# 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 relationship 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 ἀθῴων]--v 4) and 'potter' (יוצר [LXX: πεπλασμένον]--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 יוֹצֵר 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 μοι. 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, δώσωμεν 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 בֵּית יְהוָה (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. ܠܐܨܪ 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 יוצר--אוצר /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 יוצר -- אוצר 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.

Notes.

/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-Aramiac 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 Uberlieferung 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 archaeological evidence supports the thesis. The readings in the versions are not persuasive evidence since θ 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 גזרה 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.