of these ideas./6/ The freedom
with which Matthew treats his Zechariah source is already
evident, in the transposition of the two clauses, καὶ ἔλαβον
. . . and τὴν τιμήν . . . .

ὃν ἐτιμήσαντο ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ (Matt 27:9d). The change of
person in the verb is a necessary translation modification,
since τιμάω is transitive, while יקר is intransitive, but
the change undoubtedly also commended itself to Matthew as
more closely approximating his tradition./7/ The phrase
clearly depends on MT since LXX has nothing comparable. ἀπό,
like its Heb. counterpart, מן has a partitive sense./8/
Matthew substitutes υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ for the Hebrew pronominal
suffix, a modification required because of the lack of an
antecedent for the pronoun./9/ In the following phrase,
the reading ἔδωκαν is generally preferred to ἔδωκα, the
following μοι and the OT verse providing strong temptation to
assimilate to the first person./10/ On the other hand, the
following α may have led to the addition of the ν/11/ and
the narrative context would have exercised a powerful attraction
to the third person plural./12/ On the whole, ἔδωκαν is

more difficult and should probably be preferred. The less
forceful δίδωμι (contrast LXX ἐνβάλλω, MT שקל) is perhaps
used because the context '. . . calls for a less forceful
action on the part of the Jewish leaders.'/13/

   With the phrase εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ κεραμέως the major *crux* of
the quotation is reached. No extant text or version gives any
hint that a field is involved in the events narrated in
Zechariah 11. While its presence in the quotation is no doubt
due to the prominence of a field in the tradition associated
with the death of Judas, the attribution of the citation to
Jeremiah invites attempts to relate the mention of a field to
a passage from that OT book. The passages usually suggested
are Jeremiah 18 and 32./14/ The former passage features
Jeremiah's visit to the house of the potter, while the purchase
of a field figures prominently in the latter. ἀγγεῖον
ὀστράκινον ('earthenware jar') in Jer 32:14 is often cited as
the point of contact between Jeremiah 32 on the one hand, and
Jeremiah 18 and Zechariah 11 on the other./15/ Torrey
conjectures that the Hanamel of Jeremiah 32 may also have been
the potter of Jeremiah 18, but this supposition is without
evidence./16/ כסף and שקל are common roots and do not provide
sufficient basis for the joining of Zech 11:13 with Jer 32:9./17/
Therefore, the only real parallels are found in the fact that
a potter is featured in Jeremiah 18 and Zech 11:13 and the
purchase of a field in Jeremiah 32 and the Judas tradition. The
links between Jeremiah 18, 32 and Zech 11:13 are tenuous at
best and it is difficult to reconstruct a process by which
they would have been joined together. It is therefore
necessary to ask if any other passage from the book of
Jeremiah may provide a more relevant background for the
narrative in Matt 27:3-8.

   One's attention is immediately drawn to Jer 19:1-13.
Two verbal links exist between Jeremiah 19 and Matt 27:3-10:
'innocent blood' (דם נקים [LXX: αἱμάτων ἀθώων]--v 4) and
'potter' (יוצר [LXX: πεπλασμένου]--vv 1, 11). Even more
striking is the thematic parallel: Jeremiah prophesies that
a locality associated with potters (v 1) will be renamed
with a phrase connoting violence (v 6) and used as a burial
place (v 11), as a token of God's judgment upon Jerusalem (and
in particular, upon the Jewish leaders (v 1))./18/ While a
'field' is not specifically mentioned in Jeremiah 19, the
contextual similarity to Matt 27:3-10, taken in conjunction
with the verbal connection (especially the key-word 'potter')

is a solid basis for associating Jeremiah 19 with the quotation
in Matt 27:9-10. If, as seems likely, the parallel between
the tradition of Zech 11:13 and Jeremiah 19 was first
discovered through the common mention of a 'potter,' the MT
has surely been the basic text employed, since LXX paraphrases
יוצר in Jer 19:1 and 11.

The last phrase of the quotation again has no counterpart
in Zech 11:13./19/ Based on the belief that the reference
to the field is from Jeremiah 32, Torrey feels that Jer 32:6
and 8 have given rise to the reference to God's command./20/
Lindars proposes a more complex background. The words καθὰ
συνέταξεν κύριος are found in Exod 9:12, where they indicate
the fulfillment of God's promise to Moses that, notwithstanding
the plague of boils, Pharaoh would continue to harden his
heart against the requests of the Israelites. This verse from
Exodus is related to Zech 11:13 through the mention of the
furnace used for the production of the ashes which caused the
boils (Exod 9:8; cf. LXX Zech 11:13: χωνευτήριον ['foundry']).
Thus, the 'ingenious' exegete 'expresses the idea of the divine
command, suggested to him by Jer 32 (39). 14, in the phrase
found in the Exodus passage.'/21/ The LXX word for 'furnace'
in Exod 9:8 is not the same one found in Zechariah, however,
and the whole reconstruction is generally too 'ingenious'
to be acceptable.

However, while dependence on Exod 9:12, mediated through
Jeremiah 32, does not seem sufficient to explain the phrase in
Matthew, an element of truth in this reconstruction can be
seen when it is recognized that the phrase καθὰ συνέταξεν
κύριος in Exod 9:12 is only one of a number of similar sayings
in the OT./22/ It is probable that Matthew draws on this
stereotyped expression as a paraphrase of the opening words
of Zech 11:13, 'and the Lord said to me.'/23/ That the words
must be an attempt to introduce Zech 11:13a into the citation
is demonstrated by the anomalous μου. The verbal agreement
between the phrase in Matthew and the LXX rendition of many
of the 'obedience formulas' indicates that Matthew was aware
of the expression in its Greek form./24/

The formula quotation is therefore built up from several
OT elements: the foundation and essential structure is provided
by the phrases drawn from Zech 11:13, but the mention of the
field provides an important 'remodelling' of the quotation,
based on the Judas tradition and with reference to Jeremiah 19,

while the concluding phrase adds a 'decorative motif,'
drawn from the traditional 'obedience formula.' Jeremiah
is mentioned in the introductory formula because Jeremiah 19
was the least obvious reference, yet most important from the
point of view of the application of the quotation./25/

Before turning to the narrative, a significant aspect of
the text-form of the quotation should be emphasized: its
close dependence on the MT. Several of the phrases from
Zech 11:13 must depend on the MT, the influence of Jeremiah 19
is probably mediated through familiarity with the Heb., and
no part of the quotation depends on the LXX against the MT.
(The phrase καθὰ συνέταξέν μοι κύριος, while dependent on the
Greek, is not an exception, since it is a stereotyped formula
independent of any *one* OT passage.) It is not unlikely,
therefore, that the MT is the sole *Vorlage* for the
quotation./26/

II. Narrative and Quotation

What now can be said about the relationship between this
complex citation and the narrative which it interprets? On
the one hand, there can be little doubt that the tradition has
exerted considerable influence on the quotation. The
introduction of the 'field' is, of course, the most notable
example of this influence, but other minor deviations (the
third person plural verbs, δίδωμι for שקל) are also best
attributed to the impact of the tradition. What might be
termed a 're-orientation of the text' has occurred--a phenomenon
we will explore in more detail at a later point. But now it
must be asked whether the reverse process has taken place.
Have elements from the OT passages crept into or influenced
the narrative?

The 'thirty pieces of silver' (v 3) is an allusive
reference to Zech 11:13. That the idea of betrayal money is
not taken from the OT is probable since Mark records the
transaction without alluding to Zech 11:13. It cannot be
finally determined whether the exact sum is an accommodation
to the prophecy or an element in the tradition which helped
direct Matthew's attention to Zechariah 11./27/ The latter
alternative should not, however, be ruled out as summarily
as it often is.

αἷμα ἀθῷον forms the first link in the chain of 'blood'

references which serve as an important literary motif in the
story (price of blood--v 6; field of blood--v 8)./28/
αἷμα ἀθῷον is, therefore, suspect as a subsequent addition
to the tradition, perhaps based on the OT (Jer 6:15 or 19:4,
especially)./29/ However, 'to shed innocent blood' is a
standard OT expression for a particularly heinous crime/30/
and is not, therefore, unnatural on Judas' lips./31/ If
Matthew himself is responsible for the expression, he has
probably been influenced by general usage rather than by a
particular OT passage.

The action of Judas described in v 5, ῥίψας τὰ ἀργύρια
εἰς τὸν ναόν, echoes the command in Zech 11:13 to throw the
silver pieces into the בית יהוה   (οἶκον κυρίου). While the
verb is ἐνέβαλον in LXX, ῥίπτω is used in A' and Σ, so it is
thought possible that Matthew has added this detail to the
tradition on the basis of the OT text: 'It is *known*, as in
the Acts version, that Judas died suddenly and that the money
was used to buy land, but it is *assumed* that the money was
first thrown into the house of the Lord, because the prophecy
says so.'/32/ However, this interpretation is open to several
criticisms. It is, perhaps, unlikely that Matthew would have
presented Judas as throwing the coins into the *sanctuary*
(ναός)/33/ had he been creating the tradition. Moreover, if
the priest's role in the transaction is historical, their
involvement must have been precipitated by an action similar to
that described in v 4. At any rate, no OT text provides a
plausible basis for the addition of this element. It has even
been suggested that Judas' gesture should be understood as a
Jewish legal custom, apparently valid in the time of Jesus,
according to which a seller who wished to revoke a deal, but who
had been refused by the buyer, could deposit the money involved
in the transaction in the Temple, and so effect a revocation.
/34/ This historical context cannot be ruled out, but questions
concerning the date of the law and concerning its applicability
to this kind of situation mean that caution is necessary in
basing very much on it.

One further point might be raised with regard to the
appropriation of the prophecy as a whole by Matthew. It is
sometimes overlooked that the specific context of Zech 11:13 is
not as congenial to the function of the text as a prophecy of
Judas' dealings with the Jewish leaders as it might be. For the
'I' of Zech 11:13 is unambiguously identified as the prophet
himself, in the role of Yahweh's appointed good shepherd
(i.e., ruler), which role seems to be understood as a

prefigurement of Christ's as the rejected shepherd par
excellence. Matthew seems to be at pains to interpret Zech
11:13 so as to avoid the manifest absurdity of identifying
Judas with the rejected shepherd while, at the same time,
appropriating the passage as a prophecy of the history of
the betrayal money. This he can do only by substituting
circumlocutory constructions for the first person verbs of
the OT passage. We have seen that, in fact, this is exactly
what is done: 'they' (the priests), rather than the rejected
shepherd himself as the prophecy strictly requires, take the
silver coins and give them to the potter. The importance of
this insight for the specific question before us is obvious:
the necessity to avoid directly ascribing to Judas any of
the actions of the rejected shepherd in Zechariah renders it
unlikely that Matthew would introduce an action on Judas'
part ('throwing the coins into the temple') that does just
that. Thus, although the verb used (ῥίπτω) may be taken from
the OT, it must at least be questioned whether the reference
to Judas' throwing the coins into the temple in v 4 has been
introduced on the basis of the OT quotation./35/

While v 5 is said to represent an attempt to introduce an
element from Zech 11:13 into the narrative which was omitted
from the quotation, it is argued that εἰς τὸν κορβανᾶν in
v 6 is a doublet of εἰς . . . κεραμέως in the citation. Some
scholars think this alleged dual understanding of the phrase
from Zech 11:13 is based on a variant reading of אוצר
'treasury' for יוצר 'potter.'/36/ While no Heb. MS reads
אוצר the Pesh. ܠܒܝܬ ܓܙܐ seems to presume such a reading, which,
in view of the verbal similarity, could easily have been
subsequently altered to יוצר ./37/ However, the translation of
the Pesh. is too slight a support for the suggested emendation
and יוצר must surely be retained as the *lectio difficilior*./38/
And it must also be noted that, in general, the evidence for
the use of variant readings in this way is slight. But if
εἰς τὸν κορβανᾶν cannot rest on a variant reading, it is
nevertheless possible that the phrase is evidence of Matthew's
understanding of Zech 11:13 in a dual sense. This
interpretation would have been facilitated by the word-play
אוצר-- יוצר /39/ and may, moreover, be based on the belief
that the יוצר in Zech 11:13 was a minor temple official
connected with the treasury./40/

The latter possibility is not, however, likely;/41/ so
the brunt of the argument must rest on the presumption that

Matthew was aware of, and utilized the word play אוצר -- יוצר
in the writing of Matt 27:3-10. Several indications speak
against this. To begin with, there is some doubt that κορβανᾶς
in v 6 actually means 'treasury.' This meaning for the word
is very poorly attested, a single passage in Josephus (*Bell*. 2.
175) being the only alleged example besides Matt 27:6./42/
Moreover, Gärtner has argued that the meaning of the word in
Josephus is 'sacred gifts,' a definition more in accord with
the meaning of the root קרבן elsewhere and appropriate in
the context./43/ κορβανᾶν in Matt 27:6 may therefore, denote
not the treasury, but sacred gifts which were deposited in the
temple, to which the silver thrown by Judas could not be
added because of the profane purpose for which it had been
used./44/ A certain conclusion on this matter is probably
impossible, but even if κορβανᾶς is translated 'treasury,'
a serious objection can be raised against the supposed double
fulfillment of יוצר : the priests' decision *not* to put the
money into the treasury contradicts the explicit statement in
Zech 11:13 that the money was to be thrown אל־היוצר ./45/
This objection cannot be dismissed as demanding 'too rigid an
application of the quotation to the circumstances of the
context' or as failing to reckon with the 'more indirect
applications of the quotation.'/46/ An indirect application
is one thing, but the deliberate introduction of an element,
based on a variant interpretation, which expressly contradicts
the command of the prophecy is quite another. In other words,
were Matthew *inventing* details here in order to fulfill OT
prophecy, it is reasonable to expect that his creation would
be in strict accord with that prophecy.

Verse 7 introduces an important link between the narrative
and the mixed quotation of vv 9-10--ἀγρὸς τοῦ κεραμέως. The
fact that a field was in some manner involved in the tradition
associated with Judas' death is generally accepted in view
of the prominence of a field in the seemingly independent,
Semitic-colored account in Acts 1:16ff and the unexpected
addition of 'field' to the quotation in Matthew. However,
it is generally believed that the 'Field of Blood' mentioned
in v 8 is the historic kernel of the legend, while the
connection with 'potter' and the change of name has been
invented in order to bring the money into contact with a
'potter,' as Zech 11:13 indicates./47/ There is some basis,
however, for thinking that a potter's field was a part of
the original tradition. Benoit points out that the traditional
site for 'Hakeldama' was an area which was a source of clay

for the potters of Jerusalem and which, in view of its evil
reputation, was a natural location for the burial of
strangers./48/ The priest's purchase of the field for this
purpose would be in accord with rabbinic custom./49/ Moreover,
the fact that the linking of 'field' with 'potter' is not
found in any of the relevant OT texts and that this connection
does not correspond exactly to the role played by the 'potter'
in Zech 11:13 favors viewing the element as traditional rather
than as an OT-inspired creation./50/

We conclude, therefore, that there is reason to doubt
whether any important part of the narrative in Matt 27:3-8
has been created under the influence of OT passages. As we
have seen, several points in the pericope are not in complete
harmony with the OT prophecies cited, pointing to restraint
on the part of the transmitter of the tradition. Most
important, the unique features of the mixed quotation in
vv 9-10 constitute a strong evidence for the dominant role
played by the tradition in the process. As Benoit says,
'. . . the tradition recorded by Matthew in his gospel cannot
be explained by reference to the biblical texts alone, since
on the contrary, it governs the disconcerting use made of
them . . . .'/51/ In view of these considerations it is most
reasonable to think that the evangelist composed Matt 27:3-10
on the basis of a tradition that came to him substantially
in the form in which we now have it. It is probable that Jesus'
betrayal for a sum of money first led Matthew to Zech 11:13,
where the singular mention of a 'potter' reminded him that the
site of the 'Field of Blood,' purchased with Judas' ill-gotten
wages, was traditionally associated with the activity of
potters. This, in turn, led Matthew to the passage of
Scripture with a number of suggestive parallels to the
tradition, Jeremiah 19. Matthew collates Jeremiah 19 and
Zech 11:13, thereby indicating, at the same time, the
fulfillment of the prophecy regarding the wages of the rejected
shepherd and that concerned with the destiny of the Valley
of Topheth./52/

Presupposing this exegetical work is the identification
of Jesus as the rejected shepherd of Zech 11:4-14. Indeed,
the correlation of the destiny of Jesus, the God-appointed
leader of Israel, with the similar fate of Zechariah seems to
be the primary motivation for the narrative and quotation./53/
Thus, stress is placed on the fact that the money was the price
at which the 'precious one' was valued by the Jewish leaders.

This purpose is evident in Matthew's modifications of the
quotation, which, as we have seen, serve to involve Judas and
the priests in the action narrated in the text without
destroying the identification of Jesus with the Shepherd.

Thus, the wages given to the prophet in Zech 11:12 are
given to Judas in Matthew, the actions performed by the prophet
in Zech 11:13 are transferred to the priests, and the money
goes not to a potter directly but for the purchase of a
'potter's field.' While these changes are major enough, it
is important to note that there is no departure from the basic
thrust of Zechariah's prophecy. While Judas is the direct
recipient of the 'wages' in Matthew, Jesus is the one being
evaluated at this level--just as the prophet's worth is
evaluated in Zechariah 11. The verb changes serve to describe
the actions from the recipients' point of view, and the
addition of 'the field' extends the idea of the money being
given to the potter. Nevertheless, it is obvious that
the Matt 27:9, 10 quotation evidences a considerable
modification of text. Another important technique observed
here, for which there is ample precedent in Jewish literature,
is the combination of passages, based to some extent on the
use of similar words or phrases.

III. A Midrash?

In the current situation of terminological 'fuzziness'
with respect to terms like pesher and midrash, it is meaningless
and can be misleading simply to label a particular text with
these terms. Until generally accepted meanings of such terms
are forthcoming, it is essential that scholars carefully
state 'working' definitions and, beyond that, note *both*
similarities and differences between NT and various Jewish
exegetical procedures. Much of the confusion surrounding the
term 'midrash' for instance, is caused by its application by
different scholars to three different 'levels' of the
exegetical procedure: literary genre,/54/ exegetical
method,/55/ and hermeneutical axioms./56/ Thus the exegetical
methods of the rabbis (exemplified in the *middot* of Hillel
and R. Ishmael b. Elisha) may closely resemble the methods
employed by the Qumran sectarians/57/ or NT writers, but their
hermeneutical axioms or genre of writing may be entirely
different. Similarly, an eschatological orientation and
revelatory basis may characterize both Qumran and NT exegesis
(hermeneutical axioms), but exegetical methods may differ

appreciably.

In discussing midrash in Matt 27:3-10, then, it is crucial
to make comparisons at several levels./58/ In terms of *literary
genre*, the historical narration style of Matthew finds no close
parallel in rabbinic or Qumran literature. The rabbis exhibit
little interest in history *as such*; any narratives which are
found tend to be homilies based on biblical characters or
illustrations for halakic purposes. The detailed correspondence
of narrative and context is, of course, found in the Qumran
pesharim, but these, significantly, are written ostensibly
as commentaries on the text.

At the level of *exegetical method*, similarities with
the procedure of both the rabbis and the sectarians are
obvious: combination of texts based on possible word-plays
and modification of the OT text to suit its application are
well-known in both types of literature. But with respect to
what is for many the crucial characteristic of midrash--the
creation of narrative based on the OT--/59/ Matthew's
procedure is not, as we have pointed out, analogous to
rabbinic practice./60/

This last point leads us, finally, to say something
about hermeneutical axioms. For the NT authors, as in a
somewhat similar manner for the Qumran sectarians, the impact
of recent historical events was *the* decisive influence on
exegetical procedure. They were 'concerned not with
interpreting the OT, but with interpreting an *event* in terms
of the OT.'/61/ This fundamental datum is ultimately what
distinguishes NT exegesis from most rabbinic exegesis. The
latter functioned within the framework built up of tradition,
current community needs and Scripture and came to expression
in the form of detailed guidelines for behavior and edifying
stories, sometimes loosely linked to a biblical book. Granted
such a framework, creative influence on biblical narratives
from other OT texts is not unlikely. But in the NT, exegesis
functions within a framework dominated by very recent events
surrounding the life of Jesus of Nazareth, and came to
expression in, among other things, what are ostensibly
historical narratives. The creation of narrative under the
influence of the OT is *a priori* less likely in this kind of
framework simply because there is less interest in the OT
per se. In this respect, the NT situation is much closer
to that of the Dead Sea community, and few scholars have

suggested that the scrolls feature narratives *created* on the basis of the OT.

In other words, resemblances between Matt 27:3-10 and the rabbinic literature at the level of exegetical procedure are outweighed by differences with respect to literary genre and hermeneutical axioms. Whether one wants to speak of midrash in Matt 27:3-10 depends, then, on the stage of exegetical procedure about which one is speaking. But if the term is used to designate, as it most often does today in NT studies, a creative influence of the OT on the tradition, I would think the term inappropriate here.

<div align="center">Notes.</div>

/1/ See, most recently F. Mans, 'Un Midrash chrétien: le récit de la mort de Judas' *RSR* 54 (1980) 197-203. The question of historicity is closely bound up with this question. Many agree with Montefiore (*The Synoptic Gospels* (2 vols.; 2nd ed.; London: MacMillan, 1927), 2.329) who calls this narrative 'one of the clearest examples of history made up from bits of Old Testament prophecy.'

/2/ This is preferable to other explanations which attempt to account for the ascription to Jeremiah: (1) The variant reading Ζαχαριου (22 Syr^{hrg}) or Ησαιου (21 θ 33 157) should be followed. (2) Since Jeremiah stands first of the prophets in several OT books lists (J. P. Audet, 'A Hebrew-Aramaic List of Books of the Old Testament in Greek Transcription,' *JTS* n.s. 1 (1950) 136; Charles C. Torrey, 'The Aramaic Period of the Nascent Christian Church,' *ZNW* 44 (1952-53) 222), his name may be used here as a general reference to the prophetic *corpus* (Str-B, 1, 1030; H. F. D. Sparks, 'St. Matthew's References to Jeremiah,' *JTS* n.s. 1 (1950) 155; Edmund F. Sutcliffe, 'Matthew 27,9' *JTS* n.s. 3 (1952) 227). (3) An apocryphal book (which Jerome claims to have seen) contained the conflated citation under Jeremiah's name (Origen; Hieronymus; E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus* (rev. by W. Schmauch; Meyer K.; 4th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967) 378; G. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus* (FRLANT 82; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962) 80-81; (4) The quotation was found in the 'Testimony Book' under Jeremiah's name (R. Harris, *Testimonies* (with the assistance of V. Burch; 2 vols.: Cambridge: University Press, 1916, 1920), 1. 59-60; J. A. Findlay, 'The First Gospel and the Book of Testimonies,'

Amicitiae Corolla (ed. H. G. Wood; London: University of London: 1933) 65).   (5)   The ascription is due to a slip of memory (J. Finegan, *Die Überlieferung der Leidens- und Auferstehungsgeschichte Jesu* (BZNW 15; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1934) 26; K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and its use of the Old Testament*   (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1958) 123).   (6)   The last part of the book of Zechariah was traditionally ascribed to Jeremiah.

/3/   Donald Senior, *The Passion Narrative According to Matthew: A Redactional Study* (BETL 39; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975) 354.

/4/   Lohmeyer-Schmauch, *Matthäus*, 378; Stendahl, *School*, 125. Senior (*Passion Narrative*, 353) and Gundry (*The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (NovT Sup 18; Leiden: Brill, 1967) 126) are more hesitant, the latter pointing out that the influence of the LXX may have outweighed that of the context.   While relative degree of influence is difficult to assess, the probable reading ἔδωκαν (see below) is good reason to understand ἔλαβον as 3rd pl. as well.

/5/   Stendahl, *School* 125; Gundry, *Old Testament* 126; Senior, *Passion Narrative* 355; A. Baumstark, 'Die Zitate des Mt.-Ev. aus dem Zwölfprophetenbuch,' *Bib* 37 (1956) 302.

/6/   BAG 825.

/7/   Senior, *Passion Narrative* 355.

/8/   BDF (par. 164 (2)) note the unclassical use of ἐκ and ἀπό in this way.   Cf. GKC (par. 199w) for the Hebrew construction.

/9/   Gundry (*Old Testament* 127) notes that the targums often expand with the phrase 'the sons of Israel.' Senior (*Passion Narrative* 355) believes the change from indefinite to definite is characteristic of Matthew's redaction.

/10/   Cf. M-J. Lagrange, *Evangile selon Saint Matthieu* (EBib; 5th ed.; Paris: Gabalda, 1941) 513.

/11/   B. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York: UBS, 1971) 67.

/12/   A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London: MacMillan, 1928) 408; Gundry, *Old Testament*, 126. ἔδωκα is read by W. C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1907) 288; Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, 2. 343.

/13/   Senior, *Passion Narrative* 355.

/14/   F. F. Bruce, 'The Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative,' *BJRL* 42 (1960-1961) 341; C. C. Torrey 'The Foundry of the Second Temple at Jerusalem,' *JBL* 55 (1936) 252;

Stendahl, *School* 122; Strecker, *Weg* 77; R. S. McConnell,
*Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel: The Authority and Use
of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Matthew* (Theologische
Dissertationen 2; Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt, 1969) 132;
B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal
Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM,
1961) 120; Jeremiah 32 only is mentioned by A. Schlatter
(*Der Evangelist Matthäus* (Stuttgart: Calver, 1957) 770;
A. Descamps ('Rédaction et Christologie dans le récit
matthéen de la Passion,'*L'Evangile selon Matthieu,* (ed.
M. Didier; Gembloux: Duculot, 1972) 389); Lohmeyer-Schmauch,
Matthäus 379).
/15/ Lindars, *Apologetic* 120; Stendahl, *School* 122.
/16/ 'Foundry' 252. Gundry (*Old Testament* 124) points out that
Hanamel, Jeremiah's cousin, was probably of a priestly family
and hence almost certainly not a potter.
/17/ Against J. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic
Gospels and Acts* (Assen: van Gorcum, 1954) 185-186. Doeve
characterizes Matt 27:3-10 as a *haggadah* and believes the
starting point of the complex was the connection between Matt
27:5 and Jer 26:15 through the phrase 'innocent blood.' Once
Jeremiah 26 was associated with Judas' death, the similar
theme of judgment against Jerusalem would have led the
Haggadist to Jeremiah 19 and 32, the entire Jeremiah tradition
then being tied into Zech 11:13 on the basis of the roots
כסף and שקל , found in Jer 32:9. The foundation of the
whole argument is weak, however; innocent blood is a common
expression that would not alone have provided a point of
contact between Matthew and Jeremiah 26. The motivation
for the joining together of Jeremiah 19, 26 and 32 is weak,
as well; practically the entire book of Jeremiah is
characterized by prophecies against Jerusalem.
/18/ See Gundry (*Old Testament* 124-5) and Senior (*Passion
Narrative* 360) for these specific points. Jeremiah 19 had
earlier been considered the background to this quotation by
A. Edersheim (*The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (2 vols.;
London: Longman, Green and Co., 1883), 2. 596).
/19/ A few later LXX MSS have assimilated the phrase from
Matthew.
/20/ 'Foundry' 252.
/21/ *Apologetic,* 121; cf. also E. Schweizer, *The Good News
According to Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1975) 504.
/22/ The genre to which these sayings belong has been studied
by Pesch, who calls them 'Ausführungsformeln.' He notes
several instances of the obedience formula pattern in Matthew's

gospel ('Eine alttestamentliche Ausführungsformel im Matthäus-
Evangelium: Redaktionsgeschichte und exegetische
Beobachtungen,' *BZ* n.s. 10 (1966) 220-245).

/23/ Senior, *Passion Narrative* 361. Montefiore (*Synoptic
Gospels,* 2. 343), Lohmeyer-Schmauch (*Matthäus* 379), Gundry
(*Old Testament* 127) and Stendahl (*School* 123) think the phrase
is an attempt to introduce the opening words of Zech 11:13.
Stendahl's tentative suggestion that Matthew's phrase is an
interpretation of בית יהוה as ביד יהוה cannot be maintained.
As Gundry (127) points out in reply to a similar theory of
Baumstark's, ביד is always used with an instrumental sense
in association with the Word of God.

/24/ καθὰ συνέταξεν κύριος in Exod 36:8, 12, 14, 28, 33;
37:20; 39:10; 40:19; Lev 14:23; Num 8:3; 9:5; 15:23; 20:9, 27;
27:11; 31:31, 41. Matthew's dependence on this phrase is
confirmed by the fact that καθά is used only here in the NT.

/25/ Gundry, *Old Testament* 125.

/26/ Allen, *Matthew* 288.

/27/ Strecker (*Weg* 77-9), who believes that Matthew has taken
the story from oral tradition and added the quotation himself
(as does also G. D. Kilpatrick, [*The Origins of the Gospel
According to St. Matthew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1946)]81),
regards the 'thirty pieces of silver' as one of the rare
Matthean additions to the tradition.

/28/ Lohmeyer-Schmauch, *Matthäus* 375; Senior, *Passion Narrative*
386-7.

/29/ Doeve, *Hermeneutics* 185.

/30/ Lohmeyer-Schmauch, *Matthäus* 375.

/31/ W. C. Van Unnik ('The Death of Judas in St. Matthew's
Gospel,' *ATR* supp. ser. 3 (1974) 53-55) cites Deut 27:25
('Cursed be whoever takes gifts [bribes] to take the life of
innocent blood') and conjectures that Judas, in light of this
verse, takes his own life to remove the curse. While the
parallel is striking, it is doubtful that Judas would have
acted so drastically on the basis of this verse alone.

/32/ Lindars, *Apologetic* 118; cf. also Senior, *Passion
Narrative* 382. Stendahl (*School* 126) believes that Matthew
adds the detail to utilize an element from Zech 11:13 that had
been 'left hanging' after his changes to the text. But the
freedom with which Matthew uses the OT text indicates that the
retention of this phrase in the prophecy would have been no
difficult matter. Lohmeyer-Schmauch (*Matthäus* 376) argue that
Judas could not have thrown the coins into the Temple because
the Sanhedrin was not there, but at the Roman trial (cf. Matt
27:1-2). But it is obvious that Matthew has added the Judas

pericope to the Marcan framework at a break in the material so
that the position of the narrative does not necessarily
represent a chronological indication.

/33/ While there is some dissent (Michel, 'ναός,' *TDNT* 4 (1967)
884-5), Matthew, at least, seems to distinguish ναός, the
sanctuary, from ἱερόν, the temple precincts (Compare 23:16, 17,
21, 35 with 4:5; 21:12, 14, 15; 24:1; 26:55).

/34/ J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (3rd ed.;
London: SCM, 1969) 139.

/35/ Allen (*Matthew* 288) thinks the detail was a known fact
and has facilitated Matthew's use of the Zech 11:13 text.

/36/ As F. F. Bruce (*The New Testament Development of Old
Testament Themes* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968] 110) paraphrases
the priests' thinking: '"How shall we fulfill the scripture?
Shall we give it to the 'ōsar or to the yōsar? We cannot give
it to the 'ōsar because it is blood money; let us give it to
the yōsar."' See also Allen, *Matthew* 288; Montefiore,
Synoptic Gospels, 2. 342; McNeile, *Matthew* 408.

/37/ T. Jansma, *Inquiry into the Hebrew Text and the Ancient
Versions of Zechariah 9-14* (Oudtestamentische Studien 7;
Leiden: Brill, 1950) 35; Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint
and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968) 320.

/38/ I. Willi-Plein, *Prophetie am Ende: Untersuchungen zu
Sacharja 9-14* (BBB 42; Cologne: Hanstein, 1974) 22. It is
improbable that אוצר was changed to יוצר because a scribe
felt the sum was too paltry to be placed in the treasury
(contra McNeile, *Matthew* 408).

/39/ Stendahl, *School* 124-5; Lindars, *Apologetic* 118 (who
does not dismiss the possibility that Matthew knew a variant
reading); Senior, *Passion Narrative* 357-8.

/40/ Stendahl, *School* 125. This understanding of יוצר in
Zech 11:13 is based on Torrey's thesis, according to which the
'potter' is identified as an official whose job it was to
melt down and mold (hence יוצר, in the sense of 'moulder')
the large amounts of metal that poured into the temple coffers.
The readings of LXX (χωνευτήριον--'foundry;' cf. also O'
and Σ'), A' (πλάστην--'moulder') and the targum (אמרכלא --
a minor temple official) are adduced as support for this
understanding of יוצר . Torrey regards the Pesh. reading
as an interpretive conjecture and denies any double
understanding of יוצר in Matthew ('Foundry').
Torrey's theory has been accepted by K. Elliger (*Das Buch der
zwölf kleinen Propheten* (ATD 25; 2 vols.; 2nd ed.; Göttingen:
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951), 2. 154), P. Lamarche (*Zacharie
IX-XIV: Structure littéraire et messianisme* (EBib; Paris:

Gabalda, 1961) 65), P. Benoit ('The Death of Judas,' *Jesus and
the Gospel I* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1973) 198)
Bruce ('Zechariah,' 341) and M. D. Goulder (*Midrash and
Lection in Matthew* (The Speaker's Lectures in Biblical Studies,
1969-71; London: SPCK, 1974) 127).

/41/ No historical or archaeclogical evidence supports the
thesis. The readings in the versions are not persuasive
evidence since β and A are no doubt dependent on LXX, which in
turn seems to offer a conjectural emendation, according to
which it was understood that the thirty pieces of silver were
tested for their genuineness (cf. δόκιμον) in a furnace. The
Targum completely transforms the meaning of the verse, referring
to pious Israelites whose deeds are written down and deposited
in the temple (Str-B, 1. 1030). Linguistic evidence is against
Torrey, since יוצר always refers to a worker in clay in the OT
and הרׁד is used to designate a founder or moulder. Finally,
the context seems to demand an ignominious destination for the
'lordly price' with which Zechariah was paid off, while Torrey's
hypothesis would obscure this basic concept in the passage
(Cf. Gundry, *Old Testament* 123).

/42/ . . . ἱερὸν θησαυρόν, καλεῖται δὲ κορβανᾶς, εἰς καταγωγὴν
ὑδάτων ἐξαναλίσκων. BAG, 445; Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, 'κορβάν,
κορβανᾶς,' TDNT 3 (1965) 861. κορβανᾶς is not found in LXX,
and the Heb it transliterates is absent in DSS and rabbinic
literature (Str-B, 1. 1028). The term has apparently been
discovered in a pre-A.D. 70 Aramaic inscription, but with
uncertain meaning (W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann, *Matthew*
(AB 26; Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday, 1971) 341).

/43/ 'The Habakkuk Commentary (DSH) and the Gospel of Matthew,'
ST 8 (1955) 18-19. On the meaning of קרבן , see Rengstorf,
'κορβάν,' 860-66. The context in Josephus is concerned with
Pilate's expropriation of the Jewish funds for the purpose of
constructing an aqueduct. קרבנא is used meaning 'gift' in
b. Hul. 8a and perhaps also in *b.Zebah* 116b and *Tg. Hos.* 12:2
(Rengstorf, 'κορβάν' 861, n. 4).

/44/ This meaning is suggested as possible by M. Kohler in
The Jewish Encyclopedia 1. 436 (mentioned by Rengstorf,
'κορβάν,' 861).

/45/ Gundry, *Old Testament* 123.

/46/ Senior, *Passion Narrative* 357-8, n. 34.

/47/ Strecker (*Weg* 80) speaks of Matt 27:3-10 as an
aetiological legend on the name 'field of blood.' While this
is an extreme view (cf. criticisms by Senior, *Passion Narrative*
395-6), the belief that the 'Field of Blood' lies at the heart
of tradition has good foundation (cf. Lindars, *Apologetic* 122;

Schweizer, *Matthew* 504; Senior, *Passion Narrative* 387-8). It
is often thought that the area was a cemetery, known as the
'Field of Blood' before the events of Judas' death were
associated with it (McNeile, *Matthew* 408; Stendahl, *School* 196;
Lindars, *Apologetic* 122) but Benoit ('Death,' 205-6)
characterizes this as a 'gratuitous assumption' in view of
the lack of mention of the name outside the NT.
/48/ Benoit, 'Death' 200-202.
/49/ Jeremias, *Jerusalem* 140. Allen (*Matthew* 289) feels
the name change was due to influence from Jer 19:11.
/50/ The 'potter's field' is regarded as a traditional element
by Stendahl (*School* 197), Montefiore (*Synoptic Gospels,* 2. 343),
Allen (*Matthew* 288), and Lagrange (*Matthieu* 517).
/51/ Benoit, 'Death' 206; cf. also Bruce, 'Zechariah' 324;
Lagrange, *Matthieu* 517; and R. T. France, "The Formula-
Quotations of Matthew 2 and the Problem of Communication,"
NTS 27 (1980-1981) 236.
/52/ Gundry, *Old Testament* 125.
/53/ Lohmeyer-Schmauch (*Matthäus* 380), Lagrange (*Matthieu* 517)
and Bruce ('Zechariah' 346) stress the fundamental importance
of the Shepherd motif in Matt 27:3-10.
/54/ A. G. Wright, 'The Literary Genre Midrash,' *CBQ* 28 (1966)
105-138, 417-456.
/55/ This seems to be assumed by, e.g., G. F. Moore, *Judaism
in the First Centuries of the Christian Era* (2 vols., London:
Cambridge, 1927), 1. 77; S. Horovitz, 'Midrash,' *JE* 8. 548.
/56/ Cf. especially R. Le Déaut ('Apropos d'une définition du
midrash,' *Bib* 50 (1969) 395-413) who says 'Le midrash est en
effect tout un univers que l'on ne découvrira qu'en acceptant
d'emblée sa complexité.' Cf. also D. Patte, *Early Jewish
Hermeneutics in Palestine* (SBL DS 12; Missoula, Mont.:
Scholar's Press, 1975) 117-124.
/57/ The basis for the hybrid term 'Midrash pesher' (cf. W.
H. Brownlee, 'Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of
the Dead Sea Scrolls,' *BA* 14 (1951) 64-65) which is probably
more confusing than helpful (cf. G. Vermes, 'Le "Commentaire
d'Habacuc" et le Nouveau Testament,' *Cahiers Sioniens* 5 (1951),
344-345).
/58/ These three levels are isolated and studied in my
dissertation, 'The Use of the Old Testament in the Passion
Texts of the Gospels' (U. of St. Andrews, 1980) 5-78.
/59/ This popular understanding of midrash appears to derive
from the first characteristic of midrash stated by R. Bloch:
it has its starting point in the text ('Midrash,' *DBSup* 5,
coll. 1263-1281 (c. 1265)).

/60/ For the same reason, R. E. Brown hesitates to speak of
midrash in the Matthean infancy narratives (*The Birth of the
Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew
and Luke* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1977) 560-561).
/61/ X. Léon-Dufour, *The Gospels and the Jesus of History*
(London: Collins and New York: Desclée, 1968) 215.